C O N S T R U C T I O N [JUNE, 1911.

ing \$78,900, which represents an advance of 51 per cent. Halifax and Sydney were both behind with respective decreases of 62 and 63 per cent., although in these two places developments have been somewhat retarded by weather conditions. Montreal also suffered a slight loss, having failed to equal her former amount by 3 per cent., while Quebec City sends in an amount of \$13,000 without comparative figures. Montreal's total was \$1,711,971, the second largest amount registered for the month.

While the prosperity of the month was perhaps less evenly distributed than in the period immediately preceding, the general expenditure nevertheless showed a marked improvement.

Conditions throughout the country give every promise of a busy summer. Montreal has sufficient work ahead to more than offset her present deficit; Vancouver reports that the pace so far established will be fully kept up, while as for Winnipeg it is safe to predict that on the whole the volume of work this year will be equally as great as that of 1910.

Permits for April 1911.	Permits for April 1910.	In- crease Per Ct.	De- crease Per Ct.
Berlin, Ont\$ 121,733	\$ 87,881	38.52	
Brandon, Man 63,110	39,720	58.86	
Brantford, Orace 61.565	79,83		22.83
Calgary, Alta 1,127,256	603,930	86.65	
Edmonton, Alta 359,027	252,196	42.36	
Fort William, Ont 211,135	261,625		19.30
Halifax, N.S 11,100	29,650		62.57
Hamilton, Ont 624,150	382,175	63.31	
Lethbridge, Alta 94,125	100,425		6.28
London, Ont 132,334	104,883	26.17	
Montreal, Que 1,711,971	1,775,880		3.60
Moose Jaw, Sask 244,525	153,250	59.56	
Nelson, B.C 46,980	52,715		10.88
Ottawa, Ont 221,075	340,675		35.11
Peterboro, Ont 82,345	121,201		32.06
Port Arthur, Ont 69,300	107,750		35.68
Preston, Ont 110,300			
Prince Albert, Sask 162,355	17,550	825.09	
Guebec, Que 13,000		.	
Regina, Sask 562,490	307.205	83.09	
Saskatoon, Sask 808,040	292,956	175.82	
Stratford, Ont 18,868	52,168		63.84
Sydney, N.S 39,465	88.025		55.17
St. John, N.B 78,900	52,000	51,73	
St. Thomas, Ont 70,650	28.050	151.87	
Toronto, Ont 3,272,818	2,522,058	29.77	
Vanceuver, B.C 1,186,320	1,460,508		18.78
Victuria, B.C	192,440	45.55	
Winusor, Ont	18,850	354.90	
Winnipeg, Man 1,922,150	2,320,900		17.18
\$13,792,937	\$11,846,496	15.39	

46

Proposed Revision of Toronto Building By-law—Mayor and Board of Control memorialized to make changes in existing code.

THE BUSINESS and professional interests connected with building construction in Toronto want a revision of the existing building code, which has been in operation for something more than twenty years. As to what success their efforts will meet with, is difficult to presage. It may be said, however, on behalf of the efforts of the organizations and their representatives, who memorialized the Mayor and Board of Control, that the work has been most thorough in every detail. The compilation of a building code is by no means a small task and the men who have given up their time to this work deserve great credit from the citizens of Toronto. The present building code of the city of Toronto is antiquated, incomplete, very slack and loose in some instances, and unreasonably exacting in some others. The present code was never compiled for the city of Toronto by a competent commission of scientific men. The building inspector, Mr. MacCallum, was obliged to compile the code from parts, excerpts and regulations draughted from codes in use in other cities. For instance, a very large part of Toronto's code has been adapted from the New York building code, which is conceded to have been out of date ten years ago.

We are not altogether just sure as to the position Mr. MacCallum will take in reporting on the suggestions made in this memorial, but assume that he will undoubtedy follow the usual course of civic officials when their department is under the fire of severe criticism. He will undoubtedly undertake to discredit the views of these men by trying to show that they have an ax to grind. This would be most unreasonable. The men's names that appear on these several committees stand high in their respective occupations and professions. Mr. MacCallum, either from education or training, should not assume that he would be justified in criticizing or making light of the combined opinions of representative engineers and archivects who are responsible for the designing and erection of some of our larger buildings in Canada. Of course, there is always one element that has to be taken into consideration, one that seems most unfortunate, and that is the lack of knowledge with regard to matters pertaining to building construction, architectural and engineering, on the part of the average municipal politician. It very often results in important matters of this nature being set aside, upon the recommendation of their supposedly competent official who has charge of the build-The memorial takes the form of ing department. a general review of the weaknesses and incompleteness of the existing building code and of the disadvantages incurred thereby. A second part deals with a detailed criticism of the present building by-law which points out many gross inconsistencies that would be hard for any conscientious architect or engineer to defend. Considerable space is devoted to that portion of the code regulating reinforced concrete construction. The former part of the memorial is of interest, in that it outlines just what the architectural and engineering professions think of the present building code and their reasons for holding such views. It says in part:

Your Worship and Gentlemen,—For some time past there has been a growing dissatisfaction among architects. engineers, contractors and business men with the Building By-Law of this city, and there is now a general conviction on the part of those best qualified to judge, that, however well the present bylaw may have conformed to the conditions existing at the time of its enactment, it is no longer suitable. Indeed, it must be admitted that the present ordinance is prejudicial to the best interests of the city, constituting in many respects an obstacle to permanent and high-class fireproof construction.