

and improvement. What appeared to be one of the most hopeful developments of this time was the romanesque movement, and in the hands of such a master as Richardson, gave not only promise, but fruition of great charm, suitability and beauty. Had he lived longer, a permanent and distinctive style might have been evolved. But there was no one to wear the mantle of the prophet, and, in the hands of numberless followers and imitators, it degenerated, and is not now a live factor in the architecture of today.

The most notable feature of modern work in the States is the close study it shows of Italian, and especially Florentine, Renaissance. The increase of travel, the multiplication of architectural publications, the ease with which architectural and art photographs of every description can be obtained, are largely responsible for this. So close is the study that it often becomes an actual transcript of old work, and it is a curious phase of existing practice that some of the leading architects in the States do not hesitate to plagiarize unblushingly.

Their domestic architecture can be more readily praised, and many country houses have a picturesque charm, a comfort, and a striking suitability most commendable.

To those who crave for originality regardless of other qualities, the development of the sky scraper or high buildings will be an interesting study. It cannot possibly be ignored—cradled in Chicago, it has grown into lusty youth and manhood in the large cities of the States. It is indigenous to the soil of America, and I am glad to say that it has not penetrated to any great extent into Canada, or been transplanted to the Old World. These erections are like the genii that the fisherman evoked and could not control. I do not know of any very high building that its architect can be said to have mastered; they invariably master their designer. Never in the world's history has so many important and costly buildings been erected of so outrageously ugly a character. Were they built for eternity, like the temples of Egypt or of Greece, we might well tremble for our reputation as architects in future ages, but fortunately—dare I say—they bear within themselves the elements of decay. I am satisfied that before long a more enlightened judgment, not to say taste, on the part of the public will condemn all such.

Coming to our own country, I was asked recently: Has Canada, with all her timber and forests and numberless wooden houses, developed any wood architecture? I had to confess that so far as I knew she had not. Since then I have asked myself, is there any reason why she should not? I cannot find any, and I throw it out to-day to you, my conferees, many of whom, doubtless, will have multiplied opportunities of constructing in wood, to take this into your serious consideration. We have often designed for stone and brick and executed in wood. If we study the architecture of the countries which are relatively similar to ours in the abundance of their timber, we may obtain useful ideas. Switzerland, for example, has many old interesting wooden houses well worthy of our study, such as those of Iseltwald, Monthovon, Fischenthal, etc. In Norway and Sweden, also, we have charming examples of natural and legitimate wood construction, with ornament not only beautiful in itself but appropriate to the material.

About fifty years ago, and since that time we have had some good architects in Canada—men of refined thought, educated tastes, and a wide knowledge of both classic and Gothic work. In Montreal they gave to us the head office of the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of British North America, the old Court House, the English cathedral, and other buildings. In Ottawa the original block of the Parliament buildings. In Toronto the main building of the University, and others there and elsewhere.

Succeeding these, diversity has reigned—a straining after originality, a new style which often resulted only in uncouth, ill-proportioned buildings, with badly designed detail; but of these I need not further particularize. Since that time, however, better training has produced better and more refined architecture, and gives promise of greater achievements in the future.

The establishment of a regular chair of architecture, through the munificence of one of our honorary members, Mr. McDonald, at our great University of McGill at Montreal, and the filling of that chair by a gentleman, now one of our number, who is an enthusiast in his work, well trained in the art traditions of the past, and who brings energy and the strength of his manhood to the training of students of architecture, augurs well for the future of our beloved profession.

Older countries have the advantage of having numerous examples of old, good work ever before the eyes of their architects. This is a comparatively new country. We have few antiquities of any kind, whether historical or architectural. What we have got it is our bounden duty to jealously guard and preserve. Indifference, ignorance or personal interest have been the factors which have robbed us of many an interesting piece of antiquity in Montreal. In this delightfully quaint and picturesque city of Quebec, full of the charm of antiquity and historic interest, and to which it is always a pleasure to come, permit my humble voice to say: Cling to everything that makes your city interesting from an antiquarian point of view. "Grapple them to your souls with hooks of steel." Already much of the full flavor and antique aroma has been lost; let no more go, as you value your noble heritage. Your old gates are nearly all gone, and only live in drawings and models preserved in the Redpath Library in Montreal. On a recent visit St. John's gate was in process of demolition; although not an ancient gate it is worth preserving. Another scheme contemplates levelling a portion of your old city walls, which, I trust, the good sense of the citizens will never permit. Many a city would give much to possess your glorious legacy from antiquity.

All over the province the quaint old village churches with their

golden spires are being replaced with structures—many of them exceedingly pretentious and "towny," if you will permit the word. Not long ago in a small village I counted five towers and spires on one church, surely adjuncts unnecessarily abundant in a country parish. Personally, I regret to see the disappearance of the simple rural church hallowed by many years of worship and round which the social life of many generations has been nurtured.

Fellow members, let us broaden our minds with an enlarged knowledge of the sister arts painting, sculpture, archaeology, and the industrial arts, as they touch and affect our profession; nothing is too trivial in our work for the genius of art to beautify. The higher our ideals the better will be our work. It may not be appreciated now as it ought, but some time it will. Many noble buildings have come down to us from antiquity—the very name of their architects often unknown, and yet they have been a joy and an inspiration to countless numbers. I sometimes think we have the best and most interesting profession in the world. We touch life at so many points; we have so much power in our hands to sweeten and enrich the existence of our fellows. Let us accept our work as a sacred trust, not as a means simply of making money or gaining a livelihood. Let us rally round our Association; it must prove mutually helpful to ourselves and to the community at large.

The members were then called to discuss the proper measures to be taken in order to protect more effectively the licensed and duly qualified architects against the competition of unqualified persons who arrogate to themselves the honorable title of architect without being able to give an equivalent for the fees which they exact. It was generally admitted that it was time for the Association to act for the good of its members in this direction, otherwise it would soon have no standing.

The new Illinois architect's license bill, as published in the last number of the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER, and which has for its object the organization of a state board of examiners of architects with all the ordinary powers given to a committee of this kind, was given as an example of what ought to be done in the province of Quebec.

After a lengthy debate lasting till the luncheon hour, and resumed after luncheon till 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the question of amending the charter in that sense was left to a special committee composed of Messrs. Berlinguet, David Ouellet, Baillarge, Tanguay, J. Z. Resther, Maurice Perreault and J. Nelson, with all the general officers of the Association, with power to add to their number if necessary. This committee is instructed to report to a general meeting of the Association in Montreal, early in November next. Another meeting of the Association will also be held in the city of Quebec sometime before the opening of the Legislature.

On the proposition of Mr. Hutchison, seconded by Mr. Mailloux, it was decided that the next general annual meeting of the Association will be held in the city of Montreal at a certain date to be fixed by the Council. This closed the regular business session.

The next item on the programme was a lecture by Prof. S. H. Capper, of McGill University.

The following is a resume of Prof. Capper's lecture. The full text of the address will be presented in our next issue.

Mr. Capper took as his subject "Architectural Notes on New York Tall Buildings," and treated it with a view to initiate some general discussion among the members of the Association. He first commented on "towering" as an ideal in art, exemplified in the architecture of America by the tower of the city hall at Philadelphia, and by the memorial obelisk at Washington, both of exaggerated height, but not otherwise remarkable as artistic efforts. The former to obtain its actual height was distorted in design; the latter was a *reductio ad absurdum* of the ancient Egyptian monolith.