

The official report of the Students' Council concerning the use of the Union is attached. In this connection it is pointed out that residential facilities will decrease the attendance at the Union. At Cambridge, for example, the Union, which is a much older institution, is only patronized by a very small number of students.

There is nothing new about the question of the Union's disposal. The matter is now before the Governors and has been for some time.

With paragraphs on page 8, there is very little comment to be made. The report states that the importance of acquiring all the property within our boundary seems worthy of serious consideration. This is now the University's policy and has long been so.

"We do not believe that McGill can afford to give up any more of its existing land". What land has so been given up, except for the exchange of the second house above the Wesleyan College for Divinity Hall?

It is suggested that when the Westmount Mountain property is sold the receipts should be devoted to the expenses now incurred in purchasing properties here. This would be so, if it were going to be sold. I question the ultimate value of the suggestion. In the first place, I do not believe that Sir William Macdonald intended his purchase to be a speculation; in the second place, it might very well be desirable to utilize Westmount Mountain for the purposes of residences where our professors could be provided with dwelling houses at a very low cost, owing to the fact that we would have (on our books at all events) no important expenditure on land. This would be a much easier method of increasing ~~salaries~~ remuneration than ~~of~~ increasing salaries and I believe is more in line with what the benefactor intended.

As regards the last paragraph of page 9, it would be interesting to know what property is to be deeded to the University, further, what reason is there to