

phans' Home lot prior to the present year. The question to be settled then is: should the campus be left where it is (or was) and the buildings placed on the north side of Union street, or should the campus be moved across Union street, and the buildings placed on the south side of this street. Now the only objection raised against the placing of the campus across the street is that it would be too far away from the Gymnasium and the University. How about the Chemistry building, which will be used by a far greater number of students than the campus? The footballites would have all the students taking Chemistry and Mining and Metallurgy walk this distance between classes, all winter, to save their smaller number a few steps, two or three evenings a week for six or eight weeks in the autumn. If the campus is for exercise, surely the short walk would not seriously hurt the enthusiasts who use it. The convenience of the buildings to the main body of students is of considerable importance, for it is only a few years ago that the time allowed between classes was changed from five minutes to seven and one-half, and if the new buildings were placed across Union St., this time would, in all probability, have to be changed to ten minutes. This would mean an additional loss of over four per cent., which is worth considering, especially in view of the fact that the question of lengthening the session has been up for consideration more than once. Apart from the question of convenience is that of cost. If the University had owned the Orphans' Home lot, the earth which has been placed on the corner of the campus might have been dumped on this lot, and the expenditure of an additional \$1,000 would finish the work of forming a campus. If, on the other hand, the buildings were placed across the street, it would cost \$8,000 to \$8,500 to make heating and lighting connection to the central plant, while the cost of making these connections to the buildings on the campus will be only \$4,500. There is thus a net saving in favor of moving the campus of at least \$2,500, to say nothing of the annual loss on account of the greater distances, if heat and electricity had to be carried across Union street. But these are comparatively minor items when we contemplate future expansion. It does not require any keen prophetic vision to foresee that when a site is wanted for a future Science building—and this will be needed within the next five years at the present rate of growth—it will perforce be on the Clergy street side of the Orphans' Home lot, for the grip of the football interests, if sufficiently strong to hold the campus now, would be doubly strong then. Imagine now, for example, the inconvenience to the whole student body if a new Physics building were placed on Clergy street. The extra cost to connect such a building to the central plant would be at least \$5,000; and—Shade of Mars—the campus would have to be dug up again. Within ten years the Orphans' Home lot would be all taken up. And then where? If the Science buildings are to be kept within co-operating range of one another the next step would of necessity be to acquire the property on the west side of University Ave. But, perhaps, by that time we would have a Carnegie behind us.

From the foregoing it is clear that the views of the majority of the Science Faculty would not be changed by the purchase of the Orphans' Home property