

The appointment of a foreign Architect, together with the statement made to the Legislature, would tend to convey an impression that there are no Architects in this country capable of designing large public buildings, thus reflecting seriously on our profession in Canada.

That such is not correct will be admitted by those competent to judge, as it is conceded that the public buildings of Toronto compare most favourably with those of any other city on this continent of equal population and wealth.

We would also desire it to be distinctly understood that we are not actuated by any national feeling of jealousy in the matter.

If the expert had entered the competition and won it deservedly and honourably we would be the last to complain.

But what we do object to is that the competition having been honourably and deservedly won by Canadians they are not entrusted with the work, but instead thereof it is given to the expert who should have refused the appointment, as the acceptance of such by him under the circumstances reflects most gravely upon the impartiality of his report, and we feel that we would be recreant to ourselves did we not make the strongest protest in our power.

And your petitioners will ever as in duty bound most respectfully pray.

LANGLEY & BURKE,
M. SHEARD,
ARTHUR R. DENISON,
E. J. LENNOX,
WILLIAM G. STORM,
JOSEPH CONNOLLY,

SMITH & GEMMELL,
WALTER R. STRICKLAND,
S. H. TOWNSEND,
FRED C. LAW,
D. B. DICK,
MACDOUGALL & GRAY.

TORONTO, 7th April, 1884.

The above petition was the spontaneous action of the Architects who signed it, and was drawn up purely as a