from an open shot of McKinnon's, the sigh that went up was like a blast of the south wind. The bell for full time sounded with the score tied.

In the overtime period our men were in better shape. In the first five minutes they hovered continually around the McGill net, and had it not been for the remarkable work of the McGill defence, Woodyatt, Cassells and Moseley, would have pulled away from their opponents.

The score was still tied when the teams crossed over. In the second five minutes play continued around the McGill end, and it seemed only a question of time till we should score. Then Greg George took a shot on the net, the puck struck the bar behind Woodyatt, and then dropped behind. The goal judge held up his hand, and the game was won.

However that final goal has been disputed. The McGill men claimed that it was no goal, while both the goal judge and the referee say that it was. At the time of writing it seems pretty certain that McGill will protest the match, though chiefly with a view to getting a definite ruling on such a case.

There seems little chance that the protest will be sustained, for certainly the back bar is in the goal area, and the goal judge, a McGill man, was firm in his ruling that it was a score.

From now on, the cry will be 'make ready for Varsity.' On their showing here, McGill should win from Varsity in Montreal, and if we can but win in Toronto, we shall hold the championship for the third consecutive time. It is well worth working for.

As usual our defence was of the very first order. Basil George is about the best man in his position playing amateur hockey, and the other two are not far behind. The forwards all played good hockey. McKinnon, Box and Greg George are foxy stick-handlers, while Smith plays along, and never gives his man half a chance to score. The team is certainly well-balanced, and though light, shows about as good form as any in late years.

The team was:—Goal, Gilbert; point, B. George; cover, Trimble; rover, G. George; centre, Box; wings, McKinnon and Smith.

Basketball-McGill 30; Queen's 24.

By the law of compensation it was but right that McGill should win in basketball, and they did. However the law of compensation is not one which we wish to observe in such a case, and it was a sore disappointment. The men had been working hard and faithfully since the game in Montreal, and were pretty confident of winning.

On the night's play we might have won as well as McGill. The play was very close, and though McGill had somewhat the better of the play in the first half, our men were the better in the second period. One reason for their improved form was the enthusiastic cheering of the handful of supporters who turned out to see the game. As soon as the boys began to cheer there was a noticeable improvement in play.

It seems a pity that there were so few out to help the team along. The smallness of the number was emphasized when we remembered the number at