CORRESPONDENCE.

[Letters are invited for this department on subjects relating to the building interests. To secure insertion, all communications must be accompanied by the name and address of the author, not necessarily for publication. The publisher will not assume responsibility for the opinions of correspondents.]

BUILDING RIGHTS AND MEASUREMENTS.

MONTREAL, Jan. 25, 1896.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

SIR,—As there are differences of opinion, would you kindly give the law of the Province of Quebec which governs the following questions concerning walls :

1st. If the foundation of a building requires to be planked or concreted say 6 feet wide, do the respective proprietors pay 3 feet each? If the footings are 4 feet wide when there is no plank or concrete, do they pay 2 feet each, presuming in both cases there is a 2 foot stone wall built on it? And do each pay 3 feet or 2 feet of excavation respectively, or just the thickness of the 2 feet wall?

2nd. How many feet English measure are there in a toise of masonry.

3rd. How many bricks are there in a cubic foot of brick work, and does the different thicknesses of a brick wall make any difference in the number? By answering the above in your next edition you will greatly oblige.

A SUBSCRIBER.

[ANSWER.—According to Act 512 and 513 of the Civil Code of Lower Canada, all those that have right to community of wall are obliged to contribute to repairs and reconstruction to half the amount of value of the whole portion of said wall they use, unless they abandon their claims to community. 2nd. The practice in Montreal is to count 80 cubic feet in English measure per toise; measurements vary, however, according to locality. 3rd. A square foot of brick veneering is assumed to contain 7 bricks, an 8 inch wall 14 bricks, and although at this rate a cubic foot of brickwork should contain 21 bricks, it is generally reckoned as 20, there being a little less than 21 bricks in a cubic foot.—EDITOR C. A. & B.]

FIRE RESISTING STRUCTURES.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN ARCHITECT AND BUILDER.

SIR,—Regarding the article which appeared under the above heading in your February issue, I beg to submit a resume of the report of F. D. Moore, President of the Continental Insurance Co., and a member of the Board of Examiners of the Building Department of the City of New York. This gentleman says he has visited and examined the Manhattan building in his official capacity, and clearly states that the cause of the accident was due to the box girder supporting the floors not being protected ; it sagged and carried the upper floors along with it. Mr. Moore also calls attention to one part of the building, composed entirely of wood and glass, which burned fiercely.

This gentleman's report is, in my humble opinion, of far more importance than the opinion of chief Bonner, who, as a fireman, sees a building only when it is on fire. For a man like Chief Bonner to pass an opinion on fireproof buildings, of which he knows nothing, is simply ridiculous. Chief Bonner should learn first that iron which is not properly protected, is not considered fireproof by any one who knows what constitutes a fireproof building.

What does chief Bonner now think of his wooden buildings in the light of the Troy and Utica fires? The buildings, destroyed in those fires were, according to your statement, the kind he recommends. I would say further, that New York City should never be taken as an example as regards fireproof construction. I dare say there are thousands of buildings in New York that are called fireproof, but judging from what I have personally seen, I am sure that not one-half of them are actually fireproof. There is no law to prevent anyone from calling a cow shed fireproof if he chooses—he may advertise it, post up notices all over that the building is fireproof, and no one may be the wiser until it takes fire ; then men like Chief Bonner will say fireproof buildings are a failure.

I see only one remedy for this condition of affairs, and that is for the government to appoint an expert, and make it a criminal offence for anyone to advertise a building as fireproof without a certificate to that effect from the government expert. If that were done you would be surprised to see how few really fireproof buildings there are, and how easily they could be made fireproof, and those who intend to put up a really fireproof building would be protected against unscrupulous competitors with their cheap imitations as well as against fraud and ignorance.

Yours truly,

N. T. GAGNON.

TESTS OF CANADIAN BRICKS.

By the courtesy of Mr. Kivas Tully, chief architect of the Public Works Department of Ontario, we are enabled to publish the accompanying table showing the result of tests of Canadian pressed brick made during the past three years for the Public Works Department under Mr. Tully's direction. The tests were made in the laboratory of the School of Practical Science, Toronto. The table of results is as follows :—

FORMULA SHEWING SIZES, TESTS FOR ABSORPTION, ETC., OF PRESSED BRICK MANUFACTURED IN ONTARIO, MADE BY MESSRS. TULLY AND WRIGHT AT SCHOOL OF PRACTICAL SCIENCE, TORONTO.

No.	Label.	Dimensions of Brick—Length, Breadth, Thickness.	Cubic Contents	Weight in ozs. after 4 hours drying.	Weight in ozs. after 14¾ hrs. in water.	Absorbed ozs.	Weight per cub. inch in ozs.	Specific gravity.
1.	T. Nightingale..	8.42″ x 4.12″ x 2.46″	85.338″	88.40/64	100.28/64	11.52/64	1.04	1.76
2.	Boyd	8.26″ x 4.11″ x 2.38″	80.831″	82.25/64	94.57/64	12.32/64	1.02	1.78
3.	B. P. B. Co.	8.38″ x 4.11″ x 2.48″	85.622″	90.44/64	102.42/64	11.62/64	1.06	1.83
4.	T. P. B. Co.....	8.39″ x 4.11″ x 2.40″	82.758″	84.24/64	97 .7/64	12.37/64	1.02	1.76
5.	Don.....	8.38″ x 3.99″ x 2.35″	78.575″	92.33/64	99.41/64	7. 8/64	1.18	2.03
6.	Ontario.....	8.45″ x 4.18″ x 2.42″	85.670″	95.63/64	106.40/64	10.41/64	1.12	1.94
a7.	Deseronto.....	8.04″ x 3.85″ x 2.34″	72.432″	79.40/64	90.24/64	10.48/64	1.10	1.90
b8.	Garson P. & Co.	8.75″ x 4.25″ x 2.5″	92.968″	93.32/64	110.48/64	17.16/64	1.00	1.74
c9.	Garson P. & Co.	8.37″ x 4.1875″ x 2.5625″	89.868″	87	104	17	.98	1.67

NOTE :—As respects the durability and finish of the first six specimens, there is practically no difference ; all are good with a slight difference in color.

"Don" (5) and "Ontario" (6) specimens were tested for crushing by Professor Wright 175,000, about 5,100 lbs. per cubic inch.

"Don" (5) shows least absorption ; G. P. & Co. (b 8) and (c 9) show greatest absorption.

KIVAS TULLY, Architect.

Department of Public Works, Ontario, January 30th, 1896.

The South Kensington Work on "Building Construction," referring to the absorption test, says, "The amount of water a good brick will absorb is a very good indication of its quality. Insufficiently burnt bricks