

## Communications.

To the Editor of the VARSITY.

DEAR SIR,—I have only just now seen a copy of your editorial on the Western University, as contained in the VARSITY of December 1st, 1883, and I hasten to send a brief reply, feeling assured that you will, in a spirit of fairness, publish the same in your next issue.

As one who took an active interest and leading part in the inception of the Western University, I may perhaps reasonably claim to be thoroughly conversant with all that took place, and in justice to Bishop Hellmuth, I beg to say that you have been grossly misinformed in regard to his Lordship's course in the matter of the sale and purchase of Hellmuth Boy's College property for university purposes.

In the first place, the university movement did not originate with Bishop Hellmuth, but with certain of the Alumni of Huron College, and when the Bishop was first approached on the subject of the property, he stoutly refused to part with it for that purpose, knowing full well what motives would be assigned him by an uncharitable public, and he gave his consent only after much pressure, there being certain reasons why Huron College property could not be utilized for that purpose at that time.

With regard to the price paid for the property by the university, perhaps the following quotation from a document prepared by T. W. Thomas, Esq., the well-known banker, will help now, as then, to form an estimate of the value thereof:—"Whereas the founder and proprietor of the London Collegiate Institute, desiring to make the same a proprietary institution, with the view of securing its perpetuity, has submitted to us the books exhibiting his disbursements connected therewith, which shows an outlay amounting to not less than sixty-six thousand dollars expended by him in the purchase of lands, erection of the building, and in furnishing it so as to accommodate one hundred and fifty boys; and this exclusive of any consideration for his labour and time, or any expenditure incurred by him prior to the opening of the Institute, A.D. 1865. Signed by Mayor Evans, T. W. Thomas, D. Macfie, John Carling, Rev. A. Sweetman, G. Foster, Rev. H. J. Grasett, E. Baldwin and others.

The original cost of the property was therefore...	\$66,000 00
Subsequent additional buildings cost about.....	7,000 00
Increase of value of land at least .....	27,000 00

Making a total of.....\$100,000 00

The wear and tear was offset by the difference in the expense of building between 1865 and the present, but a reduction was made from these figures of the sum of \$33,000 00, and the price was fixed at \$67,000.00, the value being confirmed by the price of adjoining lands.

As to the disposition of the \$67,000.00, the sum of \$22,000.00 was required to pay off a debt which has been incurred, owing to the institution having been run at a financial loss during the last few years. The remaining \$45,000.00 belong to the stockholders, and as secretary-treasurer of Hellmuth Boy's College Corporation, for the then time being, I beg to say that I received from the University, the whole amount collected for the purpose during my term of office, and distributed the same to the several shareholders, each one receiving his share *pro rata*, along with the Bishop, and I very much doubt if any shareholder ever even offered the small remainder of his stock at 50 cents on the dollar. In any case it could only involve a question of a very few dollars.

In view of these facts alone, I think it will be admitted that the attack on Bishop Hellmuth was entirely unmerited, and in his absence open to strong exception by his friends. Opposition to the Western University was of course expected, and has been received in a very goodnatured sort of way, but an accusation of wrong, doing is quite another affair.

With reference to the course which our present excellent Bishop will pursue, I am unable to state what his intentions are, not having spoken with him on the subject, but owing to the fact that London is now the centre of a population of over a million of people, and that the impracticability of university consolidation is now very generally admitted, the conclusion is made, that the people of the west must have a university. If the Church of England drops it, other bodies of Christians are waiting to take it up.

As to the two properties being held for university purposes, such was never the intention. The Huron College property has been for some time in the market, awaiting a suitable offer.

Let me refer in conclusion to what seems to me to be a misapprehension in regard to the denominational character of the Western University. While the *Caput* must remain Church of England, yet

students, in all departments except divinity, may belong to any denomination, and be received on equal footing, and in the medical department there are at the present time lecturers holding different faiths, including Roman, Presbyterian and others.

I am, sir, yours very truly,  
J. W. P. SMITH,  
Rector of Christ Church.  
London, Ont., January 21st. 1884.

To the Editor of the VARSITY.

DEAR SIR,—I notice in the VARSITY of last week an article entitled "Football in University College," which, though presumably written with no unfair intentions, gives a very one-sided account of the development of the game in past years. As one who had some part in the establishment of the Association game, I beg to offer a few emendations. I agree with the writer of the article, in saying that the old University game was unsatisfactory; but I do not admit that it was a go-as-you-please game. The shades of Fletcher, Clements, Spotten, Boyd and others, I am sure, would protest against any such epithet. The rules were clear and well defined, and the system worked well, so much so that on one occasion, at least, the club refused to change them for either of the present games. There was, however, one defect; no other club played under those rules. Hence it was unsatisfactory and was changed, and the change was made to the Association game in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the players. During the first year of the Association *regime* the game was played with marked success. But some had a preference for Rugby, and were of course entitled to a hearing. No one, however, thought of the most sensible plan—that of forming two clubs to develop both games. In the first meeting of the autumn of '77, I think, the question was brought up again. The meeting was held very early in the term, and many members had not returned. Some of those who had returned did not know of the importance of the meeting. I can easily imagine the enthusiasm with which the Rugby rules were adopted at the meeting. It occurs to me to imagine a similar enthusiasm when a meeting of our senate in days gone by decided to divide up the endowment of University College, and distribute it among the denominational colleges. The fact is that neither side perceived the necessities of the situation. These were, that both games should be taken up. Mr. Cummings and myself, although not present at the meeting, were placed on the committee for the year. We resigned, and in consequence of numerous representations from the friends of the Association game, called a meeting and continued the old game. I will not discuss the legal point as to which club had the right to be called the proper University College club. Suffice it to say that our meeting was the larger and more representative. Any person who had anything to do with football, at that time, will remember how difficult it was to get a thoroughly representative meeting, and how unsatisfactory it was sure to be, if obtained. As well call a meeting of carpenters and bricklayers, to decide whether all carpenters and bricklayers should work at carpentering and bricklaying alone. We are told that "the victory remained in the hands of the Unionists," but it must surely have been a very barren victory that gained less than thirty members for the Rugby club during that year. This I had from a member of their committee. I know for a fact that during that year they seldom had anything like enough for two teams on the field. The Association subscription list for that year, which I have before me, numbers 79 members who had paid their fees, and fully two-thirds of these were active members. Our field was always overcrowded, as it most generally is now. We are also told that they gained the *moral* support, due to being able to adopt the name of University College Football Club; but some details are wanting. The details are these: The undivided club of the previous year was called the University College Football Association. We kept the name and fully two-thirds of the members, the remainder called themselves as above; hence they were entitled to priority of right to the ground! Thus it was that we "virtually acknowledged defeat by starting another club." The name of a club is sometimes significant, sometimes it is not. In this case it certainly was not, as the numbers show. As regards the bitterness and jealousy of the clubs, I know little of it beyond our surprise at the preposterous assumptions of a few private members of the Rugby club, in claiming all the ground for practice. We, at any rate, had no cause to be jealous during that year, and desired only to develop our game. The proposal of a joint committee made in the following year, by Rugby men, met with little opposition from us and was carried out, but I don't think it ever met, as there was no use for it. Since then I am glad to know that Rugby has increased in numbers and renown. Turned from a universal empire to an earnest working for excellence in its own line, it deserves its proud record of the past season, and stands as a good example for the Association club to follow.

Yours truly,

JAS. McDUGALL.