



VOL. XXXVII.

NOVEMBER 10th, 1909.

No. 4.

The Campus.

[NOTE—In publishing the following article on the campus question, we wish merely to say that apart from the question of the advisability of taking the campus as a building site, the students had rights therein that have been violated without notice of any kind, and all that they ask is the official assurance that suitable grounds for athletic purposes will soon be provided as an equivalent. A reply covering points at issue will be given in next Journal.—Ed.]

THE writer of the leading article in the first issue of the Journal, referring to the "sacrifice" of the Campus, claims that his aim was merely to present to the students the facts relating thereto, and thus show them that their case was presented, but without success. The casual reader will, no doubt, agree with me, that according to this article the representatives of the students made a strenuous protest against the action of the University authorities in this matter. If the object of the article was merely to make this one point clear, its purpose has been served; but if the intention was to present *all* the facts connected with this matter, then I think the writer has failed. And this is to be regretted, for the students are entitled to know all the facts so that they may form an unbiased opinion. It is also to be regretted that one finds so many qualified statements, when the claim is made to a statement of facts. For example, in the first paragraph, it is stated that "it is very hard to find anyone now who frankly admits that he advocated taking the upper campus for a building site." Now, if anyone will take the trouble to inquire, he will find that all the staff, except two or three, of the School of Mining are now, and always have been, in favor of locating the buildings on the upper campus. Their position was made very clear and emphatic, early in June when a plan was drawn up embodying the probable building requirements for the next twenty-five years. The sites then selected for the new Chemistry and Metallurgy buildings are practically the ones which have been finally decided upon by the Governors. This plan was presented to the Building Committee after being approved in writing by all the heads of departments then in the city, two or three only being absent. In view of this, I am at a loss to find any ground for the charge that there was "a complete change of front, or at least of emphasis" on the part of members of the Science Faculty. As far as I can see the only change possible is in the opposite direction.

The reasons which led to the selection of the upper campus as a site for the new buildings are very clear and well defined. These reasons will appear in a clearer light if it is assumed that the University had acquired the Or-