

was (and is now) that if the lower campus were levelled for rugby purposes, the Orphan's Home lot on the common, might be secured for Association, and the footballites would be as well off as they are now." Evidently the need of additional ground for athletic purposes is clearly recognized. That recognition on the part of so influential a body as the Faculty of the School of Mining, gives us good hope for the early purchase of a suitable equivalent for the campus that has been taken.

Professor Gill labors under the disadvantage of not having been at the various meetings during the summer, when the whole question was discussed. Hence he makes much of a point that was never disputed, namely the greater convenience for the School of Mining in having its buildings in a compact group on the upper campus. Everybody admitted whatever force there is in that argument. We have no desire to be unfairly critical, but we feel that too much is made of the point. At any rate the distance between the present science buildings and the Orphan's Home property would be the same whether the latter were used as a campus, or a building site. Yet Professor Gill speaks of this distance as "a few steps" for the football players, and in next breath argues that the time between classes would have to be lengthened to ten minutes if the new buildings should be put across Union Street. In our opinion, the site is quite close enough for either campus or buildings, and its distance from the Gymnasium was never urged as an objection to its use as a campus. Professor Gill, not knowing the facts of the case, makes the astonishing statement that this was the only objection to converting it into a campus. However, let us agree that it will be more convenient for the Faculty of the School of Mining to have their buildings on the sites they have secured. We haven't to agree, too, accepting Professor Gill's own estimate, that the net saving of \$2500 in putting the campus across Union Street, would be a minor item, a very small item indeed. Let us further agree with his estimate that in ten years the Orphans' Home lot would be too small for the buildings required. As it is practically of the same area as the upper campus, in ten years that will be insufficient. 'And then where?' to quote Professor Gill.

The whole argument in his letter was based on the assumption that the University owned the Orphan's Home property. The University did not own it, does not own it now and as yet has taken no steps to buy it. The Governors, we might point out to Professor Gill, did recommend that it be purchased by the trustees. We might further point out, that at the time they made the recommendation, we inferred that their intention was to leave the upper campus undisturbed and put the new buildings across Union Street. Indeed, certain members of the Faculty and the Board of Governors expressed themselves as willing to put the Chemistry buildings on the north side of Union Street, though all recognized that the upper campus was a more desirable site.

There is just one more point. Professor Gill writes as if he and the other members of the Science Faculty who accompanied him to address the last meeting of the students' representatives had not been fairly treated. 'All we asked,' he writes, "was a written statement to the effect that they would be satis-