

small but complete mill on the lower floor. I think it is not only a splendid experiment, but an example of sensible co-operation, and I look forward to an extension of McGill's willingness to co-operate with industry.

(c) The New Animal House, costing more than \$40,000 and entirely paid for by Dean Martin and some friends whom he interested in this necessity.

(d) The Field House—a charge on the revenue from the Stadium.

(e) The Dentistry Wing at the General Hospital, in the cost of which the hospital shared to the extent of \$10,000.

(f) The Faculty Club on University Street, the cost of which was largely borne by an anonymous friend. I might add parenthetically that not many University professors can nowadays afford to be members of other clubs.

(g) Certain other houses on University Street, all of which pay 6% interest on the investment. It is our policy to purchase additional property when we can get it at a price which enables the rent to pay fixed charges and 6% on the invested capital.

(h) The Principal's house on McTavish Street, bought very, very cheaply. And, let me add, the furniture was not supplied by the University, as gossipers, maliciously ignorant, so often contend.

At the time of our last campaign, high hopes were entertained that we might be able to supply:

(a) A Mining and Geology Building. We must do so at an early date. We should have had such a building long ago, and we would have had it if it had not been necessary to re-build the Arts Building. But it must be remembered that more than half of the students now in attendance at McGill in Montreal receive the greater part of their instruction in the Arts Building. I think I can safely add that the first building the Governors intend to authorize is the Mining and Geology Building. Plans once prepared are now being revised.

(b) A Gymnasium. We have the unenviable reputation of being the only University in Canada without gymnasium facilities. The reason for its non-existence is that we have not sufficient funds,—at least, the Governors feel that the necessary withdrawal from endowment funds to supply a gymnasium would be unwise at the present time. I would like to comment further regarding the gymnasium. I think that the only time I have had the honour of meeting the graduates since our reunion in 1921 nearly ten years ago was to discuss the site of the gymnasium. I wish we had never held that meeting. As things turned out, it was unnecessary, and no good came of it. Let me now frankly state that in the light of subsequent events (which I shall not pause now to elucidate) there will no longer be any opposition to

the erection of the Gymnasium on Pine Avenue. Sherbrooke Street will be widened; and University property there is likely to be disposed of and the facilities now supplied in those buildings arranged for elsewhere.

And now I come to the question of dormitories. Many of you, I know, are keenly interested in this question and McGill has been much criticized because we have not large dormitory accommodation. I remember a very prominent graduate and friend of mine telling me that the governors had no right to spend a single dollar of the funds provided in the last campaign until dormitories were supplied, and a prominent Montrealer intimated that he would attach a condition to his next subscription that it be used for such a purpose only. We are all keenly interested in dormitories; but, naturally, we have different views. There are throughout the University from 800 to 1,000 students who might live in dormitories. The fraternity system is well established, and many students live in these houses. The Royal Victoria College is being extended; and some students will always live at home. The cost of erecting these dormitories would be great, especially if they are to be comfortable and commodious internally and of a style of architecture consistent with the landscape externally. The question we must ask ourselves is, "In view of the great necessities of the University, would the educational returns be commensurate with the cost, and should other needs remain unsatisfied until dormitories are provided?" We cannot do everything, we can only use our best judgment, in this matter as in everything else. I admit the value of dormitories, especially to universities and colleges in small towns; and I admit also that colleges and universities so situated and so favoured often disclose a greater college spirit than similar institutions without dormitories located in larger cities. But—just what is that spirit? Is it insular or is it national? Is it genuine or is it frothy? I am not prepared to admit that the academic standards in such colleges are higher, or even as high as in some other institutions.

I have seen many dormitories which were cheerless, dismal places. Each room had its two beds, its table, its two chairs, its cupboard, its rude bookcases, its bannerettes. There was no library—a fatal mistake. I have never known a case where there were not complaints about meals. All cheap meals prepared in large quantities usually invite criticism. Who would wish to live long in a cheap hotel? And that is what the usual college dormitory really is. Are the minds and manners of students to be greatly improved by herding them together in the average dormitory? My friend who refused to contribute to anything except dormitories contends that the morals of the students would be improved, at least conserved, by such a life. I doubt that; and the experiences of colleges will confirm the grounds for my doubts. Many dormitories are relics of monasticism, and resemble military barracks.