

GRAND PRIZE OF ROME, 1901.
THIRTY-FIFTH CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS.



IRVING K. POND, DES.

LORADO TAFT, SCULPT.



Entered at the Postoffice at Chicago as second-class matter.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL	PAGE
The Thirty-fifth Annual Convention of the American Institute of Architects—Government Architectural Bureau Proposed.....	25
THE GRAND PRIZE OF ROME OF 1901.....	26
By Theodore Wells Pietsch.	
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION UNDER THE TARSNEY ACT AND SUGGESTIONS FOR MODIFYING THE REGULATIONS THEREOF.....	27
By William Boring, F. A. I. A.	
PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.....	29
PAINTS IN ARCHITECTURE.....	31
MOSAICS.....	31
NEW PUBLICATIONS	
School Architecture.....	32
OUR ILLUSTRATIONS.....	32
ASSOCIATION NOTES.....	32
INDEX TO ADVERTISEMENTS.....	XI
SPECIFICATION REMINDERS.....	XV

NORTH-WESTERN TERRA-COTTA CO.

WORKS AND OFFICE:

Clybourn and Wrightwood Avenues.

BRANCH OFFICE: 1118 Rookery Building,
CHICAGO.

J. W. TAYLOR,


Bedford Building, 215 Dearborn St., Chicago.

ARCHITECTURAL PHOTOGRAPHS,

BUILDINGS, INTERIORS, DETAILS, ETC.

Promise to purchase two dozen from the lot at \$4.00 per dozen, unmounted, and I will send 200 from which to make the selection.

FITCH SASH LOCKS



ADJUST AND PROTECT THE SASHES,
PREVENT RATTLE AND SECURELY

LOCK THE WINDOW.

SOLD BY HARDWARE DEALERS EVERY-
WHERE. CATALOGUE AND
WORKING MODEL
FREE.

THE W. & E. T. FITCH CO., NEW HAVEN, CONN.



THE WINSLOW BROS. COMPANY

CHICAGO

**ORNAMENTAL IRON AND BRONZE AND
MONUMENTAL BRONZE STATUARY**

THE WINSLOW ELEVATOR & MACHINE CO.

HIGH-GRADE ELECTRIC AND HYDRAULIC ELEVATORS

**No unsightly
Cornices with
"BURLINGTON"
Venetian Blinds**

Keep out the Sun; Control the Light; Admit Air Perfectly

Our Inside Sliding Blinds

Superior in every way to Folding Blinds

Write for Catalogue G

BURLINGTON VENETIAN BLIND CO.
BURLINGTON, VT.

WANTED—A position as DRAFTSMAN by a graduate of an architectural school, with eight months' experience in an architect's office. References furnished.

Address O. A. GUNNISON,
No. 721 West 8th St., ERIE, PA.

WANTED—An architect in a live western city, having a good practice, desires to associate with him a young architect who is strictly sober and reliable. One who is thoroughly familiar with all branches of the profession. He must be a good planner, designer, good in details and be able to make good perspectives in ink or color. A married man preferred. An excellent opening for the right party.

Address communications to
M, care INLAND ARCHITECT.

Please mention **THE INLAND ARCHITECT** when corresponding with Advertisers.

THE INLAND ARCHITECT AND NEWS RECORD

Vol. XXXVIII.

NOVEMBER, 1901.

No. 4



A Monthly Journal Devoted to

ARCHITECTURE,
CONSTRUCTION, DECORATION AND FURNISHING
IN THE WEST.

PUBLISHED BY THE INLAND PUBLISHING CO.,
609-610 MANHATTAN BUILDING, CHICAGO, ILL.

L. MULLER, Jr., Manager. ROBERT CRAIK McLEAN, Editor.

SPECIAL CONTRIBUTORS:

C. HOWARD WALKER.	D. H. BURNHAM,	W. L. B. JENNEY,
HENRY VAN BRUNT,	P. B. WIGHT,	IRVING K. POND,
LOUIS H. SULLIVAN,	ALLEN B. POND,	J. R. WILLETT,
WILLIAM S. MACHARG.	C. E. ILLSLEY.	F. W. FITZPATRICK.

TERMS: Regular number, \$5 a year; Photogravure edition, \$10 a year. Single copies, Regular number, 50c.; Photogravure edition (including 7 photogravures), \$1. Advance payment required.

The columns and illustration pages of THE INLAND ARCHITECT are open to all alike, merit and availability only determining what shall be published. Contributions appropriate to its pages are always desired.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

OFFICERS FOR 1900:

PRESIDENT	*ROBERT S. PEABODY, Boston, Mass.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER	*GLENN BROWN, Washington, D. C.
FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT	WILLIAM S. EAMES, St. Louis, Mo.
SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT	FRANK MILES DAY, Philadelphia, Pa.
AUDITOR FOR TWO YEARS	S. A. TREAT, Chicago, Ill.
AUDITOR FOR ONE YEAR	E. H. KENDALL, New York, N. Y.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

For three years.—J. M. Carrère, New York city; James W. McLaughlin, Cincinnati, Ohio; R. Clipson Sturgis, Boston, Mass.

For two years.—Henry Van Brunt, Kansas City, Mo.; James B. Hill, Washington, D. C.; Normand S. Patton, Chicago, Ill.

For one year.—*Arthur G. Everett, Boston, Mass.; *George B. Post, New York city; *Alfred Stone, Providence, R. I.

*Executive Committee.

STANDING COMMITTEES FOR 1900:

Judiciary Committee.—Wm. S. Eames, St. Louis, Mo.; James G. Hill, Washington, D. C.; Arthur G. Everett, Boston, Mass.

House and Library Committee.—Robert Stead, Washington, D. C.; Glenn Brown, Washington, D. C.; Frank Miles Day, Philadelphia, Pa.

Committee on Contracts and Lien Laws.—Alfred Stone, Providence, R. I.; W. B. Mundie, Chicago, Ill.; Arthur G. Everett, Boston, Mass.

Committee on Applied Arts and Sciences.—W. G. Preston, Boston, Mass.; F. E. Kidder, Denver, Colo.; Frederick Baumann, Chicago, Ill.

Committee on Foreign Correspondence.—Glenn Brown, Washington, D. C.; J. G. Howard, New York city; R. W. Gibson, New York city.

Legislative Committee on Government Architecture.—George B. Post, chairman. Committee.—Bruce Price, New York city; John M. Carrère, New York city; James G. Hill, Washington; Alfred Stone, Providence. Alternates—Edward H. Kendall, New York city; E. B. Green, Buffalo, N. Y.; D. H. Burnham, Chicago, Ill.; Robert Stead, Washington.

NEXT CONVENTION AT BUFFALO, N. Y.

THE ARCHITECTURAL LEAGUE OF AMERICA.

OFFICERS FOR 1901-1902.

PRESIDENT	JOSEPH C. LLEWELLYN, Chicago.
VICE-PRESIDENT	RICHARD E. SCHMIDT, Chicago.
TREASURER	AUGUST WILMANN, Chicago.
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY	EMIL LORCH, Chicago and Detroit.
RECORDING SECRETARY	HUGH M. G. GARDEN, Chicago.
ADDITIONAL MEMBERS EXECUTIVE BOARD	R. C. SPENCER, JR., Chicago. PROF. NEWTON A. WELLS, Urbana, Ill.

NEXT CONVENTION AT TORONTO, CANADA.

Thirty-fifth Convention of the A. I. A.

The thirty-fifth annual convention of the American Institute of Architects, which was held at Buffalo on October 3, 4 and 5, was only important in that the attendance was larger than at any previous meeting in several years. In fact, while at the last several conventions measures of importance to the entire country in their historical and ethical bearings were discussed and acted upon, this convention seemed to return to the old days of inactivity and lack of interest, and even had the familiar appearance to those days of innocuous desuetude in the inability of the press to secure copies of reports and other data, which was so largely a feature of that epoch. It is probable that the purpose of assemblage was to see the exposition, rather than to talk shop, and that the next convention will find the necessary activity in evidence again under the leadership of Charles F. McKim, the newly elected president. Robert S. Peabody, who has been president for the past two years, has given the Institute one of the best administrations it has ever enjoyed. His rulings have always been just, never arbitrary, but partook of that flavor of impartiality that has won the admiration and friendship of every member. Besides being an ideal chairman, his literary ability is such that his "addresses" have been accepted as classics by the profession.

Government Architectural Bureau Proposed.

The movement looking toward the placing of the public architecture in the hands of a bureau, which took tangible shape at the recent convention of the American Institute of Architects, in the resolution to appoint a committee to confer with Congress, is most important and practical. There is not and there never has been any more reason that a public building should be designed and the construction supervised by the Secretary of the Treasury than that war-ships should be built by him. Secretary Gage took this position in effect when he placed the Tarsney act in operation, and the ultimate adoption of the suggestion of the American Institute has no bar but that of custom. It is almost twenty years since this journal first advocated the separation of the building of public structures from the Treasury, and placed under the control of a bureau, or a cabinet officer, and since then the number and value of the buildings erected for Government use yearly has increased enormously. Such a committee as is proposed by the Institute, with such men as Robert S. Peabody or John M. Carrère at its head, with President McKim as its ex-officio chairman, could not fail to make a strong impression upon Congress, and by their presentation of the advantages of the change, assure to the country a further advance in the architectural methods which were inaugurated by the adoption of the Tarsney act. In advocating this change, the Institute runs the risk of disturbing the advantage gained to public architecture by the innovation brought by the Tarsney measure, but the chance of a return to the political methods formerly in vogue is small, and the gain to the country would be proportionally large in having its buildings in charge of a separate department and relieving the Treasury of what is always an unreasonable burden as well as an anomalous position.

THE GRAND PRIZE OF ROME OF 1901.

BY THEODORE WELLS PIETSCH.

THE program submitted last April to the ten candidates for the Grand Prix de Rome had something a little more special in its make-up than is customary. It breathed more of the life of reality and came safely within the limits of possibilities, without in any way trimming the wings of the muse or jeopardizing the basis of a fine architectural composition. Evidently a list, however



M. JEAN HULOT.
Grand Prix de Rome, 1901.

fertile in monumental titles, must at times prove sterile, and with no one to the rescue the old régime must be again restored, the old subjects rehearsed; these perhaps with the introduction of some new difficulty, due to the author and requiring proof of an inventive faculty on the part of the competitor, yet in substance phantoms of years ago, and calling vividly to mind the successful work of such and such a grand prix man. Certainly after more than a century, during which the ablest men in the Academy have furnished ideas for the subjects of these great competi-

tions, the problem to evolve a program that promises something new in composition is no easy matter. The more credit is due the author of the one written this year, which, freely translated, reads as follows:

GRAND PRIX DE ROME.

PROGRAM: AN AMERICAN ACADEMY IN PARIS.

The Government of the United States, wishing to facilitate the studies of Americans abroad, particularly of university graduates of high merit, has acquired a piece of land adjoining the Bois de Boulogne, on the site of the old fortifications, with the intention of erecting buildings to accommodate students in science, literature, archaeology and the arts.

This institution, similar to that proposed here (Paris), and due to the liberality of the sister of President Thiers, is very much like the Academy of France in Rome, the archaeological school of the same city, or the French school at Athens, will provide pensions for the resident students and allow them every liberty to follow their chosen work. No longer as pupils, but as young masters, formed in the universities, they will be considered prepared and ready for personal research along the lines of their own specialties.

The ground selected, two hundred meters in one sense and four hundred in the other, slopes gently. The principal axis is north and south. Near the main entrance in the garden—and for facility of control there should be but one entrance—where are located the different smaller buildings, the principal structure will be found—a building for use in common, namely, a sort of club, in which a large restaurant, smaller dining-rooms, a café, reading-rooms, meeting and reception rooms will be located, and also space provided for exposition halls for American art, painting, sculpture, architecture, engraving, etc., of high value. Other rooms would serve for the exposition of new work before shipping to America. For the convenience of those studying music there will be a small concert hall, and a lecture hall for the students of literature, history, archaeology, etc. Space must be given as well to the scientific collections, specimens of all sorts provided to facilitate work in the different branches of study.

This ensemble will be completed with the necessary vestibule, waiting-rooms, cloak-rooms, staircases, elevators, etc., as well as requisite storage space.

In a special building will be located vast living apartments and parlors for great official receptions for the privileged members of the American colony and those of Parisian society in relation with the institution. This will also be the home of the Director and his family.

The necessary adjuncts appropriate to this setting will be found in adjoining dependencies, stables, carriage houses, servants' quarters, etc.

Of the resident students, twenty provided with study rooms are supposed to live in town, namely, outside the walls of the institution, and consequently require no dormitories. There will be buildings for the young men whose profession requires but a restricted space, and who will find all comforts in small suites of two or three rooms on the different floors, and accommodations entirely free and independent. Forty such apartments should be provided.

Twenty separate pavilions or chalets of different dimensions will be reserved for artists, with their special needs; these might be arranged to

form small groups of three or four. Twenty other similar small houses, furnished with laboratories and studies differently situated, would accommodate the scientists.

There will be a small house for the concierge and the gardener, and the necessary stable and hothouses for the general service. A certain space will be given to sports, covered shelters, concert pavilion, decorative motives, exedrae, gardens, etc., all conceived in a manner to enhance the natural beauty of the site, and in the spirit of the architectural ensemble.

The subject is without precedent, and presented in an admirable way calculated to play upon the imagination. The very situation, superb in the most beautiful quarter of Paris, is determined even to the ornamentation of the lot, without, however, definitely fixing the location of the space freed by the razing of the old town walls. This allowed each competitor a certain latitude; we shall see how it was turned to best account, and what for some proved a difficulty seems for others the most natural solution, a sort of architectural privilege.

The program in its outline calls for:

I. A principal building or sort of club museum.

II. A building of lesser importance for official receptions, with certain state apartments and that of the director and his family; and

III. The apartments, studios, studies and dormitories of the resident students.

For facility of control *one principal entrance alone* is asked. The grounds are to be embellished with the arts of the architect and landscape gardener, and space provided for sports and the required dependencies, stables, etc. In short, a Utopian land of study under the patronage of a strong, free and liberal government, our own. The sanguine efforts of the Frenchman who construed the above favorably stretched a point for Uncle Sam when he lent such light wings to fancy, but even as the flower of imagination and a day dream let it go on record. Perhaps there are stranger things in heaven and earth, and for the present it is most worth while to applaud when capable men throw all their zest and spirit into such an idea and develop with a vivid semblance of reality the most brilliant compositions.

M. Jean Hulot has won the prize, and in a way that must make the bitter struggle of the last five years seem like the glad holidays of life. Since 1896, year after year he has entered the lists, was always selected one of the final chosen ten, and at the close of the competition doomed to cruel disappointment. Always a favorite with the jury, who appreciated his prodigious facility, his admirable skill and sure hand, his school work stood often unexcelled and received the highest awards, while each year he never failed to exhibit water-colors and sketches of travel that made his reputation at the salon. Everybody spoke of his versatile hand, the freedom with which he used all the different means of the architect's expression, and yet year by year the Grand Prix passed and Hulot remained in Paris. He had not hit the bull's-eye. The luminous thought and the supreme effort had not walked hand in hand. They struggled to and finally did it last August, when by a jury of thirty-one, without a dissenting voice, by a unanimous vote of masters in architecture, painting and sculpture (for the latter arts are allowed their say), M. Hulot was chosen and awarded the Grand Prix de Rome. Certainly a brilliant victory, worthy of the man and his work, which appears so resplendent, so rich and creative, that the efforts of all others of much merit in this year's fight seem poor, lifeless, almost shallow.

It is not necessary to recall in detail here the admirable disposition of M. Hulot's plan. A careful study of the photographic reproduction will reveal the great simplicity with which he has met every difficulty. The principal buildings are thrown to either side of a wide avenue, lying in the axis of the entrance and approaching boulevard. At the end of this avenue is a commemorative monument of the first importance. It is a sort of national emblem as well as symbol of the institution, and visible at a great distance on the boulevard. Back of the club building is the space given to sports, while the studios and chalets are grouped in the surrounding gardens. The large apartment or dormitory is thrown to one side, no absolute symmetry is sought, but there is always a careful study of proportion and a feeling for the balancing of parts. In the elevation, some splendor and a monumental prestige is sought for in the club museum, partly echoed by the "official quarters" opposite and emphasized by the commemorative pile in the background, while the studios, chalets and dormitories have a distinct little touch of the home quality and tempting dash of the picturesque that pays the highest tribute to the *verve*

and imagination of the author, who has not even neglected an observatory for the star students and a suspicion of a roof garden, for certainly the pergola on the dormitory roofs promises very much that way. This entire ensemble is presented in a way to charm with so close a semblance of nature that we seem in touch with her and reality. It is what the French call *rêve* and *reçu*, or a dream realized. It is an artist's dream, and if for architecture but a paper one, we yet can feel grateful that the inspiration of its birth was laid at our door. An American academy in Paris may some day be a question before the house; meanwhile many a winter eve at home when idly turning files of photos, let us stop at this, the grand prix of 1901. It is well worth while.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION UNDER THE TARSNEY ACT AND SUGGESTIONS FOR MODIFYING THE REGULATIONS THEREOF.*

BY WM. BORING, F.A.I.A.

THE object of this paper is to present briefly the practical workings of the Tarsney act in building construction, and to offer a few suggestions for its improvement. But, first, I wish to state that no criticism is intended upon the acts nor the attitude of the present officers of the Government under whom the act has first been made operative. They have shown the greatest courtesy to our profession, and have spared no pains to give the system a fair trial, and it is very fortunate that the act has been put in operation and the first building constructed during the administration of the gentlemen now in office.

This discussion is limited to an exposition of the actual workings of the statute, based upon personal experience. Broadly speaking, the Tarsney act is eminently successful, and if incapable builders could be eliminated, there would be no reason for criticism.

The practical application of the act insures the best work of a well-trained practitioner for every building of importance from its inception to its finish, while it still remains under the control of the Government in every detail.

The Secretary of the Treasurer is the executive officer who is responsible for the operation of the act in question. He determines the regulations under which the work shall be done according to the statute.

He holds the architect responsible for a completed building of superior design and good construction, and since he must pass upon all business involving the expenditure of money, he has the right to abrogate the contract with an architect at any time for cause.

The act also provides for a Superintendent of Construction to be constantly at the building during building operations, in addition to the special inspectors for the various trades which the Government properly maintains for all works being executed under contract.

The business of the Superintendent of Construction is limited to the keeping of complete record of results, but he has no authority to direct the work in any way. He is selected by the architect from a list of six men furnished by the Government. It was apparently designed to provide the correct relation between the Superintendent of Construction and his superior, who would then be the architect. It does not, however, insure this result, since the men are appointed from continuous positions in the Government service—that is, they are really only transferred.

The architect not having any definite knowledge of the candidate's ability, seeks the advice of the Government officials, and endeavors by that procedure to appoint the best man. The Superintendent of Construction is, therefore, indirectly an appointee of the Government and not of the architect. The latter can not discharge him for non-performance of duty. He can prefer charges and cause a removal, but even this may effect only a transfer of the Superintendent to another position, and he has, therefore, no reason to be loyal to the architect. In fact, he, as a Government official, looks with jealousy upon the architect as somewhat of an intruder upon his province, and if he does not act as a subordinate and work in the interest of his superior, the architect, but makes official reports to the appointing power above his immediate superior, he is necessarily in a position to warp facts, make half-true reports, and in general make much mischief, even though not always intentional.

The Government does not hold the Superintendent of Construction responsible, but holds the architect; and the Superintendent does not hold himself responsible to the architect, so that he really has no responsibility except to keep the records exact.

The total result of all this is that the business of the Superintendent of Construction serves only as a check upon the operations. He reports to the Department independently, and does not direct the work or even stop it when it is proceeding wrong.

The position taken by the Secretary is that the architect is in charge of the building, and is wholly responsible, whereas, actually, the architect is in charge only in a negative way. He is not in a position to enforce the carrying out of the contract in the manner and with the authority given him in private practice. He

can only recommend, and the action must come from the Secretary.

The Government is disposed to deal fairly and honorably with all men, and while the men who attend to official business in detail must look upon all affairs of the Government from a strictly technical point of view, the heads of departments are inclined to take a liberal view of controversies, preferring to waive small points of vantage in order to do injustice to no one and to preserve the Government's good name.

The Supervising Architect's office has had a wide experience in handling controversies relating to building construction and in taking care of emergencies which usually arise, and the officers understand the grievances which come before the architect. They are actuated by a spirit of fairness which does much to keep the architect inspired to get good work out of poor contractors.

The architect prepares designs for a building, and in his imagination there exists a beautiful, well-finished structure. He writes the specification describing the construction, which to him represents perfection in solidity, form, texture and finish, and describes in unmistakable terms his ideal.

The builder who puts in the lowest bid reads this specification and checks it off line for line to discover how he can build to come out just under the exact wording of the specification and yet omit the necessary expense incident to carrying it out in the spirit in which it was conceived, and submits a proposal accordingly.

The Government, in accordance with the law which is really mandatory, lets to the lowest bidder, not to the best bidder. Bidders for Government work usually base their figures upon the execution of such work as will pass inspection and be accepted, and not upon the character of work which is ideal.

Perfect drawings, specifications and documents can not insure a perfect building. An incompetent builder can not, and a dishonest builder will not, do good work, even with excellent supervision and first-class documents.

The chief difficulty in obtaining a good building is the system which accepts the lowest bid regardless of the contractor's training or ability or his reputation for doing good work, the only provision being that he must be able to give suitable security and show a financial responsibility.

If we start with the proposition that the building is to be a first-class construction, only the highest type of contractors should be permitted to bid. It is well known that an incompetent builder or a dishonest builder will not produce, and can not by any means produce, a proper building, and it is also known that all drawings and specifications of good architects call for good construction, so that the real responsibility for bad construction lies with the builder. The trouble is not with the documents, it is not with the superintendent, it is with the builder.

The question is *where is the system weak touching this view of the case, and how can it be strengthened?*

I think I can safely say that there is no architect who would be awarded the commission of a public building who would not be willing to change and modify and perfect his plans to almost any extent were criticism made on them by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Supervising Architect. He would endeavor by all means to please and to produce the very best that was in his power.

The builder, however, does not assume this attitude.

The faults in plans and specifications that are found in a building are very rare. The real difficulties in the construction of a building are:

1. The incompetency of the builder and his organization.
2. The attempts by the builder to vary from the specifications by supplying work or materials which are less expensive and give greater profit to him.

If it were a fact that the plans and specifications were really to be followed out to the letter, first-class builders could do the work cheaper than the men who bid below them, and the incompetent and dishonest men would soon be driven to the wall.

Under the system of the lowest bidder, when work is improperly done, the proper procedure is to take the work away from the unreliable builder and award it to a better one at a higher price, taking the difference in price from the bondsmen of the first builder, and nothing short of this will cure the evil, but the Government is loath to do this. Work poorly done can never be made quite right, and delays are too expensive to allow of tearing out and replacing the work improperly done. There is no way provided by the act for the architect to absolutely stop improper work. It may be ordered stopped, but the builder can proceed with it. The architect has not material power to stop him. The monthly payments can not be stopped by the architect under the present rule simply because imperfect work is being done. It is useless to order the work stopped when monthly payments are made by the Department regardless of improper work being done. The Superintendent of Construction furnished by the Government is not effective in this regard. His instructions are, and his duties are, to keep a correct record of events, but he is not held responsible for the execution of the work.

Payments are made regardless of the fact that defective work is being done, the Government holding that a monthly payment must be made for all work satisfactorily executed, no matter how great an amount of improper work has been done; the only provision being that the improper work is not paid for.

The position taken by the Government is that when a contractor is notified in writing that unsatisfactory work is being done and is rejected, he can then be permitted to proceed, but at his own risk. The final settlement is supposed to inflict punishment

*Paper submitted to the American Institute of Architects' convention, October 4, 1901, as a report of a special committee.

on him in the shape of deduction from the contract price for the loss to the Government sustained in having defective work done on the building.

The contractor can do work in any amount which is not right if he takes the risk of deductions on account of this, and he can demand a monthly payment on any and all work done in connection therewith which is according to the contract.

I have known of a contractor telling a Government Superintendent that he would do certain work his own way; that he would not be stopped by the Superintendent, and that the Government could only deduct a reasonable amount from his contract for the variation.

The fault lies not in a want of harmony between the Department and the architect, but because the architect has not complete control over work which is being done by men who are constantly trying to evade the contract. The architect should have the power to stop payments, to stop the bad work, and to replace it with work in accordance with the contract.

A suggestion has been made to try the experiment of purchasing the plans and specifications from the designing architect, and to have the superintendence of the construction done by the usual method employed in the Supervising Architect's office, but this would not remedy the evil.

The class of buildings which the Tarsney act has embraced are generally of a monumental character and require the careful assistance of the office in which they are designed, during construction. All sorts of constructive diagrams and interpretations and modifications are required as the work proceeds, and these can properly be made only under the same guidance as was the original design.

I consider the class of superintendents employed continuously by the Department incapable of carrying on properly the construction of a building according to a set of plans and specifications made by a private practitioner, without the guidance throughout the operation of that private practitioner.

When an important building is to be erected at a distance, it is not an uncommon thing for the Government to appoint as the Superintendent of Construction a practicing architect in the vicinity of the place where the building is to be built, it being evidently recognized that an architect of reputation will be a safer man to entrust with the work than an inspector or a superintendent who is a non-professional and who is usually a person risen from the ranks of skilled mechanics. An architect appreciates architectural qualities which entirely escape a superintendent, and is capable of dealing with structural emergencies and the various difficulties and controversies which arise in the construction of a building in an effective manner.

The Supervising Architect, if he should take the responsibility of executing the design, would have to refer all questions of construction and controversy to the different departments under his charge. His office not being intimately acquainted with all of the details, even with the best of intentions, would have to make adjustments without having all the information bearing on the subject, and I consider that the design would suffer seriously in execution, and that the value of the Tarsney act would thus be greatly diminished.

In cases of extreme difficulty, the architect would probably be called in conference. He would then be in the impossible position of censor upon the Government's conduct of the work.

The idea of the Government purchasing designs grew out of the laudable effort to harmonize the disturbing elements now existing in executing the work after designs were perfected, but it does not appear to me practicable nor right.

Now, the prime object of an architect is to secure a perfect building, and this can not be done by carrying on the business with only negative powers. To secure a perfect building is of more importance than to conduct the business in a way to give the least trouble to those in charge.

An architect can not be held for the act of a contractor, nor can he be responsible for improper work done by a contractor who is not endorsed by him nor selected by a method known to effect a proper selection. He is not expected to discover fraud. He is to give responsible supervision, but can not be held to obtain from an oversharper and conscienceless contractor a perfect piece of work.

It is useless to talk about the responsibility of a man because he signs a contract and executes a bond. A contract and a bond are one thing, and a first-class, well-finished building is quite a different thing. The best buildings are built where no bonds are given, and I might say that the best buildings are built by men who require the least watching. There would be no difficulty in getting a good building were all contractors sincerely trying to carry out the contract properly.

The Government desires to pay equal value for everything it gets in a building. It should pay good and proper prices for the building, and should get nothing but first-class work. This can be accomplished by letting only men who are competent to carry it out attempt to contract, and by giving the architect in charge proper power to enforce these men to do what their contract requires.

Government contracts are based upon the provision that should the work not be properly done an eight-day notice will be served upon the contractor, and at the end of the expiration of eight days should the work not be carried on in proper manner the Government will proceed to take entire charge of the work, take possession of materials, tools, etc., and complete the work at the expense of the contractor and his bondmen.

After the expiration of the eight-day notice, the contractor having refused to proceed, the building must be duly taken control of by the Government, new plans and specifications covering the uncompleted part of the contract must be in a general way arranged, together with a statement of what work has been done; it must then be advertised for a certain length of time, a contract let and a new organization put in possession. It is such an expensive and destructive proposition that it is seldom resorted to by the Government.

This process is too long and the penalty too great for a small variation from the contract. It is unwise and ineffective to serve an eight-day notice for a large building upon the contractor when some minor part is defective, and yet this minor part may be a defect.

A lighter sentence with a quick and effective method of carrying it out would be much more effective, and would place the responsibility with the architect in charge.

The party in power on a building must have the authority to take the initiative at certain times, and the contractors under his charge must be made to feel from the beginning that he has the power and will exercise it whenever it is necessary.

It might be better to give the architect power to proceed with a portion of the work by the day or by private contract, and deduct the expenses incurred from the next payment due to the contractor.

There must be some means of coöperation between the Supervising Architect's office and the architect in charge to enforce the compliance with the contract and specification.

In conclusion, I wish to state what appear to be the faults of the system, and to suggest modifications that will secure for the Government all the advantages of regular professional services, together with that security and thoroughness which the Supervising Architect's office affords.

The usual practice of awarding contracts to lowest bidder is not likely to be changed, and these suggestions are made on the basis of present conditions:

1. There is a provision of responsibility in having the architect supervise and the Government representative superintend the work.

I suggest that the architect be given full power; that he employ his own superintendent, who shall be responsible to him; that the Government pay the usual fee for full service; that the Government's representative be an inspector to report to the Supervising Architect, and that he send simultaneously a copy of reports to the architect.

2. The architect has not power to withhold payment to enforce the contractor to comply with the terms of the contract.

I suggest that monthly payments be under control of architect. That he have discretion to decline payment until existing defects are corrected, and in case of slow progress of work that proper force and materials be provided to his satisfaction before he be required to grant certificate.

3. The architect has not the control of funds to correct defects at cost of contractor.

I suggest that a sum equal to ten per cent retained on all payments be held subject to the joint order of the architect and the Government inspector, which shall be available on short notice to correct defects in construction or to push work which may be behind time, and the amount so expended be deducted from the money due the contractor.

With these modifications I believe that the business of construction of buildings under the Tarsney act will offer no serious difficulty, and that the architects can secure for the Government structures of that high standard that are properly expected by the Secretary of the Treasury.

ARTISTIC USE OF LEAD.

H. M. LAWRENCE, of New York, Librarian Whitney, L. F. Perry and others, who recently made a critical examination of the ceiling of the delivery-room in the public library, are enthusiastic in their admiration of that which has been accomplished. This is the room containing the decorations by E. A. Abbey, illustrating the legend of the Holy Grail. The ceiling being cut up into a great number of deep panel sections, presented a problem in treatment which was anything but easy. It would have been very easy to make a mistake in this part of the decorations, and it is therefore a matter of hearty congratulation that the right thing has been done in the right place.

The large beams have been decorated with raised ornaments. Renaissance in character, and done in lead, the ornaments being nailed to the beam wood and then heavily gilded. This is the first time lead has ever been used in this country for this purpose, and the work has been done after the manner of the Venetian ornamentation in the library of the doge's palace.

The ground has been tinted a variety of rich, subdued tints in which the greens, browns, blues and yellows predominate. The gold is in tone with bronze. The smaller beams have been treated similarly, only the ornaments are not so elaborate. The deep spaces here are tinted a dull blue.

It is expected that the rest of the Abbey pictures will be sent from London this winter, as it is understood that they are to be exhibited publicly there in October. When completed, this room will be the most magnificent in the library.

The entire decorations have been kept subordinate to Mr. Abbey's paintings, and the original scheme of C. F. McKim, the architect, has been carried out by H. M. Lawrence, of New York.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.



TOWERS OF MACHINERY BUILDING.

THE thirty-fifth annual convention of the American Institute of Architects was held at Buffalo in the New York State building of the Pan-American Exposition on October 3, 4 and 5, 1901.

There were present a larger number of members than have attended the annual convention in several years.

The proceedings opened with addresses of welcome by the Mayor of Buffalo, the President of the Exposition Company and the chairman of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds. President Robert S. Peabody's annual address followed and was received with marked attention:

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

As we gather here to-day from all parts of this great country our thoughts of necessity turn to what has occurred here during the last few weeks.

The American people have never been more drawn together than when in the night watches the solemn tolling of the bells bore from village to village the news of the President's death, or than when throughout the land from Maine to California our people thronged the churches to pay a last tribute of respect to their late chief magistrate and to ask a blessing on his successor. Indeed, the civilized world felt united in horror at the wicked deed and in defense against a common danger. This was brought home to us when on the day of President McKinley's death the President of the Royal Institute of British Architects sent us this cable dispatch: "Our profoundest sympathy with American Institute. National mourning." This is far from being a formal message from foreign parts or from a stranger. I am very glad it came. It is filled with the cordial spirit of a kinsman who feels with us and like us in times of trouble and stress. May it ever be thus. Let us be grateful that the clouds that have obscured our skies have been broken by this kindly message of fraternal sympathy and friendship.

Our profession has many causes for congratulation at this thirty-fifth annual convention. There has been a large addition to our numbers since we last met. None of us can be indifferent to the fact that eager demands are coming from all parts of our land for a high standard or artistic work, and that the pecuniary responsibilities which are committed to our care are constantly growing. As large fortunes and important business combinations increase in number an ever larger proportion of riches will continue to be spent on the patronage of Art. All men welcome these expenditures by the rich. To our profession they offer opportunities never before presented in this country. For all these reasons we have no cause to complain of our material prosperity.

Therefore, at such a friendly conference as this, it is all the more desirable that we should see clearly whither these favoring gales and currents are speeding us, and make sure that our gear is strong and our compass true. A review of the aspect and tendencies of our professional life is opportune. To what is it leading us? What opportunities does it offer? How shall we train our young men? How can we make this American Institute a more serviceable instrument? In short, I want to discuss with you the ideals to which to-day we may reasonably aspire as architects in active practice.

First of all, we note a vital change that has made much progress in the last few years. Once an architect could make with his own hand every drawing for his building, and give to it throughout his own touch and feeling. I fancy there is no one of us with a true artist's soul who does not dream of this as the ideal life for an architect. Nor is it an impossible life, and if a man is contented to do small things well, and can find clients who will pay him rightly for such artistic work, I commend this life as a happy and useful one. But though such a serene and artistic career is open to a few rare men, it is not offered to most of us; and generally where a man is faithful to this ideal life, he finds himself suddenly the steward of a larger trust. Buildings of importance will not await one man's time. Modern building, and especially American building, implies a rapid campaign. Where it used to take ten years to spend a million dollars it now takes as many months, or the financier stands agast as interest runs to waste. These modern building methods and the passion for costly structures are the exigencies from which have arisen the need of large office forces. As in business, trade has massed itself into great consolidation and combinations, so commercialism has brought new problems to our art. It is a surprising fact that in democratic America of all places—a country where individual exertion and independent action is the mainspring of public life—the spirit of coöperation and combination has largely supplanted in our art the productions of the individual. It is, perhaps, a thing to deplore that an architect's office should resemble a department store or should be open to the derisive charge of being a plan factory.

In contrast, the life of the single handed artist architect may well be thought attractive. But it is a fair question, which is the most valuable to the community. The same men are going to do the work in any event. In the one case they are nerved to comparatively ineffective exertion by personal ambition and self-interest; in the other, they contribute what they can best produce, and where they are weak they are supported by better men. It is an old story. A farmer in the oil fields may refine his own kerosene and preserve his independence, but the Standard Oil Company can furnish better oil at a cheaper price, not only to him, but to the peasant in Central China.

My intention, however, is not to argue the question nor to discuss whether by these new methods imagination and poetry are stifled. Perhaps we have had enough display of ungoverned imagination. Perhaps imagination that is valuable will make itself felt under any circumstances. I am not arguing. I only state a fact. We all recognize in these days that a man cannot be effectively both architect and builder as in mediæval days. It is only going one step farther to say that it now takes several men to make a good architect. Thus the large coöperative office is the most conspicuous feature of our recent professional life, and in many ways it is not an unwelcome one. Instead of individuals striving for public favor, clubs of artists are now engaged in this pursuit, and material success goes to those whose mutual confidence, *esprit de corps* and professional skill are most highly developed. It is not a bad situation. It is not unlike the conditions which prevailed through great periods in the history of our art in other ages and other climes. We go to Florence and reverently tread her narrow streets, and people them with the gay, light-hearted artist folk of that golden period, when genius and talent so abounded that he was a dull architect who was not also poet and sculptor and painter as well. That community of interests among the artists and students, among the goldsmiths, painters and sculptors of Florence, when Verrochio or Luini worked under Leonardo and Raffaele with Perugino—the one the master and the other the helper—was it not somewhat like the life in our own ateliers. Truly it seems as if in some of our great cities, where the workers in the allied arts have joined most thoroughly in mutual endeavor, this ideal artistic life is well simulated. Still more complete was the union of master and student during the middle ages, when the art of building was so far left to the guilds that the names of the leading spirits have vanished into oblivion, though their work still speaks to us in lofty nave and peaceful cloister and towering spire. This unselfish oblivion is not to the taste of the modern world. It is one of the great objections of the artist to these large offices. But his fears have no very substantial foundation. The organization of a great railroad does not stifle individual talent. It rather gives real genius its opportunity, and possibly it is well that mediocre ability should not obtain leadership. In humbler place it can join to its full power in the production of great works and feel and say, "*Magna pars fui*."

Let us then treat the large office as a fact, and when the head of it says "I," let us hope for his sake that he intends it as Admiral Dewey might, and let us not forget the man behind the guns without whom the guns are powerless. And when the young aspirant for fame in a large office talks as if he were the nameless ghost whose spirit pervades all the successful work of the office, let us remember how long the Army of the Potomac vainly struggled and fought before Grant's master mind turned that same armed machine to victory. Indeed, Grant at the great surrender at Appomattox—a leader because of early discipline in the small things of the Mexican war; successful because of his innate firmness and his judgment of men and things; in victory a generous, knightly soldier—may well be an example to the heads of our large offices.

The next change that I note in our professional life is the great advance in architectural education. Most of us agree that the American boys that crowd our offices, alert, intelligent, active-minded, ambitious, are admirable material from which to make artists. They are fast proving themselves to be such, and are making names for themselves in foreign schools and at home. How they shall best be trained is a vital question. How shall these young men who serve the guns now and are to command the ships later get the most thorough education? I suppose that question is put to most of you only too frequently.

Clearly, one answer is that they can pick it up in these large offices. If the apprentice system which lasted so long in England had any merit, it has vastly more when applied to life in one of our large offices. Surrounded by able workers, the young man leads in a measure the life that is offered by the French atelier, where the most potent influence is that of the "anciens." But, in our American office there is no time to teach the history of art, the theory of design, and to cultivate the powers of imagination and representation. Probably we all agree that the most interesting work which the profession has to offer—its highest refinement—is centered in the act of composition, of gathering and combining under the influence of imagination or, if you please, of inspiration. It is a hopeful sign for the country that now and to-day business comes to those who are masters of this art. An education in an office plainly does not cultivate such powers. Nor, do I believe with those who bow to that vague deity, pure design, that they are to be gained by the contemplation of Nature and the study of natural products. The art of architecture is necessarily conventional, and is bound up with the history and the life of mankind, and

the egotist who tries to play his hand alone makes a mistake. His work will be good so far as it accords with the principles that civilization has pronounced sound, and will fail when his self-appreciation prevails.

These powers of idealization and of creative composition can be brought to life and nourished and strengthened by no other means but practice, in the same way that an athlete increases his strength; and, for my part, I believe that this practice is most conveniently obtained in a school of architecture, just as lawyers have found a law school a fitter place for training than a lawyer's office. The thirst for architecture that pervades this country, and that is shown in crowded architectural exhibitions and attempts at architectural building, is shown quite as markedly in the multiplication of these architectural schools. There are more of them than there are architects fit to teach them. The more modest schools find a field for their endeavors in serving young men who aim at being draughtsmen, and who cannot reach the better organized institutions. All these schools serve a good purpose in tending to spread a knowledge of architecture among the community at large, and it is to be remembered that a man may well study architecture without expecting to gain a living by it. He can be an important influence in his community in developing the love of the beautiful to which our country is now awakening.

But, as architects, we can take a really live interest only in the best organized schools. Fortunately these are already doing work in which we may take pride. Indeed, I confidently look forward to their attracting students at an early day from other lands, as young foreigners now come to us to study engineering. The chief duty that the American Institute can have in architectural education must always be to foster this work of the highest grade and to make the best better.

Your Committee on Education in their valuable report last year made many suggestions looking to this end, and lately the *American Architect* has suggested that candidates for admission to a school of architecture should be required to pass a tolerably severe examination in drawing from the round, such as is required for admission to the great academies of fine art. This would in some ways place the beginners where graduates are now. This is an admirable suggestion. It would tend to increase, in primary schools, the teaching of drawing, which, so far as it is a means of delineation, I believe to be nearly as fit a subject of general instruction as writing. But though much is to be gained by raising the standard of admission, it is the standard of graduation that finally tests the school, and the need now is for high-class post-graduate work. Some of the schools foster this high-class work. In rare instances they produce work to vie with that done in France, and as they develop the enthusiasm and spirit that is the chief merit of the French school, it becomes less and less necessary to study in a foreign school. We now need scholarships for post-graduate study in the schools themselves. There are scholarships enough to support students in foreign travel. The clever boy can get abroad if he proves himself worth the investment; and, besides, desirable as foreign travel is, it becomes less and less necessary as books and photographs are more widely available. Scholarships that would support boys at such study not only benefit the recipient and enable him to study without visiting foreign lands, but the presence of such a class of workers in a school give it a power and influence that no amount of endowment or museums of teaching can equal. The best instructors that youth can have are companions further advanced on a good road. Hence, I ardently hope that such scholarships may be founded; and it is certain that those schools of architecture among us will quickly be distinguished as the real architectural universities which depend, not on the funds or buildings or number of students, but on their advanced graduate instruction and on a body of strong students banded together with *esprit de corps*.

Possibly the foundation of a prize, open to competition between these graduate schools, would do something to foster this very desirable advanced education. The American Institute is now about to enter into relations with these different schools by accepting their diplomas as a standard of admission. It might very properly take the charge of such a Grand Prize.

There is yet another means of education which prevails with us and which deserves our hearty encouragement. I mean the draughtsmen's clubs which join, with good fellowship, all aids to study. The Architectural Club, in Boston, maintains many classes, and is the instrument of great good in our city. I think the fact that these young men govern themselves and direct their own work is one of the reasons that the club continues and prospers. Such organizations generally do prosper while those in command are interested. To insure perpetuity it is necessary for the active members to know when their turn is over, and to yield willingly to the next generation, as they themselves proceed to the work of older men. Through all my professional life I have watched with interest the relations of the Architectural Association in London with the Royal Institute of British Architects, and have hoped for something of the sort in America. When a member of the Architectural Association comes into the active practice of his profession, he surrenders control in the association's affairs to his juniors, and takes his part in the quite different work organized by his seniors of the British Institute. I have hoped that the Architectural League of America is to take that relation to our older body. At times it has assumed a spirit of opposition to us, but I fancy that attitude, together with an indorsement of any passing cult, is but

temporary, for fads and special cults pass away and only basic principles remain, and surely we represent nothing worthy of opposition. If the energetic in our profession will take hold and administer affairs better than we have been able to, we shall ask nothing better.

I suggest referring to a committee the question whether an alliance can not be made either with the Architectural League of America, or an association like it, which might become the instrument of the draughtsmen and younger architects. I would make it the center for classes and club life from which the older members, as they recognize that their turn is passed, would naturally graduate to the Institute. To their hands, when the proper time comes, we should gladly bequeath the American Institute. If to-day our youths are apt to think that in this or that case the duties of the Institute have not been properly performed, it will be their turn then, and I trust that they will do far better than their predecessors, who had not the advantage of architectural leagues in which to prepare themselves for their work.

If our young men get their highest training in the schools, and if club life and voluntary classes are left to our youngsters to govern in their own way, with the active help and sympathy of their elders, what partly performed duties or what opportunities lie before us which may justify the existence of this Institute and the labors of its members?

We can only measure the amount of good the Institute has done by its output. Many a man who cares little for it benefits because others have cared. Many a man, outside of our numbers, is more respected in his community and has a more certain livelihood because the Institute has proved itself a reasonable public body. Certainly, through its influence the perils and hardships of competitions have been greatly mitigated. But all these are small and selfish ends. The real value of the Institute lies in its opportunities, in its openings for useful work and mutual high endeavor. Thanks to the wisdom of its founders, I think it has been a potent means of good. Thanks to them, it has none of the features of a selfish trade union. In a trade union a man's powers and skill are handicapped for the general good, but with us a member has entered into no engagements of any kind except that he will honorably practice his profession. Our compact is rather that of the ancient guilds into which no one could enter who was not a master workman. We seek to make membership a sign of established character. We are trying to make it impossible for anybody to be an Associate who has not thus established a name for honorable professional conduct, and for no one to be a Fellow who has not done really distinguished work. With the coming year, entrance to the Institute will be possible only through examination arranged by the Institute, or on presentation of a degree from an accredited school of architecture. I believe that the new tests will cause large additions to our numbers, because Associate membership, henceforth, is to mean that a definite and valuable standard of skill has been reached, and that from among this membership their comrades are to choose by honorable election the Fellows of the American Institute of Architects. To many young men these will, I doubt not, seem valuable inducements.

In its various Chapters the Institute has been and may be a power for good in scattered localities. Laying out cities, broadening avenues, arranging vistas, improving tenement districts, encouraging public art leagues and commissions—all are subjects which more and more engage the attention of our local Chapters, and in which they may readily prove themselves useful to their several communities, and now that American ambition turns toward the embellishment and beautifying of cities on grand lines, the Chapters can guide public taste and awaken public interest to schemes of artistic local improvement.

But, better than all this, a man through the Institute may have the good fortune to do something toward the raising of the standard of work and character in the country at large. During this year we have had an unusual opportunity of this sort. We lent sufficient aid to prevent unstudied and undesirable alterations in the White House which would have completely changed the character of that public monument. That was an unselfish and useful undertaking. Your members have been repeatedly called upon by Secretary Gage to serve as jurors for competition under the Tarsney act, and have rendered willing service. Your officers have had consultations with several of the Government Departments relative to architectural work, and I think the immense improvement of Government architecture under the Tarsney act may fairly be attributed, in part, to earlier action by the Institute. Our Chapters protested against permission being given to the Pennsylvania Railroad to cross the Mall in Washington. It seemed as if this protest were vain, as those who were most influential had given this up as a lost cause, but the Commission to consider the subject of the laying out of the City of Washington have not held this cause to be lost, and our action may yet prove to have been useful. We vigorously urged the appointment of this Commission on the plan of the City of Washington, and our anticipations as to the results of its labors are great. When our committee was urging the formation of the Commission before the Senate Committee we were told that they had to grant it, as no man urging it was asking anything for himself. In such disinterested public service we are able to render good service to the State, and thus perform the highest duty that can come to us.

Perhaps you will agree with me in thinking that this year we might set before ourselves the task of urging the Government

to appoint a permanent Art Commission. I commend this to you as an action well worthy the attention of a special committee.

Before I close, let me give one moment more to consider what effect this life of study and of active contact with a busy world has on the individual, for that is what finally interests us. An architect receives his training at college or in an office. He lives a busy life in the American business world. What does such a life bring to him, or what influence should it have on him? His occupations deal with art in its most conventional form; with hue and group and texture and color; with the history of art and with drawing, and all the while he is rigidly bound to scientific construction, to business methods, and to commercial honor. There can be no great place among us for even an honest builder, unless he is moved by artistic impulses and can turn his building into architecture. There should be, on the other hand, no chance for any position, among architects, for the man who shields improper professional conduct under the excuse of artistic temperament. He is not only a thief, but a weak and feeble one, without even the courage to call things by their right names. The world sometimes excuses that attitude in shiftless men of genius, who are responsible for their conduct to nobody but themselves, but an architect is trusted with the property of others, and owes a strict account like other business men. In return, it is his happy fortune to direct the use of the money of others toward the higher product of man's imagination and skill. The world of poetry and romance lies behind all human occupations, but with us artists it is especially near the surface of our daily work. It is our chief function to cherish and increase the love of the beautiful in the daily life surrounding us. While doing this, business and routine often seem to repress the artistic impulses we most cherish. But it is, doubtless, our great blessing that, as we grope upward toward the higher life of poetry and imagination, our feet must remain of necessity firm set on the bed rock of common sense and business integrity. Flowers blossom more freely when the plants are nipped back. Sir Walter Scott and Robert Stevenson might never have produced as they did but for pressure. Fortunate, indeed, are we that our daily work constantly awakens and draws from our imagination, but, at the same time, recalls us from dreamy diletantism to hard work and active life and plain, honest straightforward dealing. Our art makes the life of our community comfortable, beautiful and stately. It keeps us in touch with higher things while holding us to earth. It forms good citizens. It trains useful men. We may envy no man's opportunities in life. Let us all be glad that we are architects! Let us all exult in the position that our art holds in our country to-day.

Sometimes at the seaside come days of ugly weather. The ocean is leaden and oily. The distant shores show hard and gray, or the fog sets in and all is enveloped in gloom. From far and near the coasters, heavy laden and storm beaten, crowd into the gloomy port. Then comes a morning when the fresh northwest wind sweeps clean the sea and sky. The dark clouds vanish and leave a world in its true colors, bright and clean and sparkling in the sunshine, and down the shore in a long procession go the white winged vessels speeding on their several errands to the ends of the sea.

Sometimes troublesome clients and difficult contractors envelope our professional life in gloomy weather, and the worries and anxieties of business befog our mental vision. Then, haply, comes a time like this of meeting together, when it is given to us to see things in their true proportions and in a favoring light. The fogs lift, and with the clearing weather the fractious clients and the office cares vanish into thin air. With cheerful courage our barques make for the open main; great ships with flaunting colors, solid coasters built for heavy work, the large and the small, with divers cargoes and bound to many a port, but sailing this morning in happy company, their canvas swelling to the breezes of hope and enthusiasm and confidence.

SUMMARY OF CONVENTION WORK.

The routine work of the convention followed after the reading of the reports from the Board of Directors and standing committees, which were referred to committees for consideration. Little important discussion came up during the entire convention, and among the reports those of the special committees appointed last year on the effectiveness of the Tarsney act were the most interesting. One of these is printed in full on page 27, as it presents the most exhaustive report upon the operation of the Tarsney act that has been made since it was placed in operation by Secretary Gage.

The committees appointed to report on the reports of standing committees were as follows:

President's Address—J. R. Coolidge, of Chicago; W. S. Wicks, of Buffalo, and T. D. Evans, of Pittsburg.

Board of Directors—S. V. Seeler, of Boston; James W. McLaughlin, of Cincinnati, and J. W. Carrère, of New York.

Chapter Reports—Robert Stead, of Washington; E. J. Lewis, of Boston, and W. B. Mundie, of Chicago.

Two committees to nominate officers were appointed as follows: Samuel A. Treat, of Chicago; E. J. Lewis, of Boston, and Henry Van Brunt, of Kansas City, and E. Nolting, of Baltimore, J. L. Manson and James B. Hill, of Washington.

On motion of Mr. Seeler, a Municipal Improvement Committee was added to the list of standing committees.

The next to the last clause in the printed schedule of changes, that relating to the appointment of an architect, was ordered omitted, as it was repeated in the code of competitions, and the

last clause, that relating to soliciting patronage, was amended to read: "The attempt to secure work by offering professional services at a less rate of compensation than another architect is unprofessional conduct."

An important measure was discussed relative to the management of Government work by a National Bureau of Architecture, to have charge of all departments of national Government work, and which, though similar to the Tarsney act, should be mandatory in its character, and a committee of five was ordered to be appointed at a later date by the chair to bring the measure to the attention of the Government.

According to the Committee on Chapter Reports, the total increase in the membership of the Institute during the year was fifty-seven.

George Keller, of Hartford, read a paper which gave interesting facts regarding the connection of C. F. Anderson with the preliminary designs for the Capitol at Washington, and suggested that a report upon the same be prepared and presented at the next convention.

A cable from President Emerson, of the Royal Institute of British Architects, which had been received by the president, presenting the Royal Institute's regret at the death of President McKinley, was ordered answered by the secretary.

Auditor Treat reported the treasurer's accounts to be correct.

The metric system came up in the form of a request for a committee to be appointed by the Institute with instructions to appear before Congress and state the Institute's position in regard to the metric system, and to confer with the chairman of the Statistical Bureau. The matter was left in the hands of the Board of Directors.

A resolution in connection with the death of Edward H. Kendall, presented by Walter Cook, of New York, was adopted by a unanimous rising vote. The many standing committees were left to the Board of Directors for appointment at the first meeting in January, at which time a scheme for endowment insurance will be considered and a report made to the next convention.

The following officers and directors for three years were elected by ballot:

President, Charles F. McKinn, of New York; first vice-president, Frank Miles Day, of Philadelphia; second vice-president, Alfred Stone, of Providence; secretary and treasurer, Glen Brown, of Washington. Directors for three years: Walter Cook, of New York; William S. Eames, of St. Louis, and Cass Gilbert, of St. Paul. Auditor for two years, W. G. Preston, of Boston.

After a vote of thanks to the retiring president, Robert S. Peabody, and to the Buffalo Chapter, the Pan-American Exposition, the State of New York, and others, for courtesies received, the convention adjourned to meet at Washington in 1902.

PAINTS IN ARCHITECTURE.

"FLAT" PAINTING.

AT the present time, it is safe to say, fully three-fourths of the interior painting done is either finished with an "egg-shell" gloss or "flat." This means that the paint is left with a minimum quantity of binder, the fixed oil which commonly serves the purpose of holding the pigment in place being replaced by volatile turpentine or benzine. As a result, the pigment is only loosely held and is easily jarred off, and if it be a "chalking" pigment, chalks more readily than usual.

The consequences of this condition in the case of poisonous pigments are readily apprehended, and such pigments, in "flat" painting, are undoubtedly a constant source of peril to occupants of rooms so painted.

Fashion will have its way, however, and so long as flat painting rules the public taste, "flat" painting must be supplied. But while we can not dictate taste, we can remove the peril of disastrous consequences by specifying pigments that will not chalk, and if they did would have no ill effects. In other words, paints based on zinc white should be used to the exclusion of lead compounds, and for the tinting colors, the lead chromes, prussian blue, copper, arsenic and lead greens, should be replaced by the mineral yellows, zinc chrome, ultramarine or cobalt blue, etc.

For the so-called enamel work, zinc white is almost invariably preferred on account of its color; but fewer architects remember the greater importance of selecting an innocuous pigment when the work is to be flat. Zinc white has the further advantage, under these circumstances, of not chalking, and is therefore pre-eminently the proper base for "flat" painting.

CHARLES JOURDAIN.

MOSAICS.

THE semi-annual meeting of the Detroit Architectural Club was held on October 7. The gold and silver medals offered by the Michigan Chapter A. I. A. for an entrance to Palmer Park were presented to Richard Wildner and T. Carl Rollmar. Louis Risper received honorable mention. There will be another competition this month, in which the Chapter will award a bronze medal.

WHILE a number of citizens of Uniontown, Pennsylvania, were discussing the erection of a tall building the other day, one of them asked: "Assuming that this building is to be ten stories high, and the walls plumb, will or will it not be wider at the top than the bottom? And if larger will it be so much so that it will

be necessary for the architect to take the fact into consideration?" These queries are based on the well-known fact that the center of the earth is the center of gravity. Perhaps some mathematical genius will be able to figure out how wide and how tall a building would have to be in order that the width at the bottom and the top should show a difference of one inch. If the skyscraping mania continues to develop, it may yet be necessary to take this element into consideration.

CAPT. EDGERTON S. ROGERS, one of the most accomplished architects of Richmond, and a son of the distinguished sculptor, died recently, after an illness of several months. He was born in Rome, Italy, about forty years ago, and was the first child born and registered as an American citizen under united Italy. His father was Mr. Randolph Rogers, the sculptor, who made the Marshall and Lewis statues in the Capitol Square, the famous victory statue at Hartford, Connecticut, and other notable works. Captain Rogers was identified with Richmond by the fact that his mother was Miss Rosa Gibson, a famous beauty and belle of the '50's. Captain Rogers was sent to this country by his parents while a boy, and was highly educated. He was the master of four languages and remarkably well-informed.

SOME of the Boston papers seem to begrudge their architects the result of the latter's success. The comment of one of these papers will suffice. It will afford amusement if not food for serious thought. Ignorance, however, is seldom amusing, but is often pathetic. "The architects are making money rapidly out of the construction of the Lig office buildings going up in Boston, all of a severely plain nature. An employe can get out all the plans for the stonework in a week, and an engineer can form up the steel structure in even less time. As the commission is so much of a percentage on the total cost of the buildings, it can thus be seen that top-notch money is being made with a minimum of effort. In contrast, in New York, where a great deal of ornamentation is being placed on the buildings, this commission paid has to be spent in part in drafting and modeling models for the various stone ornaments, and in doing a multitude of other things."

THE losses from fires in the United States last year were \$155,000,000, or more than half as great as the British war loan, and in return therefor there is nothing to show, and no hope of anything to show. Well, but such losses are accidental, unintentional and inevitable, men say, and thus far different from those contracted in a war deliberately entered upon. We are not so sure of that, says the *New York Tribune*. Suppose that \$155,000,000 had been spent in improved construction of buildings, making them fireproof. Or, rather, suppose there were spent each year, to cover the additional cost of fireproof over inflammable construction, a sum equal to that lost each year in fires. We are strongly inclined to think the result would be a steady and marked diminution in the number and destructiveness of fires and in the amount lost through them. Note the insignificant sum total of losses through fire in the Tribune building in all the years since it was erected as the pioneer and model of modern fireproof office buildings. Suppose that same petty ratio of losses were extended throughout the city and the whole country. There would be no talk and no fear of any \$155,000,000 losses a year, or of anything but the slightest fraction of that sum. If prudence does not teach the lesson, pecuniary profit will, we trust, that it is cheaper in the long run, and not necessarily so very long a run, either, to make buildings fireproof than to pay fire losses.

THE awards for architectural exhibits at the Pan-American Exposition were made October 9, and a number of architects were honored. To each successful architectural exhibitor a special diploma and medal of honor above and apart from all other awards was given.

The awards were as follows:

GOLD MEDAL.

Cope & Stewartson, Philadelphia: Free Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania; Institution for the Instruction of the Blind, Overbrook; Reading-room, University of Pennsylvania; Blair Hall, Princeton, New Jersey; House at Princeton, New Jersey; Dormitories, University of Pennsylvania; House at Edge Hill.

Frank Miles Day & Brother, Philadelphia: Free Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania; House on Locust street, Philadelphia; House at Ambler, Pennsylvania; Dining-room, House on Locust street, Philadelphia.

Wilson Eyre, Jr., Philadelphia: Free Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania.

Ferry & Clas, Milwaukee: Public Library, Milwaukee; Library of the Historical Society of the State of Wisconsin.

Ernest Flagg, New York: House for the Clark estate, Entrance; Corcoran Art Gallery, Staircase, Washington, D. C.; Soldiers' Monument, New Haven, Connecticut; House for the A. C. Clark estate.

McKim, Mead & White, New York: Columbia College Library, New York; Public Library, Boston; University Club, New York.

SILVER MEDAL.

Hunt & Hunt, New York: Façade, East Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art; also Great Hall of same.

Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, Boston: All Saints' Church, Boston; Richmond Court, Brookline, Massachusetts; Choir, Church of Our Saviour.

BRONZE MEDAL.

Boring & Tilton, New York: Town Hall, East Orange, New Jersey; United States Immigrant Station, Tower and Arches, Ellis Island.

A. W. Longfellow, Jr., Boston: Front of Phillip Brooks' House, Harvard College; Cow Barn, Brookline, Massachusetts; Boston & Albany Railroad Station, at Westboro, Massachusetts.

HONORABLE MENTION.

Elzner & Anderson, Cincinnati: Union Station, Dayton, Ohio; Residence of L. W. Anderson, Esq.

Edwin J. Lewis, Jr., Boston: Draper Memorial Church, Hopedale, Massachusetts.

T. Henry Randall, New York: Residence of H. W. Poor, Esq., Tuxedo Park; Mantel, House of H. W. Poor.

Little & Browne, Boston: Library, House of E. W. Bliss, Esq., New York; Entrance Hall, Drawing-room and Dining-room of same.

The jurors were J. Carroll Beckwith, chairman, Herbert Adams, Edwin H. Blashfield, Kenyon Cox, Daniel C. French, Cass Gilbert, Samuel Isham, Henry Rutgers Marshall, A. Phimister Proctor, G. A. Reid, William R. Ware and Henry Wolf. For exhibit of sculpture Augustus St. Gaudens served on the jury.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

SCHOOL ARCHITECTURE. By Edmund M. Wheelwright. Rogers & Manson, Boston. Size, 7½ by 10½ inches; 350 pages; 250 illustrations. Price, \$5, delivered.

In 1898-1900 there appeared in the *Brickbuilder* a series of papers on "The American Schoolhouse," by Edmund M. Wheelwright. The success of these papers suggested the publication of this book, in which the original material has been recast and the scope of the subject has been greatly widened. Many American schools not considered in the original papers are illustrated and described, but the work is especially enriched from foreign sources. Examples are presented of the most typical and practically suggestive schools of Germany, Austria, Switzerland, the Scandinavian countries, England and France, the subject being more comprehensively treated than in any book heretofore published. All details of school construction are considered, yet the information is studiously condensed within the limits of a convenient handbook, which is made readily accessible by an unusually full index. It is hardly necessary to refer to Mr. Wheelwright's wide experience in the designing and construction of schools, or to his general recognition as an authority on school architecture.

OUR ILLUSTRATIONS.

House, California.

Oriental room, Residence of Dr. Fenges, Pasadena, California. Features of the Pan-American Exposition of 1901 at Buffalo, New York.

Allen County Courthouse, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Brentwood Tolan, architect.

House of E. M. Coats, Springfield, Massachusetts. G. Wood Taylor, architect.

The Henry C. Durand Art Institute, Lake Forest, Illinois. Henry Ives Cobb, architect, Washington, D. C.

École des Beaux-Arts, Paris, Competition for Grand Prize of Rome, 1901; Design for an American Academy in Paris. First prize design by M. Jean Hulot; second prize by M. Prevot; honorable mention by M. M. Barrias and Hebard.

Photogravure Plate: Residence of J. J. Williams, Scranton, Pennsylvania. E. H. Davis, architect.

PHOTOGRAVURE PLATES.

Issued only with the Photogravure Edition.

Residence, New York. Hugh Lamb, architect.

Interior View, Iroquois Hotel, Buffalo, New York. Essenwein & Johnson, architects.

Residence of James Cummings, Toledo, Ohio. Becker & Hitchcock, architects.

Residence for Mrs. R. McD. Campau. John Scott & Co., architects, Detroit, Michigan.


Residence of Arthur B. Leach, South Orange, New Jersey. George W. Maher, architect, Chicago. Three exterior views are shown.

ASSOCIATION NOTES.


KANSAS CITY CHAPTER A. I. A.

The Kansas City Chapter of the American Institute of Architects held its annual meeting on September 4 and elected the following officers: President, Frank M. Howe; Vice-President, A. Van Brunt; Secretary, J. W. McKecknie; Treasurer, G. M. Seimens; Directors, W. W. Rose, B. Von Unworth and F. B. Hamilton.


The Chapter decided to join again this year with the Art Club in an exhibition at the public library. The first joint exhibition was held last year and was a fine success, the architectural drawing being an attractive and interesting feature of the show. The organization of a draftsman's club was discussed and the Chapter will do all in its power to foster such a project.



ORIENTAL ROOM, RESIDENCE OF DR. FENGES, PASADENA, CAL.



PLAN — M. HIBRARD'S DESIGN.




HONORABLE MENTION — DESIGN BY M. HIBRARD.



COMPETITION FOR GRAND PRIZE OF ROME, 1901; ECOLE DES BEAUX-ARTS, PARIS.
DESIGN FOR AN AMERICAN ACADEMY IN PARIS.




HENRY C. DURAND ART INSTITUTE, LAKE FOREST, ILL.
HENRY IVES COBB, ARCHITECT.



PLAN — M. HULOT'S DESIGN.




FIRST PRIZE — DESIGN BY M. JEAN HULOT.
 COMPETITION FOR GRAND PRIZE OF ROME, 1901; ECOLE DES BEAUX-ARTS, PARIS.
 DESIGN FOR AN AMERICAN ACADEMY IN PARIS.







ALLEN COUNTY COURTHOUSE, FORT WAYNE, IND.
BRENTWOOD TOLAN, ARCHITECT.


STONE FROM THE HOOSIER QUARRY OF
THE BEDFORD QUARRIES COMPANY.






HOUSE OF E. M. COATS, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.
G. WOOD TAYLOR, ARCHITECT.







HOUSE, CALIFORNIA.




PLAN — M. BARRIAS' DESIGN.




HONORABLE MENTION — DESIGN BY M. BARRIAS.




PLAN — M. PREVOT'S DESIGN.




SECOND PRIZE — DESIGN BY M. PREVOT.
COMPETITION FOR GRAND PRIZE OF ROME, 1901; ECOLE DES BEAUX-ARTS, PARIS.
DESIGN FOR AN AMERICAN COLLEGE IN ROME



THE GODDESS OF LIGHT.
By Herbert Adams.



"Heroic Music," by Isidore Konti.
Copyright, 1900, by the Pan American Exposition Co.




"Lyric Music," by Isidore Konti.
Copyright, 1900, by the Pan American Exposition Co.



Testing the electrical circuit on the Machinery and Transportation Building during the early months of the Exposition.



From photographs by C. F. Whitmarsh, by courtesy of *The Inland Printer*.





Negative by H. D. Hampson, St. Louis.

RESIDENCE OF J. J. WILLIAMS, SCRANTON, PA.

E. H. DAVIS, ARCHITECT.

INLAND ARCHITECT PRESS.