

The game was not at all rough, and was seldom delayed by accidents, Walsh and Kelly were sent to the side-line for a few minutes. Their offence was mixing it up. Lappen's language won for him a deserved rest during the closing moments of the game.

Dents. won the toss, but elected to play up-hill and against the wind. The scene of play changed frequently during the first ten minutes, but finally Lappen was caught with the ball near the Dental line and carried over for a safety. Score, 2-0. Dents. kicked out. The ball was returned, and for several minutes they were playing on the defensive. The Arts' halves worked a fast criss-cross, and McAllister ran diagonally to within a yard or two of the Dental line. Arts bucked for a try. Score, 6-0. The Dentsals now played with greater vim, and time and again Arts came within an ace of being scored upon. Several Dental punts went over the line, and were quickly returned. Finally Elliott kicked into touch-in-goal. Score, 6-1. The ball went in mid-field, when time was called.

Dents. scored first in the second half. They forced the play from the start, and received as their reward a touch-in-goal. Score, 6-2. McKay kicked out, but the ball returned to Arts' territory. A series of runs and tandem plays worked out towards the Dental line, and in a mix-up Arts scored another safety. Score, 8-2. The play now tended to become closer. Both teams endeavored to hold the ball and make their yards by bucking, or running around the end. The ball travelled nearer and nearer to the Arts' line. McKay and Rathbun tried hard to save the situation, but failed. Dents. stole the ball, and Lappen ran several yards for a touch-down. Score, 8-6.

Dents. died hard, and when the whistle sounded the garnet and bleu was once again nearing the Arts' line. The Dentsals' team was:

Back, Carruth; halves, Elliott, Lappen, McDonald, quarter, Kenny; centre, Kelly; wings, Reid, Watson, New, Steele, Hamilton, Brown.

The names for the shield are: Back, Ballard (captain); halves, McAllister, McKay, Rathbun; quarter, Montague; wings, Walsh, Overend, Hoar, Dunlop, Read, O'Leary, Cooke.

Referee—Beattie. Umpire—Fleck.

SORT OF INCONSISTENT.

Below will be found some extracts from the last issue of the *Queen's University Journal*, which is published once a month in the city of many stripes. Under the head of "Editorials" is a rather mild criticism of our idea that Queen's didn't get the worst of the refereeing in their game up here with our senior team. It will be noticed that the article fairly teems with such phrases, "true sportsmanship," "referee's competence," "honesty," "criticism within proper bounds," etc.:

"The report given in THE VARSITY of the game at Toronto between Varsity I. and Queen's I. has the following: 'The Kingston team received the most encouragement from the officials.' We are sorry to see those words in the paper. To charge a referee with partiality is a serious affair, especially in the Inter-Collegiate League, which is supposed to stand for *true sportsmanship*; and such a charge should be voiced in a University paper only in a well established case of flagrant dishonesty. The referee's judgment and his competence

to act may frequently be called into question. And, indeed, when the game is going hard against us, we are quick to notice any omissions that may be disadvantageous to us, though we generally fail to notice the omissions when the disadvantage is on the other side. It is, however, a more serious affair to charge a referee with partiality. He may be partial, but the chances are that he is not, and we should give him the benefit of the doubt. Indeed, the only way to keep up the standard of our Inter-Collegiate League is to impute honesty of motive to all concerned. Let us go on the field relying upon the referee's *honesty*, and we will seldom be disappointed. But if the game should go against us and the referee's decisions seem adverse, let us always keep our *criticism within proper bounds*, and above all let us prevent any such serious charge against the representative of a sister University from entering the columns of our papers."

Evidently, however, the same man doesn't write "Athletics," for in the *Journal's* account of the above-mentioned matter we get this:

"While Queen's lost the game, nevertheless for three-quarters of the time they were complete masters of the situation at every point. However, during the last five minutes of play varsity was able to overcome Queen's lead and win out. But, even admitting that Varsity won the game, it was clearly shown, on reliable authority, that at least half the points they scored were made after time was really up. One of the timekeepers, however, a recent graduate in medicine of Toronto University, made the victory more secure by allowing the match to be played about ten minutes overtime. Such conduct as this cannot be excused, even from a partisan point of view, and it is to be hoped that in future none but reliable men will be appointed to this important office in I. C. R. F. U. matches."

And also this:

"The referee acted in a very impartial manner, and awarded penalties with strict justice. The umpire was, however, hardly strict enough at times. In scrimmaging near Varsity's line Quarter-back Pannell was so surrounded that he was unable to turn in any direction, yet the umpire, although his attention was repeatedly called to it, seemed blind to the fact."

Then in the *Journal's* account of the return match in Kingston, is found this bright little bit of "criticism within fair bounds":

"Then a strange thing happened—a Varsity man picked up the ball and ran over Queen's line, and the referee awarded a try. Such a decision has never been equalled in the annals of Canadian football. That a try made after the whistle had blown and after the players had stopped playing, should be allowed by any referee, is something new in the history of football, at least at Queen's. Such was the decision of Referee Moirson, and this decision tied the game."

Now, here at the Provincial University we may be sore when we lose a game, but we don't say much, and we generally manage to get even on the gridiron, instead of slinging ink. We have the same opinion as the *Journal* regarding "true sportsmanship," "criticism within fair bounds," etc. Moreover, we don't prove ourselves to be so inconsistent in the same issue of the University weekly. Our modest little bit of criticism on a referee, as compared with the *Journal's* uncalled-for attack, is something of the ant and the elephant type. There is no doubt that the heads of the Queen's city sports are sore.