

proposed to continue the game under protest, giving the point to Bucknell, and subsequently to refer the point to proper authority for decision. Bucknell refused. We refused to play under Bucknell foot-ball rules, as erratic as Bucknell courtesy exemplified by the *Mirror*. The game closed. The statement that we "were perfectly willing to sneak off without demanding any money for expenses," requires a slight explanation at our hands. It is a bald lie.

We asked for the \$20.00 promised in the letter above referred to. Their manager stated that they did not have the money;—he would pay us out of his own pocket if his present circumstances would allow. We agreed to release them from the claim, they absolving us from the \$20.00 guaranteed for the ensuing "return game" promised in the above letter, and again promising a "return game." All these matters of money for expenses" Bucknell will readily recall. But there are some other items of the same nature connected with our relations with them which they may not recall. If the business manager of the "Bucknell athletic" association will look over his several accounts he will find the following account with State College unsettled:

	BUCKNELL.	DR.	CR.
1886, May 6, To guarantee money on base-			
ball game, . . . . .	\$20 00		
By cash, . . . . .			\$14 50
1888, June 9, To guarantee money on base-			
ball-game, . . . . .	20 00		
To stage fare from Lemont			
to college and return, . . . . .	5 50		
By cash, . . . . .			20 00
1888, Oct. 27, To guarantee money on foot-			
ball-game, . . . . .	20 00		
	\$65 00		\$34 50
Balance due State College,			31 00
			\$65 50

The "challenge from Bucknell" is also before us under date of October 30. Mr. West wrote: "The team will not play you a game at State College. . . . However, we chal-

lenge you to play in a deciding game at Williamsport on the athletic grounds, if they can be obtained November 10, on the *following terms*: All traveling expenses of both teams, each consisting of not more than fourteen men, are to be paid, the rent of grounds and cost of advertising, and the surplus to be divided *equally* between the two teams. If there is *deficit*, it also to be sustained equally by each team;" (we italicize as Mr. West underscored). Where is the return game promised to be played on our own campus? Where is our \$20.00 guaranteed? We are asked to go to Williamsport, farther away and harder to reach than Lewisburg itself. We are asked to bear half the expenses. We are asked to forget our \$20.00. Moreover, in view of our experience with Bucknell "in money for expenses" and promises of a "return game," only God knows (perhaps Bucknell knows) whether they would have been at Williamsport to play, and whether we would have recovered any "money for expenses" at all from Bucknell without a civil suit. The base-ball matter referred to in the *Mirror* is a thing of the past, and we regard this fling at us only as blatant speech, calculated for nothing in particular, unless it be calculated to offend. However, since we are dealing once for all with this matter, we take the opportunity to say that our team was not in condition to play last season, because our ground was entirely destroyed in the erection of our new buildings, so that the team got scarcely any practice at all, and because our pitcher suddenly left us in the spring, thus leaving us without even a man in prospect until very late. Moreover, in the game at Lewisburg, the pitcher was in a state of health making him entirely unfit to pitch, and he went into the box only at dangerous risk to himself and under great disadvantage to our team. Again, Bucknell nine contained only five Bucknell men. The battery were not Bucknell men, and two others, making four in all, did not belong to the University. Bucknell nine never furnished a