

THE  
OCTAGON

---

*A Journal of The American Institute of Architects*

---



*The Convention Program*  
*Nominations of Officers and Directors*  
*Architectural Competitions*  
*Coordination Through Competition*  
*"Architects' Small Home Service"*

*Volume 8*

*APRIL*  
1936

*Number 4*

# Chapters and Officers

PRESIDENTS (\*) AND SECRETARIES (†) LISTED AS OF MARCH 15, 1936

- ALABAMA**—\*Frederic Child Biggin, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; †Hugh Martin, 916 Title Guarantee Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.
- ALBANY**—\*Clarence H. Gardiner, 64 Bellview Terrace, Rensselaer, N. Y.; †Gilbert L. Van Auken, Delmar, N. Y.
- ARKANSAS**—\*Harry Wanger, 1814 Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.
- BALTIMORE**—\*James R. Edmunds, Jr., Calvert Building, Baltimore, Md.; †Francis H. Jencks, 113 West Mulberry St., Baltimore, Md.
- BOSTON**—\*H. Daland Chandler, 75 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.; †G. Houston Burr, 83 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
- BROOKLYN**—\*Herbert C. Bowman, 299 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; †Ralph M. Rice, 22 West 42nd St., New York, N. Y.
- BUFFALO**—\*John J. Wade, 723 Marine Trust Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.; †David B. Crane, 1 Niagara Square, Buffalo, N. Y.
- CENTRAL ILLINOIS**—\*F. N. Emerson, 1600 Peoria Life Bldg., Peoria, Ill.; †Thomas E. O'Donnell, 119 Architecture Bldg., Urbana, Ill.
- CENTRAL NEW YORK**—\*Conway L. Todd, 815 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.; †Walter V. Ward, 315 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.
- CHICAGO**—\*Emery Stanford Orr, 956 Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrodt, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- CINCINNATI**—\*H. P. Van Arsdale, 1024 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio; †George F. Roth, Jr., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- CLEVELAND**—\*A. C. Robinson, National City Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio; †Elmer J. Raeb, 1509 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
- COLORADO**—\*George H. Williamson, Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.; †Roland L. Linder, Insurance Building, Denver, Colo.
- COLUMBUS**—\*Galen F. Oman, 258 East Como Ave., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, 50 West Broad St., Columbus, Ohio.
- CONNECTICUT**—\*Douglas Orr, 956 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.; †Herbert Gilson, Jr., 904 Main St., Hartford, Conn.
- DAYTON**—\*Clifford C. Brown, 1129 Belbold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Geo. T. Neuffer, 437 Ludlow Arcade, Dayton, Ohio.
- DELAWARE**—\*Walter Carlson, 3028 du Pont Bldg., Wilmington, Del.; †Reah de Bourq Robinson, Equitable Bldg., Wilmington, Del.
- DETROIT**—\*Alvin E. Harley, 1507 Stroh Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †N. Chester Sorenson, 2201 Industrial Bank Bldg., Detroit, Mich.
- EASTERN OHIO**—\*Ellis M. Keppel, 506 Second National Bank Bldg., Warren, Ohio; †Wm. H. Cook, 83 North Hazel St., Youngstown, Ohio.
- FLORIDA CENTRAL**—\*Geo. Foote Dunham, P. O. Box 295, Orlando, Fla.; †Frank A. Parsiala, 412 Robertson Bldg., Ocala, Fla.
- FLORIDA NORTH**—\*H. J. Klutho, 2030 Main St., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Leo Roy Sheftall, 905 Main St., Jacksonville, Fla.
- FLORIDA SOUTH**—\*F. E. Paist, 834 Ingraham Bldg., Miami, Fla.; †Robert F. Smith, 2943 S. W. 27th Ave., Coconut Grove, Fla.
- GEORGIA**—\*H. C. McLaughlin, Commercial Exchange, Atlanta, Ga.; †Jos. W. Cooper, Jr., 327-30 Forsyth Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
- GRAND RAPIDS**—\*Harry L. Mead, 901 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Miss Marion F. Blood, 609 Wealthy St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- HAWAII**—\*C. W. Furer, 504 Hawaiian Trust Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.; †Claude A. Stiehl, 3566 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, T. H.
- INDIANA**—\*Kurt Vonnegut, 4365 No. Illinois St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Herbert Foits, Architects & Bldg. Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.
- IOWA**—\*Charles Altillisch, 117 Winnebago St., Decorah, Iowa; †Edwin E. Wetherell, 506 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.
- KANSAS CITY**—\*Alfred E. Barnes, 2500 Telephone Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.; †John R. Brust, 2500 Telephone Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.
- KANSAS**—\*W. E. Glover, 301 National Reserve Bldg., Topeka, Kan.; †Ralph M. Seasmell, 711 National Reserve Bldg., Topeka, Kan.
- KENTUCKY**—\*C. Julian Oberwarth, 301 Second St., Frankfort, Ky.; †Ostian F. Ward, 1602 Washington Bldg., Louisville, Ky.
- LOUISIANA**—\*M. C. Curtis, c/o Tulane University, New Orleans, La.; †Alan C. Reed, 461-3 Nola Bldg., New Orleans, La.
- MADISON**—\*Arthur Peabody, State Capitol, Madison, Wisc.; †Edward J. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wisc.
- MAINE**—\*John Calvin Stevens, 187 Middle St., Portland, Me.; †Philip S. Wadsworth, 198 Middle St., Portland, Me.
- MINNESOTA**—\*Robert T. Jones, 1200 Second Ave., So., Minneapolis, Minn.; †E. B. Croft, 1084 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.
- MISSISSIPPI**—\*E. E. Norwood, National Bank of Gulfport Bldg., Gulfport, Miss.; †James E. Stevens, III, 743 North State Street, Jackson, Miss.
- MONTANA**—\*Fred A. Brinkman, Kalispell, Mont.; †W. R. Flew, Bozeman, Mont.
- NEBRASKA**—\*Wm. L. Steele, 2236 St. Mary's Ave., Omaha, Nebr.; †H. S. Seymour, 708 World-Herald Bldg., Omaha, Nebr.
- NEW JERSEY**—\*Kenneth W. Dalsell, 41 Maple St., Summit, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
- NEW YORK**—\*Hobart B. Upjohn, 5962 Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y.; †Frederick G. Frost, 144 East 80th St., New York, N. Y.
- NORTH CAROLINA**—\*Walter W. Hook, 1205 Commercial Bank Bldg., Charlotte, N. C.; †Eric G. Stillwell, Hendersonville, N. C.
- NORTH LOUISIANA**—\*C. W. King, 1029 Dalsell St., Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Nelld, Shreveport, La.
- NORTH TEXAS**—\*Walter C. Sharp, 707 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Tex.; †Geo. L. Dahl, Insurance Bldg., Dallas, Tex.
- NORTHERN CALIFORNIA**—\*Will G. Corlett, 1801 Bank of America Bldg., Oakland, Calif.; †James H. Mitchell, 389 Pine St., San Francisco, Calif.
- NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA**—\*Clement S. Kirby, Commerce Bldg., Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks, 127 West 7th St., Erie, Pa.
- OKLAHOMA**—\*Leon E. Senter, 308 Philtower Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.; †Leonard H. Bailey, Colcord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.
- OREGON**—\*Fred Aandahl, 911 Lewis Bldg., Portland, Ore.; †John T. Schneider, 1099 Spaulding Bldg., Portland, Ore.
- PHILADELPHIA**—\*Arthur H. Brocks, Architects Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.; †Boy F. Larson, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
- PITTSBURGH**—\*Raymond M. Marlier, Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Ralph M. Reutti, 2941 Baum Blvd., Pittsburgh, Pa.
- RHODE ISLAND**—\*F. Ellis Jackson, 1216 Turkus Head Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †J. Peter Goddes, II, 840 Hospital Bldg., Providence, R. I.
- SAN DIEGO**—\*Frank L. Hope, Jr., Bank of America Bldg., San Diego, Calif.; †Sam W. Hamill, Bank of America Bldg., San Diego, Calif.
- SANTA BARBARA**—\*E. Keith Lockard, 117 E. de la Guerra St., Santa Barbara, Calif.; †Ralph W. Armitage, 235 West Victoria St., Santa Barbara, Calif.
- SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE**—\*Charles L. Levy, 176 South Main St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; †Thomas H. Atherton, 139 South Main St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
- SOUTH CAROLINA**—\*Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †J. Whitney Cunningham, 2 Pierson Bldg., Sumter, S. C.
- SOUTH GEORGIA**—\*Henrik Wallin, 408 East Bay St., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Sugden, 125 East 49th St., Savannah, Ga.
- SOUTH TEXAS**—\*Birdsall P. Briscoe, 4361 Main St., Houston, Tex.; †R. W. Leibals, 711 National Standard Bldg., Houston, Tex.
- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**—\*Ralph C. Fiewelling, 614 Architects Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.; †George J. Adams, 5514 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif.
- SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA**—\*Chas. Howard Lloyd, 1011 North Front St., Harrisburg, Pa.; †James W. Minick, 500 North Second St., Harrisburg, Pa.
- ST. LOUIS**—\*P. John Hoener, 3605 Laclede Ave., St. Louis, Mo.; †Benedict Farrar, 1367 Arcade Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.
- ST. PAUL**—\*G. A. Anderson, 1509 Pioneer Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.; †Thomas F. Ellerbe, 1100 Minnesota Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
- TENNESSEE**—\*Jos. W. Hart, 602 Hitchcock Bldg., Nashville, Tenn.; †H. C. Parrent, Jr., American Trust Bldg., Nashville, Tenn.
- TOLEDO**—\*Karl E. Hoke, 1217 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio; †Thomas D. Best, 303 Richardson Bldg., Toledo, Ohio.
- UTAH**—\*Raymond Evans, 310 Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †John Fetzer, 506 Templeton Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- VIRGINIA**—\*M. C. Lee, Federal Housing Administration, American Bank Bldg., Richmond, Va.; †W. R. Crowe, 610 Krass Bldg., Lynchburg, Va.
- WASHINGTON, D. C.**—\*Arthur B. Heaton, 1211A Conn. Ave., Washington, D. C.; †E. Philip Schreier, 1517 H St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
- WASHINGTON STATE**—\*L. E. Gowen, Textile Tower, Seattle, Washington; †William Bain, 704 Textile Tower, Seattle, Washington.
- WEST TEXAS**—\*Carlton W. Adams, Insurance Bldg., San Antonio, Tex.; †Bartlett Cocks, Maverick Bldg., San Antonio, Tex.
- WEST VIRGINIA**—\*C. C. Wood, Lowndes Bldg., Clarkburg, W. Va.; †C. E. Silling, Box 361, Charleston, W. Va.
- WISCONSIN**—\*William G. Herbst, 1249 North Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wisc.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1249 North Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wisc.

# 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.

## The Sixty-eighth Convention

### FOURTH AND LAST NOTICE

**A**LL indications point to an outstanding Convention—at Old Point Comfort and Williamsburg, Virginia, on May 5, 6, 7, and 8, 1936.

The January, February, March and April numbers of THE OCTAGON set forth complete information—for the guidance of chapters, delegates, and members.

For convenience an index of Convention items is listed as follows:

#### In the January OCTAGON—

Early Election of Delegates  
Procedure for Delegates and Proxies  
No Taxes or Refunds  
Chapter Meetings on Convention Business  
Nominations of Officers and Directors

#### In the February OCTAGON—

Qualifications of Delegates  
Proxy Representation  
Hotel Headquarters and Reservations  
The Program in General  
The Attractions of Williamsburg

#### In the March OCTAGON—

Looking Ahead—by President Voorhees  
Hotel Reservations, etc.  
Invitation to All Members  
Article on Williamsburg  
By-law Amendments

#### In the April OCTAGON (this number)—

Headquarters at Williamsburg  
The Dinner at Old Point Comfort  
Tentative Program of Convention  
How Will You Travel?  
The James River Plantations  
Nominations of Officers and Directors

#### Headquarters in Williamsburg:

Through the courtesy of the College of William and Mary, the Phi Beta Kappa Hall, on the campus of the College, at Williamsburg, will be Convention headquarters, for May 6, 7, and 8.

The Phi Beta Kappa Hall has a good auditorium with ample lobby space. On the second floor are lounging rooms, which will be reserved as the exclusive headquarters for the ladies during the three days in Williamsburg.

#### The Dinner at Old Point Comfort:

It is an old Institute custom to conclude its conventions with a dinner party. This year formal addresses will be omitted. Time will be taken to pay appropriate tribute to some of those who made possible the restoration of Williamsburg; and to award two medals of the Institute in acknowledgment of outstanding accomplishments in the Fine Arts and in Craftsmanship.

With reference to dress the dinner will be formal, but a dinner jacket will not be mandatory.

## Tentative Program of the Convention

**T**HIS tentative program, published more than a month in advance of the Convention, is subject to change. It is merely a forecast of the final program, which will be distributed in printed form at the opening session of the Convention.

### Hotel and Convention Headquarters:

The New Chamberlin Hotel, at Old Point Comfort, Virginia, will be hotel headquarters for delegates, members, and guests. All the sessions on the first day—Tuesday, May 5—will be held in the hotel. The railroad station and steamer landings are within a block of the hotel.

Beginning on Wednesday, May 6, the Convention will hold most of its sessions in the Phi Beta Kappa Hall, on the campus of the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg. These sessions will begin promptly at 10:30 A.M., each day.

There will be adequate transportation for every one—by automobile and bus from Old Point Comfort to Williamsburg each morning, and back to Old Point Comfort in the late afternoon.

### Registration:

Delegates, members, and guests should register upon arrival at the hotel, with the Registration and Credentials Committee.

For the convenience of those arriving on Monday, May 4, this Committee will be on duty at the New Chamberlin Hotel on the afternoon and evening of Monday, May 4, from 3:00 to 10:00 P.M. It will also be on duty on Tuesday, May 5, until 6:00 P.M., at which time registration records will be closed in order to permit the Committee to make its report to the Convention.

Prompt registration upon arrival at the hotel will greatly expedite the work of the Convention.

### Program, Tickets, Etc.:

The final program of the Convention, with complete information concerning procedure; tickets of admission to Williamsburg buildings, and to the dinner; and all Convention documents will be available at the time of registration.

### Meetings Before the Convention:

#### Board of Directors:

Annual meeting of the Board of Directors at The Octagon, Washington, D. C., April 30 to May 3, inclusive.

Chapters or members having communications for the Board should address them to the Secretary, at The Octagon, for delivery there not later than April 30.

### Associations and Councils:

Meetings of Associations and Councils, at the New Chamberlin Hotel unless otherwise stated, are as follows:

The State Societies of Architects—May 4.

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards—May 4.

The Producers' Council—May 5, 6, 7.

The Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, The Jefferson Hotel, Richmond, Va.—May 4.

The American Section—Permanent Committee, International Congress of Architects will meet on call, during the Convention.

Information concerning these meetings may be obtained from the secretaries of the various groups.

## TENTATIVE ORDER OF EVENTS

### TUESDAY, MAY FIFTH

(The Chamberlin Hotel, Old Point Comfort)

#### Morning Session

The President, Stephen F. Voorhees, *Presiding*

9:00 A.M. Registration continued.

10:00 A.M. Opening of the Convention.

The President's Address—  
By Stephen F. Voorhees

The Report of the Treasurer—  
By Edwin Bergstrom

\*The Report of the Board of Directors—  
By Charles T. Ingham

\*(NOTE—This report will be read and acted upon section by section.)



**Luncheon**

1:00 P.M. Luncheon and Joint Meeting with  
The Producers' Council.

**Afternoon**

The President Presiding

2:30 P.M. Board and Committee Reports.  
Consideration of By-law Amendments.

5:00 P.M. Reception by the President and  
Mrs. Voorhees.

6:00 P.M. Registration closes.

**Evening**

The President Presiding

8:00 P.M. Report of Committee on Credentials.

8:15 P.M. Nominations of Officers and Direc-  
tors.

Adoption of By-law Amendments.

**WEDNESDAY, MAY SIXTH****Morning Session**

(*Phi Beta Kappa Hall, in Williamsburg*)

The President Presiding

10:30 A.M. Opening of the Session.

Address—By Dr. William Stewart Bryan,  
President, College of William and Mary.

Address—By Kenneth Chorley, Vice-Presi-  
dent, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

Address—By William G. Perry, Architect.

12:00 Noon—At Bruton Parish Church

Services and Address—  
By Dr. W. A. R. Goodwin.

**Luncheon**

1:30 P.M. At the College Refectory.

(*At this luncheon all attending the Convention  
will be the guests of the College of William  
and Mary.*)

**Afternoon**

2:30 P.M. Visiting in Williamsburg.

**Evening**

No meetings scheduled.

**THURSDAY, MAY SEVENTH****Morning Session**

(*Phi Beta Kappa Hall, in Williamsburg*)

The Second Vice-President, Francis P. Sullivan,  
*Presiding*

10:30 A.M. Opening of the Session.

Discussion of Housing—led by R. H. Shreve,  
Chairman of Committee on Housing.

12:00 M. Discussion of Public Works Program—  
led by Francis P. Sullivan, Chairman,  
Committee on Public Works.

**Luncheon**

1:30 P.M. At the College Refectory

(*Each person must have a ticket*)

**Afternoon**

2:30 P.M. Visiting in Williamsburg

Joint Planning Conference—

Under the auspices of three national planning  
groups.

All attending the Convention of The Institute  
are cordially invited to this Conference.

**Evening**

(*The Chamberlin Hotel, Old Point Comfort*)

The First Vice-President, Louis LaBeaume,  
*Presiding*

8:00 P.M. Polls Open

8:15 P.M. Unfinished Business.

Discussion of Educational Program—led by  
William Emerson, Chairman, Committee  
on Education.

Discussion of Construction Industry Rela-  
tions—led by William Stanley Parker,  
Chairman, Committee on Construction  
Industry Relations.

11:00 P.M. Polls close.

**FRIDAY, MAY EIGHTH****Morning Session**

(*Phi Beta Kappa Hall, in Williamsburg*)

The President Presiding

10:30 A.M. Opening of the Session.

New Business.

Report of Committee on Resolutions.

Open Forum Discussion.

Announcement of Elections.

## The Program—Continued.

## Luncheon

1:30 P.M. At the College Refectory.

*(Each person must have a ticket)*

## Afternoon

2:30 P.M. Visiting in Williamsburg.

## Evening

*(The Chamberlin Hotel, Old Point Comfort)*

The President Presiding

8:00 P.M. Dinner of the Institute.

Presentation of Medals.

Presentation of Fellowship Certificates.

Presentation of Tributes.

Adjournment.

## SATURDAY, MAY NINTH

## Visit to the James River Plantations

By the courtesy of plantation owners, and through the good offices of Merrill C. Lee, President of the Virginia Chapter, there will be a visit to several of the historic James River plantations.

The entire day of Saturday, May 9, will be required.

The hotel, in Old Point Comfort, will be the starting point.

All are cordially invited, and urged to stay another day and participate in this informal and delightful tour to these old colonial houses—famous for their historical associations and for their architecture.

Ample transportation by automobile or boat will be available for everyone.

## Nominations of Officers and Directors

THE Offices and Directorships to become vacant at the time of the Sixty-eighth Convention are those of President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer; and Directors of the South Atlantic, Gulf States, Sierra Nevada, Central States, and Illinois-Wisconsin Divisions.

An official notice concerning nominations and the procedure for making them appeared in the January number of THE OCTAGON.

All nominations received at The Octagon on or before March 25th—the last day for filing nominations by petition—are listed herein. These nominations were made in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VI, Article 6, Section 2 of the By-laws.

### NOMINATIONS BY PETITION ARE:

#### *For Regional Director, Sierra Nevada Division—*

Albert J. Evers, San Francisco, California.

By members of the Northern California, San Diego, and Southern California Chapters.

#### *For Regional Director, Illinois-Wisconsin Division—*

Gerrit J. DeGelleke, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

By members of the Central Illinois, Chicago, Madison, and Wisconsin Chapters.

### OFFICES FOR WHICH NO NOMINATIONS HAVE BEEN FILED:

Those offices becoming vacant at the Convention, for which no nominations by petition have been received, are as follows:

For President and Director

For Vice-President and Director

For Secretary and Director

For Treasurer and Director

For Regional Director, South Atlantic Division

For Regional Director, Gulf States Division

For Regional Director, Central States Division

Under Chapter VI, Article 6, Section 3 of the By-laws, opportunity will be given at the Convention to make nominations from the floor, for any office about to become vacant.

Under Chapter VI, Article 6, Section 4 of the By-laws, in the event that a nomination is not made by petition, or by the delegates from the floor of the Convention, to fill any vacancy that is about to occur, a nomination to fill each such vacancy shall be made by a nominating committee, from the floor, on the day prior to the opening of the polls. Such nominating committee is appointed by the President on the opening day of the meeting, and consists of five delegates.

## How Will You Travel to The Convention ?

### Travel by Automobile

**I**N view of the ease and economy of modern travel by automobile, all members attending the Convention from points within convenient driving distances are urged to come by automobile. In so doing they will find opportunities to be hospitable—

By bringing to the Convention some brother architect from the home town who might not otherwise get there;

By giving a lift from Old Point Comfort to Williamsburg—and back again—to those who do not have automobiles.

Automobile stickers will be distributed at the Convention to those who are willing to extend this courtesy.

As noted elsewhere, ample chartered bus service will be available between Old Point Comfort and Williamsburg for all who prefer a regular schedule.

Through the cooperation of the Continental Oil Company, every member will receive by mail, prior to April 15, a business reply card of the Conoco Travel Bureau.

Members filling out and returning that card to the Conoco Travel Bureau will receive:

1. Marked highway maps showing choice routes from point of origin to Old Point Comfort, Virginia.
2. Current road conditions, construction, detours, etc. shown by symbols on the maps.
3. A Conoco mileage chart and itinerary builder.
4. Descriptive literature on Convention area and points of interest enroute.
5. Hotel and cottage camp directories, giving rates and accommodations.
6. Conoco Passport and Conoco Travel Club membership.
7. Convenient mail forwarding and emergency locating service.

Members desiring to break their journey at Boston, New York, Baltimore or Washington, may place their cars aboard ship and continue on to Old Point Comfort or Norfolk, but steamship reservations for automobiles should be made well in advance. Steamship rates will be found elsewhere in this notice.

### Travel by Rail

By arrangement with the Central Passenger Association, a reduced railroad rate and a reduced steamship rate of one fare plus one-third for the round trip from point of origin to Old Point Comfort, Virginia, and return, will be in effect.

1. Each member will receive by mail, about the middle of April, an Identification Convention Certificate. This certificate will entitle the holder to a reduced rate if presented within the authorized selling dates. For these dates in your city, and other information, consult your local ticket agent.

2. A member and his family may purchase round trip tickets at the one and one-third fare rate on one Certificate.

3. The round trip ticket will be purchased from the ticket agent at the point of origin of the journey, the Certificate being surrendered to the ticket agent at the time the ticket is purchased.

4. The return half of the ticket must be validated at the Convention.

5. Any route going may be selected, and the return journey may be made over a different route. Members should indicate their preference of routes—going and returning—when purchasing tickets.

6. Stop over privileges will be allowed under the Certificate plan.

7. A rail and water journey may be combined on the same ticket, under the Certificate plan. For instance, a member whose journey originates in a New England State may travel by rail to New York or Boston and there continue the journey by boat to Norfolk, thence by a short ferry trip to Old Point Comfort; or a member may journey by rail to Baltimore or Washington and there continue by boat direct to Old Point Comfort.

### Travel by Boat

Due to the heavy passenger traffic during April and May, members going by boat are cautioned to make their reservations immediately. Members should write or go directly to the steamship lines which they intend using, with respect to dates of sailing, types of accommodations desired and fares. Confirmation should be secured in every instance.

*From Boston:*

Steamships of the Merchants and Miners Transportation Company sail from Boston, Pier 2, Northern Avenue, at 4:00 P. M. on Saturday of each week, arriving in Norfolk at 7:00 A. M. the following Monday; they also have a sailing at 4:00 P. M. Tuesday of each week, arriving in Norfolk the following Thursday at 7:00 A. M. There is convenient ferry service from Norfolk to Old Point Comfort.

The one-way fare is \$18.00 and the round trip, under the Identification Convention Certificate Plan, is \$24.00. All rates include meals and a berth in a regulation two-person stateroom. More desirable accommodations may be had at additional charge. Automobiles will be carried at low rates, depending on the size of the car.

Members of the Boston and Maine Chapters might form groups and enjoy a week-end sea voyage, leaving Boston on May 2nd, arriving at Old Point Comfort on the morning of May 4th in ample time for preliminary reconnoitering before the formal opening of the Convention on Tuesday, May 5th.

*From New York:*

The Steamships of the Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc. (Old Dominion Line) sail from Pier 18, North River, daily except Sunday, at 1:00 P. M. and arrive in Norfolk at 7:00 A. M. next morning.

The one-way fare from New York to Old Point Comfort is \$12.00 and the round trip fare, under the Certificate Plan, is \$16.54. This rate includes meals and berth in minimum price stateroom and passage on the Pennsylvania Railroad ferry between Norfolk and Old Point Comfort. Automobiles will be carried at low rates.

*From Baltimore:*

Both the Chesapeake Steamship Company and the Baltimore Steam Packet Line (Old Bay Line) operate luxurious bay steamers between Baltimore and Old Point Comfort. Steamers leave Baltimore daily at 6:30 P. M., arriving at Old Point Comfort at 5:30 A. M. the following morning. Steamers of the Chesapeake Steamship Company sail from Piers 18 and 19 Light Street, Baltimore, and steamers of the Baltimore Steam Packet Company sail from Pier 10, Light Street, Baltimore.

Round trip fares are \$5.00. Fifteen or more persons in a party may obtain special round trip fares of \$3.50 per person. Parties of ten may obtain round trip fares at \$4.00 per person. Outside staterooms range in price from \$1.75 to \$4.50. This price is for the room, and two or more persons may occupy the stateroom at no additional charge. Meals are reasonably priced and automobiles will be carried for the flat rate of \$4.00 each. Draining of gasoline is not necessary, cars being driven directly aboard.

This voyage down beautiful Chesapeake Bay represents a saving of 230 miles of driving and provides a restful and enjoyable night aboard ship.

*From Washington:*

Steamships of the Norfolk and Washington Steamboat Company sail from Washington daily at 6:30 P. M., arriving at Old Point Comfort at 6:40 A. M. next morning. Round trip tickets are \$4.70—on the Certificate Plan. Staterooms are from \$1.00 up, according to the accommodations desired. Meals are reasonably priced. Automobiles will be carried free on straight fare tickets of \$3.50 each or on round trip tickets of \$6.00.

A charge of \$4.00 per car will be made against tickets at \$4.70 each. Draining of gasoline is not necessary, cars being driven directly aboard.

This delightful trip down the historic Potomac river and Chesapeake Bay saves approximately 200 miles of driving.

**Travel by Bus**

The advantages of group or individual travel by bus should not be overlooked. Chapters or delegates interested in this form of transportation should communicate with the Greyhound or other bus lines for rates.

**Travel by Airplane**

Rates for airplane travel originating most anywhere and terminating in Washington, are greatly reduced; in some cases being slightly lower than the combined railroad and Pullman fares.

Those interested in airplane travel should communicate with their airport for full details. The Certificate Plan is not in effect for airplane travel.



## An Exhibition of Craftsmanship

### AT THE CONVENTION

THE Committee on Allied Arts is in process of arranging an exhibition to be held in the New Chamberlin Hotel at the time of the Convention.

The purpose of this show is to indicate in somewhat restricted fashion to be sure, materials now on the market. These materials will include furniture, textiles, metal, glass, floor coverings, accessories, kitchen, bathroom and other details that will be of interest to the profession. Nothing has been accepted that is not specifically available in normal buying centers and an effort will be made to have

as much data as may be possible prepared for distribution during or after the show.

The committee in charge consists of Ralph Walker of New York, John Root of Chicago, Eliel Saarinen of Cranbrook and Ely Kahn, New York, as Chairman. The exhibit will be arranged by the committee and includes beyond the collection already noted, an interesting display of native crafts covering American Indian work, as well as products of other communities that have maintained original designs and processes of craftsmanship.

### Call for Meeting of State Associations

LAST year an interesting and well attended meeting of representatives of the State Associations of Architects was held in Milwaukee on the day preceding the Convention of the Institute.

This year many members of State Societies will attend the Institute Convention, at Old Point Comfort and Williamsburg, Virginia.

It has been suggested by several of the State Associations, and by the Institute's Board of Directors, that a meeting of representatives of all of the State Associations would be of value to the profession and mutually advantageous to both the Institute and the State Societies.

Therefore, the Committee on State Societies has addressed a communication to all of the State

Associations, irrespective of affiliation with the Institute, inviting them to send representatives to a meeting to be held in conjunction with the Convention.

The date selected is Monday, May 4th, the day preceding the opening of the Institute Convention.

The place is the New Chamberlin Hotel, at Old Point Comfort, Va., and the time is 10:00 A.M.

The call for this meeting, which was also a cordial invitation, was sent to all of the State Societies of record at The Octagon, in care of the President and Secretary of each society.

JOHN R. FUGARD, *Chairman,*  
*Committee on State Societies.*

### British Architects' Conference

THE Royal Institute of British Architects extends, through THE OCTAGON, a cordial invitation to members of The American Institute of Architects to attend the British Architects' Conference which is to be held in Southampton, June 24 to June 27.

On June 24 a reception will be given by members of the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Architectural Association at the Chantry Hall where an architectural exhibition will be on view.

The Conference will be formally opened on June 25th and the inaugural address will be presented by the President of the R.I.B.A., Mr. Percy E. Thomas, O.B.E.

The afternoon will be given over to visits to places of local interest including: Southampton

Docks, King George V Graving Dock, Civic Centre, Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton Airport, Winchester College and Cathedral, St. Cross and the West Gate Winchester. The Conference banquet will be held in the evening.

Many interesting trips have been arranged for the morning and afternoon of June 26th. The Conference will be brought to a close in the evening of the 26th by a reception and dance given by the Mayor and Corporation of Southampton.

American architects who plan to be in England during the time of the conference are invited to communicate with Sir Ian MacAlister, Secretary of the Royal Institute of British Architects, London, for further details.

## Architectural Competitions for Public Buildings

The following paper is published in this number of THE OCTAGON at the request of the signers, all of whom are members of the Institute.

It should be borne in mind that it has not been acted upon, or endorsed by The Board of Directors of the Institute, or by the standing Committee on Competitions, or by the standing Committee on Public Works.

This paper will come before The Board at its pre-convention meeting.

Comments and opinions on the proposals contained therein are invited—from the Chapters, and from individual members.

Any communications in this matter should reach The Octagon *not later than April 30*, if they are intended for submission to The Board.

CHARLES T. INGHAM,  
*Secretary.*

THE undersigned members of the Institute believe that the Architectural Competition is the best method of obtaining designs for and architects to supervise the erection of all buildings and monuments *where the expenditure of public funds is involved*. We propose to have this subject brought up at the 1936 Convention for action at that time. We are presenting the following analysis and conclusion in order that each chapter may become conversant with the subject and will thus be able to discuss it in chapter meetings and be prepared to instruct their delegates. We hope to show that a system of Architectural Competitions is of advantage to the owner, is fair to the profession and is of benefit to the advancement of architecture. It is our hope that The American Institute of Architects will record itself as approving such a policy.

The purpose of the Institute for the seventy-eight years of its existence has been dedicated to the advancement of American Architecture. It has rendered inspiring and unselfish service to society and has furnished leadership of a high order. This honorable position of the Institute in the life of the Nation carries with it responsibilities of a high order.

Public Building—whether of the small town, the city, the county, the state or the Federal Government—is one of the most important activities of our profession. The most persistent controversy between our Public Works Committees, and various Government agencies has been in regard to a proper method of selecting architects for public works. This question is ever before us. Various means of selection have been suggested. None of these has seemed satisfactory. For lack of a proper answer to this question we have seen Federal, State and Muni-

pal authorities set up architectural organizations of their own. The profession has deplored this condition and has objected continuously to the growth of bureaucratic architecture. We occupy a weak position. We have been asked by various officials to recommend a fair scheme for selecting architects. We have only retorted "Your system is wrong." Both the public authorities and the profession look to the Institute for guidance and leadership in solving this problem. We must agree among ourselves upon a method which we can whole heartedly advocate and then we must energetically and continuously work for its adoption wherever possible.

To date The American Institute of Architects has never taken a positive position in regard to competitions. In effect we say to the public, "If you wish to hold a competition, we have set up here the procedure for conducting a proper architectural competition." In fact the general tendency of the Institute has been to discourage competitions. The Royal Institute of British Architects which has been in existence for one hundred and one years has for the last twenty-five years taken a definite position that the architectural competition is the best means of obtaining a design and an architect for a public building. They have put the prestige of their organization directly behind such a policy and endeavor wherever possible to persuade the public to use the competition method.

Mr. Percy E. Thomas, President of the Royal Institute of British Architects, has put the case for competitions in a most telling fashion. We take the liberty of quoting him as follows:

"One often hears arguments against the holding of architectural competitions. Let us

examine these arguments and see what they are worth.

"1. There is the usual one about the waste and cost to the profession. A typical example of this was published in one of the technical journals last month where the contributor proved that for a job to cost \$360,000.00 the total cost to the profession was approximately the same amount. Simply put, that for every competition held, many times the amount of the fees is spent by the profession as a whole.

"2. That the architect is not in close touch with his client in the early stages of the job.

"3. That promoters in general, and public bodies in particular, are unwilling to leave the final decision regarding the design of their public buildings in the hands of a jury.

"4. That competitions are costly to promoters and involve delay in proceeding with the work.

"5. That there is a danger in open competitions of an unknown and inexperienced architect being successful.

"6. That for a number of buildings, particularly buildings of a special character, experts or specialists in that particular class of building should be engaged."

In answer to these objections he continues:

"1. With regard to the cost to the profession, the architect can, after all, please himself whether he enters for a competition or not, and apart from the fact that the estimated cost of preparing an architectural design is often exaggerated, it should be borne in mind that in the average architect's office ordinary work is not sacrificed for competition work, and that time is made for it; even the payment of overtime is in many cases entered into on a sporting basis by the whole staff.

"Against the actual expense in wages and material must be counted the gain in experience and technical knowledge which is to be obtained from every competition. Everyone who seriously enters for a competition knows that the preliminary research work and the production of the design add to professional knowledge and experience, whatever the result.

"2. There is something in the objection that the architect is not in touch with his client in the early stages of the job, but if, when the competition is decided, the successful architect feels that any decision previously arrived at between the assessor and the promoters could be im-

proved upon, there is no reason whatever why this should not be done. In practice I do not think the necessity would occur very often.

"3. The third is the objection to delegating the sole authority to the assessor. I am firmly convinced that in the interest of the promoters as well as competitors the arguments are overwhelmingly in favour of our present system.

"Speaking generally, the average layman is quite incapable of judging the best solution of a planning problem, and his taste in the matter of elevational treatment is more likely to be influenced by the manner of presentation than would be that of a trained architect. A recent notorious competition has given us an example of this kind, but past history shows many more.

"The objection that because of the Jury's final decision, the promoters may have a design imposed upon them which they do not like and do not want to build, is answered by the fact that once the award is made they are at liberty to instruct their architect to make whatever alterations they require.

"This has been stated to mean that competitions are merely to be considered as a means of selecting an architect, but this is obviously against the whole principle of our competition regulations which is stated to be 'To obtain the best design for the purpose in view,' and an examination of results will show that in practice it is the best solution of the problem which is placed first, and almost invariably carried out in the building.

"4. A competition should make little difference in the matter of time. If an architect is engaged without competition he would, or should, spend the same time in digesting thoroughly the requirements of his clients, and in producing his preliminary scheme. In fact he would probably not work at such high pressure as the average competition requires.

"I think it could be claimed that the directness and simplicity of buildings erected as the result of competitions are due to the thought and care spent in the preliminary stages.

"As to cost, a competition means approximately in a building costing, say, \$500,000, an additional one per cent to the promoters. These figures would be slightly increased for smaller sums and decreased for larger undertakings. For this additional one per cent, the promoters are able to obtain suggestions for the solving of their problem from some of the best architects in the country.



"5. The fear of promoters in having an inexperienced young architect thrust upon them is, in practice, unfounded. Experience has shown that it is almost unknown for a man to win an important competition and be incapable of carrying out the work. Young he may be, but the very fact that to win in an open field calls for such qualities of planning, knowledge of the subject and powers of grasping the essentials, ensures that the winner, whoever he is will be quite capable of carrying out his design. It may also be said that many of the leading members of our profession commenced a successful career by winning an open competition whilst young and unknown men.

"6. The architectural specialist, unlike the specialist in other professions, obtains his position largely as the result of opportunity or accident, rather than deliberate intention. The main principles of planning and design are common to all classes of building, and while greater experience may bring perfection in detailed planning and equipment, it is more than counterbalanced by the freshness of mind and variety of solutions which are obtained by means of competition.

"The function of any building, whether a town hall, school, or hospital, is to fulfill its purpose in the most efficient and economical way, and, whatever the building, this fundamental principle remains the same and is largely a matter of skillful planning and sound common sense.

"It should be remembered that success in competitions is not all luck. The architect who seriously enters for competitions knows that it is a waste of time unless he prepares himself by a thorough study of his subject, often involving many hours of research and visits to the latest buildings of a similar character.

"So much for the objections of the competition system. Its advantages to the public are immense. It enables the building owner at a small extra cost to obtain solutions to his problem from some of the best men in the profession, and to retain the services of the successful one at the same fee that he would pay to any other member of the profession. It obtains for him the result of concentrated study of his particular problem; the experience gained in the latest buildings for his particular requirements both at home and abroad. It also means, in the case of public work, that the architect is appointed on merit alone and not by wire-pulling or political influence, and for the

profession, apart from the opportunity it gives to the young and brilliant men, it has done more than anything else to advance the art of planning.

"A study of competitive plans will show that nearly all accepted arrangements for buildings such as baths, hospitals, courts, etc., are largely the result of the competition system, just as any new and original treatment of a problem generally comes from the same source.

"It is the concentrated effort to produce something better than what has been done before, in order to win, that makes the standard of architectural achievement in competitions so high."

In addition to the above arguments by Mr. Thomas we occasionally hear it contended in this country that an Institute policy advocating competition might make it more difficult for us to combat illegal competitions. In other words the proponent of the illegal competition might use our general sanction of this method as a means to defend his procedure.

We are not impressed with the weight of this argument. The competition in regard to public works is either right or wrong in principle. We must take a definite position and having taken such a position we must bend all our energies toward the elimination of all competitions except those which conform to our competition code. It should be the duty of all members of the Institute to report at once any proposed competition which comes to their attention. The Institute should then through its proper representatives approach the promoters of the competition and offer them the facilities of the Institute in seeing that the competition is properly regulated. If after negotiation it should be found impossible to properly safeguard the program the competition should be banned and all members of the Institute prohibited from entering it. In this way can we be of real service to the cause of better public architecture in this country.

For years the Institute has evaded this issue, and the subject of competitions has been heard less and less if at all on the Convention floor. We are thereby neglecting our younger members and are remiss in our duty to aid in producing competent architects for tomorrow. We are in danger of becoming elderly, broad-waisted, slow-moving and conservative in the midst of a vital and progressive age. We are not offering a proper service to the young man. We need young, vigorous and ambitious creative architects. We



must perform in a manner that will invite their allegiance, and their enthusiasm. This can only be accomplished by a definite and determined effort to serve them. Much of the Fine Architecture of America has been produced by men in their thirties and forties. The roll of honor of American Architects is replete with names of men who received their chance in a competition. The following list of architects and their ages when they won their right to be numbered among the worthy in our profession is also a compilation of buildings which causes us to be proud of our art.

**Results of American Architectural Competitions**

*Showing comparative ages of winners*

<i>Architect</i>	<i>Building</i>	<i>Age</i>
Donn Barber.....	Connecticut Library and Supreme Court.....	35
Paul Cret.....	Pan-American Building.....	31
Cass Gilbert.....	{Minnesota State Capitol... 37 New York Customs House.. 40	
Bertram Goodhue.....	{St. Thomas Church, N. Y. .... 34 West Point.....	
Thomas Hastings.....	New York Public Library... 38	
James Hoban.....	The White House.....	30
Raymond Hood.....	Tribune Tower.....	41
Guy Lowell.....	New York County Court House.....	43
H. VanBuren Magonigle...	McKinley National Memorial	
Robert Mills.....	{Monumental Church, Richmond..... 30 Washington Monument, Baltimore..... 33	
William Nolting.....	Baltimore City Court House	
H. H. Richardson.....	Trinity Church, Boston.....	34
James Gamble Rogers.....	New Haven Post Office.....	44
Egerton Swartwout.....	Missouri State Capitol.....	42
White and Wilder.....	Washington State Capitol	
York and Sawyer.....	Commerce Department, Washington, D. C.....	39
William Thornton.....	United States Capitol.....	33

**Comparative Ages of Architects of Important Architectural Projects**

*(Not Competitive)*

<i>Architect</i>	<i>Building</i>	<i>Age</i>
Thomas Jefferson.....	Virginia State Capitol.....	42
Benjamin Latrobe.....	{Bank of Pennsylvania.... 36 Architect of the Capitol... 39	
Charles Bulfinch.....	{State House, Hartford, Conn. 29 Boston State House..... 24	

Charles McKim.....	Boston Public Library.....	40
Stanford White.....	Farragut Memorial.....	28
Henry Bacon.....	Lincoln Memorial.....	46

Recently a limited competition was held for a new Federal Reserve Bank Building to be located in Washington. The average age of the nine competitors was 62 years.

We believe that the architects of this country have cause to ask the Institute why they allowed this competition to proceed without calling the attention of the owners to this fact. We feel that such an attitude is neither encouraging to the younger architects nor in harmony with a due concern for our future. We are at present in a condition where there are few younger and middle-aged architects who have been developed with a proper training to care for the more important and monumental buildings of tomorrow. We must remedy this situation.

The following is the text of an official document of the R. I. B. A. which sets forth clearly and briefly their position in regard to competitions. We hope that it may be possible for The American Institute of Architects to issue such a document.

**AN EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM ON THE SYSTEM OF ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITIONS**

*(From The Royal Institute of British Architects)*

The system of architectural competitions has been recognized for many years as the best method of obtaining designs for, and architects to supervise the erection of, all buildings, particularly where the expenditure of public funds is involved. For a modest expenditure which represents a very small proportion of the cost of the building the promoters can obtain designs from competent architects in all parts of the country. If the competition is properly organized in accordance with established practice there can be no question but that the building promoters will benefit from the concentrated study of a large number of architects all of whom will submit differing solutions of the problem.

During the past century most of our important buildings were erected as the result of architectural competitions, and since the Great War over 320 competitions have been held under the auspices of the Royal Institute of British Architects, including 70 town halls, law courts, fire stations or art galleries, 50 schools and other buildings of

an educational character, 30 housing and town planning schemes, 30 hospitals and between 30 and 40 war memorials, 10 churches or Sunday schools, and over 100 for buildings of a miscellaneous character.

During many years' experience in the conduct of architectural competitions the Royal Institute of British Architects, representing the great majority of the practising architects in the country, has built up a series of Regulations governing the Promotion and Conduct of Architectural Competitions which are recognized as most satisfactory and equitable to all concerned, and have been used as a model in other countries. Whilst modifications in these regulations may be made in certain instances, particular clauses, such as that providing for the appointment of fully qualified professional assessors, and that stipulating that no promoter nor assessor nor employee of either shall compete or assist a competitor or act as architect for the work, are regarded as essential.

Promoters should have no hesitation in agreeing to accept the award of an assessor as being that of one who has heard and assimilated their views and requirements, and who, through his technical qualifications, is able to act judicially in selecting the best of the designs anonymously submitted. Moreover, promoters have the right to ask that reasonable modifications shall be made in the winning design before the building is carried out should they desire to do so.

The Royal Institute of British Architects is always ready to nominate assessors and to offer suggestions or guidance in the conduct of competitions. In the interests of architecture and of the public those concerned in prospective building schemes are strongly recommended to avail themselves of the competition system.

IAN MACALISTER,  
*Secretary, R.I.B.A.*

9 CONDUIT STREET,  
LONDON, W. 1.

*Issued by the R.I.B.A. Council, 5-3-34.*

Let us for a moment picture an average building committee charged with the duty of building a new building with public funds—a Town Hall—a County Court House or a Federal building. They are a conscientious group of men impressed with the duty of properly carrying out this task. At once they are deluged with offers of architectural services. They are solicited by both the

competent and the incompetent. They, as laymen, are not able to separate and classify them. Their confusion is natural. The dignity of our profession suffers under the solicitation of numbers of architects. If at this time they are presented with such a document, dignified and brief, and backed by the prestige of the Institute, explaining the merits of the competition method and offering the advice and service of the Institute in initiating a competition, they may perhaps find the proper way out of this dilemma.

We need publicity. Continually in Chapter meetings the question arises as to how to make the public more familiar with architecture and architects. Architectural competitions are excellent material for publicity. We Americans are competition-minded, and we believe that a more general use of the competition method will do much to educate the public in the value of architectural service and will stimulate an interest in better architecture.

Many opponents of competitions base their opposition not so much on the principle of the competition system as on the manner in which competitions are now conducted. This constitutes a confusion of two distinct problems. It is our hope that The American Institute of Architects first will go on record as advocating the competition system because it is the best method of selecting architects for public works. It is also our hope that they will follow this at once with an exhaustive study of the best methods of conducting competitions for the purpose of eliminating those elements which many of us feel are unfair to the profession in general.

The majority of architects would feel more kindly disposed toward competitions if they felt that every possible step had been taken to insure a simple and uniform presentation of drawings by all competitors thereby placing the maximum emphasis on architecture and very little on elaborate rendering. It is a recognized fact that some architects possess greater ability than others in the production of fine renderings. It is likewise a fact that beautifully rendered trees, entourage and skies greatly help a drawing but have little to do with the ability of the architect to produce a fine building of brick, stone, marble or granite. It is equally true that juries cannot avoid being influenced by a skillful presentation. And finally it must be admitted that our metropolitan centers contain more architects who are either skillful delineators themselves or have at their disposal professional renderers of outstanding ability with

the result that many excellent men in the smaller centers who may be equally good architects find themselves under a handicap when competing under present methods.

The number of drawings required for a competition should be as small as possible and their scale should be the minimum consistent with legibility. Frequently it would be quite possible to have the drawings presented in pencil on mounted tracing paper. By adopting these and any other methods of simplification not only would the cost to the competitors be greatly reduced but the resulting similarity of presentation would enable the jury to concentrate its attention on the merit of the architecture. Obviously in an architectural competition as in any race the competitors should strive under equal conditions in order that the winner may be the best man available.

Criticism is frequently heard concerning the fairness or rightness of judgments of competitions. We feel that almost always where such criticism can be upheld, it is a result of the present Institute Code on Competitions not having been strictly followed. A rigid adherence to such points as complete and absolute anonymity of drawings and that a majority of the jury must be architects in good standing, would do much to obviate the justice of such criticism. Here again as in the broader question of competitions the fault lies not in the principle but in the procedure. We believe that with few exceptions juries have selected the best design submitted and certainly the average of good selection is higher by the competition method than by any other.

In asking the members of the Institute to consider a definite and more comprehensive policy in regard to competitions we wish to call attention to a suggestion that has been made of subdividing the country into regional competition districts. Such a method is already being used by the Division of Painting and Sculpture of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department for selecting by competition painters and sculptors for Federal Works of Art projects.

In order to explain the possibilities of this idea let us assume the same regional boundaries now in use by the Institute. For instance we have the New England District, the Central Atlantic District, etc. The Institute would advocate and advise the local authorities concerned with a proposed public building to invite competitors only from the district in which the building is to be located provided the building is to cost under a

certain sum, say \$250,000.00. Should the building cost more, say up to \$500,000.00 architects from the adjoining districts would also be invited to compete. Should the project amount to say \$750,000.00 or more the competition would be open to all the architects of the country. Some such system as this would provide competent local architects with an opportunity of obtaining commissions for public work in the smaller communities and at the same time would insure proper architectural talent commensurate with the size of the job.

There are of course excellent architects who do not perform their best under the stress of competition procedure. On the other hand it must be remembered that there are many who are unable to master the technique of obtaining political preference. The heads of various Government architectural agencies state that the least capable architects who seek public work come with the longest and most complete files of political recommendation. The persistence of this state of affairs is one of the prime reasons why some public authorities have given up employing private architects and have increased the size of their architectural bureaus.

No one can determine the basis of the political or friendly relationship method of awarding work. It is constantly shifting. It can produce good buildings or it can give us the worst. The most capable artists produce but one or two masterpieces in a life time. The segregation of talent by whatever means if carried to its ultimate end would result in the appointment of perhaps one or two men to do all the public work. Obviously this would be absurd as a basis for getting the best work since it would ignore the talent hidden in the hearts and minds of the untried which should be made available to the public and its officials.

To sum up, we feel that it is the definite responsibility of The American Institute of Architects to determine and then to advocate strongly the best method of selecting architects for public buildings. The growth of many Government bureaus and the increasing tendency to regiment our profession out of an independent existence is, we believe, to a large extent due to the inability of the Institute to formulate and advance a proper answer to this question. No solution will be entirely satisfactory. We can only attempt to find an answer based on the greatest good to the greatest number and to the cause of the advancement of architecture itself. We must



choose between two methods. One is the anonymous selection of an architect by a jury based entirely upon his submitted evidence of ability to solve a given problem. The other is the selection of an architect by some means such as his past performance, his friendly relationships, or his political preferment. Both methods are susceptible of misuse and errors of judgment.

In conclusion we propose that the Institute at its 1936 convention resolve that "The Architectural Competition is the best method of obtaining designs for and architects to supervise the erection of all buildings and monuments where the expenditure of public funds is involved."

It is our conviction that the time has come to act and therefore we wish to urge our fellow

members to give this subject their thoughtful consideration and bring about an action which we are convinced will be of greatest benefit to the entire profession.

- (J) HARRY H. BENTLEY.....Chicago
- (J) PIERRE BLOUKE.....Chicago
- (J) BENJ. C. FLOURNOY.....Washington
- (J) WM. DEWEY FOSTER.....New York
- (J) RICHARD KOCH.....New Orleans
- (J) REGINALD D. JOHNSON.....Southern California
- (J) LORIMER RICH.....New York
- (J) ALEXANDER C. ROBINSON III.....Cleveland
- (J) JOHN H. SCARFF.....Baltimore
- (J) HENRY R. SHEPLEY.....Boston
- (J) RUDOLPH STANLEY-BROWN.....Cleveland
- (J) EDGAR I. WILLIAMS.....New York
- (J) WADDY B. WOOD.....Washington

## Coordination Through Competition

### A MUTUAL PLAN FOR ARCHITECT, REALTOR AND OWNER

**M**EMBERS of the Washington, D. C., Chapter have established and put into effect a new type of small house competition.

The idea was first sponsored by Irwin S. Porter, a former President of the Chapter, who has long contended that there should be greater recognition of the architect in the speculative building field; and that closer cooperation between the architect and the realtor would be to their advantage, and to the very great advantage of the building public.

This commendable and successful effort to bring about coordination between the architect, the realtor, and the small house builder is publicized for the information of other chapters of the Institute, and in the thought that they will find in it suggestions of value for local application.

The following paragraphs summarize a report made by Mr. Porter at the March meeting of the Washington, D. C., Chapter—and are self explanatory:

The "My Home" competition, sponsored by W. C. and A. N. Miller, prominent realtors, and endorsed by the Washington, D. C., Chapter of The American Institute of Architects, has aroused in the mind of the public so much general interest, and the results have proved to be so satisfactory, that the basic idea should be passed on to all who are interested in the building industry.

While this type of competition originated with the sponsors, it was discussed at length with many members of the architectural profession.

Out of those discussions the program developed.

The major points were (1) to give to the public an opportunity to express its own ideas about that "dream home" which exists in every layman's mind; (2) to get the public home-building conscious; (3) to foster locally the program for moderate price homes endorsed by the Federal Housing Administration; and (4) to bring about a closer relationship between the architect, the realtor, and the public.

As a first step, a program inviting the public to enter "My Home" competition was published in the Washington newspapers, giving the general requirements, and the location, size, and restrictions of a lot in a good nearby suburban area.

The public responded with over 400 ideas, a most gratifying return in view of the short time allotted for this part of the program. The ideas submitted were in word descriptions, and many crudely drawn and some well drawn sketches. Each submission was the layman's approach to his own building problem—his conception of the house he hoped to build some day.

The committee in charge of selection included the Hon. Stewart McDonald of the Federal Housing Administration, honorary chairman; the Hon. Melvin C. Hazen, president of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners; Mr. Arthur B. Heaton, president of the Washington, D. C., Chapter of The American Institute of Architects; Mr. F. Eliot Middleton, president of the Wash-



ington Real Estate Board, and the architectural adviser, Irwin S. Porter.

This representative committee made its choice of the five most attractive original ideas from the 400 submissions. This was the beginning of the second stage of the competition.

Thereafter, the five winning original ideas were turned over to a selected group of registered architects for interpretation, and the preparation of preliminary drawings. The program for this competition among the architects was written in accordance with The American Institute of Architects' recommendations, and was drawn to guide them in a fair competition, including all mandatory requirements, a definite cubage, and a specific site. Each selected idea was given to two architects, who were asked to consider and develop it as if the proposal was that of a client, bringing his project into the architect's office for the first time.

The drawings submitted by the competing architects were unusually well presented, and a great deal of credit is due to them for the noteworthy results obtained.

The judges selected the five best solutions from the architectural entries, and from these were made one-half scale detail models which, with the architects' drawings, were placed on display at Woodward and Lothrop, one of Washington's leading department stores.

Up to this time, thousands of persons have viewed this exhibition, which continues to hold the center of interest in the shopping district. When the exhibition is closed the winning architectural design will be selected by popular vote. To the author of the original idea on which the

design is based will be awarded a cash prize of one hundred dollars. Thereafter the house will be built upon the designated lot, and in accordance with the winning plans and specifications.

The architect of the winning design will be paid by the sponsors a fee of 6% for his drawings and services. The other four architects, whose plans and models were on display during the period of voting, will be paid the usual fee for preliminary services (one-fifth of a 6% commission). Should the sponsors of the competition desire to build more than one of these houses, the architects of those selected will receive full architectural commissions, the same as the winner.

While the house is under construction, the rooms will be reproduced and furnished in Woodward and Lothrop's department store. The public will then have the pleasure of watching this home become a reality—of seeing the original crude sketch developed into working drawings, specifications, and finally, the completion of actual construction.

The firm of W. C. and A. N. Miller have not spared expense in sponsoring this competition. They have recognized the importance of good architecture, and the part which the architect takes in the construction of a good house, not to mention the advantage to the community. It will not be surprising if this competition becomes an annual affair. Since small house construction constitutes the largest part of the building industry today, this competition has fully justified the expenditure of time and money involved. The sponsors are to be congratulated and deserve the appreciation of the architectural profession.

## "Architects Small Home Service"

### The Washington Plan

WHEN, at the January meeting of the Washington, D. C. Chapter, Mr. James W. Follin of the Home Owners Loan Corporation suggested that the members of the Chapter interest themselves in the matter of providing architectural service for small homes along the lines recommended by the Board of Directors of the Institute the seed, so to speak, fell upon fertile ground.

For some months a number of the men had been considering the formation of just such a group and, having digested briefs of various similar plans, had concluded that the real prob-

lems of organization and successful operation would be: Developing a dignified and ethical means of acquainting the public with the service; financing the set up which would be essential to the successful operation of the plan and, finally, establishing direct contact with persons who might be thinking seriously of building.

The proposal that the Home Owners Loan Corporation through its representatives, Messrs. Pierre Blouke and James W. Follin, be permitted to co-operate in the development of a complete pattern for the co-ordination of all major factors

which enter into small house work, not only offered a solution to our problems but promised to serve as the means of furthering the policy of that body by helping to create better security for mortgages and establish a more sound mortgage market.

The plan as outlined involved the preparation of designs for houses costing not more than seven thousand, five hundred dollars (\$7,500.00). Preliminary sketches of these designs, all of uniform size and containing pertinent information as to construction, equipment, finish and cost, would be displayed at a local lending institution and the service advertised by that institution in all local papers. All inquirers would be interviewed and each would be asked to fill out a form giving name, address, size of house required, location of property and a brief financial statement. If, after examination of the information thus received, the person was considered to be a serious prospect and had selected a design from those on display, he would then be directed to the author of that design and the procedure from then on would be the same as for any client. The architect would make his own contract with the client and the service involved would be almost identical with that already given by similar groups elsewhere and described in previous issues of THE OCTAGON.

The novelty of the proposal lay in the fact that, for the first time, the Architect, the Builder and the Lending Institution would already be in accord and prepared to give service when called upon and thus obviate the necessity of a prospective home builder shopping around for plans and a builder before having determined his ability to finance the home he might have in mind.

This suggested plan of operation was received with considerable interest by the Chapter and was directed to a committee appointed to investigate its feasibility. At the February meeting the committee reported favorably and a resolution authorizing members to participate in the service plan was adopted.

Acting under authority of this resolution, six of the younger members of the Chapter formed an independent group for the operation of the plan of service described above and—where some six months had previously been spent in “just talking about it”—less than two weeks of a real “charette” was required to organize and prepare display material.

On a pre-determined date an announcement that the service was being offered to the public

was made by the Perpetual Building Association, a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, through which the service will be available exclusively for a trial period of three months.

If, at the end of that time, results justify it, this plan of advisory and supervisory service will be offered through other agencies and it is hoped that eventually an independent business headquarters may be set up.

The plan has now been in operation for two weeks and, while it is too early to draw any definite conclusions, still we have been able to make some interesting observations.

During that two-week period there has been an average of twelve inquiries per day. Some of these now are actual prospects and have been put in touch with the Architects in whose work they are interested. It is interesting to note that while the designs included in the display are for houses costing not more than seven thousand, five hundred dollars, (\$7,500.00) three of the prospective clients want larger homes and are arranging for architectural service on the regular fee basis—having selected their Architect on the strength of the designs displayed. It is thus evident that this plan may be the means of providing contact with prospective clients on the regular fee basis who might otherwise have procured their plans from someone other than an architect. Such results would make the venture well worth while.

The primary advantage in the plan as operated here is that the prospective home-builders are not directed to the Architect until they are known to be serious prospects and their ability to “handle” the project has been established.

I do not foresee that the most extensive use of this service will make it an extremely lucrative venture but there is real value in it for the lending institutions in the better built homes which will form the security for their mortgages and equal value to the Architect in the fact that his field of potential clients will be greatly broadened. As Mr. Wesley S. Bessell, whose work in and about New York in the small house field is well known, said in commenting upon the plan—“If the Architect does not take advantage of this opportunity to educate the small home owner of to-day, who may be the bank executive or business official of to-morrow, to the service which the Architect gives, then he is making a sad mistake.”

E. P. SCHREIER, A. I. A.

## Conference on Low Cost Housing

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE,  
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, APRIL 16-17, 1936

"THE lively and increasing interest manifested during recent months in cheap and effective housing for urban and rural communities has encouraged The Pennsylvania State College to arrange a conference on Low Cost Housing to be held April 16th and 17th, 1936, as a complement to the usual Industrial Conference in May. The preliminary report of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, issued last year, pointed out that in the last fifteen years relatively few dwellings have been constructed in the Commonwealth within the price range of the majority of the people. The possibility of expansion in this hitherto neglected field is one which is being vigorously explored by architects, engineers, planning boards, realtors, bankers, industrialists and State and Federal Agencies. The time seems ripe for the College to provide in Pennsylvania an opportunity for the consideration of various elements from which a practical program of Low Cost Housing would evolve. Attractive costs are essential, taking into consideration materials, labor and financing.

"The program has been so arranged that it will review the various factors which may bring about a reduction of price, to the consumer, of the house which is furnished. Among papers on

the program will be those presented by Mr. H. S. Buttenheim, Editor, *American City*, on the subject of 'Taxation as a Factor in Housing for Low Income Groups,' and by Mr. N. H. Engle, Assistant Director, Department of Commerce, Washington, on the 'Interrelation of Industrial Decentralization and Housing.' Mr. Arthur C. Holden, A.I.A. Consulting Architect and Housing Expert, New York City, will present 'An Analysis of the Housing Problem for Low Income Groups,' and Dr. Edith E. Wood, author of 'Recent Trends in American Housing,' will give a paper on the subject of 'Cooperative Housing for Workers.'

"Other papers will be presented by Ernest W. Fisher, Director, Division of Economics and Statistics, Federal Housing Administration, on 'The Role of Government in Housing'; by Mr. H.W. Peaslee, F.A.I.A., Chief Economic Analyst in the Housing Division, P.W.A., on 'The Economics of Low Cost Housing'; and by Dr. Leifur Magnusson on the subject of 'Housing by Employers in the United States.' Mr. William Pope Barney, A.I.A., Philadelphia Architect, will be Chairman of one of the sessions. The College is arranging a Housing Exhibition to coincide with the Conference."

## 22nd Annual Convention of the Michigan Society of Architects

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF PRESIDENT CLAIR W. DITCHY, A.I.A.

\* \* \* "I believe I am making a conservative statement when I say that the services of the architect are better understood and appreciated today than ever before. Bitter experience has taught its lesson; and the caution which is always present when normal activities are resumed is having its effect as is the tendency toward simpler and more substantial building. Quality is being emphasized more than ever before, and architectural services and quality in building are synonymous.

"During the depression, the architect often found himself pushed far afield in his efforts to make an honest and an adequate living. He took his talents with him to unusual places. Today we find gadgets, packages, articles of furniture and objects of all sorts which confront the eye daily, greatly enriched by the design imparted by some architect 'on holiday.' This undoubtedly

has contributed to the education of public taste and has prepared the public to look for something better in the design of buildings.

"In this return to our drafting boards then, we must bear in mind that the public generally is more discriminating than ever before, our co-workers in the contracting ranks, in the manufacturing fields and elsewhere are more conscious of the rôle we play and we ourselves therefore must be fully aware of our responsibility. When a national producer advises the public, as many of them have, to engage an architect, we must see to it that his advice does not miscarry. I am not speaking of ourselves as individuals, but as a profession. Our problem of strengthening the profession through the maintenance of high standards of practice is as insistent as it ever was. Our opportunity for promoting better architecture is greater than it has ever been before. \* \* \*"



## United States Building and Loan League

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT PELLETT

"THREE things, it seems to me, are essential for the building and loan institution to keep in mind when considering a loan: 1—The applicant's personal credit in respect to the loan sought (he must not be allowed to attempt too much); 2—His house must possess the advantages accruing from capable design lest it be obsolescent before it is built; 3—The construction must be so supervised as to insure the owner's getting what he pays for and the loan's being fully safeguarded during its life. The first of these essentials can be secured by our own careful administration; the second and third, being in the province of the professional technician, should be put squarely up to him. The architectural groups formed under the guidance of The American Institute of Architects will provide a logical and economical means of controlling these two essentials."

### Applications for Membership

Notice to Members of the Institute:

April 1, 1936.

The names of the following applicants may come before the Board of Directors, or its Executive Committee, for action on their admission to the Institute, and if elected, the applicants will be assigned to the Chapters indicated:

<i>Boston Chapter</i> - - - - -	LEWIS MORSE LAWRENCE
<i>Buffalo Chapter</i> - - - - -	R. MAXWELL JAMES
<i>Central Illinois Chapter</i> - - - - -	ARTHUR F. DEAM
<i>Cincinnati Chapter</i> - - - - -	GEORGE FREDERIC ROTH, JR., CARL SCHMUELLING
<i>Cleveland Chapter</i> - - - - -	ROBERT WALLACE DICKERSON, GEORGE HUNT INGRAHAM
<i>Connecticut Chapter</i> - - - - -	PASQUALE MARIO TORRACA, EDWARD GREGORIE WALLACE
<i>Minnesota Chapter</i> - - - - -	EDWIN W. KRAFFT
<i>Northern California Chapter</i> - - - - -	ANDREW T. HASS
<i>Oregon Chapter</i> - - - - -	HERBERT A. ANGELL, JOSEPH W. HEILER, ROSCOE DELUER HEMENWAY, THAYNE J. LOGAN
<i>Philadelphia Chapter</i> - - - - -	CLYDE S. ADAMS, LOUIS E. McALLISTER
<i>South Texas Chapter</i> - - - - -	JAMES EDWARD MONROE, JR.
<i>Virginia Chapter</i> - - - - -	FORREST WINFIELD COILE, BASIL A. PIPINO, A. BYRON WILLIAMS
<i>Washington, D. C.</i> - - - - -	S. CLEMENTS HORSLEY
<i>Washington State Chapter</i> - - - - -	THOMAS LOUIS HANSEN

You are invited, as directed by the By-laws, to send privileged communications before April 30, 1936, on the eligibility of the candidates for the information and guidance of the members of the Board of Directors on their final ballot. No applicant will be finally passed upon should any Chapter request, within the thirty-day period, an extension of time for purpose of investigation.

CHARLES T. INGHAM,  
Secretary.



## With the Chapters

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES, BULLETINS AND REPORTS

### Buffalo.

The Chapter was fortunate in having as its guest at the February meeting, Richmond H. Shreve, regional director of the New York District, and chairman of the Institute's Committee on Housing.

Of great interest to the meeting was the address by Mr. Shreve in which he very clearly stated the Institute's position toward the many complexities confronting the profession at this time.

Mr. Shreve stated that the Government bureaus were striving for the adoption of a sounder and more permanent policy, and expressed confidence that the design of Government buildings would soon be put back into the hands of private architects.

Touching on the temporary Government activities, especially the Government's participation in the small house field, Mr. Shreve reported that considerable progress had been made by the Institute in cooperation with the Government agencies in following through the Housing Committee's resolution adopted at the 1935 Convention, and the resolution adopted at the December, 1935, Board Meeting.

The purpose of the Institute in this action, Mr. Shreve said, is two-fold—first, to put the architect in control of supervision; and second, to assure better mortgage value through sounder construction and more economical planning. He reported that the F.H.A. and certain lending institutions such as the Brooklyn Savings Bank have already stated they will not issue loans on any building not built from competent plans and specifications. The Institute hoped, he said, to encourage all such lending institutions in the adoption of a similar attitude.

The Chapter was complimented by Mr. Shreve on the progress being made by the Buffalo Small House Bureau, and he indicated that the Bureau had made great strides toward the proper solution of the problem of small house plan service.

The A.I.A. Short Form Contract for Small Construction, recently issued by the Institute, was cited as one of the many accomplishments of the Institute in its efforts to solidify the profession's position in the small house field. The Short Form Contract is the result of months of study and preparation by the Institute in cooperation with the Federal Housing Adminis-

tration, and is now incorporated in that Administration's releases and instructions to field offices.

In concluding his address, Mr. Shreve expressed confidence that the profession, through the constant efforts of the Institute, is surely making its way back into its proper sphere, and that the entire profession, whether Institute members or not, whether independent architects or salaried draftsmen, derived great satisfaction from the feeling that they were all under the protective wing of the A.I.A.

### Chicago.

The regular March meeting of the Chapter, held at the Architects' Club in Chicago, was preceded by a dinner attended by more than 40 members and guests.

Immediately following dinner President Hall introduced Mr. Haynes, a representative of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, who gave an interesting talk regarding the tour of inspection to historical points in Virginia prior to the convention in May.

The Chairman of the Membership Committee reported that a vigorous effort was being made to secure the early reinstatement of those members recently dropped.

Mr. Merrill discussed the Building Show program sponsored by the Real Estate Board of Chicago and endorsed by F.H.A.

The Secretary then proceeded with the balloting for the delegates and alternates to represent the Chapter at the Williamsburg convention.

After the balloting the meeting adjourned to enable the members and guests to attend "Architectural Tragedy" a dramatic production presented by members of the Architects' Club of Chicago.

### Connecticut.

The Annual Meeting of the Chapter was held in Hartford, and the following officers were elected by acclamation:

President.....	DOUGLAS W. ORR
Vice-President.....	LORENZO HAMILTON
Secretary-Treasurer.....	HERBERT GIBSON
Director for 3 years.....	THOMAS R. BALL

The combined Secretary-Treasurer's Report was submitted by Lorenzo Hamilton, while

W. W. Sunderland and A. R. Ellis were appointed to audit the Treasurer's portion of the report. Mr. Palmer reported that the Connecticut Construction League has requested the Chapter to adopt the articles of fair competition in bidding, as set forth in their Committee's Report. Considerable discussion ensued, action on the matter being deferred until a later meeting.

After the business meeting the members repaired to the University Club to attend the annual dinner of the Chapter.

#### Delaware.

The annual meeting of the Delaware Chapter, held in Wilmington, was the occasion for an inspiring address by the retiring President, Roscoe Cook Tindall, who expressed his great appreciation for the cooperation of the members during the past year.

President Tindall spoke enthusiastically of all members of the Chapter who, in their efforts for the welfare of the profession and their activities in public life, were keeping before the public the benefits to be derived from the utilization of competent architectural service.

Mr. Tindall recommended that an open meeting be held occasionally to discuss the ethics of practice and that an architectural exhibition be held during the year 1936.

Mr. Tindall, terminating eight years as President of the Chapter, was given enthusiastic praise for his splendid administration during his tenure of office.

The following officers were unanimously elected to serve during 1936:

*President*.....WALTER CARLSON  
*Vice-President*.....GABRIEL MASSENA  
*Secretary*.....REAH DEBOURG ROBINSON  
*Mem. Exec. Comm.*.....ROSCOE COOK TINDALL

#### Florida Central.

Through Frank A. Winn, Jr., past Secretary-Treasurer of the Chapter, we learn with regret that the recent flu epidemic has affected many members, seriously curtailing attendance at Chapter meetings.

In spite of this handicap the annual meeting of the Chapter held on March 9 was very well attended, and the following were elected officers for the year 1936.

*President*.....GEO. FOOTE DUNHAM  
*Vice-President*.....FRANK A. WINN, JR.  
*Secretary-Treasurer*.....FRANK A. PARZIALE

#### Executive Committee:

*For three years*.....F. O. ADAMS  
*For two years*.....F. J. KENNARD  
*For one year*.....H. T. TAYLOR

#### St. Louis.

The Melbourne Hotel was the scene of a recent dinner meeting of the Chapter, attended by more than 40 members and guests.

The business meeting following the dinner was given over to the discussion of various committee activities, and it was decided that future committee reports be furnished to the entire membership.

Formation of the Small House Service Plan was discussed, President Hoener explaining in detail the "Baltimore Plan."

The By-law Revision Committee report, at the suggestion of Messrs. Hirsch and Hill, was referred to the Executive Board for study and recommendation.

Mr. Leimkuehler, in reporting for the Publicity Committee, urged that the membership make every effort to furnish the necessary material for publication in the *Sunday Post Dispatch*.

The following were unanimously elected officers for the year 1936:

*President*.....P. JOHN HOENER  
*Treasurer*.....IRVING R. TIMLIN  
*Vice-President*.....DAVID STEPHEN, JR.  
*Ex. Bd. Mem.*.....PROF. LAWRENCE HILL  
*Secretary*.....BENEDICT FARRAR

The meeting was concluded with an address by Dr. George M. Park on "Architecture in Siam and Cambodia." Dr. Park's address was most enjoyable and instructive, and the members were of the unanimous opinion that the evening will be long remembered.

#### Toledo.

The March Meeting of the Chapter, held in the Tower Room of the Hill Crest Apartments, at which dinner was served to more than 40 members and guests, was of more than usual interest, due to the advance showing of the drawings for the small house exhibition.

This exhibition was the outcome of the presence at the February meeting of John J. Wade, President of the Buffalo Chapter and Architectural Supervisor of F.H.A., who submitted the proposal for the Architect's Small House Exhibition, the details of which were left to Horace W. Wachter, Chairman of the Chapter's Publicity Committee.

In all, about twenty-five drawings were submitted, and were divided into two classes: houses costing from \$5000 to \$7000, and from \$7000 to \$9000. The drawings were later placed on display in the show rooms of the Toledo Edison Company for the entire week of March 8, the public being invited to vote for their preference in each class.

After the exhibition a most entertaining program was enjoyed, due largely to the presence

of Professors Wells Bennett and Jean C. Hebrard, of the College of Architecture of the University of Michigan, who discussed the problem of group housing with special reference to European housing developments. Their discussions were received with great attention and the Chapter members expressed their warm appreciation to them for having made the interesting program possible.

### Members Elected—October 16, 1935, to April 4, 1936

<i>Alabama Chapter</i>	-----	EARLE GUTHRIE LUTZ, JR.
<i>Boston Chapter</i>	-----	FRANK H. COLONY, WILLIAM W. FREEMAN, ROBERT REID, CARL ANTONY RITTER, EDWIN THEODORE STEFFIAN
<i>Central Illinois Chapter</i>	-----	FRANK MILLS LESCHER
<i>Chicago Chapter</i>	-----	ELMER A. GYLLECK, M. LOUIS KROMAN
<i>Cincinnati Chapter</i>	-----	PAUL PRINCE WIAINT
<i>Cleveland Chapter</i>	-----	RICHARD HAWLEY CUTTING, ANTHONY THORMIN
<i>Delaware Chapter</i>	-----	CLARENCE A. SMITH, II
<i>Detroit Chapter</i>	-----	EDGAR ROLLINS KIMBALL
<i>Florida South Chapter</i>	-----	GEORGE H. SPOHN
<i>Grand Rapids Chapter</i>	-----	JOHN P. BAKER
<i>Iowa Chapter</i>	-----	J. WOOLSON BROOKS
<i>Kentucky Chapter</i>	-----	STRATTON O. HAMMON
<i>Minnesota Chapter</i>	-----	PAUL W. JONES, DALE ROBERT McENARY, ROY NORMAN THORSHOV, REV. GILBERT L. WINKELMANN, O.S.B.
<i>Mississippi Chapter</i>	-----	JOHN T. COLLINS
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	-----	ROBERT PAUL BAECHLIN, HAROLD FOSTER CLARK, PAUL WOODHULL DRAKE, LEONARD G. FEINEN, ALBERT LUEDERS, ELMER S. TUTHILL
<i>New York Chapter</i>	-----	REUBEN HENRI BOWDEN, ANTHONY J. DePACE, HARRISON GILL, ELLERY HUSTED, RICHARD A. KIMBALL, AUGUSTE L. NOËL, ROBERT H. SCANNELL
<i>Northern California Chapter</i>	-----	HARRY M. MICHELSEN
<i>Oregon Chapter</i>	-----	PIETRO BELLUSCHI, MARGARET GOODIN FRITSCH, GEORGE H. JONES, ROWE DAVIS KENNEDY
<i>Philadelphia Chapter</i>	-----	CHARLES DUHRING FRIDY, JOHN DUHRING FRIDY, H. MARTYN KNEEDLER, MARGARET F. SPENCER, CLARENCE CLARK ZANTZINGER, JR.
<i>Pittsburgh Chapter</i>	-----	RAYMOND CHERUBINI CELLI, ROBERT JOHN BROCKER
<i>St. Louis Chapter</i>	-----	RUSSELL ORRIN DENTER
<i>San Diego Chapter</i>	-----	SAM W. HAMILL
<i>Santa Barbara Chapter</i>	-----	ROLAND F. SAUTER
<i>South Carolina Chapter</i>	-----	STEPHEN THOMAS
<i>Southern California Chapter</i>	-----	HARBIN F. HUNTER, BEN HILLIARD O'CONNOR, HERBERT J. POWELL, EDGAR BISSANTZ, DONALD BEACH KIRBY
<i>Southern Pennsylvania Chapter</i>	-----	ROLY G. LODDENGARD
<i>Tennessee Chapter</i>	-----	ALBERT I. BRADY, LOUIS G. CARLISLE, G. ALBERT CHANDLER, WILSON JETER EASON, HOWEL BATMAN HULSEY, GRANBERRY JACKSON, JR., DUDLEY EMERSON JONES
<i>Washington, D. C. Chapter</i>	-----	MARIO VINCENT CAPUTO, THOMAS HALL LOCRAFT, CHARLES E. PETERSON, HOWARD LELAND SMITH, HOWARD PARK VERMILYA
<i>West Texas Chapter</i>	-----	DAN J. DRISCOLL, ARTHUR FEHR, CLIFFORD HENRY JAMES
<i>Wisconsin Chapter</i>	-----	HENRY PHILIP PLUNKETT





