

The drawings are clear and well thought out, and the specification and priced quantities carefully prepared and explicit. Together they show thoroughness and grasp of the whole position. The one adverse comment I would make is in regard to the silhouette of the terminal, which I have no doubt the author will improve as he executes it.

I heartily recommend this design No. 59 to your Committee, advising that its author receive the first prize of £200 and that he be commissioned to carry out its erection.

It is essential that the sculptor employed shall be a first-class artist, whose work should equal that of eminent members of the present British School. Anything less would be a source of lasting regret. This need should be impressed on the author.

I also advise that the author be commissioned to re-form the entire Queen's Gardens in keeping with and as a setting to his monument.

I further advise that if suitable New Zealand stones be available by the time you are ready to proceed, that they be substituted for those suggested, even if somewhat greater costs be involved. I am sure that the author will agree that the best artistic effects are only obtainable by using the stones of the locality, and patriotic considerations also dictate this course. The present difficulty with which he is contending is the high cost and rather unsympathetic colour of the Dominion stones presently available. I have good reason to believe this state of things will soon be remedied by excellent material becoming available from the province.

I found it a difficult task to select the second best design, and in this respect am thankful that No. 59 was so unquestionably superior to the rest, of which the best are Nos. 26, 35, 19 and 24.

No. 26 would make an elegant and artistic structure. It consists of a substantially proportioned monument, described by its author as an obelisk, but partaking almost of the character of an elevated cenotaph raised above a wide-spreading platform, and having on its face of principal approach a sculptured semi-prostrate figure of a woman depicting "grief," which it is proposed should be executed by one of England's foremost sculptors. The general material to be white marble from Nelson and the figure in bronze. This design fails by expressing abject despair rather than the elevating sentiments permeating No. 59, and fails also to fulfil the condition of symbolising the deeds of our soldiers. It is presented by rather ineffective plans and elevations which do not do justice to the scheme, and a very effective perspective drawing.

No. 35 consists of a pylon mounted above a substantial stone pedestal surrounded by a spreading base, with low parapet and steps. In front of the pylon, on its principal face, is a sculptured figure suggestive of Zealandia in an attitude of grief, while the four sides of the pedestal are embellished with bas-reliefs depicting some of the chief scenes of action in which our troops participated.

This design fails by the inelegance of its stunted principal feature and its rather diminutive size. It lacks the noble sentiment and uplifting proportions of No. 59, and the scale and elegance of No. 20. The lack of scale is probably due to the author's use of Carrara marble for the principal structure. His intention to use perishable Oamaru stone for the outer parapet is inconsistent and unwise, and contrary to the reply given to one of the questions of competitors as to the use of that material. I like the opportunity afforded for symbolical treatment, and would on that account have given this design second place had the pylon been better proportioned and better.

No. 24 is a well-proportioned, lofty obelisk giving ample scope for commemorating the names of the principal actions; bold and impressive, but lacking the poetry of the first three.

No. 19 is a triumphal arch spanning a sarcophagus. The latter is considerably elevated, and approached from two sides by a bold flight of steps. This design is in good taste and proportion, rather academic and commonplace, and inferior in its conception to the first three. Unless extremely bulky, a memorial or triumphal arch is seldom impressive, and in that respect this fails.

These and several others are beautifully drawn. It appears a great pity there should be so great a waste of time and labour, when a simple pencil sketch containing the germ of any one of these designs would have sufficed to explain to the assessor all that was necessary.

## Competitions.

Competitive designs are invited for Auckland's War Memorial, for which the sum of £120,000 is already promised. The Citizens' War Memorial Committee hope to get £200,000 for the purpose. Alternative designs are asked for. In one case the competitors are asked to design a building not to exceed in cost £120,000, and in the other a building not to exceed in cost £170,000. The balance of the £200,000 objective is required for fittings and general equipment, having particular regard to the war memorial section. Whether the building should be of plain concrete, or of a more ornate and dignified design faced with stone, depended entirely upon the response of the public to the appeal for funds.

The building would be placed on the top of Observatory Hill, in the Domain, one of the most commanding sites in Auckland. Its chief feature would be its war memorial character, and in the words of the preamble to the terms and conditions of the competition, it would have the double object of providing "a noble and dignified building suitable for the war memorial of the city and provincial district of Auckland, and also a worthy repository for the collections of the Auckland Museum, including its unrivalled Maori treasures."