

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



JULY
1931

Volume 3

Number 7

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OFFICERS

President.....	ROBERT D. KOHN, 56 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
First Vice-President.....	ERNEST J. RUSSELL, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.
Second Vice-President.....	HORACE W. PEASLEE, 1228 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
Secretary.....	FRANK C. BALDWIN, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.
Treasurer.....	EDWIN BERGSTROM, Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

For One Year (1931-32)		For Two Years (1931-33)	
FREDERICK W. GAMBER, 616 Walnut St., Cincinnati, Ohio (Great Lakes Div.)	FRANKLIN O. ADAMS, 509 Twigg Street, Tampa, Fla. (South Atlantic Div.)	M. H. FURBERGER, 110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Div.)	FRED. H. MEYER, 525 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)
CHARLES T. INGRAM, 1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. (Middle Atl. Div.)			
FRED F. WILSON, P. O. Box 497, Bozeman, Mont. (West Mount. Div.)			
For Three Years (1931-34)			
ALBERT L. BROCKWAY, Clinton Sq. Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y. (New York Div.)	GEORGE H. GRAY, 30 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Conn. (New England Div.)	FREDERICK M. MANN, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (Can. Sta. Div.)	

LIST OF CHAPTERS 1931

ALABAMA—*Frederic Child Biggin, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; †Jesse W. Green, 713 Education Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.	MONTANA—*Chandler C. Cohagen, Box 1305, Billings, Mont. †W. B. Flew, Bozeman, Mont.
ALBANY—*Norman R. Sturjya, 91 State St., Albany, N. Y.; †Harvey W. Jackson, 32 Clermont St., Albany, N. Y.	NEBRASKA—*W. L. Younkis, Capitol Commission, Lincoln, Nebr.; †Noel S. Wallace, 2561 Whitmore Ave., Omaha, Nebr.
ARKANSAS—*George H. Wittenberg, Home Insurance Bldg., Little Rock Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.	NEW JERSEY—*Seymour Williams, Woodruff Bldg., Rahway N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
BALTIMORE—*Henry E. T. White, Baltimore Life Insurance Building, Baltimore, Md.; †Charles D. Loomis, 12 East Pleasant Street, Baltimore, Md.	NEW YORK—*Stephen F. Voorhes, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Theodore I. Coe, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
BOSTON—*Wm. Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.; †Millard B. Gulick, 20 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.	NORTH CAROLINA—*James B. Lynch, Southern Bldg., Wilmington, N. C.; †W. W. Dodge, Jr., 20 Woodlark Rd., Asheville, N. C.
BROOKLYN—*Chas. C. Wagner, 32 Court St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; †George Francis Kies, 130 E. 15th St., New York, N. Y.	NORTH TEXAS—*Rocco P. DeWitt, Kirby Building, Dallas, Texas; †M. C. Kleuser, 806 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas.
BUFFALO—*Karl G. Schmill, 1242 Prudential Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.; †Benning C. Buell, 547 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Henry H. Guterson, 526 Powell St., San Francisco, Cal.; †James H. Mitchell, 969 Pine St., San Francisco, Cal.
CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*Philip R. Hooton, Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.; †E. L. Stouffer, 206 Administration Bldg., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.	NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Karl E. Morrison, Marine Bank Bldg., Erie, Pa.; †Walter T. Monahan, 808 Palace Hardware Bldg., Erie, Pa.
CENTRAL NEW YORK—*Melvin L. King, 300 Denison Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.; †Merton E. Granger, 474 So. Saina St., Syracuse, N. Y.	OKLAHOMA—*Leon B. Senter, 306 Philhower Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.; †Asbury Endacott, 625 Wright Building, Tulsa, Okla.
CHICAGO—*Clarence W. Farrier, Administration Bldg., Burnham Park, Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrod, 201 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.	OREGON—*Harold W. Doty, 697 East 46th Street, Portland, Oregon; †W. H. Crowell, 1041 Pacific Building, Portland, Oregon.
CINCINNATI—*Ernest Pickering, 1 Interwood Place, Cincinnati, Ohio; †Russell Potter, 1905 The American Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.	PHILADELPHIA—*Ralph B. Bencker, 1601 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.; †M. Edmunds Dunlap, 1805 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
CLEVELAND—*Philip L. Small, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; †James H. Duthie, Union Trust Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.	PITTSBURGH—*Frederick Bigger, Westinghouse Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Robert C. Bowers, 407 N. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
COLORADO—*George H. Williamson, Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.; †Roland L. Linder, Insurance Building, Denver, Colo.	RHODE ISLAND—*Gorham Henshaw, 87 Weybosset Street, Providence, R. I.; †John F. Hogan, 315 Grosvenor Bldg., Providence, R. I.
COLUMBUS—*W. C. Roman, 1694 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, Atlas Building, 8 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio.	SAN DIEGO—*Wm. Templeton Johnson, 1400 San Diego Trust & Savings Bldg., San Diego, Calif.; †Charles H. Mills, 1400 San Diego Trust & Savings Bldg., San Diego, Calif.
CONNECTICUT—*Edward B. Caldwell, First National Bank Bldg., Bridgeport, Conn.; †Louis A. Walsh, 69 Center Street, Waterbury, Conn.	SANTA BARBARA—*Russell Ray, San Marcos Building, Santa Barbara, Cal.; †E. Keith Lockard, 114 East de la Guerra Street, Santa Barbara, Cal.
DAYTON—*Edwin F. Simpson, 869 Reinbold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Eliasson R. Smith, 1005 Commercial Bldg., Dayton, Ohio.	SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE—*Thos. A. Foster, 909 Brooks Bldg., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; †Donald F. Innes, 176 S. Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
DETROIT—*Branson V. Gamber, 3500 Union Trust Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †Arthur K. Hyde, 904 Marquette Bldg., Detroit, Mich.	SHREVEPORT—*Clarence W. King, Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Neid, Shreveport, La.
EASTERN OHIO—*Barton E. Brooks, 821 Dollar Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio; †Walter J. Canfield, 1301 City Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.	SOUTH CAROLINA—*Albert Simons, 43 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.
FLORIDA CENTRAL—*Henry L. Taylor, Times Building, St. Petersburg, Fla.; †C. Sedgwick Moss, 509 J. Bruce Smith Bldg., St. Petersburg, Fla.	SOUTH GEORGIA—*Walter P. Marshall, 1001 Savannah Bank & Trust Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Suggden, 125 East 49th Street, Savannah, Ga.
FLORIDA NORTH—*Mellen C. Greeley, Fifth floor, Exchange Bldg., 218 West Adams St., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Jefferson D. Powell, Professional Building, Jacksonville, Fla.	SOUTH TEXAS—*Alfred C. Finn, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas; †J. Russ Baty, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas.
FLORIDA SOUTH—*Richard Klahnal, 930 Soybold Bldg., Miami, Fla.; †Russell T. Panecast, 1139 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Harold C. Chambers, 1107 Cal. Reserve Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.; †H. Roy Kelley, 1102 Architects' Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
GEORGIA—*Francis P. Smith, Norris Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †Preston S. Stevens, 101 Marotta Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Henry Y. Shaub, 201 1/2 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.; †Harry E. Yessler, 38 Schmidt Bldg., York, Pa.
GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 902 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 463 Houseman Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.	ST. LOUIS—*Eugene S. Klein, 716 American Trust Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †P. John Hosmer, 3605 Laolode Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
HAWAII—*Wm. C. Furer, 507 Hawaiian Trust Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.	ST. PAUL—*Roy H. Haslund, 1212 Builders' Exchange, St. Paul, Minn.; †Edgar Busenger, 525 Minnesota St., Rochester, Minn.
INDIANA—*Arthur Bohn, 215 East 32nd St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Warren D. Miller, 619 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.	TENNESSEE—*William Crutchfield, 1st Nat. Bank Bldg., Chattanooga, Tenn.; †Louis H. Bull, 1301 Volunteer Bldg., Chattanooga, Tenn.
IOWA—*Vernon F. Tinsley, Hubbell Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa; †Edwin H. Wetherell, 517 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.	TOLEDO—*Leonard Gerow, Spitzer Bldg., Toledo, Ohio; †Karl B. Hols, 1118 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
KANSAS CITY—*H. H. Dunham, 300 West 47th Street, Kansas City, Mo.; †Raymond L. Voskamp, 4011 Charlotte Street, Kansas City, Mo.	UTAH—*Raymond J. Ashton, Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †Lorenzo Young, 1458 Princeton Ave., Salt Lake City, Utah.
KANSAS—*Charles W. Shaver, 147 1/2 South Santa Fe Street, Salina, Kansas; †George M. Beal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kansas.	VIRGINIA—*Philip N. Stern, 21 Law Building, Fredericksburg, Va.; †S. J. Collins, 230 Institute St., Staunton, Va.
KENTUCKY—*Wm. G. O'Toole, 714 Louisville Trust Bldg., Louisville, Ky.; †G. M. Grimes, 1708 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.	WASHINGTON, D. C.—*George Oakley Totten, Jr., 808 17th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Fred E. Robbins, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.
LOUISIANA—Richard Kosh, 604 Audubon Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †Andrew M. Lockett, Jr., Balter Bldg., New Orleans, La.	WASHINGTON STATE—*Roland E. Borhek, 918 Washington Bldg., Tacoma; †Lance E. Gowen, 307 Lumber Exchange Bldg., Seattle, Wash.
MADISON—*Frank Riley, 24 E. Millin Street, Madison, Wis.; †James R. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.	WEST TEXAS—*Emmett T. Jackson, Builders' Exchange Bldg., San Antonio, Texas; †Robert M. Ayres, Smith-Young Tower, San Antonio, Texas.
MINNESOTA—*Wilbur H. Tuelar, 104 S. 9th St., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Guy C. Crawford, 517 Essex Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.	WEST VIRGINIA—*L. G. Tucker, Masonic Temple Bldg., Charleston, W. Va.; †Herbert S. Kyle, 1107 Union Trust Building, Charleston, W. Va.
MISSISSIPPI—*Emmett J. Hull, Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †Frank P. Gates, Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.	WISCONSIN—*Roger C. Kirchoff, 710 N. Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1240 N. Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.

*Presidents.

†Secretaries.

THE OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects

Published Monthly by

The American Institute of Architects

Executive and Publication Offices, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS THE COPY. \$1 PER YEAR. (FOREIGN \$2)

Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects.
All communications for publication should be sent to The Secretary, The A. I. A.

Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects

Entered as second-class matter, February 9, 1929, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.

The Unification of the Architectural Profession

A FOREWORD—By THE SECRETARY OF THE INSTITUTE

CIVILIZATION is now going through a crisis. Readjustments and new relations are taking place throughout the whole world. When stabilization finally comes in the United States the architectural profession, and the individual architect, will be confronted with conditions of practice and with forms of competition not encountered before. The opinion of many architects is that the profession of architecture, at least in the United States, must be prepared to meet the new conditions if it is to survive as a profession, and if it intends to maintain intellectual command in the building industry. Now is the time to lay the foundation, to prepare for competition, and to make ready for the opportunities of the future.

In numbers the architects are but a handful. Because they are individualists they have so far failed to unite as one professional group under national leadership. At present there are a multiplicity of independent state, city and county organizations of architects and of draftsmen, and other types of local societies—all of which are uncoordinated and, therefore, a source of confusion to the architectural profession itself, to the building industry, to the community, to the public

press, and to the legislative and executive agencies of state and federal governments.

One effect of many uncoordinated local societies is to encourage the individual architect to make small contributions of his time and money to one of them, and to then reach the conclusion that he has thereby fully discharged the obligations which he owes to his community and to his profession.

The architectural profession is too small and too widely scattered, and too sensitive to economic phases and social changes to support multitudinous isolated organizations.

The imperative necessity of unification of the architectural profession under national leadership is apparent. The solution of the problem—the writing of a workable plan for making unification a fact—is another matter!

Following the Sixty-fourth Convention of the Institute, in San Antonio, in April, the President of the Institute and the Board of Directors appointed a special Committee on Unification to meet with a like committee from the State Societies for the purpose of developing a workable

plan under which every reputable practicing architect would have the privilege and duty of putting his shoulder to the wheel for the purpose of advancing the cause of architecture and his own professional interest.

The Chairman of the Institute's Committee on Unification, Edwin Bergstrom, of California, was elected chairman of a meeting between that Committee and the Unification Committee of the State Societies, of which Robert H. Orr, of California, is Chairman. The meeting took place in Indianapolis, Indiana, on June 26 and 27, 1931.

The report on the work of that joint meeting, as prepared by Mr. Bergstrom, appears as a communication and report to the entire membership in the following pages of this number of THE OCTAGON.

For the information of each Institute member, it should be stated that the report has been sent as a separate document with individual letters of transmittal to the Presidents of the State Societies; to the Presidents of the Chapters of the Institute; and to the members of the Board of Directors of the Institute.

In his letter of transmittal to Chapter Presidents the Chairman of the joint Committees said:

It was the understanding of the Unification Committees that the members of the State Societies Committee would consider the report with their respective societies and secure their approval of the fundamental principles of unification agreed to by the Committees, and that the Institute would present the report to the Presidents of its various Chapters for the same purpose.

In presenting and considering the report, it should be clearly understood that the report is tentative and is not the final conclusion of the two Committees.

If the chapter approves or is at variance with any of the major fundamental elements of unification as they are contained in the report, then the Committees ask that it set out those approvals or variances in writing and send them directly to the Chairman, Edwin Bergstrom, at The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C.

All letters should be in the hands of the Chairman before September 1. He has been requested by the Committees to analyze the letters as he receives them, harmonize their expressions so far as he can, and present his conclusions to the two Committees on or before October 1, 1931. Undoubtedly, the Committees will hold another joint meeting prior to the Institute Board meeting in November, and thereafter will meet with the Board.

Meanwhile there is a vast amount of work which must be done to get ready for those meetings. The legal questions involved and the changes in the corporate arti-

cles and by-laws of the Institute to permit a unification will have to be considered and solved. The Chairman will see that this work is done, but the societies and chapters must help by transmitting their views promptly.

By order of the two Committees, this report will be published in THE OCTAGON, and released to other interested magazines and papers.

The purpose in here submitting the report to every Institute member is two-fold:

First—to invite his consideration of the reasons for unification, which the Board and the Convention deemed to be of great weight;

Second—to invite his support of the fundamental principles set forth in the report, under which it is hoped to make unification an accomplished fact.

The chapters of the Institute have been requested to send their comments and their approvals to the Chairman of the Unification Committee, at The Octagon, prior to September 1. Individual members are asked to express their views at their own chapter meetings, or to send them direct to The Octagon. They should bear in mind that:

The report is a tentative one. It does not present the final conclusions of the Unification Committees, or of the Institute Board. The report merely attempts to set out certain basic principles—a skeleton outline if you like—under which it is believed unification can be brought about. Therefore, no concern need be given to the lesser details of the proposed set-up, to the phraseology used in this or that paragraph, or to technical or hypothetical cases which might tend to show that the scheme is not one hundred percent perfect. Many minor imperfections are inevitable. They must be met and ironed out under the process of time.

What is sought now is a statement of fundamental principles on which the whole profession can unite, and under which The American Institute of Architects with the cooperation of the State Societies of architects can proceed to organize the architectural profession as a compact, aggressive and democratic national organization of professional men.

FRANK C. BALDWIN, *Secretary.*

The Report of the Unification Committees

By EDWIN BERGSTROM, F. A. I. A., Chairman of Joint Meeting

July 21, 1931

Unification Committee for the Institute:

	EDWIN BERGSTROM, <i>Chairman</i> , California
CHARLES BUTLER, New York	LOUIS LABEAUME, Missouri
FREDERICK W. GARBER, Ohio	FREDERICK H. MEYER, California

Unification Committee for the State Societies:

	ROBERT H. ORR, <i>Chairman</i> , California
TIRRELL J. FERRENZ, Illinois	WALTER R. McCORNACK, Ohio
MERRITT HARRISON, Indiana	LANCELOT SUKERT, Michigan
FREDERICK MATHESIUS JR., New York	R. M. TRIMBLE, Pennsylvania

*Consideration of the basic principles herein proposed is earnestly requested
Please leave minor matters of form and details of organization for later development*

PREFACE

The Board of Directors of The American Institute of Architects stated to the sixty-fourth convention of the Institute at San Antonio in April of this year that—

The exercise of leadership is primarily the function of the national body and always should be. The Institute must lead the architectural thought of the country, and develop general principles and policies which it must promulgate for the general benefit of the public and the architectural profession. Consequently, it cannot act in detail to carry out these policies throughout the forty-eight states, and the state societies that have been developed are agencies which will achieve this result.

The Board feels that the Institute, in collaboration with the state societies, should work out some plan of organization which will give the unattached men in the various communities an opportunity to become members of architectural societies in their states, and by which those state societies shall be related to the Institute in a very definite manner. To this end the Board invited the present state societies to hold a meeting at this Convention, in order that they might discuss these matters and so that the Board might perhaps find a method of relating these societies organically to the Institute. The Board believes that they should become a definite part of the Institute organization. It believes that this can be brought about without changing the character of the Institute membership, or giving up anything that it has so splendidly achieved in the seventy-four years of its existence. It believes that the Institute can immeasurably expand its usefulness and its influence by so doing.

Therefore, the Board offers this resolution for approval and adoption by the Convention:

Resolved, That The American Institute of Architects, in Sixty-fourth Annual Convention assembled, believing that the prevailing conditions with respect to the practice of architecture and the development of state societies of architects offers a most opportune time to collaborate with such groups and bring about a unification of the architectural profession, hereby authorizes and directs the Board of Directors of the Institute to invite such societies to collaborate with it and to formulate a plan whereby such societies can be brought into direct unified relationship with the Institute, and to present at the next Convention the necessary recommendations to achieve such result.

The idea of unifying the profession under the leadership of the Institute appealed to the Convention and it unanimously adopted the resolution above quoted.

There are active state organizations of architects in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Washington, California, New Jersey, and Florida. Representatives of these state organizations, except the two last named, met with representatives of the Connecticut Architectural League and the Arizona State Board of Architects in San Antonio prior to the Convention of the Institute. These representatives subscribed to the unification idea and in the Convention supported the position of the Board of the Institute.

During the Convention the Board of the Institute set in motion the unification program by adopting the following resolution:

Resolved, That the resolution of the Convention with respect to the unification of the architectural profession be referred to the special committee appointed by the President, with instructions to confer with a like special committee representing the state societies of architects and to report and make recommendations to the Board of Directors of the Institute at the November meeting.

The two Unification Committees were appointed immediately and conferred jointly with the Board of the Institute.

Thereafter the two committees held a joint session in San Antonio, and adopted a procedure for developing the unification plan. They directed Edwin Bergstrom, Chairman of the Institute Committee, and Robert H. Orr, Chairman of the State Societies Committee, jointly to develop a tentative plan of unification, without instructing them as to its elements, and to present their plan to a joint meeting of the committees to be held in Indianapolis in June. That joint meeting is the one covered by this report.

THE REPORT

The joint meeting of the Unification Committee of The American Institute of Architects and the Unification Committee of the State Societies of architects was held in Indianapolis, Indiana, on June 26 and 27, 1931. The meeting was opened with the presentation of a tentative plan of unification prepared jointly at the request of the committees by Chairmen Orr and Bergstrom. That presentation was followed by an expression from each committee member, and by the consideration of differing plans of unification. The meeting continued through a two-day discussion of the fundamentals involved in a unification program.

The members of the two committees unanimously agreed that the final plan of unification must be based on and embody certain fundamental elements, the most essential of which were declared to be as follows:

(1) *One national organization*

There should be only one national organization of architects and that should be The American Institute of Architects.

(2) *The Institute should be inclusive*

The American Institute of Architects should represent all factors of the profession of architecture nationally.

(3) *State organizations*

A state-wide organization should be incorporated and maintained in each state to represent all factors of the profession of architecture within the state.

(4) *Local branches of state organizations*

Every state organization of architects should establish and maintain local branches within the political divisions of the state, and such local branches should be allied with the local chapters of the Institute for pronouncements and affairs affecting the profession locally.

(5) *Chapters of the Institute*

The Institute should establish and maintain chapters of the Institute within the states as local organizations of Institute members.

(6) *Membership of state organizations*

Every state organization should provide corporate memberships to which shall be eligible every registered, licensed, practicing or resident architect in the state and every person teaching subjects relating to the profession of architecture in recognized schools of architecture in the state.

(7) *Architectural clubs—Junior Associates*

Local architectural clubs should be established and maintained within every state to which shall be eligible every person, not a corporate member in the state society, who is employed within the state for the preparation of drawings, specifications, or other documents or for the supervision or superintendence of the construction of works of architecture.

Such architectural clubs or the members thereof shall be allied as Junior Associates with the chapters of the Institute within the state.

The Junior Associate should be under no compulsion to change his membership status, unless he becomes a practicing architect. This would also replace the present Junior Class of the Institute.

(8) *Student clubs—Student Associates*

Local student clubs should be established and maintained in every recognized school of architecture within the state, wherein every student of architecture shall be eligible to become a member while he is attending such school or while he is spending the major part of his time in post graduate architectural studies in such school, or elsewhere under its jurisdiction.

Such student clubs or the members thereof shall be allied with the chapters of the Institute within the state as Student Associates.

(9) Alliance of state organizations with the Institute

Every state organization of architects, as and when it becomes representative of the entire profession of architecture within the state, shall be eligible for alliance with The American Institute of Architects.

(10) Convention representation

Every state organization of architects when allied to The American Institute of Architects should pay annual dues to the Institute, dependent on the number and classes of the members of the state organization, and be represented by a delegate and one or more alternates in the conventions of the Institute. Such delegates shall be Institute members. Each state organization shall be entitled to cast through its delegate or his proxy at least one vote on each question at the convention, and not more than three such votes apportioned according to the membership of the state organization, but the total number of such votes of all delegates of the 48 state societies shall not exceed 96 votes in a convention limited to a total of 250 votes.

(11) Election of Directors by Divisions

Those members of the Board of Directors of the Institute who represent geographical divisions of the country, the Regional Directors, should be nominated by the chapters of the Institute within the respective divisions and elected by letter-ballot of the Institute members within the respective divisions, prior to conventions.

(12) Objects and purposes of state organizations

The objects and purposes of every state organization of architects should be similar to the objects and purposes of the national organization.

(13) National leadership vested in Institute

The American Institute of Architects should adopt and promulgate the general policies of the profession of architecture and carry on all national activities relating to that profession.

(14) Support of Institute by state organizations

Every state organization of architects and its branches should support the national organization unreservedly in its national activities.

(15) Freedom of action of state organizations

Every state organization of architects should maintain and exercise the freedom of action of an independent organization with respect to the manner, degree and extent to which and the time within which it supports and carries out the general policies adopted by the national organization, but it shall not nullify or subvert any such general policy.

In making the above declarations the committees did not intend thereby to suggest any change in the memberships of individual architects in the Institute, their representation by delegates in the conventions of the Institute, their method of selecting the delegates, or the value of the votes of the delegates. Nor did the committees intend to suggest any change in the disciplinary procedure with respect to Institute members or in the status of the chapters other than to require the chapters to act in collaboration with the local branches of the state organizations in matters of local pronouncements and affairs, and probably to place upon the chapters the prime responsibility for the Junior Associates and the Student Associates.

The committees at this meeting considered only superficially such matters as dues and the manner of their collection, the manner of organizing state societies and the establishment of permanent offices by them, the nomenclature, powers and duties of the state organizations and their further affiliations and associations, the disciplinary procedure for non-members of the Institute within the state organizations, the privileges of the various memberships in the state organizations and with respect to the Institute and other details of unification. The discussion of these and many other matters will follow logically at the next meeting of the committees, after the major fundamental elements of unification have been developed.

The Architects' Registration Law in Ohio

By WALTER R. MCCORNACK, A. I. A., *President, The Ohio State Association of Architects*

THE Ohio State Association of Architects attempted for several years to secure the passage of legislation providing for the registration of architects. Those bills, which included both architects and engineers, met with disaster at each attempt. In 1929, the architects of the state, led

by the Toledo group, introduced a bill which did not include the engineers, and were almost successful in securing its passage. At the last moment some influence, thought to be inspired by those interested in the erection of group houses, succeeded in burying the bill in committee. The work done

was not wasted, however, as the friends made, and the legislative experience gained at that session, were of the greatest assistance in accomplishing the legislation this year.

Preparation of bill

In October, 1930, the Executive Committee of the State Association appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Charles St. John Chubb, in charge of the Department of Architecture at Ohio State University, to prepare a bill for introduction during the early days of the General Assembly of 1931.

After the first draft of the bill was completed, it was submitted to each Chapter of the Institute in Ohio for study and criticism. When the criticisms were returned to the committee and such changes were made as were deemed wise, the revised bill was then submitted to the Executive Committee of the State Association for review, after which it was ordered introduced in the Senate and House.

Introduction of bill—Arguments

The bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Lloyd, of Portsmouth, and in the House by Representative Hansen, of Toledo. The architects of Ohio are deeply indebted to these men for the splendid work they did in securing the passage of the measure.

Great care was taken in presenting the case to the committees of reference of the Senate and House. A group of seven architects, one of whom acted as chairman of the group, was appointed to present the arguments in favor of registration, which were divided into six sections. The chairman allowed each speaker three minutes in which to present his portion of the case. The divisions were as follows:

1. National policy of registration of architects.
2. The need for registration in the state.
3. The relation of the architects in the state without registration to those in surrounding states with registration.
4. The benefits to the public.
5. The benefits to the architects.
6. Resume of the advantages of registration.

The time of the reference committees was thus conserved, and the friendship of these small but influential groups was secured at the outset, with the result that both committees were unanimous in reporting the bill out with a recommendation for passage.

One of the strongest arguments used was a map of the United States showing in cross-hatching all states having registration laws. Ohio stood out as an isolated spot, entirely surrounded by the cross-hatched states with registration. With the average legislator, that settled the case, as it was easy for

them to see that Ohio became the dumping ground for undesirables from the surrounding states.

Some difficulties in disguise

What at first appeared to be a difficulty, but which later proved to be a blessing, was the wholesale introduction of bills to license many types of engineers, barbers, morticians, beauty parlor operators, and others. This aroused considerable opposition to wholesale creation of boards, which seemed to many to be government by commission instead of by direct legislative action. However, the opposition abated, and all of these measures were passed, only to be vetoed by Governor White for valid reasons. The blessing to the architects through the introduction of this large number of similar bills came through the study of the veto messages which accompanied their rejection. Those messages clearly pointed out the defects, and the architects' bill was promptly amended to eliminate the objectionable features.

Counsel retained

The State Association retained Eagleson and Laylin, attorneys of Columbus, to study the bill and to help steer it through. Their advice and experience in legislative matters were invaluable.

Steering committee functions

A special steering committee was appointed to follow the bill in the General Assembly, under the leadership of Mr. R. C. Kempton, of Columbus, who, with Mr. Robert G. Ingleson, of Columbus, Mr. Charles F. Cellarius, of Cincinnati, and Col. Vernon Redding, of Mansfield, did splendid work all through the session. Also active in assisting the special committee were Thomas D. Best and Charles A. Langdon of Toledo; Walter G. Schaeffer of Dayton, R. F. Eastman of Springfield; Wesley P. Ridenour of Portsmouth; Thomas D. McLaughlin of Lima, and Walter J. Canfield of Youngstown.

Consideration by Governor

With all our machinery working smoothly, the bill passed both Houses with but little opposition and was sent to the Governor, who, with his advisors, gave it very careful study.

Governor White was opposed to the wholesale licensing of so-called trade professions, and all during our campaign of education the point was stressed that there is a difference between registration and licensing. The former applying to such outstanding professions as medicine, law, architecture, and engineering, related in a large degree to health and safety, while licensing applies to the trades or trade-professions, the activities of which are regulated by existing laws, so far as health and safety are concerned.

While there was little difficulty in securing the passage of the bill, once it got to the floor of the Senate and House, constant attention was required to prevent it from being lost in the unusual mass of general legislation introduced at this last session.

For the final step, which was the signing of the bill by Governor White, Mr. Frederick W. Garber, of Cincinnati, was appointed a committee of one to call on the Governor and to present the arguments in favor of registration, and we can safely assume that he did a good job since the bill was signed on April 30, 1931, and becomes a law ninety days thereafter.

Able registration board sought

Recognizing that the law will be ineffective without a Registration Board of able men, the State Association appointed a committee of three, consisting of Mr. Frederick W. Garber, of Cincinnati, Mr. Harry I. Schenck, of Dayton, and Mr. Robert G. Ingleson, of Columbus, to present a list of fifteen architects to the Governor, all of whom are regarded by the profession as qualified to serve on the Board. The list includes both Institute and non-Institute men, and the record of the appointments by Governor White encourages us to believe that we shall have a good Board.

Mr. R. C. Kempton, as chairman of the steering committee, is constantly making political contacts for the purpose of securing the proper men on the Registration Board.

The fruits of cooperation

Many architects throughout the state, both within and without the Institute's membership, worked faithfully to secure registration, and we confidently count upon them for continuing cooperation during the formative year before us.

While the bill is not perfect, it will be of inestimable value in raising standards, and in uniting the architects of the state in a manner not to be accomplished in any other way.

The State Association is prepared to support the Registration Board, and to assist in any way possible to place the practice of architecture on a higher plane by means of the powers granted the Board under the new law.

The operation of the bill will be carefully observed, and it is hoped that the weak spots found in our law and in those of other states may result in the preparation of a uniform law which may be adopted nationally.

The long struggle to secure our registration law has taught the architects the value of organized attack in legislative matters, and will result in their active participation in other forms of legislation for the benefit of the building public, which always has been, and still is, poorly represented in our legislative halls.

Editor's Note: The author of this article, Walter R. McCornack, does not mention his own part in securing the Ohio registration law. His brother architects in the state are of the opinion that—"Without his leadership the law might never have been passed. He led the architects against almost overwhelming opposition."

With the Editors

The Architectural Forum.

To Bring Back the Building Industry—Kenneth K. Stowell.

The building industry is exhorted to get under way with its work so that prosperity may be brought back. We are told that if building would pick up, the suppliers of materials would resume production on a large scale, putting people back to work, giving them purchasing power, new demands for staples and luxuries, more people to supply these, and so on, and the cycle turns upward. The government is doing its best to keep the building industry alive doing federal work while waiting for private projects to be undertaken. States and municipalities likewise. Yet what types of buildings shall the industry concentrate upon to thus bring back prosperity? Certainly the industry itself should know! What means has it of inaugurating projects for its own and the common good? The industry itself is not organized, it does not study the supply of and demand for buildings. It does not, as

an industry, plan its work. It depends rather largely on the guess or judgment of the entrepreneur builder (sometimes called "the promoter" or "speculative builder") and takes it for granted that governmental, institutional, educational and religious buildings will develop about as formerly. The promotional or speculative building activity is controlled by individual initiative in search of quick profit rather than by sound investigation to ascertain a real need and to provide an economic building. If an office building is successful in a certain section of the city, others will be undertaken nearby in the hope of the same success, until an excess of office space produces abnormal vacancy percentages and lower rentals. Thus a "natural" process of working out of the old law of supply and demand is brought about, with equally "natural" periods of boom and depression in the building industry. The "law of diminishing returns" is relentlessly at work.

This is, of course, not the whole story or the complete picture, but it does indicate that it is im-

perative for the industry to organize for its own stabilization and protection, to have its own fact-finding and statistical body to study building needs throughout the country and to formulate a production program based on analysis which would be of permanent benefit to all. Capital would not be lacking to back building projects which were in line with such a program. Capital is now shy about construction loans, for it has suffered the after-effects of the speculative building boom. It has loaned on uneconomic structures; it is foreclosing on properties it does not want because it looked only at the "cost and income set-up" for the properties and not at basic conditions. Today great building projects are being considered in the same short-sighted way, and the result will be the same. Until the leaders in architecture, engineering, real estate, building, investment, contracting and manufacturing realize that planned construction can be brought about by cooperation and coordination, we may expect cycles and even catastrophes. This is but one reason for our advocating the organization and integration of the building industry.

The Constructor

(Magazine of the Associated General Contractors)

Practical Means of Cooperating.

A. P. Greensfelder, President of the Associated General Contractors, in his talk before the convention of The American Institute of Architects at San Antonio, presented a clear-cut and straightforward analysis of the relations between organized architects and general contractors. His presentation of ways and means to develop factual rather than ideological cooperation seems to have summed up the views of both organizations.

The way for two organizations to cooperate is to delegate one or more individuals from each organization to do the cooperating and to be responsible for the development of that cooperation. It is on this theory that the A. G. C. and the A. I. A. are now proceeding through the recently formed Joint Committee on Building Practices.

Mr. Greensfelder made this clear in his talk to the architects. His forecast of still further development of joint effort both locally and nationally presents a hint to local groups of contractors and architects that now is a good time to form local contact committees to work on the solution of local problems.

That local cooperation has existed in several communities for many years is, of course, well known, as are the valuable results of that cooperation. Yet in many other sections organizations of contractors and architects go their own way without any means of combining forces for mutual objectives or for the correction of conditions that bear down on one or another group.

Pencil Points.

The Cost of the Architect—Richard E. Bishop, President, A. C. Horn Co.

A strange statement of fact is that a material man seldom hires an architect for his own building work. A grievous error, as he usually finds out. If I may be permitted frankness without censure, I believe this is because the salesman type sees the wrong picture and fails to appreciate the real worth.

Frankly, I have built without architects and I have built with them. For purely selfish, financial reasons I would not consider financing a structure without a capable architect. His mistakes of the past are my protection of the future. His urge for beauty and harmony are my insurance of saleability. It costs real money to flounder around and add those items which even a trained contractor forgets. To my mind, architects are not paid a fee—they are simply paid a share of the actual money they save on the job—the balance of such savings I pocket.

State Association of California Architects, Bulletin of Northern Section.

What Are Architects Doing with Their Unoccupied Time?

That architects are not, under present conditions, working up to their full capacity and that they have unoccupied time on their hands is now generally admitted. In view of this situation the suggestion is hereby presented that each architect give a portion of his unemployed time to careful, collective study of the many problems confronting the building industry in general and the architectural profession in particular.

The consummation of this suggestion would involve the organization of a series of conferences or symposia wherein individual architects would contribute their best thought and reasoning toward a possible solution of the problems common to the practice of all. The procedure might even be carried so far as to call into consultation experts in other fields of endeavor.

Perhaps out of such discussion and research work there might be evolved some new thought and procedure. Other groups, in both professional and business circles, have followed such practices with outstanding success. Jealous guarding of so-called "trade secrets" is no longer practiced; indeed among industrial groups even the pooling of patents is quite common.

As one outstanding practitioner in the engineering field recently put it, the day of the individualist is gone. Architects, in their practice, are too closely tied in with the business side of building to successfully operate as individualists.

Certainly there would be no scarcity of subjects which could be presented for study and research. First there could be the old standbys such as meth-

ods of construction, specifications, office practice, office accounting, cost data and economic use of materials. Then there is the small-house problem for which—insofar as the profession is concerned—a satisfactory solution has never been found. And so, shunned by the architects, it has grown up in evil ways. Last year, a poor year, one of the large mail-order houses did a \$30,000,000 business in ready-cut houses. Not business taken away from architects? Some of these projects ran as high as \$100,000 in cost.

And there is the question of house construction. While advances have been made in practically every other line of human endeavor, houses are still framed in the laborious and uneconomical manner of a long-forgotten period. It is known that mass production experts have had their eye on home construction for some time. Why can not the architectural profession do the research work in this and many other fields, find solutions which will be satisfactory to both the practical and the aesthetic

sides, and then lead the way instead of being an unwilling follower.

A great deal of serious thought might well be given by architects to the economic situation as regards building as an investment. The real estate securities committee of the Investment Bankers' Association is reported in the public press as having characterized the real estate bond situation as one of the blackest spots in the present financial outlook; to have predicted a sharp curtailment of new building projects unless borrowers can be found to supply the required 40 per cent to 50 per cent margin of security; and to have reported that while buildings can be constructed today at prices about 25 per cent less than five years ago, this is not enough to start a building program, and that this will not be justified until there has been a further decline in costs.

Here are many situations to challenge the best thought of the members of the profession.

Items of Interest

President Elected to Institute of Art.

President Kohn has been advised by the President of the Bund Deutscher Architekten (national German society of architects) of his election as a Corresponding Member. In making acknowledgment, Mr. Kohn said: "Will you be so good as to communicate to your Governing Committee my sincere appreciation of the great honor conferred upon me by this election. I am sure that my fellow Directors will understand that this distinction you have shown me as President of The American Institute of Architects is in great measure a gesture of friendly craft-fellowship which we reciprocate."

Acknowledgment to Mr. Ripley.

The April and May numbers of THE OCTAGON contained supplements, each of which was a reproduction of sketches of the old churches and missions in San Antonio, by Hubert G. Ripley, F.A.I.A.

Those sketches have been greatly appreciated by many members of the Institute, and this opportunity is taken to express their thanks, and the Secretary's, to Mr. Ripley.

As the supplements were in the form of separate sheets, reprints were made. A few of them are left at The Octagon. One each of the two series of views may be had on request and without cost, as long as the supply lasts.

Advisory Committee on Technological Studies.

Congress, at its last session, placed on the Department of Labor a long-time job of investigating

and reporting upon the effects of technological development upon the American people.

The Secretary of Labor is now organizing the work and has appointed a sub-committee on technological studies, of which Mr. L. W. Wallace, engineer, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., is chairman.

In turn, Mr. Wallace is asking the support of the leading professional and technical societies through the creation of special committees, whose functions will be to advise and cooperate with his own committee.

On invitation, President Kohn has appointed the following Advisory Committee on Technological Studies to act for the architectural profession:

Frederick L. Ackerman, *Chairman*, New York.

John Donovan, Oakland, California.

Thomas J. Nolan, Louisville, Kentucky.

Decentralization of the City.

(Statement by Frank Lloyd Wright)

The acceleration we are witnessing in the tyranny of the skyscraper is no more than the hangover of a habit. The very acceleration we mistake for growth heralds and precedes decay!

Decentralization not only of industry, but of the city itself is desirable and imminent. Necessity built the city, but the great service rendered to man as a luxury by the machine as seen in automobilization and electrification will destroy that necessity. Already internal collision of the mechanistic device of the skyscraper and of these more beneficent automobilization and electrical factors may be seen win-

ning in the struggle between the greedy skyscraper and the fleet automobile—the city splitting up in consequence. This is only one of the more obvious evidences of disintegration.

• • • •

Hectic urbanism will be submerged in natural ruralism. And we shall see soon that the natural place for the beautiful tall building—not in its present form but in this new sense—is in the country, not in the city.

The Dublin (Ireland) Architects' Conference

Some Remarks by C. Howard Walker, F. A. I. A.

We are very young; we are learning; we are not instructing others. It is not very many years ago that whenever anyone came from Europe to America the one word of praise we received was that we seemed virile. Naturally that was a little irritating. If we have not that quality what do you expect we should have? We are pioneers, we are forming our way with splendid traditions, but these traditions are very different in different areas. The traditions were English on the Eastern Coast, Dutch in Pennsylvania, Spanish on the Western coast and French in New Orleans. The country is made up of all sorts of people, every kind of tradition is there and it is a melting pot, but lately it has called the attention of the architects of the world to some strange and wonderful traits in its architecture, which have created a new expression—the skyscraper. We in Boston cannot build them over 150 feet high and are so building, but in New York and Chicago there is no limit to the heights of skyscrapers.

In 1849 Chicago was a trading post with a frontier fort and wooden shacks; today it has a population of nearly three millions of people. Boston 100 years ago had a population of 30,000 people; today it has 890,000, and it is well nigh impossible for you to conceive what has come to us which we must amalgamate. As you know, there has been held every four years an International Congress of Architects. These began in 1892 and take place every four years. In 1906 there was one in London; then in Vienna and in The Hague and last year in Budapest, and the next Congress is to meet in Washington in 1933. I have had the honor to be elected to replace Mr. Gilbert, who for twenty years has been chairman and has resigned, and as Chairman of that Committee I am here in Europe to extend courtesies, goodwill, and a welcome to the U. S. A. to whoever will come.

I have just come from France where I have had to make speeches in French. They told me frankly I was droll but that I made my message clear. They are very enthusiastic and we want you to be equally enthusiastic. In Budapest there were 600 architects who took great interest in the Congress.

The topics at the Congress may interest you for this reason. I told the Frenchmen, as they are the invited guests and we were the hosts, that of the ten topics the guests should have eight. I was very glad to be able to tell them that and they accepted very cordially.

The first of the topics we suggest for the Congress is "The penetration and significance of art to every human being and into the education of all schools, colleges, and universities." I have been for eight years the liaison officer for The American Institute of Architects throughout the 48 States of the United States. I have been to over 100 colleges and spoken at Federal and State conventions and to other societies, and to all sorts of civic organizations who have had no training whatever in the arts or a knowledge of what art means. The arts give the purest pleasures man can have; they take him into more by-ways of great delight than any other thing. I was asked what I wanted, did I want more art courses in the university, and I told them that I wanted in every course, in every university—there are 500 courses by the way in Harvard—two questions that will force people to recognize art. That is one of the topics we have suggested for the International Congress.

The second topic which we suggest is "The value of conventionalism to architectural design." We are still a young and rather crude nation in many ways, but we are learning and improving and appreciate that we cannot do without reflecting on the past. Traditions have survived because they were worthy. To ignore them or condemn them is a callous procedure. The architecture of Dublin gives fine testimony to adherence to and respect for traditions.

Contractor Becomes Trustee under new Michigan Law.

(Bulletin of the Michigan Society of Architects)

The Michigan State Legislature enacted into law Act No. 186 of the 1931 Session Laws, making it a felony for contractors to misappropriate the funds of a building contract.

Eliminates "Less Than Cost" Construction

The Act protects the responsible builder and eliminates the irresponsible contractor who deliberately entered into a contract for the construction of a building at less than cost for the purpose of misappropriating the funds to the detriment of the owners, laborers, sub-contractors and materialmen, and who diverts business from the legitimate contractor at a great loss to the building industry generally.

Contractor—Trustee of Building Fund

The Act provides: That all moneys paid by the owner to the general contractor or sub-contractors

must first be distributed to those entitled to payment before any part of the contract fund can be appropriated to the personal use of the general contractor or the sub-contractors.

Violation of the Act a Felony

Misappropriation of the building contract funds subjects the contractor or sub-contractor violating the provisions of the Act to imprisonment in a state prison from six months to three years or a fine of \$100 to \$500.

Misappropriation—Prima Facie Evidence of Fraud

The misappropriation by a contractor or sub-contractor of moneys paid to him for building operations is prima facie evidence of fraud.

(Effective September 1, 1931.)

Sawyer to Head Federal Stabilization Board

Robert P. Lamont, Secretary of Commerce and Chairman of the Federal Employment Stabilization Board, has announced the appointment of D. H. Sawyer of New York as Director of the Board. Mr. Sawyer is an engineer, and past Secretary of the Associated General Contractors of America. The board, created by statute enacted during the last session of Congress, is directed to arrange the advance planning of federal construction in all its branches in the preparation of future unemployment relief. In addition to the chairman, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Agriculture, and Labor are members of the board. The statute provides for pres-

entation currently to the President of advice upon the trends of construction in order that he may be prepared to recommend to Congress the appropriation of funds to provide work during times of stress.

It is also contemplated by the Act that the board will cooperate with states, municipalities and other private and public agencies in collecting information concerning advance construction plans by these. In order that reliable information may be available to the President the aid of public and private agencies accumulating statistics on construction will be sought, to the end of preparing adequate studies correctly representing the ups and downs of building operation, enabling forecast as to future and anticipated work.

Since the passage of the Act, the Department of Commerce has engaged in numerous studies as to the best means to pursue in conforming with its provisions, and has built up a provisional organization which will now be transferred from the Division of Building and Housing to the Board. The advice of persons intimately acquainted with the construction problems of the country will be sought, and their willingness to lend counsel and assistance in making the new organization effective is being counted upon.

Correction—April Octagon

In the April number of THE OCTAGON in the report of Mr. Saarinen's address, Bertram Goodhue was referred to as the designer of the Cranbrook Church. This should be corrected to indicate that the church was designed by the Goodhue Associates.

Joint Meeting of the Washington State and Oregon Chapter

(From the Monthly Bulletin of the Washington State Chapter)

June Meeting

The June meeting of the Chapter was a notable one being for the first time a joint meeting of the Washington State and Oregon Chapters, and while not strictly a "Regional Convention" in the parlance of the Institute, was regional to the extent of comprising the entire Pacific Northwest, which with Alaska and the Pacific possessions, a part of the territory of the Washington State Chapter, includes an area of not far from a million square miles.

Following the schedule promulgated in the program the members of the two Chapters and guests assembled at the Olympian Hotel, Olympia, Washington, early in the afternoon of Saturday, June 20. Under the guidance of the Chamber of Commerce a trip was made to the State Capitol grounds where the early part of the afternoon was spent in inspecting this notable monumental group. A cordial re-

ception was given to the visitors by the Governor who personally conducted them to points of notable interest.

Business Meeting

Returning to the Olympian Hotel the business meeting was called to order by President Borhek of the Washington State Chapter at 3:30 P. M. President Borhek spoke of the significance of the occasion, expressing a hope that this would be followed by other meetings of the two Pacific Northwest Chapters. He complimented the Pacific Builder and Engineer on the interest they had shown and assistance given toward making the meeting a success.

President Doty of the Oregon Chapter was then called upon and asked to tell of some of the expe-

riences and activities of his Chapter. Mr. Doty, after expressing gratification in behalf of his fellow Oregonians for this cooperative opportunity, mentioned as one Chapter activity the establishment of a "clinic" which had been instituted in the interests of better practical architectural procedure and particularly to assist the newer practitioners by discussing practical building problems. This "clinic" idea was heartily commended by others who were asked to express their opinions.

Passing to other subjects which had been mentioned for consideration, Dean Ellis Lawrence of Portland was called upon and mentioned among other things the Building Congress with which he had been actively identified. He believed that this organization, national in scope, and comprising all elements of the building industry was well equipped to exert a forceful influence on all matters connected with building. He spoke particularly of the apprenticeship system as a notable feature of the Oregon Congress. To present another point of view Mr. Fred S. Cook of the McCracken-Ripley Company of Portland, dealers in building material, was called upon and expressed his belief in the value of the Congress idea and spoke particularly of its Board of Reference which he thought would be valuable in adjusting differences of opinion among different elements in a construction enterprise. Mr. Doty added to the discussion of this subject by giving an account of a meeting of the Oregon Building Congress with our national Senators and Representatives.

Education was another topic associated with Mr. Lawrence for in addition to being Dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Oregon, and member of the Institute Committee on Education, he is now the President of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. This Association was reported by Dean Lawrence to be now working in harmony with the Institute Committee on Education. Of the Government building activities Mr. Lawrence spoke of the efforts of the Institute to establish a Federal Department of Public Works which, if properly organized and conducted, should secure better architectural procedure on the part of the Government. In the discussion which followed on the subject of governmental architecture Mr. Loveless suggested that it might be beneficial to have a government building, planned and built under the established system, investigated and deficiencies reported.

After some reference to financing, which occasioned no definite constructive suggestions for improvement, President Borhek introduced the subject which had been given particular attention by the Washington State Chapter, the movement to get the Government out of the architectural business. After referring to a list of Government buildings of which the construction had been au-

thorized, he read a proposal from the Washington State Chapter that the various other Chapters of the Institute be urged to cooperate and advance the movement to get the Government out of architectural work, in line with the fundamental proposals of the Institute Committee. This proposition was adopted by the Oregon Chapter; then by the Washington State Chapter and finally by the two Chapters in joint session. After some discussion it was voted to withhold outside publicity on this matter for the present as activity so far advocated was primarily within the Institute.

The Evening Session

As the hour set for the dinner was rapidly approaching adjournment was made at this time, the party gathering for a group picture in the park in front of the hotel and the interim further enlivened by effective provision made by the Entertainment Committee to promote the cordiality of the occasion. A bountiful dinner was provided by the hotel and regrets for inability to be present were received from some invited guests, Governor Hartley and Director of Licenses Maybury on account of previous engagements and Mayor Mills on account of illness, Mr. Maybury appearing in person prior to the dinner to pay his respects.

At the conclusion of the dinner President Borhek said a few words appropriate to the occasion and called upon Mr. W. J. Howard, representing the Pacific Northwest Brick and Tile Association, to present the Clay Products Trophy presented by his Association to the winner of the Washington State Chapter Golf Tournament. Mr. Howard, in an appropriate speech, said that as the Chapter members, unlike the members of his Association, could not compete in the conduct of their business, his Association was glad to give them this opportunity to compete in another form of activity. J. Lister Holmes proved to be the recipient of the Clay Products Trophy for the past year and he, and the runner-up, Victor Jones, were each presented with additional prizes in behalf of the Chapter.

City Planning in Olympia

A guest from the City of Olympia was then next introduced, Mr. Elbert M. Chandler, President of the Olympia Planning Commission. Mr. Chandler spoke of the efforts being made, and the desire to make, Olympia distinguished as a Capitol City. A notable city planning feature was the new Pacific Highway, which was to be changed in location and the Capitol grounds extended to meet it. To avoid traffic interference, the Highway would pass under the present Capitol Way now running north and south. Deschutes Waterway, a conspicuous feature of the city, it was proposed to have dredged and parked.

A new zoning ordinance regulating use, height and area has been prepared by the Planning Com-

mission and was about ready for enactment. Olympia needed legislative provision to properly establish zoning powers, the right to enforce zoning regulations not now extending beyond cities of the first class, an adequate enabling act to remedy this condition failing to pass the last session of the legislature.

A notable feature of the Olympia City Plan now in effect was architectural control of the buildings on a portion of Capitol Way, this having been secured through consent of the property owners.

President Borhek thanked Mr. Chandler for his interesting speech and expressed appreciation of his efforts to direct the growth of the Capitol City in an orderly and worthy manner and spoke of the value of such efforts in the smaller city as possibly

more effective than in larger communities where more conflicting and complex interests were involved.

Convention Movie

The stage was then set for the concluding feature of the program, a moving picture of the Washington State Chapter delegates' excursion to the Institute Convention. This feature effectively presented with descriptive dialogue by Lister Holmes and Lance Gowen, the participants in the trip was run through both forward and backward, giving vivid expression to this notable excursion to the Institute gathering at San Antonio. At the conclusion of the picture the meeting was adjourned.

Joint Meeting of Detroit Chapter and Michigan Society

Over fifty, including architects, their ladies and friends, gathered at the Michigan Union, Ann Arbor, on Monday evening, June 22, for dinner. This very enjoyable and decidedly more social party than usual was the last meeting before summer of the Detroit Chapter, and was held jointly with the Michigan Society of Architects and the faculty of the College of Architecture of the University of Michigan.

Departure from the usual schedule of date and place of meeting was occasioned by the rare privilege and distinct honor in having as a guest one of America's distinguished architects, Claude Bragdon, F.A.I.A., of New York, the recipient that day of the honorary degree of Master of Architecture conferred upon him by the University of Michigan.

Many of the group from Detroit spent an interesting hour or two before the dinner wandering through the new Architectural Building, viewing the many permanent exhibits of the constantly growing collection of rare art objects. The tour of the building was personally conducted by Professor Emil Lorch and was intensely interesting. Of chief interest was the work of the students on display in the large exhibition hall. In the exhibition was the winning design and two others submitted for this year's Booth Traveling Scholarship.

President Gamber, after welcoming the guests on behalf of the Chapter and the Michigan Soci-

ety, called upon Professor Lorch to introduce the speaker, Mr. Claude Bragdon.

Mr. Bragdon told of his long interest in the theatre and the design of stage settings and costumes. He took his listeners back in his reminiscence to the early days of the stage—describing minutely those characteristics of the last century's theatre until it seemed to his audience as if they were seated in one of the gas lighted play houses of New York's old Broadway witnessing a tragedy of immortal Shakespeare as produced in 1880.

He described the properties then in use and the costumes worn; he took his audience back stage to view the production from that vantage point, and to glimpse many of the human and amusing incidents lost to those in the orchestra seats. He told of his advent into the field of stage designing, and the pleasure he had found in working with light and color; their effects upon the audience in producing mirth and solemnity. His address was interspersed with choice humor as he depicted the characters of the play, described the scenes, and related the efforts of the producers to secure effects they desired.

Mr. Bragdon said that successful results were sometimes caused by accident, and that the play itself often depended for success upon every detail of its production.



