opinion of this House, the abrupt discontinuance of the employment of the architect who has hitherto been engaged whenever professional skill and responsibility were required, at a moment when works entrusted to his direction were still in progress, is uncalled for and of doubtful expediency.'

Mr. Gladstone, as referred to, said:

"The words of the motion evidently implied that the completion of works in progress under his charge was to be taken out of his hands; but that was a statement which was entirely without foundation. Mr. Barry was to complete the works which were in progress exactly as he would have done if this correspondence had not taken place; and as to the future, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given it as his opinion, that Mr. Barry ought to continue to be employed when works were required in that building. The employment of Mr. Barry as an architect neither had been discontinued with regard to works in progress, nor had been declared to be about to be discontinued with regard to architectural works which might hereafter be declared necessary.

"We will say nothing of the terms of the correspondence on which the opinion out of doors was founded. On these statements being made in the House it would have been as well if the motion had been withdrawn. However, it was pressed to a division, and being twisted into a sort of 'want of confidence' motion, was, of course, lost, 109 voting for it, and 152 against, a small difference under the circumstances, especially as several members quite opposed to the proceedings of the First Commissioner,—for example, Lord Elcho, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Sir James Lawrence, and others,—refrained from voting, considering it not desirable to press the Minister too hard.

"The claim to ownership of drawings still remains open, and to this we shall doubtless have to return."

ARCHITECTURE AS IT IS IN AMERICA.

IN one of those able and clear sighted leading articles with which the veteran editor, Professor GODWIN, conducts the London *Builder*, we find the present position of architecture in this country, taken up and reviewed under the caption of "American Professional Papers," in such a friendly, yet critical manner, that we cannot refrain from adverting to it.

The article commences with a sketch of the history of our Institute of Architects; and is as follows:

"Twelve years have now elapsed since the architectural profession in America gathered itself together, and founded an Institute of Architects. This raising of the standard has placed the profession upon a legitimate basis; not only bonding together and making it a tangible reliable fact before the public, but creating for it headquarters, an agreeable fellowship among its members, the possibility of action in unison, and pervading it with that subtle quality of cohesion, combination, and competition, known as *esprit de corps*. The last three years of the period in which the Institute has existed have been the most fruitful, whence we may assume that those to come will be still more so. The progress made is most recognisable in the fact of the inauguration of annual conventions of one or two days' duration, in which the president gives an address, the reports of the local chapters are read, and papers on various professional subjects are read and discussed. As would be observed in the *Builder* of the 23rd ult., the Institute has issued a schedule of charges, endorsing as a starting point the time-honored fee of five per cent. usual on this side of the Atlantic, and some of the details in common with the schedule of the British Institute. It has also pub-

lished the proceedings of the three conventions that have now been held, and the papers read on those occasions. But it is not by the work it has accomplished itself so much, as by that it has called forth in other directions that we must measure the amount of usefulness it has performed. Since these annual conventions have been arranged, a number of professional journals, altogether independent of the Institute and of each other, have appeared upon the face of American literature. Directly architecture came to the front, in a word, sympathizers and supporters appeared on her right hand and on her left; and we must look upon the position so assumed and thus ensured as one of great promise."

In noticing the published proceedings of the Institute, he says:

"They show us the great, busy, work-a-day America, with its tall warehouse-looking dwellings and tramway-laid streets of bold-faced, self-asserting stores, in every respect indicative of the fact that trade and traffic are the main considerations taken into account in their eager, daunting, pushing continuity; and they show us, too, that other America, bountiful as boundless, that had rest and release in it for troubled spirits in the days of the Stuarts, the Old Colony days, the land of Miles Standish and John Alden, that our forefathers spoke of as 'our plantations in America.' This last phase is most apparent in the paper read by the president of the Institute, Mr. Richard Upjohn, on 'The Colonial Architecture of New York and the New England States.' He tells us that only a few of the colonial buildings remain, but they are striking evidences of the taste and skill of the period to which they belong, and identical in style with cotemporary buildings in Holland and England. If the Institute should be able by its influence to preserve these interesting fabrics from demolition, it will be doing a good work. As pictures in the history of America, they are absolutely priceless; nevertheless, their number is gradually getting smaller and smaller. In the face of the strong feeling there is in our own country in favor of the conservation of our ancient buildings, it is scarcely to be credited that this comparatively new country ruthlessly razes to the ground the architectural links that connect it with the Old World. Even some of the old churches of the early colonists have been destroyed; relics we should have deemed as precious as Saxon remains are in this country. Their ancient features, with their refinement of quaint simplicity, associated with so much that is worthy in the history of the sons of Japhet, have been considered as naught; as no more, in fine, than the rosemary odor, 'commingled with pansies,' 'the Puritan pansies,' that Edgar Allan Poe would have found lingering in them. The North Dutch Church, erected by the Dutch colonists in Fulton street, was destroyed last year; and the South Dutch Church, now used as a post-office, is doomed. Mr. Upjohn remarks that St. Paul's one of the most prominent landmarks in the city of New York, still stands in almost pristine vigor. We trust that it may long remain to do so, for a companion edifice, Old Trinity Church, has been already thrice rebuilt. All the domestic buildings of the primitive days of this city are either utterly lost or so defaced as to be of little interest; but Brooklyn is more fortunate in still retaining some of the picturesque homes built by the earnest, stout-hearted, faithful colonists. Mr. Upjohn records, and we are glad to pass on the word, that there is an old house in South Brooklyn, on Fifth avenue, near Greenwood Cemetery, with the date 1699, in wrought-iron figures forming the anchor heads, on the outside. He says: 'It is a brick building, built, as was usual at that time, of bricks brought from Holland, and laid up with mortar probably made of shell lime. It is remarkable that the gable walls of this house are without coping, but are finished with bricks standing angle-wise, and forming the zigzag lines still seen on the gables of houses in Holland and Belgium; yet the mortar joints, exposed to the weather two hundred years, are still intact.' The period of this erection will be better realized if we remind our readers that it was only thirty years after Charles II., by the grace of God, King of England, Scotland, France, greeting, granted to his 'dear and entirely beloved cousin, Prince Rupert,' and others, the sole trade and commerce of Hudson Bay. Architecture and the art of building have not arrived at so much perfection in America that the loss of such an example can be afforded; and we must add, again, the Institute will advance its interests by protecting from demolition the Old World homes that were transplanted with so much effort and care. Boston, Cambridge, Newport, and New London, Connecticut, also retain attractive examples of genuine domestic architecture, of which, Mr. Upjohn suggests, that the members of the academy of design should make careful studies, as they will be buried in oblivion in the course of another century; which prophecy all well-wishers of architecture in America will desire may not be fulfilled."

THE BLOCKLEY ALMSHOUSE.

IT is a very general error into which our cities are apt to fall, that of neglecting present opportunities which might be easily embraced, and prove very great benefits to future tax-payers.

The value of the real estate occupied by the Blockley Almshouse is very great, and the immediate sale of it urged by one of the city papers (*The Star*), as being most advisable. It proposes to leave the hospital department, but to remove the pauper and insane wards to the farm north of the city, on which the new House of Correction is to be built.

We consider the subject to be one of very great moment, and perfectly agree with *The Star*, in its view of the question as connected with the necessary enlargement of the insane department of the present structure.

Additions, alterations, and repairs, arising therefrom, must cost a considerable sum of money, and the buildings erected will by no means permanently suit either the wants of the city or the pockets of the tax-payers; for, as *The Star* truly remarks, "in the course of a very few years the removal of the Almshouse from its present site may be regarded as a fixed fact." Then, is it not unwise to think of building new additions on ground so valuable, and so sure of an immediate purchase as is the present site, when the money which could be had for it would more than pay for permanent and all-sufficient buildings on the farm of the House of Correction already the property of the city.

The Blockley Almshouse is a crude collection of additions to old buildings, making up an appearance unworthy of the character of Philadelphia for architectural taste, which stands up in our very midst, bearing witness against us.

Whether viewed in a sanitary, an economic, or a tasteful light, the most prudent course to be adopted is that of the sale of the present site, and building *de novo* on the farm just such a structure as the future, rather than the present, calls for. The city grows at a rate that will demand a building of a size which in our present condition may seem extravagant. But, time will rapidly fill up its capacity, and make it none too large (if large enough), for the requisitions of a doubling population, with the too sure accompaniments of poverty and insanity.

The suggestions of a removal of the two departments from the Blockley site, and the selling of the property are well worthy attention.