

5. During the Campaign many subscribers had evinced a keen sympathy with the idea of erecting as soon as possible, Dormitories, which, by the way, had the hearty approval of the Board of Governors. Other matters, however, seemed of even more paramount importance. The salaries of the Professors and teaching staff had to be placed on a reasonable basis, enlarged appropriations had to be made to the various Faculties and Departments so that they might effectively carry on their work and great pressure was received for extension of almost every building, for sufficient appropriations to house and teach the largely increased number of students registered. These were matters which must receive the immediate attention of the Governors, even should it delay an almost equally important development of dormitory accommodation for the students. It therefore became quite apparent that it might be many years before the development of Macdonald Park, costing some \$5,000,000 could be carried out, especially in regard to the erection of dormitories.

The erection of Dormitories to house say 250 students was estimated by the architects, would cost at least \$600,000 (1500 students would cost at least \$3,750,000 (without endowment) To begin such construction in smaller units would be a most expensive manner of building, taking into consideration the heating, lighting and other facilities which would be required, and which would most economically be developed as a whole. If the dormitories were not erected for many years it would seem to do away with one of the chief arguments for erecting the gymnasium on the proposed location. The late Dr. James Douglas, however, has left the sum of \$200,000, since increased to about \$275,000, for the erection of dormitories. For two reasons it was considered wise to add this amount to the sum allotted for the erection of the gymnasium.

- (a) If the gymnasium and dormitories could be combined there would appear to be a saving in construction as contrasted with two buildings with separate foundations, roofing, etc. and there certainly would be a very decided saving in the cost of administration, operation and control of one building as against two.
- (b) To a more or less degree certain facilities or requirements of the two buildings were identical, such as lavatories, smoking and common rooms, the administration offices, caretakers' quarters and laundry equipment.

Further if the building combined dormitories certain features occupying large spaces, such as reception, lounge, smoking and billiard rooms, as well as provision for a restaurant or cafeteria could be dispensed with if the building was erected on the Campus site, as the students would be well provided for in the Students' Union, which arrangement would, in turn, greatly benefit the Union. This would naturally mean that residence for a far greater number of students can be provided at much less cost.

It was also discovered that roughly 45% of the students were residents of Montreal, that another 20% (say 600) lived in accommodations close to the Campus, such as the Strathcona Hall, Presbyterian, Diocesan, Wesleyan and Congregational Colleges, while those living in the Fraternities were situated about equal distance from either the Campus or Macdonald Park, and it was estimated the large proportion of the balance lived either west and south of Sherbrooke St. or as close, if not closer to the Campus than to Macdonald Park.