to make a complete tie. At the ends they ran back 3 feet 6 inches into the piers and were embedded in cement. The reason for the centre wall being poor was stated to be on account of inferior mortar, probably owing to its having passed through a fire some years ago.

Another point in connection with the disaster was the presence on the upper floor of Reid's building of a large quantity of crockery, no stipulation with regard to the allowable quantity of which was made by anyone during the course of the alterations. From evidence adduced at the investigation it was made clear by several witnesses that not only was the quantity of crockery stored in the Reid building of considerable dimensions, but that its weight was frequently changed by outgoing shipments and additions.

From all appearances it was a combination of these two circumstances which caused the collapse—the weak centre wall and a heavy load of crockery on the upper floors. On whom rests the responsibility is a weighty question to decide.

London has no building inspector. City Engineer Graydon is the nearest approach to such an official, and he emphatically characterized the present system in vogue in London as "rotten, simply rotten." For years Mr. Graydon claims to have been trying to get a proper by-law passed for building inspection, but so far has failed to do so. London at present has practically no building restrictions outside of those preventing the building of frame structures in a certain district. There is no inspection and only a general responsibility.

Engineer Graydon claims to have visited the collapsed building a few days before the disaster, in order to inspect a frame elevator in process of construction there, and on that occasion had remarked on the frailness of the east wall pierced by so many windows, but apparently without any action being taken.

Already a by-law governing the inspection of buildings is being prepared by a special committee of the London City Council, and applications are being received for the position of building inspector.

MONTREAL NOTES.

The indications seem to be that the amount of building in Montreal during this year is equal to that done last year, but probably not much in excess. A strike amongst the steel constructors, who are asking for 40 cents an hour, is the chief trouble in view. The weather has on the whole been favorable to building operations.

As a result of the disastrous fires which took place at McGill University there is now great activity there in preparation for reconstruction. Messrs. Brown & Vallance, architects, have been given the award in the competition for new Medical Buildings. Under Professor Nobbs' charge the new building taking the place of the former Engineering Building, which was burned down on the 5th of April, is now progressing fast and has reached the second floor level. The Architectuural department, which at the same time lost its house and home and most of its worldly goods, has been well treated by the Governors, who voted four thousand dollars towards the re-equipment of this department. Prof. Armstrong is in England looking after the interests of the department, and has purchased an excellent collection of casts to replace the architectural museum which was destroyed. The collection of photographs and other equipment is also being replaced, and it is hoped that it will be possible to open the new session in the new building under very favorable conditions.

VARIATIONS IN CITY GROWTH.

From a perusal of the building statistics available in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg for the current year, some idea may be had of the differences in building activity prevailing in the sections of Canada in which these three cities are situated. Although the unparalleled growth of Toronto cannot be taken as an example of what prevails in Ontario generally, it is a pretty safe indication of what is going on in a lesser degree in most of the larger building centres of the province. Despite the increasingly high prices of material, the stringency in the money market and the unfavorable spring, the value of permits issued in Toronto for the first seven months of this year totalled $10,239,330, as compared with $7,391,905 in 1906, representing an increase of about 38 per cent.

For July the number of permits issued was 538, while for the same month last year the number was 460.

In Montreal the total building permits issued, including both new structures and alterations, were, curiously enough, 1,102 this year, as compared with 1,107 up to 30th June, 1906; so that, both in value of building, as well as in the number and quantity, this year's construction for the first half is almost numerically identical with last year's.

The following comparative statement shows the cost of new buildings month by month. It must, however, be borne in mind that only about 60 per cent. of the actual value is recorded, a fact which may make Montreal's operations appear unduly small when compared with Toronto:—

	1907.	1906.	1905.
January	$ 50,450	$ 65,075	$ 27,490
February	157,460	158,481	100,215
March	534,636	262,215	315,450
April	1,030,866	873,440	658,001
May	1,870,465	855,580	963,662
June	864,266	2,343,597	396,943
	$4,508,143	$4,558,388	$2,461,761

In Winnipeg the amount and value of the building operations for the present year have been considerably less than for 1906.

Returns from the department of the building inspector at Winnipeg show that 272 permits were issued in July, covering 325 buildings, representing a total cost of $870,700. In July, 1906, there were 345 permits for 407 buildings, at a cost of $1,526,800. The building total to date, this year, is $5,225,820, as against $8,584,950 at this date last year.

The proposal to enfranchise the Montreal Street Railway to handle freight appears to be meeting with favor on all hands, the action of the Builders' Exchange having been further endorsed by other representative bodies, viz., the Board, of Trade, Canadian Manufacturers and the Chambre de Commerce.