

and white to do so. To make an agreement with a club and then to break it for the sake of making one with another club, is considered by sportsmen to be a very mean trick. But the circumstances of this case make it still meaner. If Montreal had broken the contract before Nov. 7th, it would not have been so bad, and there might even be slight grounds for excuse if it were Osgoode Hall that had asked Montreal for a game instead of it being Montreal that had asked Osgoode Hall, or if an unforeseen event had prevented Montreal from getting together their full team. But there were no such palliating circumstances. On the contrary, the circumstances of the case make the act more disgraceful. Varsity had gone to considerable expense to fulfil their half of the agreement, and trusted to the gate on Thanksgiving refunding them for their outlay. After the match in Montreal, the Montrealers assured the Varsity captain that they would be in Ottawa on the 12th. Then instead of keeping their written and verbal promises, like true gentlemen, they held a "quiet meeting" and decided to arrange a match with Osgoode Hall and throw Ottawa University overboard. They wire Varsity to that effect on Nov. 10th, when the latter team had advertised the match. No excuse was given except that they were going to play Osgoode Hall and "sorry, writing." Failing to make arrangements with Osgoode, Montreal wired the following day that they would be on hand on Thanksgiving Day. They came, not because they were actuated by any desire of honorably fulfilling their contract, but because, as they said in their telegram, "Osgoode cannot play us." Talk about Ottawa Varsity ever wanting their own way in football matters, why, they are mere novices at the business compared with such a gentlemanly amateur organization as the Montreal Football Club. And the latter are very Shakespearian about it, to boot, ever ready and anxious to "leave honor out of the question." This way of doing business may be very successful for a while, but we are inclined to think that the club that has resort to such unsportsmanlike and dishonorable tactics will, in the long run, gain thereby but very little indeed. Here is what the *Ottawa Evening Journal* thinks of the matter:

"Montreal's crack football players were cutting a pretty sorry figure in their dealing with the Ottawa College team. We do not remember any instance in which amateurs professing to be gentlemen so calmly prepared to violate their spoken and written pledges."

However, Thanksgiving day saw the wearers of the red and black in Ottawa, and if Dr. Elder had been somewhat more of a mathematician,

Montreal would have been the defeated team by the referee's score, the reporters' and every other score. As it was, they were virtually defeated by nine to eight.

With regard to what was Montreal's score, there is no difference of opinion; with regard to what was Varsity's, there is. It is the referee vs. everyone else. The referee said that eight was the total number of points he allowed Varsity; everyone else says nine. The score for the first half was 5 to 5. In the second half the score at one time read 10 to 8, and the referee seeing it, took objection to the ten. Varsity scored four times in the second half. One of the points was claimed a safety, but the referee allowed a rouge only. The scorer had counted it as a safety, and hence a ten appeared on the board, when it should have been a nine. When the referee objected to the score, there was a discussion with regard to the disputed point. Finally, the ten was changed to nine, but it is probable that the referee through mistake deducted a point from his score also. Or it may have been that he omitted marking on his score one of the rouges he allowed. This latter may perhaps seem a rather poor explanation of the matter, but when anyone that saw the match remembers in what rapid succession the first three rouges were scored in the second half, he will see that it is not altogether improbable that the referee forgot to mark one of them. The figures on the board at the end of the match were 9 for Varsity and 8 for Montreal. When the referee blew his whistle for the last time, he left to catch the 5 o'clock train. The Varsity players on emerging from their dressing-room, learned that the referee on leaving had announced the score 8 to 8. He was telegraphed to that evening and his reply was a confirmation of the rumor. Those who saw the match, however, are convinced that the actual score was 9 to 8, and that the referee made a mistake. The *Montreal Gazette* of the following day claims that Montreal made a touch-down that was disallowed, but that should have been allowed, and that their score should have been 12 instead of 8. Whether or not the touch-down should have been allowed is matter of opinion. Moreover, what people think should have been allowed does not count in making up a football score. If it did, every spectator would have a score to suit his own peculiar taste. For instance, Troy in the first half kicked the ball into touch-in-goal. We think it should have been allowed, but it was not, and hence added nothing to Varsity's score. We do not ask for what we think should have been allowed us, but for those points only that were allowed by the referee when they were made, and which through forgetfulness