This paper will investigate exemplars of commercial architecture from Toronto’s prolific early twentieth-century building period (1900 to 1916), often referred to stylistically in Canada as Edwardian, through two lenses. The introduction of the skyscraper—that most American of built form—to Toronto’s flourishing new banking district is the first lens. That story aims to unravel the influences on Toronto architecture emanating from Chicago (through technological advances in commercial architecture), New York (where Beaux-Arts rules were stretched to compose tall building façades), and London (through adherence to Imperial architectural taste). The second lens considers two contemporary, competing architectural practices that succeeded in tall building design: Carrère and Hastings of New York (in association with their Canadian alumni) and Darling and Pearson of Toronto.

Toronto’s first modern skyscraper ensemble appears at the intersection of King and Yonge streets in the years after the Great Fire of 1904. These new buildings inalterably changed the skyline image of the city and were erected in spite of pervasive health and engineering concerns, not to mention aesthetic ones. Indeed with the completion of the Traders’ Bank Building by Carrère and Hastings in 1906—the first in the ensemble—the editors of Canadian Architect and Builder petulantly sniffed: “we cannot regard the arrival of the tall building with entire satisfaction.” If genuinely unsatisfied with their arrival, then the editors and the general public were nevertheless fascinated by these impossible-to-ignore giant architectural forms.

FIG. 1. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF SKYSCRAPER ROW, C. 1920. | CITY OF TORONTO ARCHIVES.
The introductory narrative on context will outline the linkages between Edwardian Toronto’s commercial, civic, and architectural culture; that is, the forces that conjoined to erect this building ensemble. This grouping marked the intersection of the imperial outpost’s new cardo and decumanus upon its rising skyline. The architectural narrative then follows the buildings’ dates of completion: Traders’ Bank Building (1906), Lumsden Building (1910), Canadian Pacific Railway Building (1913), Dominion Bank Building (1914), and the Royal Bank Building (1916). The Richardsonian landmarks of the Old City Hall (1899) and the Independent Order of Foresters’ Temple Building (1897) will also be analyzed in order to illustrate the earlier adoption of American precedents (fig. 1).

The shrewd and wealthy barons of Toronto and Montreal, observing the successes of their peers in Chicago and New York, had come to understand the value of sky-scraping landmark buildings that also generated high rental incomes across multiple storeys. Connecting ambitious architects to these baron patrons was assured by the established yet ever multiplying “club system,” of both the business and cultural varieties.

TORONTO’S EMERGING ARCHITECTURAL CULTURE

It is important to sketch an outline of the early twentieth-century Anglo-Canadian establishment’s search for an autonomous culture and economy specific to the relatively new idea of the confederated Dominion of Canada. Could an authentic Canadian culture develop that was nourished as much by the brash energy exploiting the hinterland of the quickly modernizing country as by the cultural and professional ties to Great Britain, and less overtly to the United States? The genesis and mission of the Group of Seven Painters is a clear analog in the fine arts, about whom much has already been written.\(^6\) Indeed many of the Group of Seven were “club men,” instrumental in directing the Arts and Letters Club of Toronto. Manifestos and grand ideas were formed by these gatherings of men in the plethora of other clubs, societies, and unions that had evolved since Confederation, or that had sprung anew in lockstep with the modern, post-Victorian age. They served to incubate initiatives for the new nation. Those that focused on the civic scale (York and Toronto clubs for instance)\(^8\) promoted Toronto business at a time of unprecedented expansion of both the city and the Dominion, counting as members the male elites of business, government, and the arts. Many architects, like Edmund Burke, Frank Darling, and his partner John Pearson, were members of these establishment clubs.\(^8\) Other architects at the vanguard of practice like Eden Smith formed clubs to further the art of architecture, often focussed on reforming architectural education. The Toronto Architectural Eighteen Club (1899)—to be discussed later on—was one such club. The list of turn-of-the-century politico-business clubs and their members is long. For our purposes however it is illuminating to note the chronology of those clubs and societies formed to promote both the profession and the art of architecture\(^9\): Toronto Society of Architects (1887); Ontario Association of Architects (1889); University of Toronto School of Architecture (1890); Toronto Guild of Civic Art (1897); Toronto Architectural Eighteen Club (1899); Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (1907); Arts and Letters Club (1908); Toronto Civic Improvement Committee (1911); University of Toronto Architectural Club (1911).

TORONTO’S HYBRID MODERN ARCHITECTURE

This paper will also consider Toronto architecture of the Edwardian period\(^10\) as a New World hybrid: balancing an adherence to the progress of Imperial Great Britain with its geographical situation on the shores of Lake Ontario, an optimistic and observant neighbour to the commercially fecund and populous cities of the United Sates. Of the influences operating

---

on Toronto’s architectural and material culture its outlier position on the tight network of rapidly developing, innovating, and prosperous American Great Lakes cities is rarely explored. Connections to Montreal of course were historically strong, but this regional, lacustrine aspect is worth exploring in more depth. At the turn of the century, Chicago, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Detroit, the cities closest and most accessible from Toronto, were absorbing great waves of new citizens and developing a boisterous, inventive, and corporate wealth. The urban expansion revealed itself in the growth and complexity of industrial and business structures, and was reflected in novel contemporary architecture, most notably in industrial buildings—like those of Albert Kahn of Detroit—and in the remarkable new heights and organizations of office buildings. The concomitant explosion of architecturally delightful bank buildings enticed and dignified everyday depositors, while giving the appearance of safeguarding this explosion of wealth.11

The growth of these northern American cities was monitored by the well-subscribed architectural press, through periodicals such as The Architectural Record, Architecture, Inland Architect, and the Toronto-based Canadian Architect and Builder and Construction. The magazines published generously the pertinent and novel developments of modern architecture, as well as opinion pieces and essays. Newly founded architectural societies also published illustrated annuals and exhibited their members’ works to the interested public. Architectural publications certainly expanded the knowledge horizons of the regions’ architects. Additionally, extensive railway and Great Lakes passenger steamer networks literally expanded their horizons, so that Toronto architects could easily visit (sumptuously too, when it came to the waterborne steamships12) the nearby sister cities to study successful precedents and incorporate their lessons into projects back home. In this regard, the architectural tourism seems somewhat one-sided, although Toronto boosters felt that their city held up “magnificently” to the others in comparison.13 The volume of innovative precedents to study encompassed not just sound planning and building forms, artistic and decorative trends, or material and technological advances. Toronto architects would also have been confronted with proven new organizational methods applied to architectural practice itself, methods that streamlined modern building production through the hierarchical division of architectural expertise and construction document production, not to mention the increasing specialization of the role of construction manager to oversee complex projects.14 One could say that by the year 1900, the modern architectural practice’s advanced structure and work flow, employed to oversee the construction of modern building types, was to a large measure due to the methods learned by the legions of American architects who attended—if not matriculated from—the famous École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, coupled with new, American business management strategies developed in an environment of ruthless competition.

As alluring as much of this astonishing progress must have seemed, Canadians looked across the border through the
portals of newspaper opinions and political speeches with a smug concern at the seemingly chaotic growth, corruption, and “mongrel” nature of large American cities. There was a generally accepted belief that republicanism and unbridled democracy were inferior and potentially dangerous forms of government.15 If Canadian thinkers were publicly critical of the disparate and unbridled forces at work on the politics and social fabric of the Republic, is it not likely that this sentiment translated to its architectural forms and thought as well? On the one hand certain Toronto architects and their clients embraced American models and techniques, and profited from Toronto’s situation on a growing, interconnected system of expanding Great Lakes cities; while on the other there was a resistance to the wholesale importation of these models, especially via American architects working in Canada. This tension was reflected in the debates over the future of the Dominion itself. Canadians agonized to understand how the country would evolve politically and economically: as an independent but minor branch plant nation tied inextricably to the United States orbit (the federal election of 1911 was lost over “trade reciprocity” and the fear it fomented of annexation to the US) or as an essential and resource-rich semi-autonomous dominion in the global chain of the British Empire, a concept referred to as “Canadian Imperialism.” The twentieth-century British Imperial project was, after all, a globalizing capitalist one, rife with opportunity, within which eager Canadian imperialists lobbied to have Canada treated as an equal partner in a reconceived federated organization of dominions and colonies where, in the best outcome, she would become its richest state. Canadian imperialists were vociferous nationalists of a kind, somewhat paradoxically, and in their rhetoric mined that vein of anti-Americanism that often courses quietly under the surface of the Canadian worldview.14 Their legacy and general influence is overlooked today17 since, in effect, their cause for a united Empire with preferential imperial trade was ultimately unattainable and dissipated rapidly after the horror of WWI. Their florid pro-Canada, pro-Empire rhetoric had undeniably profound impacts on contemporary political debates of course, but they were no less profound on the discourse over Canadian arts and letters.

How did this imperialist/nationalist rhetoric infiltrate architectural theory and practice? One obvious way was through the architectural press. An editorial from The Builder, a British architectural periodical, unapologetically shared in the Toronto-based Construction in 1912 haughtily suggested that all the cities of the British dominions should strive toward the same imperial character: “An empire can nurse no finer ideal than the cohesion of its dominions and cities erected in one style of architecture recognized throughout the world as the expression of its own imperial ideals . . .”18 The writer included an undisguised warning to Canadian architects that they were vulnerable to anti-imperial tendencies:

When Great Britain is incapable of setting an example of architectural achievement to her dependencies other nations more virile will slowly but surely take advantage of her relapse . . . and bring about an imperial disaffection . . . In Canada today there are but too evident tendencies to an appropriation of American ideals and methods of expression not entirely to be attributed to the natural influence of Cosmopolitanism and opposed to imperialistic ideals.19

Percy Nobbs, the tireless Scot-Montrealer architectural nationalist, in his efforts to promote a truly Canadian architecture made clear in his many essays and lectures its necessary ties to the culture of Great Britain, while adjusting for climatic considerations. Even Francis Baker, the Toronto architect who helped to bring the first American-designed skyscraper to Toronto’s skyline had this to say about the development of Canadian architecture, perhaps more patronizingly: “As a rule however we are safe in saying that, while we have not yet developed a Canadian architecture, our buildings in the matter of both design and construction give evidence of culture and good taste, together with the stable characteristics of our people.”20

Toronto architects’ adoption of British or American precedents was an indispensable and defensible practice employed to assure the proper erection of the new building types demanded by the modern age, in garb that reflected their clients’ aspirations. Their particular bias toward the choice of suitable precedents was informed by nationalism, pedagogy, and proven technological successes. Skyscrapers and banks, the main focus of this paper, are worthy building types to analyze this idea. Local architects who sought a Canadian/imperial architecture based on British models were nevertheless influenced to greater or lesser degrees by the innovative planning and vertical growth of American cities, itself spurred by American capitalism and business acumen. American architects working in Canada of course did not concern themselves with seemingly subtle cultural transgressions. They were engaged by Canadian businessmen because their designs brought with them the architectural connotations and executive connections to American commerce. This paper will not be the first to observe that Toronto architects processed both worldviews to arrive at a hybrid architectural culture.
IMPERIALIST VS. REPUBLICAN ARCHITECTS

The record of Canadian architects bristling at American firms winning commissions for Canadian buildings for which they felt fully qualified to prepare designs and administer over their construction has been explored in Kelly Crossman’s *Architecture in Transition*, Angela Carr’s *Toronto Architect Edmund Burke*, and Isabelle Gournay’s essay in *Montreal Metropolis 1880-1930* to the extent that it could be described as a defining motivator in the evolution of modern Canadian architecture. The scandals reached a high point during Toronto’s Edwardian period, owing no doubt to their fomentation in the architectural press. In that vein it is tempting to look at the construction of ever-taller skyscrapers on Yonge Street as a battle as much between business interests vying for architectural presence as between the local “underdog” architectural team and the effete American interlopers. Again, the reality is more complex, and here it makes sense to introduce the two firms responsible for the early skyscrapers. Toronto’s Darling and Pearson had asserted themselves by the turn of the century as a sophisticated establishment architecture firm enjoying highly placed admiration and patronage, fully ensconced within their Imperial Edwardian Canadian culture. New York’s Carrère and Hastings (themselves alumni of the illustrious McKim, Mead and White) were already a celebrated and accomplished “Beaux-Arts” firm designing in the “Modern French style” boasting an impressive portfolio of built projects. They also graduated a host of talented alumni, an important set of them Canadian.

Regarding the many prestigious architectural commissions being awarded at the time in Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg, it was not unreasonable for Canadian businessmen to directly seek out the architects responsible for the successful advances of American architecture (and their implied relationships with proven American businesses) and employ them in the Dominion, even if it irritated their fellow club-member architect-friends in Toronto and Montreal who were keen to activate the idea of a homegrown architecture. Awarding important commercial design commissions to American architects instead of Canadians was an ongoing controversy. To name only a few: Bruce Price (1845-1903) was instrumental in forging the romantic Chateau Style of the Canadian Pacific Railway under the leadership of Cornelius van Horne, Henry Ives Cobb (1859-1931) “collaborated” with E.J. Lennox on the King Edward Hotel (1903), and Richard Waite (1848-1911 although born in the UK but practicing out of Buffalo)—besides famously stealing the Ontario Legislature competition from Frank Darling—designed some handsome commercial buildings in Montreal and Toronto.
The decades preceding the twentieth century skyscraper boom in Toronto show that local architects were indeed able to take on the challenge of erecting tall and fireproof buildings. We must look to the technical and structural innovation of 1880s Chicago to understand the allure of American architecture for Canadian patrons. Chicago of course had been a mesmerizing draw for architectural tourism since the marriage of the steel frame and elevator had brought forth a new architectural expression enrobed in the functional, commercial, and Romanesque “Chicago School” style of the 1880s. Chicago architects, most notably Daniel Burnham, continued to innovate with the paradigm-changing World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, the generator of the City Beautiful Movement. This movement was extended more locally to Buffalo in 1901 (then twice as populous as Toronto) during the architecturally florid Pan-American Exposition.

It is from Chicago’s brown decades however that Toronto architects truly began their enthusiastic importation of modern American architectural innovation, an admiration spurred by proximity as much as civic affinity. If they disliked the implication that they were not qualified to design modern (that is, American), technologically advanced buildings, then they were certainly prepared to study them and learn new methods from US practices until they got their break at home.

**Toronto’s Third City Hall (1899)**

In Toronto’s Romanesque years of the 1880s the wounding sting from the fiasco surrounding the Provincial Legislature competition was still strongly felt. The perceived inferiority of the local architectural scene by ambitious clients undoubtedly spurred Toronto architects like Edmund Burke, George Gouinlock, and E.J. Lennox to take special interest in the structural and stylistic innovations occurring in Chicago’s architectural hotbed and thus to put themselves in a stronger position to wrest commissions from American firms. In the 1880s, an opportunity arose when Toronto’s reform-minded aldermen proposed the institution of a new city council structure and with it new municipal buildings outside of the Old Town, which were to reflect modern ideas of municipal governance and therefore Toronto’s inexorable progress. A competition was held (originally for new Court facilities but then expanded to include a new City Hall) and was won by Toronto architect E.J. Lennox. He went on a fact-finding mission across the region to study and report back on such modern municipal buildings, as a way to prove his architectural mettle to the building committee. He admired but one: the 1888 Allegheny County Courthouse, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, by H.H. Richardson. This civic masterpiece was equally admired by scores of other burgomeisters and versions of Richardson’s design were erected in many cities of the Great Lakes region. It became a shared icon for modernity, efficient governance, and, most importantly, progress.

The relocation of Toronto’s City Hall from the sooty and gross environs of the St. Lawrence Ward market building to the more salubrious location at Queen and Bay streets would trigger a micro building boom in this quarter—the business core was clearly migrating west and north from Wellington and Church streets. King Street, always considered the main commercial promenading street, was being challenged by Timothy Eaton’s and Robert Simpson’s huge department stores (and their ancillary buildings), which soon faced each other across Queen Street at Yonge.

Toronto’s new, russet-toned Richardsonian City Hall was completed at long last in 1899. Its tall clock tower visually terminated Bay Street and marked a new civic centre of the city (fig. 2).

**The Independent Order of Foresters’ Temple Building (1897)**

Around the same time that the new City Hall was on the boards, Toronto architect George W. Gouinlock was hired by Six Nations-born Dr. Oronhyatekha to design the headquarters of the Independent Order of Foresters’ Temple Building. Also garbed in the modern American Romanesque, the Temple Building loomed a block south of the new city building, at the corner of Richmond and Bay streets (fig. 3). As Adam Sobolak states, “the Richardsonian Romanesque changed the visual scale of Toronto . . . the last (of this style), the biggest of all, the Temple Building of the IOF . . . rising some two hundred feet from the street.”

The design of the Temple Building emulated the Rookery Building in Chicago, designed by Burnham and Root and completed in 1888. This is an obvious precedent reference that to our knowledge has not been generally recognized: the Temple Building adopted the Rookery’s Chicago School Romanesque massing, corner siting, fenestration, and detail concepts (fig. 4), especially in the filigreed entry arch (but not the Rookery’s glorious interior court).

The IOF Temple Building was Toronto’s first definable skyscraper and was a manifestation in red brick and Credit Valley sandstone of personalities, time and place: designed by a southern Ontario-born Toronto architect, employing a successful Chicago School precedent, envisioned by an accomplished Mohawk doctor and housing the headquarters for a revivified British fraternal society.
The editors of Canadian Architect and Builder begrudgingly acknowledged that tall, “Metropolitan” buildings were here to stay with the completion of the Temple, but offered some thoughts on how to locate them:

The many large buildings that have been erected in Toronto within the last six or seven years and those which are in process of erection at the present time, have given a metropolitan character to the city which it did not formerly possess. The appearance of most of these buildings, including the new City Buildings (City Hall) and Foresters’ Temple, now nearing completion, is satisfactory. It seems to us subject of regret however that the important structures have been situated in such close proximity to each other. Both would have gained in appearance had they been farther apart. The view of the new city buildings at present obtainable from Bay Street is very meagre and unsatisfactory indeed, partly due to the towering structure at the north-west corner of Bay and Richmond street, which has reached a height of eleven storeys . . . The new city buildings are now sufficiently advanced to show that they will present, when completed, a character at once imposing, pleasing and refined in comparison with the American creation in Queen’s Park. [Emphasis ours]

BROWN TURNS TO WHITE

At this moment at the turn of the century, two ultra-modern buildings albeit of somewhat retardataire expression stood close to each other at the new centre of power in the city; both based on American models, both making an indelible impression on the skyline and, importantly, both designed by Toronto architects in a waning style. Very nearby, Edmund Burke’s Robert Simpson Department store’s Chicago-imported technological advances were similarly impressive while the tall Eaton’s Department Store warehouses north of Queen Street were increasing the bulk of built form in the neighbourhood.

This ensemble however marks the swan-song of the heavy Romanesque fashion in architecture in Toronto. In 1901, the death of Queen Victoria and the ascent of Edward VII signalled the new century’s modern epoch. In Great Britain and the United States classical revivals on a monumental scale would take hold, although derived from different national models. The brown decades turned decisively to white, and the heavy courses of Credit Valley sandstone were superseded by seemingly weightless confections of American terracotta. New York City had now decisively surpassed Chicago as the focus of architectural innovation, and the new Parisian architectural fashion enrobed the de facto capital of the New World.

Neither were the two new tall buildings at Queen and Bay just discussed to be the new epicentre of architectural height or business aspirations. After the Great Fire of 1904 that decimated areas below Wellington Street, new high-rise development occurred on the northern fringes of the burnt out area while financial institutions continued their inevitable march along King Street toward Bay Street.

It is at the corner of Yonge and Colbourne streets that Toronto received it first “Beaux-Arts” skyscraper. The erection of the Traders’ Bank of Canada (1906), designed by Carrère and Hastings of New York, would be the first stroke in the composition of Yonge Street’s Edwardian skyscraper row.

AMERICAN BEAUX-ARTS FORMS

A point on terminology: “Beaux-Arts” has become an easy and accepted catch-all term for fancy monumental classical buildings of the turn of the century. But it helps to be more specific. Beaux-Arts refers more properly to the design process (but not the style per se) of American architects, who were trained at (but not necessarily matriculated from) the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris. There they submitted to the atelier system, where they were educated through a strict methodology for composing and representing a design for a building or urban ensemble: monumental, axial, and hierarchical.

Although not accurately described as a style, the term Beaux-Arts does carry with it a certain “Frenchness” of appearance referred to in contemporary criticism as the “Modern French” style. New York was the welcoming recipient of this rarefied style, also “known as Cartouche Architecture because of its extensive use of that particular ornamental device as well as the swags, garlands festoons and a host of other over-scaled motifs to enrich the façade.” Modern French modes became so dominant in turn-of-the-century New York that a Chicago architect accused New York of becoming a French city, with buildings that failed to “fit the design of the utilitarian idea” so vaunted on the shores of Lake Michigan. The waves of young American architects returning from their studies in Paris were eager to materialize their lessons and experiences. The long standing cultural resonance between France and the United States remained strong, and the Modern French style was deemed an appropriate way to conceive of the new American city: Paris of the Belle Époque.

THE ARCHITECTURAL LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Architectural Beaux-Arts societies multiplied throughout American cities, led by Beaux-Arts-trained architects. These societies were allied to the cause of
promoting architecture as an art—the quintessential Beaux-Arts ideal, improving cities through grand urban design as well as entrenching Beaux-Arts architectural training. They held exhibitions and published annuals, typically illustrating their projects in the Modern French style, with their recognizably gorgeous watercolour elevation and plan studies (fig. 5).

Beaux-Arts pedagogy was becoming pervasive in architectural training. One cannot talk about contemporary American architectural precedents without mentioning the irresistible pressure of the proven and effective methodologies of the Americanized system of Beaux-Arts planning and architectural education. Its allure to younger, non-Beaux-Arts-trained Toronto architects put them askance of the British apprenticeship model prevalent there. Beaux-Arts education was seen as superior to the unreliable apprenticeship methods, especially during the restless period in the evolution of the profession in Ontario. A Toronto architectural society with Beaux-Arts sympathies was formed in 1899, namely the Toronto Architectural Eighteen Club, of which the well-respected Arts and Crafts architect Eden Smith was a prominent member. They allied themselves directly with the Architectural League of America in the hopes of challenging the architectural establishment at home, staking the position that it was the artistic side of architecture that should be the critical focus of practice, not the bureaucratic aspects of the professionalization of the discipline. Most of Toronto’s talented practicing architects participated in the Eighteen’s Annual and exhibitions, regardless of their professional or formative bent, due, no doubt, to the excellent exposure that came with participation (fig. 6).

Now, if Beaux-Arts training was excellent for designing traditional load-bearing monumental buildings in France, for skyscraper design it posed some problems that architects and indeed the general public were struggling with: how to compose and decorate tall building volumes unknown to classical precedent? One way was simply to refuse commissions for tall buildings on aesthetic grounds. For those who took the challenge, critics weighed in on how Beaux-Arts rules might express—or not—the obvious structural truth of skyscrapers:

Since the day when the importation of the so-called Beaux-Arts influence was first “declared” there has existed among the more strictly “domestic” architects a snickering curiosity to see how the curious alien tradition and method would fare when brought into working relation with the American office skyscraper. The Parisian mode could, no doubt, maintain its native gait easily enough in dealing with the problems of the sort presented by American libraries, City Halls, churches and residences. They know of those things in France, but the skyscraper—that glory and reproach of American architecture—is a very different affair.

To address this problem architects sought analogies in the classical vocabulary and here we can light upon Bruce Price’s “eureka moment” in the design of the American Surety Building in New York (1896) (fig. 7) that immediately became normative: by superimposing the ancient proportional rigour onto tall buildings, they could embody at a colossal civic scale the classical Orders of architecture: the pedestal was expressed in a base of two or three storeys; a relatively undifferentiated vertical extrapolation of wall and window was analogous to a fluted shaft; and of course the decorated crowns of the upper storeys evoked the capital and cornice.

EDWARDIAN BAROQUE FORMS

More or less in parallel but splendidly aloof from American/Modern French architecture was the classical revival emanating from Britain, which relied on bold reinterpretations of English Baroque mannerism. Often the two stylistic modes are lumped together and referred to as “Beaux-Arts Style.” Again it helps to be more precise; but what then do we mean by Edwardian architecture?

“Edwardian” architecture has a few subcategories, but we will focus here on the grand mode of Edwardian Baroque. It implies a reverence toward, but also an architecturally witty reinterpretation of the favoured details of the masters of English Baroque architecture, namely: Sir Christopher Wren, James Gibbs, Nicholas Hawksmoore, and William Kent. These architects pursued a purity of classical form more related to Palladio than to les frères Perrault. Sir Edwin Lutyens went so far as to coin the term “Wrenaissance” to describe the Edwardian adherence to Wren’s historic forms.

One of the main proponents of the revival was the British architect John Belcher (1841-1913). His Institute of Chartered Accountants (1890) in London is regarded as a prototypical example of Edwardian Baroque because of its robust classicism and sculptural program. Indeed Belcher had obvious intentions as an educator and tastemaker: his magnificent 1901 two-volume publication Later Renaissance Architecture in England surely fuelled and mirrored this revived interest in the buildings of the period and provided details, photos and precedents for use in contemporary designs. Interestingly, the Toronto Public Library appears as a subscriber to the volumes.
Distinctive elements of Edwardian Baroque are: an increased appearance of cupolas and roof pavilions; an abundant use of Gibbs surrounds (a feature so apparently beloved of James Gibbs that it took his name), that is exaggerated cubic quoin sin and voussoirs; over-scaled classical details; figurative sculpture—usually representing Britannia; and an additive, boxy volumetric massing with deep relief and shadow lines (fig. 8). Examples of Edwardian Baroque buildings, referred to at the time as “Modern Renaissance” architecture, were disseminated by publications such as *The Builder*, *Studio Magazine*, *The Modern Building Record*, and *The Architectural Review* published by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), to which we know Frank Darling subscribed.

CARRÈRE AND HASTINGS

With that overview of the classical revivals taking place in the Anglosphere, we return to their impact on Toronto and focus on one of the major practitioners of American Beaux-Arts architecture, the same firm that designed Toronto's first skyscraper. Mervin Carrère and Thomas Hastings’s architectural partnership, Carrère and Hastings, lasted twenty-five years and produced many fine buildings that “defined the elegance of America’s . . . cities at the beginning of the twentieth century.” They are perhaps most well known for their exquisite and monumental New York Public Library (1897-1911).

John Carrère (1885-1911) was born in Rio de Janeiro to American parents. He attended the École in 1878, where he met fellow American Thomas Hastings (1860-1929). They both returned to New York and by 1883 were working as draughtsmen at McKim, Mead and White’s offices. By 1885 the ambitious duo had secured a Florida hotel project from under their employers auspices and divided their duties as business procurer and manager, and designer, respectively. Carrère died in 1911 in a fatal taxi accident, but his name was retained in the masthead.

Hastings’s love of French art and architecture and his leading role in the formation of the Architectural League of New York cast him as a formidable tastemaker. He was a proponent of École training and was interested in learning of the latest architectural trends from the younger men in the firm who had returned from Paris. He stated: “For many years the constant collaboration with young men of character and ability . . . has become a continuous school for us all, in effect an atelier.” Indeed, their Canadian short-term employees would take from their sympathetic masters not only heightened *au courant* design skills, but also an entrepreneurial spirit that would bode well for their future collaborations back in Canada.

The firm forayed into skyscraper design in their base of New York City. Their design for the Blair Building of 1903 (fig. 9), a skyscraper in lower Manhattan, garnered many favourable reviews in the architectural press (after a few earlier misfires) as a new approach to tall building.
expression, and followed the Priceian model of base, shaft, and capital, in this case demarcated with a light, projecting metal cornice-balcony. H.W. Desmond concluded his critique in the Architectural Record late that year:

If, from the point of view of design, the skyscraper still awaits its creator, if we must for the time being be content in our tall buildings with a denial, or at least a concealment of the facts of structure, clearly, en attendant, the architects of the Blair Building have shown us a safe intermediate path to follow.48

The Traders’ Bank Building 1906 (fig. 10)

Carrère and Hastings’s Traders’ Bank Building in Toronto was modelled on the successful Blair Building precedent. The fifteen-storey Traders’ Bank Building (in association with an alumnus, British-born Toronto architect Francis Baker49), at the corner of Yonge and Colborne Streets, was, when completed, the tallest commercial building in the British Empire—a distinction that would continually, gleefully, be surpassed throughout Toronto’s history. In the category of “damning with faint praise,” in their critique of the edifice, Canadian Architect and Builder again voiced their unease with the inevitable appearance of tall buildings, similar in tone to their notes on the Temple Building six years earlier. To expand on the citation entered in an earlier section, we see their unease tempered somewhat by a well-executed design:

We cannot regard the arrival of the tall building in Toronto with entire satisfaction, but it is at any rate satisfactory that the first—for this is the root of dissatisfaction, that it will not remain long alone, so susceptible to public approbation are the banks—it is satisfactory to have at least a good example to begin with.50

Seven years later Carrère and Hastings’s design for the monumental four-storey Bank of Toronto at the corner of King and Bay streets (fig. 13), with associate Eustace Bird, would herald a sumptuous new gravitas for bank architecture in the city, but not without controversy. Due largely to Bird’s apparently unforgivably haughty tone in a published interview, in which he seemed to denigrate Canadian architectural talent in favour of his American collaborators, the Bank of Toronto would unfortunately be Carrère and Hastings’s last significant Toronto commission.51

Regardless of the future controversy over the Bank of Toronto, the American firm had their work cut out for them. Local practices were transforming the architectural character of Toronto with sophisticated, modern expressions employing the latest construction management
techniques for complex buildings. The Toronto firm Darling and Pearson was pre-eminent among them. Frank Darling (1850-1923) was a leading Ontario-born Toronto architect most active in the early twentieth century. Of note is his apprenticeship with well-regarded Toronto architect Henry Langley (1836-1907) before he sailed to England in the early 1870s to train with George Edmund Street (1824-1881) and Sir Arthur William Blomfield (1829-1899), where he experienced the rich architectural culture of the imperial metropolis as envisioned by not only his employers but also its leading talents such as Richard Norman Shaw (1831-1912) and Philip Webb (1831-1915).52

Darling’s London apprenticeship placed him within the generation of the students and employees of the latter two masters who went on to become important Arts and Crafts and Edwardian architects.53 Darling’s connection with Sir Arthur William Blomfield (not to be confused with Sir Reginald Blomfield, a nephew54) is of interest since the career of his son, Arthur Conran Blomfield (1863-1935—also an architect but thirteen years Darling’s junior), seemed to parallel Darling’s in their designs for buildings in a mature Edwardian Baroque idiom (the building shown in fig. 8 was designed by Blomfield the younger).

Upon his return to Toronto in 1873, Darling managed his partnerships, career, and club connections brilliantly, culminating in the patronage of influential businessmen for their homes, commercial buildings, and the cultural institutions that they benefited. Darling remained a bachelor his entire life and, perhaps as a result of his singlehood, there is little anecdotal information or other resources to help reconstruct his personal life. Part of his architectural library was donated to the University of Toronto as evinced by the bookplates in Internet archival materials.

Darling’s partnership with British-born John Pearson (1867-1940) commenced in 1892, five years after Pearson’s arrival in Canada. The 1913 Year Book for Canadian Art, compiled by the Arts and Letters Club of Toronto (of which Pearson, but not Darling, was a member), states:

[FIG. 11. CARRÈRE AND HASTINGS’S TRADERS’ BANK BANKING HALL. | FROM THE HOIDGE MARBLE COMPANY AD IN CONSTRUCTION, JANUARY 1910, VOL. 3, P. 87.]

[FIG. 12. TRADERS’ BANK. | DAVID E. WINTERTON, 2015.]

His association with Frank Darling has lasted nearly 25 years. An admirable combination this, in which one man evolves broad classic proportion, harmony and dignity, and the other brings to bear on all projected designs an uncanny knowledge of details, structural materials and building possibilities and limitations. They fight—both partners admit it—fight with a cheerful acrimony over plan after plan.55

On Frank Darling and the firm Darling and Pearson, we join other commentators and historians, such as Robert Hill in his introduction to the online Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada,56 who have bemoaned the lack of extensive scholarship, published archival materials, and general regard for truly one of the finest architects Canada has ever produced. The breadth of the inventory of projects, the sophisticated aesthetic and educated form-making of his designs, his belief in the positive role of imperialism on Canadian cultural life, allowing him to celebrate British precedents while reinterpreting them to suit unique Canadian conditions, lent a distinct “imperial” flavour and classical elegance to Toronto’s architectural character. Indeed, in 1915 his talent and service were recognized when he was honoured with the prestigious RIBA gold medal—the first Canadian and only second overseas recipient (preceded by Charles McKim). In his acceptance letter to the Institute he stated:

As a Canadian born and bred and an Imperialist from the bottom of my heart, I welcome everything that tends to bind more closely together the Mother Country and the great Dominions beyond the seas and can think of nothing better calculated to help bring about . . . such desirable results than this gracious action on the part of the Institute . . . That a body of
such eminence as the R.I.B.A. should have singled out Canada as the first of the overseas Dominions to receive the Gold Medal will, I know be valued by the architects of this country.57

Darling’s clubby ties to Toronto’s business and banking elite garnered many commissions, not the least of which was from Byron Walker, also a staunch imperialist (and a great patron of the arts in Canada and an early promoter of the Group of Seven, often referred to as the Canadian Medici) and president of the Bank of Commerce, and Edmund Osler, director of the Dominion Bank, to name but two titans of Canadian business.58

Darling and Pearson kept their offices at 2 Leader Lane (at Wellington Street) in the former Toronto Exchange Building, long since converted to the Imperial Bank of Canada. The building provided a rich architectural pedigree with a prestigious address from which to lead a practice. The firm designed an addition and alterations to the Bank in 1894 and doubtless used the knowledge acquired altering this building to inform their prolific work on other low-scaled bank buildings.

The Bank of Nova Scotia 1903

The General Offices of the Bank of Nova Scotia (fig. 14) on King Street West was an exuberant example of such prestigious, small-scaled banks. The Bank relocated from Halifax, NS, to Toronto in 1900, and their new Toronto building was completed in 1903 (and demolished in the 1960s). This was Darling and Pearson’s third bank as a dual partnership firm, although a handful of others had been completed in the late nineteenth century from previous compositions of the firm. It was however as Darling and Pearson that the remarkable design production of at least forty bank branches and headquar- ters in Toronto alone—and almost double that number throughout Canada—was accomplished. Although not a skyscraper, so outside the true scope of this paper, this building was an unconventional exclamation in the sculpted streetscape of banking chambers taking over King Street West. A significant group of King Street’s new edifices were designed by Darling and Pearson, but this one is perhaps the most perfectly Edwardian in its forms.59 When compared to the Bank of Toronto, we can begin to see clear distinctions in form and deployment of classical detail between the visually coherent Modern French style (Beaux-Arts) embraced by the Americans and the additive and volumetric Modern Renaissance style (Edwardian Baroque) promoted by imperial architects.

CANADIAN SKYSCRAPERS

The Lumsden Building 1910

Of the skyscrapers designed by Canadian firms, the ten-storey Lumsden Building at the northeast corner of Yonge and Adelaide streets (standing just north of the main ensemble) stands out for its bold Edwardian expression (fig. 15). It was designed by J.A. Mackenzie (1876-1946), a Toronto architect who went on to design a handsome suite of the relatively rare occurrences of apartment buildings in the city. From that we can infer that he...
was at the vanguard of modern architectural practice with an interest in building tall and for densifying urban conditions with modern building types. The Lumsden Building was constructed as a speculative office building in the district servicing the Courthouse (and its various legal bureaucracies) on Adelaide Street near Church Street. Completed in 1909, its façade is a study in the strident use of Gibbs surrounds in precast stone.

This building perfectly exemplifies the idea of an Edwardian skyscraper: stylized Gibbs surround rustication extrapolated vertically and horizontally, the hard geometry and blocky volumes of the quoins (fig. 16) mitigated by the extended fabric awnings (whose original colour is unknown), softening the composition. The relatively shallow metal cornice finishes the strong geometric façade while allowing the quoins and awnings the essential expression of the building. The lack of both the cornice (removed during Toronto’s “cornice annihilation” period of the 1970s) and the awnings today are a pitiable diminishment of the visual richness of the original. The rusticated granite base facing Yonge Street (at the time fast becoming the new shopping street, as King Street shifted its role to banking) was expressed in three rectangular bays containing shop fronts (Oak Hall Clothiers was the single tenant in 1911). The central bay, the shop entry, was protected by a suspended metal canopy. The Adelaide street frontage contained seven arcaded bays, six bays extending the length of the shop, and the seventh, easternmost bay (adjacent to George Gouinlock’s fine Birkbeck Building of 1908), provided the entry to the office building lobby and lifts. The published plans and permit drawings show a swimming pool and steam room in the basement, an enticing amenity for an office building. The Lumsden Building was heralded as the “largest building in the world entirely faced in manufactured stone.”

The Canadian Pacific Railway Building 1913

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company was a thoroughly modern and thoroughly imperial enterprise by the time of its signature building commission in Toronto in 1911. The remarkable growth of the company was aided in no small way by the opening of the Prairies, the concomitant wheat boom, as well as the industrial expansion and consolidation of the urban network of southern Ontario. Its scope of business included running passenger steamers, rail lines, parcel delivery, and telegraphy communications.

The CPR was an important cog in the national, continental, and imperial machinery: a passenger could travel from England by CPR steamship, cross Canada by CPR rail, taking breaks and staying in lavish CPR hotels along the way, then embark on a CPR steamer to Hong Kong from Vancouver. Bruce Price (1845-1903) worked with American-born CPR president William Cornelius van Horne (1843-1915, president from 1888 to 1899) to develop a “Chateau Style” for many of CPR’s signature buildings. American-born Thomas Shaughnessy (1853-1923), president of CPR from 1899 to 1918, equally ambitious, was not only
responsible for the CPR Building's construction but also during his presidency, the Canadian Pacific's steamship services, first domestic, then from Vancouver to the Asia (the Empress Line), then trans-Atlantic, were steadily expanded and upgraded, eventually making this railroad one of the world's major shipping owners as well. To promote tourism and passenger traffic, new or existing C.P.R.-owned hotels, chalets and mountain camps were expanded or built in from the Maritimes to Victoria, each held to Shaughnessy's meticulous standards for cleanliness.

Although headquartered in Montreal, the Company's reach was international, and a built presence expressing its importance was required in Toronto. The choice of the building site at the southeast corner of King and Yonge streets would place it beside the Traders' Bank—and become the second stroke in the Edwardian skyscraper row. The building housed company offices, a telegraphy floor, a grand ground floor hall to serve the public's intermodal ticketing needs, as well as income-producing rentable floor space. The resulting fifteen-storey building (fig. 17) superseded significantly the height of its eight-year-old rival, the Traders' Bank Building, and then, quite fittingly for its imperial role, held the record for the tallest building in the Empire. An austere two-and-a-half-storey granite base transitioned above the simple street cornice to a shaft and crown clad in gleaming white, expressively moulded terracotta, while the tower's three visible corners were punctuated by storey-high copper domed cupolas. The double-height ground floor retail space was defined on the exterior by a secondary entablature below the street cornice, interrupted by the three-storey flat piers. The interior intermodal service centre, with its marble walls and counters and subtly decorated ceiling (fig. 18), lent importance to the acts of buying train or steamship tickets, and sending telegrams or packages. The double-height top floor was reserved for telegraph operations (according to the archived permit drawings). The ground floor space was demolished and currently serves as a drugstore. The upper telegraphy floor was converted to a conventional office floorplate.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Building when completed was Darling and Pearson's tallest and most structurally complex design, and quite decidedly not in the CPR's trademark National Romantic Chateau Style. The circumstances that materialized this remarkable building are undoubtedly a rich architectural narrative that would be fascinating to know better. Composing their first skyscraper of “American” height, one wonders what research was employed to settle on the most appropriate precedents for Toronto's new icon of modernity at its most important intersection. The “cupola-ed” roofscape and general composition recall in silhouette the pavioned crown of the earlier and taller tower Park Row Building (1899) (fig. 19) in New York. Otherwise, such punctuated corner pavilions on the period's skyscrapers are relatively rare, presumably due to the requirement to maximize rentable volumes within prescribed height envelopes (which were becoming stricter in cities across the continent). Vertical crown expressions like cupolas could cause height limits to be exceeded or require that the area be inefficiently redistributed. Darling employed similar Edwardian cupolas on the Medical Sciences Building (1903) at the University of Toronto, and the Toronto General Hospital (1912). We propose that the cupolas on the CPR Building Edwardianized the skyscraper form, in much the way that Mackenzie Edwardianized the Lumsden Building using Gibbs surrounds. Interestingly, the original elevation blueprints of 1911 show restrained Edwardian details applied to the distinct building volumes, especially the cupolas and roofscape (fig. 20), and could possibly have been intended to be
clad (more expensively) in stone since no material labels are discernable and the simplicity of detail does not evoke the almost unlimited expressive qualities of terracotta.

Regardless of the original material concept, the final choice of cladding was unapologetically white terracotta and for that example we can credit the exuberant patterns used on the People’s Gas Building in Chicago by Daniel Burnham (1911). Northwestern Terra Cotta of Chicago was contracted to design and provide the terracotta cladding for both buildings, and identical motifs and tile moulds abound (fig. 21). When completed, the lofty, gleaming whiteness of the CPR tower must have heralded a new modernity across the besooted but ascendant city. The handsome building was equal to her cousins in Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, and New York.

The CPR Building was the culmination of the firm’s studies in the application of this new and versatile cladding material to tall buildings. As suggested in the collection of essays on the topic in Terra Cotta Artful Deceivers, Darling and Pearson practised their terracotta vocabulary on a series of tall buildings of increasing height and/or sophistication leading up to the CPR Building commission: The Standard Bank (white terracotta, eight storeys [fig. 22]), 1909, King and Jordan streets, Toronto; its west coast twin the Canada Life Assurance Building on West Hastings in Vancouver, 1910; and The Union Bank (six storeys clad white terracotta similar to CPR), 1910, at King and Bay streets.

Is it ironic that this acme of Canadian skyscraper terracotta design was undone and returned to its likely original material conception in stone? The terracotta was removed in 1929 and replaced with a rather lifeless and simply detailed Indiana limestone (fig. 23), ostensibly due to climatic issues, but one wonders if the taste for white terracotta cladding was exhausted and considered too old-fashioned to remain palatable for CPR’s always modernizing brand.

**The Dominion Bank Building 1914**

By 1914 Darling and Pearson had accumulated scores of bank branch buildings—and the nation’s greatest skyscraper—into their portfolio when their respectable
twelve-storey, three-sided Dominion Bank was completed directly across Yonge Street from the CPR Building, at the southwest corner of King and Yonge streets, extending south to the corner of Melinda street. Here is the third member of the skyscraper ensemble (fig. 24). This building impressed with its dignity and elegance: a two-and-a-half-storey granite-clad base with a simple Tuscan portico facing King Street West (fig. 25) was topped by seven undifferentiated storeys clad in light terracotta and terminated by a secondary stringcourse. The two-storey arcaded crown, housing boardrooms and offices, was topped above the projecting terracotta cornice with urn finials aligned with the structural piers. The interior public spaces were dramatic and grand, yet decoratively restrained compared to the excesses of the Modern French style, they
nevertheless embraced the continent-wide fashion for opulent banking halls meant to impress and ennoble. Upon passing through the King Street portico, a monumental off-axis stair in a high vestibule led up to the main banking hall while a shorter stair on axis with the portico led down to the Savings Department. Ascending the main stair one enters the piano nobile two-storey arcaded banking hall (fig. 26): a large rectangular hall with coffered ceiling and a shallow-domed clerks gallery adjacent to Yonge Street, rather beautifully lit by double-height arched windows and originally day lit from both long sides. The shallow domes and austere detailing recall the interiors of John Soane’s Bank of England, a building which one assumes would have been on Darling’s London itinerary, and which brings the architecture well into the British orbit. This hall added to the growing collection of sumptuous urban rooms along King Street’s now fully coalesced banking canyon (the promenading and shopping aspect of King Street had decisively waned by 1914), rivalling those of rue St. James in Montreal. The twelfth and top floor contained offices devoted to bank executives (Edmund Osler was the bank’s president at this time), surrounding the open secretarial pool which was lit by a strikingly modern skylight. The wood-paneled boardrooms and stockholders’ room faced south and north respectively while bank officers enjoyed views through arched windows across Yonge Street to the CPR and Traders’ Bank buildings—a lofty perspective and privileged view. The banking hall, offices, and boardrooms were converted to a hotel and event space uses in recent times.

Interestingly, Construction devotes twenty-two pages to the Dominion Bank’s architectural expression and finishes, and eleven pages to its advanced mechanical systems. Although tedious reading for
refrigeration, sanitary plumbing, and passenger and service elevators, as well as advanced lighting concepts to enhance the visual experience of the large hall. The Royal Bank Building 1915

The last member in the King and Yonge skyscraper family is the twenty-storey Royal Bank Building by Ross and MacDonald of Montreal, sited at the northeast corner of King and Yonge streets, and the tallest stroke in the Edwardian/Beaux-Arts ensemble (fig. 27). This building was also the Montreal-based bank’s first skyscraper, and here again their leadership understood the profitability and symbolism of erecting the tallest multi-storey office building in booming Toronto, not to mention the bragging rights to the new tallest building in the British Empire. Skyscrapers of this height would not appear in Montreal until the Royal Bank’s twenty-two-storey head office of 1928, designed by York and Sawyer (themselves alumni of McKim, Mead and White).

The building brought with it some of the classical elegance of rue St. James in Old Montreal, Canada’s original banking street. The Royal Bank Building is nevertheless a textbook Beaux-Arts skyscraper showcasing the refinements of Carrère and Hastings’s best work in New York; the firm quietly collaborated with Ross and MacDonald on the project. George Allan Ross (1879-1946) was a Montrealer who trained at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the École des Beaux-Arts. He worked briefly in New York for Carrère and Hastings prior to returning to Montreal to form a partnership.

The new skyscraper conformed to the Priceian composition model and its two main façades were identically composed: a granite base surmounted by three-storey
Here was unveiled the last of the sumptuous Modern French piano nobile banking halls, this one’s design directly credited to Carrère and Hastings (fig. 29). The hall was however removed, and the floor levels rationalized to modern uses, such as the current mattress shop (a similar fate befell their Traders’ Bank hall). The upper floors contained the chambers for the Toronto Board of Trade, and Construction describes in great detail the furnishings and finishes of the dining rooms, lounges, and libraries.

With the completion of the Royal Bank Building the intersection of King and Yonge streets was three quarters completed with the new, towering symbols of Canadian prosperity (fig. 30). The ensemble cradled a suite of gorgeous piano nobile urban rooms that dignified the act of banking and travel (fig. 31). Construction did not hold back in its enthusiastic wonderment and satisfaction at this ensemble:

They express the acme of all that can be summed up in the work success. More wonderful than the pyramids of Egypt, more attractive than the hanging garden of Babylon, more beautiful than the Parthenon of Athens . . . they seem to . . . combine all the characteristics of all that counts in life . . . This small space contains . . . buildings of greater height than within a limited area of any other city with the possible exception of New York.72

A NEW METROPOLITAN SKYLINE

By 1915 the north shore of Lake Ontario had a new metropolitan skyline, an architecturally hybrid vertical expression of Toronto’s New World prosperity (fig. 32), fairly—and fittingly—described as a half-Edwardian and half-Beaux-Arts concoction. The skyscraper group became the object of the public’s gaze and the subject

Indiana limestone Corinthian columns supporting a warm caramel-toned terracotta entablature. The intercolumniation was inhabited with two-storey arcaded bays (fig. 28). The design of the base was matched at the crown with three-storey metal bays defined by terracotta piers, and a projecting copper cornice, also serving as a balcony and observation deck for the privileged tenants of the attic storey.
of art. The expectation for a “completing” tower on the northwest corner of King and Yonge streets was the subject of speculation.

The Great War however refocused the Canadian economy and much construction was halted. After the war, a different attitude about participation in the Empire and the idea of a global imperial economy arose, and many architects would refocus their search for an identifiably Canadian Canadian architecture before the juggernaut of the International Style redefined the parameters and meaning of such a search. One could say that architecturally, before the Great War, Toronto heeded the call for an identifiable imperial architecture for the Dominions—but was also Canada’s most American city at the same time, heeding the allure of the new building types of American capitalism.

In 1928, The Telegram published an aerial view drawing depicting future proposed high-rise projects for the business core, presciently illustrating the dramatic Manhattanization of future Toronto (fig. 33). The Telegram’s heady predictions for an abundance of classically robed tall buildings were denied due to the financial insecurities caused by the Depression. Ultimately the decorative motifs and heights of skyscrapers would morph from the recognizable proportions of the Orders to the strident ultramodern verticality of Art Deco ziggurats, like the thirty-four-storey Bank of Commerce Tower erected in 1929 (York and Sawyer and Darling and Pearson) that dominated Toronto’s skyline for decades. The presence of the four-tower ensemble at Yonge and King streets would languish in the face of the inevitable swings of architectural novelty, but more precisely by the impact of taller buildings erected around them after WWII, effectively obscuring their original importance (fig. 34).
Given the current explosion of tall, view-capturing buildings in Toronto, many attempting to market themselves through novel (some could say arbitrary) silhouettes, it is comforting to look back at these elegant originals. One hopes that their rich architectural story can strike the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of black and white photography. These elegant originals. One hopes that their rich architectural story can strike the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least the public imagination as a subject of renewed admiration, and at the very least

NOTES


2. This paper will define a skyscraper as a commercial building achieving a minimum of ten storeys, incorporating a fireproofed structural steel frame, elevators, and modern mechanical services (electric lighting, central heating, advance plumbing technology, telephones, and telegraphs).

3. Other skyscrapers appeared in Toronto at that time, somewhat scattered north and east beyond the post-fire commercial district. This paper excludes those and focuses on the more intentional ensemble around King and Yonge streets. The other pre-WWI skyscrapers we have identified are: the ten-storey Kent Building, 1910-1911, demolished (Denison and Stephenson Architects), at the southwest corner of Yonge and Richmond streets; the ten-storey Hermant Building, 1913 (Bond and Smith Architects), recently beautifully restored, at Dundas Square; and the eleven-storey Excelsior Life Building, 1914 (lobby destroyed), at Toronto and Adelaide streets (E.J. Lennox architect). Lennox’s unusual seven-storey Beard Building of 1894 at King and Jarvis streets is considered by some to be Toronto’s first “skyscraper.” See Sobolak, Adam, 1988, “A Lennox Folly-The Beard Building,” *Newsletter of the Architectural Conservancy of Toronto*, November, p. 13-18. The tall Eaton’s factories and warehouses north of Queen Street (all demolished) require further study but were clearly an architectural presence in the evolving middle-class shopping area at Yonge and Queen streets.


6. For an erudite overview of the mood of the country and the cultural optimism of Canadian artists and the nascent Group of Seven during that period, see King, Ross, 2010, *Defiant Spirits: The Modernist Revolution of the Group of Seven*, Vancouver, Douglas and McIntyre and McMichael Canadian Art Collection, especially chap. 2, “This Wealthy Promised Land,” p. 12-25.


This essay puts the Canadian Edwardian cultural period between 1900 and 1916. That time frame obviously serves as an art historical designation rather than a precise bracket of Edward VII’s reign (1901-1910). Indeed the “Edwardian Age” can also be thought to have ended with the conclusion of WWI, already well into King George V’s reign (1910-1936).

The proliferation of grand banking halls reflecting the worldly taste of the banking officers can in part be attributed to the much vaunted designation rather than a precise bracket of that time period between 1900 and 1916. That time can in part be attributed to the much vaunted ‘Edwardian Age’. For scholarship on the well-appointed interior of the banking officers, see especially Gournay, Isabelle, 1998, “Prestige and Professionalism: The Contribution of American Architects,” in Isabelle Gournay and France Vanlaethem (eds.), Montreal Metropolis 1880-1930, Montreal, Canadian Centre for Architecture, p. 113-131.

For scholarship on the well-appointed interiors of contemporary buildings that define the Edwardian Age, see Henry John, 2013, Great White Fleet; Celebrating Canada Steamship Lines Passenger Ships, Toronto, Dundurn Press; and also the sub-chapter in Charles Hill’s chapter entry “For An Integration of the Arts” entitled “The Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company and Fred Challenier” (p. 145-146), in Charles Hill (ed.), Artists, Architects and Artisans Canadian Art 1890-1918, Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada.


16. For instance in certain imperialist speeches, like the provocatively titled “The True Seed of Britain” (1910) by Sir John Willson, delivered at the unveiling of Walter Allward’s South African War Memorial (Toronto), in Willson’s collection of speeches published in 1923: Partners in Peace; The Dominion, the Empire and the Republic, Toronto, Warwick Bros and Rutter.


19. Ibid.


27. A partial list of contemporary buildings that adopted aspects of H.H. Richardson’s design and planning innovations at the Allegheny County Courthouse: Detroit Federal Building, 1898, James H. Windrim of Philadelphia (demolished); Minneapolis City Hall, 1895-1902, Long and Kees; Milwaukee Federal Building, 1892, W.J. Edbrooke; Cincinnati City Hall, 1893, Samuel Hannaford.


38. Id. : 23.


41. Stern et al. : 158.


46. Id.: 22

47. Francis Baker worked at Carrère and Hastings possibly in the late 1880s; Eustace Bird was employed by the firm in 1899 and returned to Toronto in 1906 to set up an associate firm in order to execute their first Toronto commission for the Royal Bank on King Street. John Lyle worked there briefly in 1901 during their focus on the Pan-American Exposition pavilions in Buffalo, but never collaborated with them in Toronto. George Allen Ross worked at Carrère and Hastings for one year then returned to Montreal in 1905, to open his own firm, which would go on to collaborate with Carrère and Hastings in the design of the Transportation Building in Montreal (1912), and of course the Royal Bank Building in Toronto (1916).


49. Baker, it seems, was quite aware that his firm was out of its league designing and coordinating such a complex building and reached out to his more experienced masters.

50. CAB, 1905, vol. 18, no. 11, p. 165.


56. This online resource has been critically important in conducting this research: [http://dictionaryofarchitectsinCanada.org/].


60. Gad and Holdsworth: 182.


62. Price’s masterpieces of CPR Chateau Style corporate branding in the Province of Quebec: Chateau Frontenac in Quebec City (1894); Windsor Station (1889) and Place Viger Station and Hotel (1898), both in Montreal.

63. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Shawghnessy_1st_Baron_Shawghnessy], accessed December 9 2015.

64. Also claiming fifteen (shorter) storeys.


68. People’s Gas Building, Chicago; Architect D.H. Burnham and Co. completed in 1911, twenty-one storeys. Interestingly, D.H. Burnham and Co. was approached in 1912 (the year of Daniel Burnham’s death) by Eaton’s Department store in Toronto to prepare sketches for a monumental City Beautiful extravaganza, never realized. The Ryerson and Burnham Archives in Chicago suggested that “some of the drawings for Eaton were already being signed as Graham, Burnham & Co., leading me to believe that Ernest Graham may have been one of the lead designers (if not the lead) on the project. From reviewing the entries in his diaries, it’s almost certain that Burnham was not in Toronto in either 1911 or 1912.” From an email dated October 23, 2015. See also Lachapelle, Jacques, 2001, Le fantasme métropolitain: l’architecture de Ross et MacDonald, Montreal, Presses de l’Université du Québec à Montréal, p. 67.


71. Rue St. James, a street quite used to American architects such as McKim, Mead and White and their design for the Bank of Montreal and Royal Trust buildings and Carrère and Hastings Transportation Building, completed in 1911 with Allan Ross; the same banking street on which Darling and Pearson had completed their colonnaded, low-scale Bank of Commerce in 1911.