

were omitted in the final addition. If the score be reckoned from this standpoint, it will readily be seen that the claim that Montreal's score should have been 12 instead of 8, is an entirely groundless one.

The game must have been a surprise to everyone, but especially to the Montrealers. Five days after Montreal had defeated Varsity, by playing a dribbling game, the latter take hold of that same dribble and manage better than the Montrealers themselves. The dribbling game worked well in Montreal, but its term of effectiveness, and consequently of usefulness, at least in playing against Ottawa University, expired on the evening of Saturday, Nov. 7th. The garnet and grey jerseys were determined to stop that dribble, and they stopped it, and not only stopped it but turned it back in the direction whence it came. That was what puzzled Montreal. The visitors' whole strength was in the dribble. Our players knew that, so they prevented Montreal from dribbling, dribbled somewhat themselves, and moreover played the open game as much as possible. Some of the newspapers made the remark that there was very little heeling out. That can be accounted for to a certain degree when it is remembered that the referee objected to heeling out. He evidently was a little bit rusty in the rules. For hard, fast and scientific play seldom, if ever, has a better football match been played in Canada. No time was lost in lining up or in forming scrimmages. The backs had no time to "fool" with the ball or to make any brilliant play. The wings would not tolerate any such useless performances. (Quickness, sureness and accuracy were required to do one's duty, and whenever any player failed to display these qualities, his side lost thereby considerable territory. For Montreal, Fry and J. Campbell at half and R. Campbell and Bell in the scrimmage, did excellent work. On the Varsity side, Troy, McCarthy and Guillet were conspicuous in stopping the dribbling, and every man of the remaining twelve played harder and better than at any time this season. The forwards were in such condition that the more they worked, the fresher they seemed to be. The backs made no errors, but, on the contrary, were equal to every emergency, and the wings, especially Murphy, travelled with electric speed from the forward line to the Montreal halves, whenever circumstances necessitated such a performance. With three exceptions the teams were the same as in Montreal on the previous Saturday. Louson replaced Mitchell on Montreal's wing and on Varsity's wing Tetreau replaced Troy, who played quarter instead of Gaudet, as the latter's leg was injured in the previous match. Newman's ear was some-

what better, and he took his place in the forward line. The gentlemen who assisted Dr. Elder in seeing to the observance of the rules were: Touch judges, J. L. Walker, McGill; T. L. Patton, M.A.A.A. Goal judges, J. McDougal and J. P. Crerar, Ottawa F.B.C. Following is a brief synopsis of the play.

Game starts at about 2.45 and three minutes later Montreal forces Varsity to rouge. First point for the visitors. Varsity braces up and rushes the play. Twenty minutes after the opening they score a touch down, but fail to kick a goal. Montreal 1, Varsity 4. The ball is hardly in motion again when Claxton is hurt and a substitute takes his place. Then Fairbanks and Vincent forget what they are about and the referee tells them they may retire till the second half. Shortly after, Louson foully assaults McDougal and the latter retaliates, and is sent to the fence, whilst Louson who was the real offender is allowed to continue playing. The referee admits having seen Louson commit the foul, but contends that complaint to him and not retaliation on Louson, was the course McDougal should have adopted. Yet that is no reason why Louson should not have been ruled off also. However, Varsity did well the remainder of the half, playing thirteen men to fourteen, but of course it was a great advantage to Montreal to have a man uncovered on the wing. They soon made a touch-down but did not convert it into a goal. Montreal 5, Varsity 4. A rouge for Varsity makes it five in all, and completes the scoring in the first half. After ten minutes' rest play was resumed and for the greater part of the second half, the "guerillas" had by far the best of the play. They made one costly error, however. They scored those first couple of rouges in too quick order for the referee to count them. Play was in Montreal territory for the greater part of the half. As a result Montreal was forced to rouge. Montreal 5, Varsity 6.

In less time than it takes to tell it, the performance was repeated. Montreal 5, Varsity 7. Then the men in red and black had their turn, and Varsity had to rouge. Montreal 6, Varsity 7. Again the tables are turned and the next point made is a rouge by Varsity, and the score is 8 to 6 in favor of the home team. After a little more play, the ball is again behind the visitors' goal posts. There is a dispute as to whether it is a rouge or a safety-touch, but the score board reads 10-6 in favor of Varsity.

Montreal then makes two more points, and the board indicates Montreal 8, Varsity 10. Then only is it that the referee notices the score and objects to it and Montreal argues that the score should be nine instead of ten. No more scoring