

HISTORY OF THE BUILDING



The building where the Legislative Power works, known as the 'Legislative Palace' ever since it was built, is undoubtedly the most important testimonial example in the country of beautifully balanced neo-classic architecture. With strong Greek influence in the whole of its external façades, it displays an efficient functional plan and shows a splendid conception and decoration in some of the main indoor spaces.

Seen from a long time perspective, the developments that led to the construction of the building seem to fade away. And only the building itself in its serene majesty comes up to bring us a beautiful, tangible reality, with the enlightening spiritual meaning of the unyielding adherence of the men of those times to the imperishable principles of representative democracy.

Uruguay was a small country with very few economic resources, but with very deep democratic roots. And with the creation of a building that was necessary for the correct functioning of the legislative duties, Uruguay succeeded in satisfying the double purpose of solving a pressing functional urge, and at the same time creating a public building with the characteristics of a national monument.

Due to the beauty and majesty of its architecture and the magnificence of the materials used, the building became the most appropriate emblem of the ideas it represented.

For many years now, as a testimony of unyielding faithfulness to the principles of representative democracy, General Artigas' immortal words "My authority emanates from you and it ceases before your sovereign presence", addressed to the Delegates' Assembly held in the year 1813, have been presiding over the meetings of the Chamber of Representatives and the General Legislative Assembly. These words are inscribed in roman characters that were stucco-worked and filled in with gold plate on a tablet that crowns the desk podium of the chamber.

We understand there would be no point in giving a detailed account of dates and names pertaining to the steps leading to the accomplishment of this important building, neither in lingering in the description of the physical features of the building without previously stressing its ideological meaning. Such meaning did ultimately give the impulse for this work to be carried out as the embodiment of the deep democratic feeling that characterised that time.

Conceived in the last years of the XIX century, the project materialised by the turn of the XX century, initially through an international competition of architectural projects. After several

modifications and enlargements, the building was finally inaugurated on the 25th of August of the year 1925.

There are three clear stages in the process of the construction:

The first stage starts in the latter half of the XIX century and comes up to the year 1902, when the international open competition of architectural projects for the Parliament building was provided by law.

The second stage starts when the calling for open competition was made in 1903, and comprises all the enlargements and modifications of the project chosen in the competition, and the construction of the building up to the year 1912. José Batlle y Ordóñez, who had encouraged with enthusiasm the project from the very beginning, was by then holding office as President of the Republic for a second time. And in that year, he gave new impulse to the idea of furnishing the building, already in progress, with the magnificence, the nobility and the artistically rich finishing it called for because of the important objective it was to fulfil and which had been curtailed due to funding reasons.

The third stage refers to the brilliant contribution made by Architect Gaetano Moretti, who was hired in 1913, up to the inauguration of the building in 1925.

First stage: Preliminary proposals.

Undoubtedly, after the declaration of independence, the Legislative Power was faced with increasing activity, and, as foreseeable, the urge was felt for a space appropriate for such function.

As the end of the century approached, a cumulus of different initiatives of varied origin aiming at solving this problem kept piling up. Some considered that the Parliament should have a building of its own; while others thought about the possibility of incorporating it to an architectural ensemble where the three powers would be together. And those that were the most realistic stuck to the idea of the improvement of the Parliament working conditions by enlarging the building where it was functioning, which was no other than the Cabildo building of Montevideo.

Everything led to expect that the enlargement proposal would be the one preferred. However, on the 10th of February 1896 the Parliament approved a law (the National Bank Liquidation Law) providing that the Parliament premises would be erected on the plot surrounded by the streets Nicaragua, Venezuela and Pampas, on Avda. Agraciada [the part of it now called Avda. del Libertador Brigadier Juan Antonio Lavalleja] right opposite to the Church of La Aguada.

The fact that the location of the 'Legislative Palace' had already been defined did not prevent that further proposals for the construction in other locations kept arriving for consideration of the Chambers till the middle of 1902. An international open competition for a 'project for a Parliament Building in the city of Montevideo' was then organised. The location would be the one agreed upon pursuant to the above-mentioned Law of 1896, that is to say the site facing

the Church of La Aguada.

A committee was created, the 'Legislative Palace Committee', whose Chairman was Jose Batlle y Ordóñez, then a member of the Senate. And the preparation of the rules and conditions for the competition, entrusted to Engineer Jose Serrato, secretary and member of the committee, started immediately.

Second stage: the competition of projects for the Legislative Palace.

In April 1904, twenty-seven projects by architects from different countries were admitted to the competition. Among them there were three projects by Uruguayan architects, two of which were awarded mentions of honour.

An Advisory Committee, made up of different eminent persons, was appointed. Their duty was to judge the projects and to submit their opinion and grounds to the Legislative Palace Committee, which was to take the final decision.

The Advisory Committee reached a consensus agreement on the fact that no project among those submitted for consideration did fully comply with the requirements established among the rules for the competition, and therefore no first prize ought to be awarded.

They also agreed that there were two interesting projects under the pseudonymous of Hispania 11 and Agraciada, respectively. These two projects stood out among the rest because of some particular qualities.

For the sake of simplification it could be said that one of them represented the new ideas, and the other, the conservative spirit of the time.

Hispania 11, among those of the first group, was, according to the Advisory Committee's majority opinion, the best project in terms of the grandiosity of the plan. But its façade did not seem admissible for a building that should be representative of one of the Powers of the State. In contrast, Agraciada corresponded to the group of the conservative projects. Its neo-classic architecture reflected the taste of the time, and, according to the author himself, it had been inspired in the superb building of the Parliament of Vienna, designed by the renowned Danish architect Theophile Hansen.

Undoubtedly, this brief synthesis on the evaluation of both projects, does not illustrate fully the importance of the specialised discussion held by the Jury - Advisory Committee – that was judging the projects. However, the main observations and the grounds for its decisions are conveyed faithfully.

After these side comments, we come back to our Advisory Committee, whose duty was to report to the Parliament Building Committee its conclusions and grounds for them. Such conclusions were basically that no first prize ought to be awarded, a runner-up award ought to be given to the project under the pseudonymous of Hispania 11, and that under the pseudonymous of Agraciada ought to be awarded a third place in the competition.

The Building Committee analysed very rigorously the foundations for the above-mentioned decisions of the Advisory Committee, and accepted just partially its recommendations. They

agreed that no first prize had to be awarded, but disagreed as to the qualities of the projects Hispania 11 and Agraciada. They believed both projects, differing greatly, were, however, of equivalent worth, so much so as to deserve both the same award. They therefore decided to award two runners-up prizes, instead of just one and a third prize, as suggested by the Advisory Committee. And finally decided to choose the project under the pseudonymous 'Agraciada' for the immediate construction of the building, as it required less modifications, complied more closely with the envisaged budget and had an exterior appearance with the necessary magnificence demanded by this kind of building.

After a century has elapsed, we believe the decision has proved to be the correct one. It was decided to build the Palace according to an architecture that would not undergo the natural ageing that would indeed affect the transitional styles, which were not yet mature due to their essential characteristics. Maybe the opportunity was missed to materialise some of the architectural trends of the time. But a lot was gained in what was fundamental, the exaltation through the majesty of the building of the importance of the Legislative Power for a democratic system.

The pseudonymous Hispania 11 turned up to correspond to architect Manuel Mendoza Sáez from Madrid.

And the selected project corresponded to Italian architect Vittore Meano, who had been residing in Buenos Aires for many years, and who had also won the competition for the Argentine National Congress Building, which was being built at that time.

Unfortunately, architect Vittore Meano never learned that his project had been chosen for the Parliament building in Uruguay, because he found a tragic death in Buenos Aires in the month of June 1904, before the Parliament Building Committee had adopted its final decision in August of that same year.

Almost simultaneously with the selection of the project for the building, it was decided to relocate it.

There were actually many good reasons for such relocation. The site provided for by the 1896 Law was not really appropriate to the importance of the building that was in preparation.

The general opinion was that the importance of the envisaged Palace of the Laws demanded a much more spacious environment, where it would appear great in all its splendour, and which would at the same time permit to solve the problems related to public agglomerations and city traffic circulation.

Besides, the Committees in charge of the selection of the project had stressed the necessity of enlarging some of the areas defined in the selected project. This was obviously an additional reason for relocation on a plot of larger dimensions than the site located opposite the Church of La Aguada, the one originally meant for the building.

It was then decided (1905) that the building would be sited on Plaza General Flores, an asymmetrically shaped, almost triangular, space, very close to the previous location. The following streets surrounded the new site: Sierra (east), Guatemala (south) and Agraciada (west).

The building would be placed facing Northeast, along the base of that triangle, that is, along

the street Guatemala.

The plans drawn for that purpose showed that such location would not be appropriate, unless the plan was enlarged so as to obtain a good spatial relation between the building and its environment.

Engineer, and then legislator, Victor Sudriers put it in a masterly way in his report to his fellow-members of the Committee for the Parliament Building.

He pointed out that in every building there must be a correlation between the plot of land and the surroundings for which the building has been designed, and such correlation concerns both magnitudes and form. Therefore, a small and symmetrical building like the one projected for a regular piece of ground could not be transplanted without the necessary adjustments onto an irregular and asymmetrical site, completely different from the one considered originally.

He insists upon the fact that the problem ought to be approached from three points of view:

1. Increasing the built surface area in order to correct some of the exiguous spaces, as mentioned in the decision of the jury of the competition. To solve most of such problems it is recommended that the main axis of the building should be made twenty meters longer.
2. Bringing the area surrounding Plaza General Flores to a regular situation by making the necessary expropriations, so as to obtain an environment with the shape and surface area appropriate for the projected building and for an easy access from all streets and avenues that meet at that point. It should also allow for a good circulation of carriages and for parades of troops in the occasions where the Parliament protocol so requires.
3. And finally, giving the building the orientation it has now, that is, with its main axis coinciding with the direction of Avenida del Libertador, its main façade facing South, fronting that Avenue, and not Northeast, as suggested first.

As a reporting member of the Committee, Legislator Alberto Canessa joined Engineer Sudrier in his proposal, as did also the members of an Advisory Committee specially appointed for the purpose of analysing that report.

The Parliament Building Committee proceeded as recommended and prepared its report accordingly. This report was accompanied with a draft law on the expropriations of Plaza General Flores and surrounding area.

It could be said that the long process of embellishment of the Palace surrounding area started at that time. A space with a balance of design and proportion in line with the magnitudes and shape of the building was envisaged as an environment.

Much later Architect Gaetano Moretti, who was entrusted with the finishing of the building in 1914, materialised those ideas in his design of a rectangular plaza made up of a wreath of buildings with ground-floor portico frontage on the north, east and west sides of the Parliament building. He pushed back the façades of those new buildings to sixty meters and designed a larger area on the south stretching out from the main entrance front. In brief, a space enclosed with a frame of buildings having the Parliament Palace in the centre.

Undoubtedly, Moretti wanted to isolate the Parliament Palace from the adjoining areas, which must have been a quite unpleasant sight at that time, and to bring some order to the environment where the majestic building, then in progress, would be inserted.

This kind of solution, although varying in the details, continued to be valid until a new conception was analysed in 1958. The surroundings of the Palace would be covered with garden extensions up to the natural borders of the pentagon formed by the streets around it (Madrid, Batoví, Agraciada, César Díaz, and Francisco Acuña de Figueroa). These streets would channel up vehicle circulation not pertaining to the Parliament Building and the garden surfaces so obtained would be a reserve for future enlargements of the building.

Part of this program was accomplished when the Annex to the Parliament was built, a hundred meters away from the main building, and not sixty as previous studies established, by using expropriation land that had been gradually incorporated since 1958.

These ideas about the new site were approved and in 1905 the enlargement and adjustments of Meano's project were entrusted to architects Jacobo Vázquez Varela, a prestigious local architect, and Antonio Banchini, who had been a direct co-worker of Meano's at the construction of the National Congress Building in Argentina.

Then the Parliament Building Committee invited tenders for the construction and selected the lowest and most convenient offer, that of the firm Manuel & Juan Debernardis.

A year later, in 1908, the construction was started and continued with no further major changes till Architect Gaetano Moretti took over in 1913. He was entrusted with finishing the building according to the new ideas the Parliament Building Committee and the President of the Republic himself were then promoting and which determined fundamental changes in the final appearance of the Palace.

In his capacity as technical director, Engineer Jose Foglia acted as a representative of the Parliament Building Committee during the whole period of construction.

Third stage: Moretti's contribution

To talk about Moretti's work is to talk about an important part of the history of the construction of the Palace. It has to do with the long series of modifications that were necessary so that the building could reach the magnificent presence it has today.

Professor Gaetano Moretti was not a neo-classic architect, contrary to what could be inferred from what he accomplished in our Parliament building.

He was a great Italian architect, with modern ideas and a large experience, very cultivated and an expert in classical architecture, the author of important essays and a renowned professor. He was at the time (1913) in Buenos Aires to assist in the construction of a monument to Argentine Independence.

Once the Parliament Building Committee had made the corresponding contacts, it engaged Moretti and entrusted him with their dream project of transforming the Parliament Building, already at an advanced stage in the construction, and turning it into the most representative

architectural work in the country.

Moretti's most important Uruguayan co-worker was architect Eugenio Baroffio, an outstanding person in local circles, who later became responsible for the maintenance services of the Parliament Building. And Dario A. Pedroni, Italian by birth, who came to reside in our country in 1914, was Moretti's permanent representative in Montevideo, and also an efficient co-worker of his.

It must be pointed out that Moretti's contribution is the epilogue in a long process of adjustment changes introduced to architect Vittore Meano's original project, the winner at the competition that had been held in 1904. Meano's sudden death had determined that the modifications had to be made by architects Vazquez Varela and Antonio Banchini.

These two architects were engaged to adapt Meano's project according to the requirements of a site other than that it was intended for at the time of the competition, and to correct the deficiencies that had been pointed out in the jury's decision.

It was then upon a project that was already clearly defined and at an advanced stage in the building process that architect Moretti had to work and establish a possible plan for the modifications and decoration. And he obtained the best results. He modified what he deemed necessary, by taking advantage of the old structures or by changing them radically to introduce new architectural forms. He showed great command in the use of sumptuous materials for the decoration. He incorporated to the building unique craftsmanship works in noble kinds of wood, in marble and porphyry, and in bronze. He gave much more richness to the decoration, incorporating sculptures, bas-reliefs, stained glass windows, Venetian mosaics and a balanced classical ornamentation.

Moretti made use of all his wisdom and sensitivity in handling proportions, colours and materials, and in many cases the results were splendid and captivating.

Two main aspects must be considered with reference to Moretti's contribution. In the first place, there is the weight and influence of his personal dimension as a brilliant architect on all the process of finishing the building. In general this refers to the improvement of what had already been done, sometimes by using already existing structures, and some other times by creating new ones. And also to the excellent decoration he achieved in every room and area of the Palace, and the wise choice and the quality of the materials that he used.

This aspect imbued and marked the general tone of majesty and sometimes solemnity of the Building.

But despite the importance of Moretti's participation in the general aspects, we believe that what contributed most to his future fame and renown was the fact that he introduced new architectural elements, such as the central skylight-watchtower. This body added to the general composition of the building and modified substantially the relationship of the whole with the outdoor space. Besides, the introduction of the vaulted ceiling and the transept and cross vault in the Main Hall or Central Lobby contributed to give the building the grandiosity it lacked before.

This great Hall is the main axis of the building. It is adjoining to the Main Entrance Lobby (on the south), the Receptions Room (north), and has, on each of its long sides, respectively, the entrances to the plenary meeting-rooms.

The Main Hall

Moretti's most important and successful modifications to the Main Hall were, as already mentioned, the roman vaulted ceiling for the nave, the creation of the transept and the cross vault, and the beautiful central skylight crowning the crossing of the vaults. This skylight turns into a beautiful marble watchtower on the outside, which stands out to indicate the presence of the Uruguayan Parliament at a very long distance.

This great Lobby, which would have had a flat ceiling according to the original project, gained, with the solution devised by Moretti, a spatial grandiosity only comparable to that of the nave of a great cathedral of the Renaissance.

The ceiling consists of two barrel vaults, with the four arches of their crossing supporting the square that gives shape to the central skylight-watchtower, so characteristic of the building on the outside.

The vault of the nave is divided into two halves by the transept cross vault. Its zenith lighting is obtained through three large stained glass ceiling windows. Two of them with a curved surface so as to adapt to the curvature of the vaults they are inserted into. And a third one with a flat surface, placed at a higher level inside the skylight that crowns the crossing of the two vaults, the nave vault and the transept vault.

The transept is very short, just long enough to receive the aisles and the aisle galleries that enclose the nave of the Main Hall. This transept creates an appropriate space preceding the magnificent doors of the entrances to the Antechambers of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Over each of these doors there is a small Greek pediment and a rich display of sculptures and bas-reliefs by sculptor Edmundo Prati. Above, beautiful stained glass windows made under cartoons by Italian artist Giovanni Buffa stand full of colours in their semicircular shape and add to the lighting of the Hall.

The richly coffered ceiling of the vault of the nave is also splendidly decorated with bas-reliefs by local sculptor Jose Belloni. The two lunettes at the ends of this vault are covered with marvellous mosaics depicting allegoric subjects and made according to cartoons by the above-mentioned Italian artist Giovanni Buffa.

The Central Skylight

The central skylight or lantern (watchtower) of the Palace, together with the transformation of the Main Hall, is one of the features that made the Building worthy of its acknowledged reputation among those of his time.

Meano's original project, strongly inspired in the Parliament of Vienna, unsuccessfully intended the building to give the horizontal impression Hansen's building gave.

On the contrary, Moretti understood that the dimensions of the building volume called for a raised body crowning the centre.

Thus, he decided to raise the square body of a beautiful skylight tower in the centre of the building and to decorate it with elements of Greek style. Among such elements, the twenty-four almost 4-meter tall caryatids, six on each side, and the superb pinnacles on each corner stand out. The caryatids, draped statues of female figures, which were used here just as pilasters, were used by the Ancient Greek as columns at the beautiful gallery of the Erechtheion on the Acropolis in Athens, an unavoidable historic site for tourists and scholars.

There are twelve different caryatids made by different sculptors with a different signification. Opposite sides of the square of the skylight tower are covered by the twelve caryatids and the other two sides by copies of them.

Besides the intrinsic aesthetic value of the skylight tower created by Moretti, its importance lies basically on the fact that it was the most successful solution for adapting the shape of the building volume to the space where it is situated. It favoured undoubtedly the perspectives it generates from every angle.

Other important features

Besides the important modifications introduced to Meano's project in the Main Hall, that we have mentioned above, such as the creation of the skylight tower, many other changes were gradually made in order to transform the original building into the Palace we have today. The miracle did happen, and the building became the majestic and solemn Palace it is today, because of the perfect decoration that was added, a deeper transformation of the design and the quality of the materials that were used. Besides the already mentioned skylight tower, the attractive feature that appears on the outside is the main entrance Portico or Pronaos, with its beautiful tympanum decorated with impressive bas-reliefs wonderfully designed and performed by the Italian sculptor Giannino Castiglioni.

This important and beautiful architectural element is situated right after the magnificent stairs and ramps of the main entrance front.

Due to the lack of space, Meano's project had not solved properly how to unfold the ramps for vehicle access, which would reach the level of the Pronaos.

The architects Vázquez Varela and Banchini corrected this defect by reducing the height of the ramps by half. This enabled a much more appropriate impression of amplitude.

Moretti maintained this solution, but he perfected proportions and the decoration of the whole. The great main entrance, which includes the upper body of stairs and the connection of it to the Pronaos itself, became thus a balanced and powerful ensemble of architectural features enhancing the monumentality of the main façade of the building.

The indoor spaces were decorated according to their rank and importance.

But all of them, however, bear to a lesser or greater degree a high level of excellence in the details: highly decorated ceilings, rooms and spaces covered with beautiful wood panelling of Slavonian oak, walls usually papered with an incredible silk-like paper, which just needed been replaced after forty years. Oak parquet floors in big tiles resting on wood crosspieces, and high doors and windows of beautiful workmanship also made of Slavonian Oak.

Other rooms were decorated in a much more sophisticated manner, such as the Honour Entrance Lobby, which connects the Pronaos with the Main Hall. Vaulted niches supported by red porphyry monolithic columns with gold plated Corinthian capitals were used in it. And there are large mural paintings on each side depicting important historic subjects, such as "The Swearing of Allegiance to the First Constitution", by Pedro Blanes Viale, and "Artigas standing in front of the Siege of Montevideo", by Manuel Rosé.

The antechambers and the Meeting Rooms were also decorated with special care and attention.

Silk and walnut wood covering, beautiful and imposing stained glass windows on each side, and an elegant coffered ceiling have contributed to make these Antechambers the appropriate linking space between the majesty of the Main Hall and the solemnity of the parliamentary meeting rooms.

The meeting room of the Senate, of beautiful proportions and sober decoration, reflects the serenity and maturity that must prevail in the debates held in this room.

Resting upon the mahogany panelling that surrounds the tiered arena of the amphitheatre, a beautiful colonnade with a round arch arcade separates the gallery for the public from the rest of the room and holds the ceiling of the Chamber. Immediately after this support, the ceiling becomes a great stained glass skylight window letting the light into the room. The wall facing the amphitheatre has a huge apse that stands at the back of the platform for the finely crafted chairing desk of mahogany.

As for the meeting room of the Chamber of Representatives, a high wood panelling surrounds the amphitheatre over which a colossal series of big pilasters separate the two levels of tiered galleries for the public from the central space that forms the floor area. Like in the case of the Senate, the ceiling of this room is also a huge stained glass window. But in this case, behind the desk platform, there stands a large vaulted niche that, as a background, shows a large painting by Ferdinand Laroche representing Artigas and Rondeau in front of the city of Montevideo.

The Receptions Room, situated at the other end of the Main Hall, is made up of a central room of significant dimensions and two smaller side rooms. It is noted for the remarkable decoration of the ceiling, made by the Italian artist Enrico Albertazzi, and for the rich paintings that can be found in it. Great mural paintings are hanging on its walls. "The Instructions of 1813" by Pedro Blanes Viale, "The Battle of Las Piedras" by Manuel Rosé and portraits of national heroes, Rivera, Oribe and Lavalleja, by Jose Luis Zorrilla de San Martín and Manuel Rosé.

And finally, also the Central Room of the Library must be included among the rooms most noted for their sophisticated finishing details. It is situated on the second storey and can be considered a precious jewel in the building. It is wholly covered with two levels of shelves of mahogany. A gallery with a beautiful banister, from where the books of the upper part can be reached, separates the two levels of shelves. Thin columns of light coloured wood with capitals in bronze, refined inlaid woodwork details and a splendid coffered ceiling of mahogany are also part of the magnificent decoration of this room.

Paintings and Sculptures

With the passing of time high quality paintings, of different dimensions and by different renowned artists, have been incorporated to the rooms and halls of the Parliament Building. Some of these paintings were awarded prizes in Fine Arts competitions. Some depict general subjects, but most of them are portraits of important persons or refer to events or episodes of the recent or distant history of the country or the Parliament.

As for the sculptures that adorn the building on the outside, it must be said that most of them were assigned through national or international competitions. The highest artistic expression among them was perhaps achieved in the sculptures of the tympanum over the pediment of the Central Portico or Pronaos, which were made by the Italian sculptor Giannino Castiglioni.

The same artist made the four big sculptures cast in bronze that can now be found in the gardens surrounding the Palace.

These sculptures would have been placed together with an important ornamentation of bas-reliefs over the top of the lateral façades, since Architect Moretti intended to crown these bodies with a chiaroscuro of white marble that would be given by such sculptures and bas-reliefs. The fact that these beautiful and powerful sculptures made by Giannino Castiglioni have been cast in bronze is no obstacle, however, for them to be some day copied back in marble and relocated in the place for which they were conceived.

The other façades of the building have bas-reliefs made by sculptors A. Bassi, J. Belloni and Furest Muñoz.

The stones that decorate the Palace

The granite, marble and porphyry that were used to decorate the Palace are all local. Quarries were opened, machinery was brought for the processing, and a strict quality control was conducted, so much so that the marble that would cover the façades originated deep doubts and strong discussions about its quality. The theory of those who held our marble was excellent was triumphant in the end, and the façades were covered with it. Time has proved that they were not too wrong. Marble has performed well the task assigned to it and has only undergone the wearing-out process that the passing of time, the effect of gas emissions and natural agents such as the exposure to the sun, the rain and the wind cause in all cases to this kind of stones.

For the inside of the building, marble and porphyry of very varied colours were chosen. Those stones were used in such a way that the work done with them was unprecedented and never repeated again in our country.

Moretti's great sensitivity, his devotion to and enthusiasm for the work he was doing, and the exceptional workforce he employed, which also loved what they were doing, made the miracle possible. A building that could have been just an important building because of its characteristics became a true work of art in many aspects.

Literature consulted

Report by Angel Venturini, Director (1958-1962).

“Historia del Palacio Legislativo de Montevideo”, by Luis Bausero (1987).

“Palacio Legislativo” with illustrations by Pierre Fosey (1962).

“Palacio Legislativo” by the Chamber of Senators (1954).

The pictures belong to the 1954 Senate publication.

The author of this article had the honour of working together with Architect Eugenio Baroffio, while Baroffio was in charge of the Department of Preservation and Maintenance of the Legislative Palace, a position from which he resigned in the year 1974 in order to work in the private sector.