To the Athletic Department of the University of Chicago, and the Faculty Committee on the Men's Commons, 

Sirs:—

The Advisory Committee of the Men's Commons begs leave to present the following suggestion: That the training table of the football, base ball and track teams be transferred to the Men's Commons.

We believe that such an arrangement is desirable for the following reasons:—

(1) It would enable the university men to know the members of the teams better, with resulting greater interest in the players.

(2) The players would realize more fully the support of the University, and we believe that the acquaintance and personal contact would increase the devotion of both players and supporters to their common University interests.

(3) Better opportunities would be provided for making demonstrations of loyalty and enthusiasm before and after games.

(4) Such an arrangement should make the Commons the centre of student activity. The Commons and Reynolds Club together ought to profit by the arrangement and more fully realize the purpose for which they were established.

(5) Besides an increased patronage, the resources and menu possibilities of the the Commons should be increased.

At present, comparatively few opportunities are given to university men for acquaintance with the members of the athletic teams. Since the adoption of almost constant secret practice,
this condition has been particularly bad.

The strong feeling throughout the University that there are not enough opportunities for university men to know the men representing them on their athletic teams has been very clearly shown by the recent action of the student councils in petitioning for fewer secret practices. We believe that the arrangement provided for in our suggestion would meet this situation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. M. Strong
Wm. M. Brown
Leon Lewis
James Oliphant
Carleton J. Lynde
Minutes of Advisory Committee, Autumn Quarter, 1904.

On Wednesday evening, November 2nd, Professor George E. Vincent as representative of the Faculty Committee of the Commons, addressed the members of the Commons at the dinner hour, giving the results of his investigations of the systems at Harvard and Yale, and explaining the problems confronting the Commons here.

Mr. E. M. Kerwin having resigned as President of the Commons Committee, Nominations were called for on Thursday, November 3rd. Dr. R. M. Strong was the only nominee, and was elected on November 4th.

Regular meetings of the Committee have been held commencing Monday, November 7th. The meetings have been held each Monday evening at the dinner hour, the members of the Committee dining together and transacting the business of the Committee at that time. Mr. Boylen, the Steward of the Commons, consults with the Committee at these meetings and such complaints and suggestions as the Committee has seen fit to bring to the attention of the management of the Commons have been made to him personally.

On Monday, November 14th, a dinner mass meeting was held in honor of the work of the football team at Ann Arbor on the preceding Saturday. This was one of the most successful mass meetings ever held at the University.

A letter, copy of which is attached, was approved by the Committee and transmitted to the Athletic Department and the Faculty Committee of the Commons for consideration. No action on the part of either of these two bodies has been reported to this Committee.
Two reports to President Harper were submitted by the President and December 5th of the Advisory Committee of date November 7th, and a report was made to the Commons diners on Wednesday, January 11th, 1905, both of which reports are to be found among the reports of the Presidents of the Advisory Committee.

At the meeting of the diners in the Commons held January 11th, 1905, the following Resolution was passed:

"Resolved: That Section III of the Recommendation adopted January 20, 1904 (this Recommendation as adopted constituting the Constitution of the University Commons for Men) be amended to read as follows:

"III. Members of this committee shall be holders of tickets in the Commons and shall be nominated and elected by the holders of tickets in the Commons.

"1. Nominations for president, secretary, and the three other members of the advisory committee shall be made on the evening of the second Wednesday of each alternate Quarter, commencing with the Winter Quarter of 1905. The names of the nominees shall be posted in Hutchinson Hall.

"2. The election shall take place on the evening of the Wednesday next following the nominations. The election shall be by ballot. The candidates receiving the largest number of votes for president and secretary respectively, and the three highest on the poll for committeemen, shall be declared elected, and shall serve for six months and until their successors are chosen.

"3. The committee may at any time call a special election to fill vacancies caused by the resignation of members of the committee or by their inability to serve."

At this meeting the following nominations for officers and members of the committee for the ensuing six months were made:--

For President:--

R. M. Strong.
W. F. Keller.

For Secretary:--

C. J. Lynde.
H. E. Shaw.

For Members of the Committee:--

A. E. Bestor.
W. R. Blair.
W. M. Burns.
J. H. Larson.

The names of the candidates having been duly posted as required by the Constitution, an election by ballot was held Wednesday evening,
The University Commons
Hutchinson Hall, January 18, 1905.

ELECTION OF
THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

President
R. M. STRONG 71
W. F. KELLER 93

Secretary
C. J. LYNDE 101
H. B. SHAW 61

Members of Committee
Vote for three of the following, drawing a line through the name of the man for whom you do not wish to vote:

A. E. BESTOR 146
W. R. BLAIR 144
W. M. BURNS 142
J. H. LARSON 58
Report to the
Voluntary Committee

W. M. Page
C. H. B. Shaw
A. K. Smirke
W. S. M. Hughes
W. J. Jackson
January 13, 1905, which resulted in the election of the following officers and members of the Committee:

President - W. F. Keller. (93 votes)

Secretary - C. J. Lynde. (101 votes)

Members of the Advisory Committee - A. E. Bestor. (146 votes)
W. R. Blair (144 votes)
W. M. Burns. (142 votes)

Leon J. Lewis
Secretary, Autumn Quarter, 1904.
President Charles R. Van Hise,
The University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

My dear President Angell:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Capps and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understood the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly signed into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting and that there...
It seems from3 records and reports on the conference on Education that the meeting realized that
such a greater transfer of faculty in a settlement may have
inadvertently been from them the other aspect in the way
of a settlement was the fact that the representation of women
and women was taken from them that not only the case of the
women college in 1929, but also other colleges and
universities between the three institutions specifically the
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
and on another claim in fact for representation for a continuing
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
and on another claim in fact for representation for a continuing
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
and on another claim in fact for representation for a continuing
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
to make in recognition with a contract until after the
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
to make in recognition with a contract until after the
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
to make in recognition with a contract until after the
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
to make in recognition with a contract until after the
settlement of the Intercollegiate Federation for the future need
other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this
meeting by either you or President Angell in your correspondencewith me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference.
Further in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as
defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with
any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898,
except that there was such a claim; and since this claim pro-
ceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement had ever
been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to those two
delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and
furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration,
our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there
as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference.
In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the
meeting without full power and information on these two subjects
which had never been referred to in the correspondence between
the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two
years over which this correspondence extended, and had
only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settle-
ment of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion
of which you sent a copy to Mr. Hackman a year ago. But no
further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor
was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.
other discussions had never been brought to your attention at this
meeting or other than your President. And as to your correspondence
with the commission representative for appreciation of your conference
particularly in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as we
getting in the call for representatives were not prepared with
any information whatever as to the earlier claim of 1885.
except that there were such a claim and since they claim in
connection with the Mosaic and Waco mining, and on statement has ever
been submitted either to our Affidavit Board or to those two
get ready on to me writing four the proof of the claim and
therefore as with the same needs to the committee.
our governor was able to take up the case thus and there
in fact, they were rather carefully reconsidering for coming to the
meeting without full board and information on these two subjects
which had never been lettered so in the correspondence between
the representatives of Waco mining and Chicago mining the two
year ago when this correspondence extended, and had
never once been suspected as having a bearing upon the subject
wore at the convention case in full judge since in my opinion
it might have meant to get your attention another year ago but it
is certain some one of them or both of them in a connection with
were the correspondence renewed in the more recent correspondence.
I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations were alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was calling and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Angell's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin, who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up, this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Capps and
I concur that I sympathize with the position taken by our colleague in achieving what the administration to achieve the scope of the conference may in reaching that those new con-
ventions were alien to the objectives matter of the conference.

The case for the settlement as a matter for the conference was calling
any time in any combination matters were to have been brought.
I regard the meeting on your ability as President Adr. I.

Any may have been notified of the change in plan. I can generalize
the authority of the opinion that no change in plan was to be
conferred upon you for only the substantive measures of M'far
and M'far who were present as experts, may not as a general
problem were广州市 with the necessary information as to the
incident of 1908 had that not in communities form nor in such
a place as to offer any plans for your immediate coordination of the

scope of the authority of the case. At the meeting of 1908 any
takes as the authority of the case. In the meeting of 1908 may
have been an intrenched claim and our colleagues felt that the
general to be an intrenched claim and our colleagues were to be intrenched upon

general to be an intrenched claim and our colleagues might have
general to be an intrenched claim and our colleagues might have

with the ordinary conference case.

I may say "In the connection that between" and
Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic managers, Messrs. Baird and Donner, and Mr. Donner's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, the chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, though their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin
of a few days ago. I trust you will be able to make the connection. The weather here is still quite pleasant, and I hope you are also enjoying the same.

I understand that the new regulations are causing some inconvenience. I hope you are finding a way to adapt. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to assist you.

Best regards,

[Signature]
desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refuse to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1896, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, however, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, hold that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a period meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in
At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, reference was made to the question of the erection of a new building for the school. The Board was unanimous in its decision to proceed with the construction, and arrangements were made for a suitable site to be selected. The Board also discussed the financial aspects of the project, and it was agreed that a committee of trustees would be formed to oversee the progress and ensure that the project was completed within budget. The committee was instructed to submit its report to the Board at the next meeting. The Board expressed its thanks to the various organizations and individuals who had contributed to the project, and it was agreed that a public dedication ceremony would be held at the completion of the building.
the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And if you and President Angell's desire that a conference shall be called which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 grandstand case, concurrently with or in any relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I enclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it required supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

[Handwritten signature]
The conference was successful. And further, the Board requested that we meet to reconsider the committee make up and re-elect a board that we
might constitute a committee to fill any other vacancies at
such a future. And if you and President Wood will agree that a
conference shall be called which shall be composed of members
and report the 1938 examination case, comparatively with the in
sight of the same case at 1935, we shall be glad to
send reference. We can only state that we were interested in the
sentiment of the gentlemen at the conference.
In order that you may be fully prepared as to the position
that the importance of discipline taken in the primary case, and
as to theificio of the case in general, I enclose a copy of
a statement of if prepared by our representatives to the
conference. They have not been satisfied with the statement of facts and asked the
work. But have given up the statement of facts and asked the
parts of any position which, from hectic discussion of law or
precepts, it is necessary that if necessary an amended to
some points, that it is as complete in outline as our fifteen
benefit.
President C.R. Van Hise,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

My dear President Van Hise:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Capps and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understand the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly entered into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which cost it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting, and
President W.R. Van Hecke

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

My Dear President Van Hecke:

I am with great regret that I am unable to be present at the conference on Saturday, April 20, as I am on a leave of absence in New York. However, I have discussed the matter with my colleagues and I am confident that we can make arrangements to have the necessary representatives attend the meeting.

The conference on April 19 is also of great importance and I hope that arrangements can be made to have the necessary representatives present.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
that these other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this meeting by either you or President Angell in your correspondence with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference. Further, in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement has ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to these two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the meeting without full power and information on these two points— which had never been even referred to in the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion of which President Angell sent a copy to Mr. Heckman a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.

I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by
I assume that I am worth with the position taken by

at this meeting by asking you to present any material in your capacity

experience with some constructive statements for appreciation of

conference. Further, in view of the specific purpose of this
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our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations are alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was called: and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Angell's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Capps and Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal
our delegates in Georgeville, where the circumstances are entirely
the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new
considerations were taken into the specific matter of the settlement
for the settlement, or whether the conference was called;
and that it must with all due respect to have been prepared
before this meeting by your gentle of President Amell, I
should have been notified of the purpose to plan our conference
at this moment of the opinion that no chance to plan was in fact
considered by you, nor only the application of a fine, with the necessary
and Wisconsin, who were present as members, and not as de lege
proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the
incident of 1839, and that not in communication from you in each
shape as to offer any part for an adequate consideration of
the facts of the duty of the case. At this meeting it was
and had to be, an intricate affair, and our delegates felt that
the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to regard
the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin more simply through the limitation under
which our delegates operated, and in other that their representatives
might have time to rest up the case to be later considered
considerably with the original complaint.
I may say, in the connection, that Maine, Georgia, and
ought not at their own motion invite any change in the Maine law,
and little for two weeks ago, when the matter was generally new.

I thought of them as an important meeting to see that a formal
statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered more fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic Managers, Messrs. Baird and Downer, and Mr. Downer's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, our chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, although their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed
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between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refused to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. The proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast by one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, hold that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a special meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And you and President Angell desire that a conference shall be called
between the members of our conference.

The understanding of the present situation to claim the
safety of Milwaukee and Wisconsin rests upon our
resolution and our courage to undertake the
necessary steps to secure a settlement of it, and
immediate action was necessary to protect the
property of the railroads and the
arrangement of the conference. The Chicago delegation granted
the request of the note, each party leaving to its own
vote the decision of the same, while conference that he propose the
vote of the delegation. Judge Lane, concluded that he propose the
vote of the delegate of the Wisconsin conference and come to an
agreement not to propose this issue separate from the other case.

Space mentioned.

At a special meeting of the Board of Trustees, Dr. King,
Affirmative of the position of our delegates in the
conference, and approval. My further, the Board recommended
we to continue the conference more upon other matters of
importance to correct congratulation to all other matters of interest
and an influence with the Board of other institutions to our
it to far before our Board, either now or in the future, and
you and President Grant agree that a conference shall be called.
which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 grandstand case, concurrently with or in relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I inclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it requires supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
with which your opinion is accompanied. As regards the
execution of the case, the point is that in reference to the
condition of the case, we shall refer the matter to your
generosity. We see only
that we are furnishing the report with information
concerning the
nature of the case.
In order that you may be fairly acquainted as to the present
situation of affairs, see in the
interest of the case, I inform you of a
statement of the premises or our representations to the con-
ference. They have not been necessitated by necessity in this work,
but have grown in the statement of facts and evidence of the parties
of our position. With this in mind, in order that it might
be as free as possible from accretions of fact or the
concerned. I am aware of the nature and extent of these
points, and it is as well to outline as our lines of action
Yours very truly,

W. H. Harper
January 23, 1905

President James B. Angell,

The University of Michigan,

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

My dear President Angell:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Capps and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understood the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly signed into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting and...
President James E. Ford
The University of Michigan

Dear Mr. President,

I write with great regret to inform you that I have received a letter from the University of Michigan, expressing a desire to terminate our contract for representation in the next four years. The letter states that the University of Michigan, along with other institutions, is unable to continue its representation of the Intercollegiate Association for the coming year.

I am deeply concerned about the implications of this decision and wish to express my disappointment and shock. The Intercollegiate Association has been a valuable resource for our institution, and the loss of its support will be felt significantly.

I amwriting to request an opportunity to discuss the matter further and to explore any possible solutions. I believe that the Intercollegiate Association has made a significant contribution to the academic community, and I am hopeful that we can find a way to continue our collaboration.

Please let me know your availability for a meeting to discuss this matter in detail.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this
meeting by either you or President Van Hise in your correspondenc
with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference.
Further in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as
defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with
any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898,
except that there was such a claim; and since this claim pro-
ceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement had ever
been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to those two
delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and
furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration,
our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there
as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference.
In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the
meeting without full power and information on these two subjects
which had never been referred to in the correspondence between
the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two
years over which this correspondence extended, and had
only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settle-
ment of the accident case, viz.by Judge Lane in an opinion
of which you sent a copy to Mr.Hackman a year ago. But no
further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor
was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.
See the beginning of this page for the continuation of the text.

You may need to refer to the previous page for context.

The text continues on the following page.
I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations were alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was calling and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Van Hise's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin, who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Capps and
I am unable to sympathize with the position taken by
our delegates at Genoa and the circumstances to which
the scope of the conference may be referring that these few con-
ferences were called to the specific matter of the conference
and that it seemed appropriate to make the conference more clear.
I believe the meeting of your justice on December 30th
would have been helpful to the cause in play. I am grateful
for the assistance of the opinion that no opinion in play are to be
considered by you, for only the immediate measures of Middle
and Wisconsin were presented as evidence and not as delegates
proposed. I am limited with the necessary information as to the
intention of 1880 and the note in your committee from you in your
speech as to offer any picture to an adequate consideration of the
facts to the duty of the case. At this meeting it was, and
the facts to the duty of the case. All other delegates to the
and to be in evidence of all and Wisconsin were too to think now as
delegates to Middle not simply through the Rambler under which our
delegates refer you, but in other that they presumably might have
time to get up the case to be later considered commendably

with the actual present case.

I may say "in the connection" that Measure.Capre and
Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic managers, Messrs. Baird and Donner, and Mr. Donner's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, the chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, though their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin
Resolutions fall of their own motion inviting any agency necessary
Baring and Wilson declared two weeks ago, when the matter was an
exempted from an International meeting, to see that a formal
Mentioned at the earlier one was submitted to our Advisory
Board for presentation to the Board that the Advisory Board
concluded that Mr. and Wilson, but it was not at that time
proposed or sanctioned by the Board. Baring and Wilson declared that the
two cases sprang from the proposed conference, not from
which voices called on them to print it the matter there, so far
as advised we concluded.

May I suggest further, that if the conference is to have
another meeting it might go well to have the memorandum
more strictly adhered to. If the conference was to represent
on a case, as electoral, there were those, besides being two
noteworthy memoranda, M'leish's and Wilson's, Affiliations, Members,
Secretary's Hints, and Minutes of the Committee, proceedings, Mr. Mr.
Chairman, and in addition Mr. Meal, were given, issues connected to Morgan.

and Wilson's in the socialist case. As an Amendment, put
with the amendments, the opposition, under the instance, that not only to
form the other three sections, namely, Minneapolis, Chicago, and
be present and interpret. Of course there was no objection to
their presence on personnel grounds. If Minneapolis and Minneapolis
desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refuse to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1896, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, however, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, hold that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a special meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in
generate that the number of generations to intervene, Chicago will
efforts to continue; however, we must much better that the
generation of these species might be conducted in the
academic spirit as far as possible, and nothing bedaprocated
by the same permanent relations that have always existed
between the members of our faculty.

W. M. Neeley states that the present attention is to be
conceived of Michigan and Wisconsin taken to conclude the
session, some members on the committee, and many of our
members'statement that a settlement of the and immediate
when considering communities the contract of 1833, which
now are minor to Michigan. Then proceed to analyze with

Wish next for the settlement of these two cases and the
arrangement of the committee. The Chicago generation discussed
the lesson was a case, every part of it, and out one
vote. The opposition, take the same, however, concludes that if we
prove the view of the committee, the alternate course being
voted for the alternate course for the alternate. Our cabinet

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, the report of our cabinet in

affiliates, note how distant the present at our cabinet in

the case.
the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And if you and President Van Hise desire that a conference shall be called which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 grandstand case, concurrently with or in any relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I enclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it required supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
The conference was adjourned. I am therefore, the Board recommends
me to certificate the circumstances made by our referees that we
shall give notice of this decision to all other matters of
grudge or vengeance with the Board or other institution
apply see fit to tax for or in favor of our Board, neither now or in the
future. And if you any President when these cases that a
conference shall be called which april be empowered to consider
and settle the 1862 Expenditure case, concurrently with or in
any reference to the similar cases of 1866, we shall be glad to
send reference. We can only that we are familiarized perform
with information concern to the matters of the case.

In order that you may be fully apprised as to the position
that the universality of opinion fixes in the Iowa case, and
that the percentage of our own cases in the Iowa case, and
as to the position of this case in general, I enclose a copy of
a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the
conference. They have not been satisfied by conciliatory in this
work, and have given up the attempt of late to makes and submit the
partial or our position fully in thevance in order that it
might be as free as possible from technical demonstration of law or
prosecution. It is possible that if leading witness at our file
some points, but it is as complete in outline as our file
permitting.

Yours very truly,

W.R. Hunter
My Dear President Harper:

President Van Hise has evidently misunderstood Graduate Manager Downer in reference to Chicago's attitude in regard to a football date for it does not seem possible that Mr. Downer would misrepresent the situation to him since we have had a perfect understanding in regard to the matter, both through our correspondence, and also through personal talks which we had with one another on Wednesday, April 26th and Thursday, April 27th. I have written to Mr. Downer telling him of President Van Hise's misunderstanding and have asked him to straighten the matter out.

The present situation is as follows: Chicago has open dates on October 28th and November 4th. Wisconsin has open dates on October 21st and October 28th. Both schedules are in such condition that it is impossible to make any arrangement for any other date than October 28th and possibly October 21st. In my talk with Mr. Downer I told him that Chicago would be willing to play Wisconsin on October 21st if we could get Northwestern to change the date for the Chicago-Northwestern game to October 28th. Wisconsin prefers to play Chicago on October 28th, but I do not feel that our team would have a fair chance of winning the Wisconsin game if we played on that date, since in that event we should have games with Iowa on October 7th, Indiana on October 14th, Northwestern on October 21st, and Wisconsin on October 28th, which would make too hard a schedule for the team to stand. From the Chicago team's standpoint, the arrangement of playing Wisconsin on October 21st and Northwestern on October 28th, is also bad and under other
Dear President:

I understand from a recent conversation with Mr. President that you are planning to visit Chicago in October. I am writing to express my thoughts and concerns regarding your proposed visit.

I understand that you have been approached by several individuals who wish to meet with you during your stay in Chicago. While I fully support your efforts to engage with the community, I would like to express some concerns regarding the timing and scope of these meetings.

As you may be aware, our region is currently facing significant challenges related to education, healthcare, and economic development. I believe that these issues should be the primary focus of your visit.

In addition, I am concerned about the potential impact of your visit on the local economy. While I understand the importance of networking and building relationships, I believe that your time could be better spent addressing the needs of our community.

I would like to propose an alternative schedule that would allow you to meet with key stakeholders and community leaders while also providing an opportunity for the public to engage with you. I understand that you may have other commitments, but I believe that it is important to consider the needs of our community.

I would be happy to discuss this proposal further and to provide additional information. Please let me know if you would like to schedule a meeting.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
circumstances I would be unwilling to make even that arrangement since it is throwing a burden on the team which is harder than it ought to stand; but on account of Wisconsin's generous attitude in the bleacher controversy and for the sake of preserving the pleasant relations which we have always had with Wisconsin in foot ball, I have been willing to make the arrangement which I have suggested--of playing Wisconsin on October 21st provided Northwestern is willing to play the Chicago game on October 28th.

I wish to have myself and Chicago entirely cleared of any shadow of thought that we were unwilling to meet Wisconsin half way in the arrangement of a game next fall, because the facts do not bear out such suspicion.

On the 17th of December last I wrote to Charles Kilpatrick who has been manager of athletics at Wisconsin for several years, the following letter: "In case the bleacher controversy is satisfactorily settled would Wisconsin care to play Chicago on November 11th? If not, what date would you suggest for a game? Please address me Mount Clemmons, Mich."

I did not receive any reply to this letter and I presume it was never turned over to Manager Downer when he took up the work of manager of athletics at Wisconsin when Mr. Kilpatrick resigned. In the meantime Michigan and Wisconsin had arranged a date for November 18th, and on the 12th of November Chicago arranged a date with Northwestern for October 21st. At the beginning of the correspondence between Mr. Downer and myself late in March, Chicago had arranged only one date, namely, that with Northwestern--but of course it was commonly understood that the Michigan game would take place on Thanksgiving day. Otherwise I left an entirely
open schedule for arranging the Wisconsin date.

Sometime during the winter Wisconsin had arranged for the Minnesota game on November 4th, which was the date which I had anticipated Wisconsin and Chicago would probably play. Under what is considered the best arrangement of football schedules,—namely, to have a heavy game not oftener than every other week,—the arrangements for a Chicago-Wisconsin game were entirely blocked unless the game were played very early in October, because while Chicago had only arranged a game with Northwestern on October 21st and expected to arrange one with Michigan on Thanksgiving day, Wisconsin had already arranged games for November 4th with Minnesota and November 18th with Michigan. In the correspondence which has passed between Mr. Downer and myself the practical difficulty of adjusting the schedules has been strongly recognized and at first there seemed to be no possible adjustment, but on April 4th Mr. Downer made a suggestion of trying to get the Chicago-Northwestern game changed from October 21st to November 4th. This was satisfactory to us and an attempt was made to bring this about but we were not successful. Since then Mr. Downer has suggested that the Chicago-Wisconsin game be played on October 28th, and I made a counter suggestion that Chicago try to get the Chicago-Northwestern game changed to October 28th and the Wisconsin-Chicago game arranged for October 21st.

In the early part of this letter I have explained the reason why Chicago prefers this arrangement rather than the one which is suggested by Wisconsin, and it was understood between Mr. Downer and myself that he was to see the Northwestern management
open southeast for positioning the Wisco/Madison gate.

Sometimes cutting the Wisco/Madison and southwest for the

Wisconsin game on November 18th, which was the date which I had

suggested Wisconsin and Chicago would properly play.

Week 16 is considered the peak arrangement of football games.

Remember to have a break game not offered from every other week.

The arrangement for a Chicago/Wisconsin game was entirely produced.

Wisconsin was played very early in October, because White

Chicago had only strangely a game with Northwestern on October 1st.

and expected to arrange one with Michigan on Thanksgiving Day.

Wisconsin had strangely arranged games for November 18th with Minnesota

and November 18th with Michigan. The correspondence between Minnewa

and Wisconsin 18th with Michigan was considered the breakeven high

interest between ML Power and myself. It was felt that the arrangement a

arrangement for November 18th with Michigan was useless for the non-arrangement

arrangement for November 18th with Michigan. This was useless.

Since then ML Power was suggested that the

Wisconsin-Madison game be played on October 18th and I made a

counter suggestion that Chicago play to get the Wisconsin-Madison

arrangement for October 18th. The Wisconsin-Madison game

arranged for October 18th.

In the early part of this letter I have explained the

reason why Chicago preferred the arrangement letter shown the one

which is suggested by Wisconsin, and it was understood between

ML Power and myself that we saw to see the Northwestern arrangement.
and find out whether this adjustment were possible. Since returning from Philadelphia I have telephoned Mr. McCormack, coach of the Northwestern team and he seemed favorable to the change and advised me that he would have Manager Smith confer with me in regard to the matter. I have since written Manager Downer of Wisconsin telling him of my conversation with Mr. McCormack and again asked him whether Wisconsin would be willing to play Chicago on October 21st if Northwestern is willing to change to October 28th.

Trusting that such part of this letter as will satisfactorily explain matters to President Van Hise can be submitted to him, I am,

Sincerely,

A. A. Stagg.
and find out whether the treatment were possible. Since returning
the firm's representatives I have rephrased Mr. Macomber's answer to the
Northwestern term and have seemed favorable to the change and notified
me that the would have Manager Smith confer with me in regard to
the matter. I have since written Manager Doane of Wisconsin
setting him of my conversation with Mr. Macomber and asking him
what if Northwestern would be willing to play Chicago on October
1st if Northwestern is willing to change to October 28th.

Trusting that much more of the letter as well as the
section for further matters to President Van Hise can be submitted

to him I am

Sincerely

[Signature]
My dear President Harper:

I desire to present in writing form the subject which recently we discussed informally. My family obligations demand my consideration of that which formerly I considered of minor importance. I think that you know enough of my opportunities in earlier life to know that financial considerations have not guided my course. Perhaps you will recall the fact that when I came to the University, I had the opportunity of taking up a similar work at another university at a much larger salary. At different times in the history of my work here, I am confident that I could have secured positions at other universities at an increase of salary, but at no time have I sought for nor courted such opportunities. I do not hesitate to say that at all times I have been absolutely loyal to the University, standing behind the athletic work with my own salary for several years, and turning down several of opportunities for personal gain which my position makes possible.

My home obligations supported by my recent physical condition have led me to reflect upon the expectations of my work and the financial return, and I feel that I am justified in asking the University for a salary of $6000, part of which could very properly come from the Athletic Fund.
The reasons which I feel justify my request are that I am subjected to a nervous wear and tear out of proportion to the financial return, judged by the standard of reward for work which I am doing, to wit:

1. The character of any work is of itself extremely wearing, nervously and physically.
2. The special dealings and relations with the candidates for the players on the teams, with the students, the public and rival universities are, at the same time that they are often complex and delicate, quite trying.
3. The work of carrying on satisfying intercollegiate contests with limited material and the strictest of scholarship eligibility rules is burdensome.
4. The struggle to secure a fair proportion of athletic material from the high preparatory schools is a continuous moral as well as nervous strain.
5. The athletic part of my work is always in the scales and being tested, and more brittle one if he does not preserve a good balance.
6. The nature of my work is such that I can not get away from it, because there is a constant university and public pressure bearing down on me.

For several years there has rarely been an hour, day or night, during residence which I have devoted to personal enjoyment, and Mr. Stagg has worked many hundreds of hours helping me
without financial reward. The pressure is so great that I never feel free even during my vacation periods, and very few days pass when I do not do some special work for the University.

I feel that it is only fair to myself to recall the fact that in the organization and work of the Department of Physical Culture and Athletics, I have to do with the work which in all large universities falls to the lot of from three to five different men, and which in every case where the work is conducted on a broad plan, costs several thousand dollars more money.

I would not ask for this salary if the financial outlook for the future did not seem to be settled and sufficiently prosperous to provide amply for the payment of it and still leave a sufficient sum to meet the expenses of the Department and to provide for future growth.

I would respectfully ask that I may learn the decision by the University on this matter sometime before the first of August.

Sincerely,

A. Amos Alonzo Stagg.
Chicago

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the recent developments at the university. As a member of the faculty, I have observed a significant decline in the quality of teaching and research in recent years. The lack of resources and support has had a detrimental effect on the academic environment.

I urge the administration to take immediate action to address these issues. It is important that we maintain the high standards that have made our university a leader in its field.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. George Lytton,
The Hub,
Jackson Boulevard and State Street,
Chicago.

Dear Sir:-

Your favor of the 21st inst. to Dr. Harper is handed to me. I am trying to save the President from as much detail as possible and so take the liberty of replying without referring it to him.

Mr. Chitwood tells me that the applications for seats were so many that his office was quite overwhelmed in trying to answer them. They were checked up readily and seats assigned so that he felt safe in the delay. The particular seats which you requested he tells me he could not assign as letters were considered in the order in which they were received and many others preceded yours. He tried as far as he could to meet the wishes of applicants. I may add that Mr. Chitwood tells me that your previous letter was not written on your usual letter head paper and he was not aware that special consideration was due. I think the young
Mr. George Hyatt

The Hub

Jackson, Boulevan and State Streets,

Office

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the date here to P.R.

I regret to learn that the

President thinks as much as we do about the

case the interest of laying away without reference to

Mr. Outwood tells me that the application

for seats were not made from the office was due to

the office being in the process of moving to

the new offices. I feel sure that the office

will do everything that you desire it to do or can do not matter

what position we are in or where we are or where we are

He judge as well as we do to some measure of

expression. I mean what Mr. Outwood tells me

that your previous letter was not written on your

manuscript paper or such anything as it

appears communication was given. I think the money
man has done his best in the matter. There were numerous applications from people whom we should rejoice to accommodate but which came so late that there is no room for them. The seats sent you are in the best section. If any seats should be given up so that it will be possible to do better by you, I have asked Mr. Chitwood to bear it in mind.

The handling of seats by speculators is something which it has seemed impossible to prevent. They induce a great many people to buy tickets in bunches of two, three, and four and of course our clerks have no means of knowing that such purchases are intended for speculators. The whole thing is exceedingly annoying and I am sorry you have been inconvenienced.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Chandler
Secretary to the President.
Chicago, Nov. 21, 1905.

Dr. William R. Harper,
President, University of Chicago,

Dear Sir:

Kindly pardon my addressing the following to you. However, I believe the same should be brought to your notice.

More than two weeks ago I addressed a letter to Mr. Chitwood, of the University, asking that eight seats be reserved for me for the Thanksgiving football game. After waiting ten days and receiving no acknowledgment of my letter I phoned Mr. Chitwood's office and was informed they had been too busy to acknowledge my letter but had made reservations for me. The seats were not what I had asked for, but I accepted them and said I would forward my check at once, which I did yesterday.

In view of the fact that I asked for these seats two weeks in advance of the opening of the sale, it does seem strange that I was not able to procure a desirable location. Mr. Henry C. Lytton, my father, having donated quite liberally to the University, feels rather keenly the fact that he is not entitled to any consideration, all of which is due to the management of this sale of seats for the games.

There have been no two- or three-dollar seats on sale at all at Spaldings. Speculators are handling the seats openly in the city and the elevator boys in the Marquette Building are offering them for sale.
Dear Mr. Hubert,

I hope this letter finds you in good health and high spirits. I am writing to update you on the progress of our project at the University of Chicago, as well as to address some issues that have arisen.

Firstly, I would like to inform you that the new lab equipment has arrived and is being installed at the laboratory this week. However, I kindly request your assistance in addressing the following situation. However, I believe this is possible by having a phone or email conversation.

More than the recent issues, I would like to express a letter of thanks to all the staff members, especially those involved in the Transportation Department, for their support and dedication.

I also want to thank you for your assistance in getting the necessary permits for the project. The staff were very helpful and made the necessary arrangements for the project.

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my appreciation and gratitude for your support. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]
Chicago,

Harper, Wm. R.  11/21/1905.  - 2 -

I feel sure you will pardon me for troubling you at this time, and that you are not acquainted with the above facts.

Yours very truly,

George Lytton
Chicago, Nov. 25, 1905.

Dr. H. P. Judson,
University of Chicago,
City.

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 22d instant received today and I wish to express to you my thanks for your personal attention in the matter of which I wrote to Dr. Harper. My seats have arrived today and from what I learn I must be fortunate indeed. However, it seems difficult to realize that I was not able to obtain seats a little lower down (my wife being fearful of being as high up as the 20th row) when my letter was written on the 6th of this month. I shall start after seats for the next Thanksgiving game some time in the month of the coming July or August and fool some of these speculators.

Once again thanking you for your trouble, I remain

Very truly yours,

[Signature]