

with "heeling-out" allowed, it may be laid down as an established principle, that there must be no one between the centre scrum-mager and the quarter, else the quarter cannot get the ball with the same exactness and precision that he must needs get it, if he is to have a fair chance to play it. Hence the men must be on the wings.

Now then, the ball does not go out towards the sides of the scrum-mage. The wings do not expect it. Their sole endeavor is to keep the men opposite them from "getting-on" to their halves and quarter; and the men opposite to them strive to break through. With four men on one side of the scrum-mage and three on the other, standing opposite their opponents for an hour and a half, one side straining every muscle to break through, the other equally watchful and determined that this must be prevented, what can be expected but that nothing is further from their minds than to remember "that the spirit of the Grand Old Rugby Game must be preserved?" What I urge is this: That if a team was composed of twelve men—if the wings were reduced by three—thus leaving two on each side, those remaining are not so far away but that the ball is easily watched, and their attention will not be given solely to keeping the men opposite to them "on-side," and preventing them from "getting-on" to their halves. And so there will be less of this continual "scrapping" on the wings which so decidedly disfigures the game as played in 1890. It may be said that the wings will still "scrap" even with but twelve men a side; but even should there not be less proportionally there will still be less on the whole.

Minor reasons may be advanced for the reduction in the number of players; more running by the halves; fewer men for the referee to watch; less difficulty in discovering fouls; less expense in travelling; and so on. If the game can be made faster, cleaner, and more presentable and acceptable to the public, whose intelligent interest in the game it is surely worth while to gain, if for nothing else for the sake of the "gate" which popularity in any game insures.

Another question I ask is this: Is a referee capable of conducting a game satisfactorily single-handed? Can a single man watch the ball and the players? Experience has I think taught us that he certainly cannot. To be sure this has been denied. But I doubt if those who gainsay it have refereed close matches, and know from personal experience how difficult it is, to say the least, to watch the ball and to tell whether a man is "off-side" or is taking advantage of the numerous opportunities afforded for interfering unlawfully with an opponent. The system of an umpire and a referee has been in vogue in the United States for some time, and found to work satisfactorily.

The American rule reads as follows:

There shall be an umpire and a referee. The umpire shall be nominated by the executive; the referee shall be chosen by the captains of the opposing teams in each game. In case of a disagreement the choice shall be with the executive, whose decision shall be final.

(a) The umpire is the judge of the players, and his decision is final in regard to fouls and unfair tactics.

(b) The referee is judge for the ball and his decision is

final on points of play, though his construction of the rules may be appealed from to the executive.

(c) Both umpire and referee shall use whistles to indicate cessation of play on fouls, etc.

Who shall appoint the umpire and referee respectively is a subordinate question. Taking as the underlying principle that the umpire is judge for the players, and the referee is judge for the ball; and that in all cases in which the ball comes in question (as for instance when a player lies on the ball in a scrum-mage, or handles it in a scrum-mage) the referee alone shall decide; regulations might easily be framed that would prevent the conflict of opinion between umpire and referee, or even the necessity of their agreeing, for where ever the ball came into question the referee alone would decide.

Hoping that this will lead to an expression of opinion of the Queen's players, I remain,

Yours, etc.,

J. F. S.

### GEOGRAPHY ENTRANCE PAPER.

MR. EDITOR,—

In your issue of Jan. 22nd you severely criticize the geography paper submitted by the Department of Education for the recent entrance examination. You write "many of the questions were simply puzzles, and the majority of them do not deal with the subject in hand." I cannot agree with you in this statement. The paper to my mind was a fair resume of the three departments of geography, viz.: mathematical, political and physical. If the pupil is to learn the definition of township, county or city, why should he not learn the practical and political object of these divisions, and the functions of their chief officers? You would not say that to define latitude, longitude, or zone, was outside the domain of geography; then why should not the student learn the practical application of these lines as in ocean travel or in division of climate. It is surely not a puzzle to ask the natural and manufactured products of Ontario and her sister provinces, and yet, sir, you would be surprised to learn how few could answer such a question. You must certainly admit that to draw a map of North America, or to trace the course of a vessel from London to Australia, was not without the limits of geography, and yet these two questions, if correctly answered, were sufficient for a pass. The fact is that the teaching of geography in our primary schools consists in the learning by rote of the definitions of geographical lines, without any idea of their practical application, and in committing to memory the names of the various divisions of land and water without any continuity whatever. The difficulty of this paper lay in its being a departure from the ordinary stock questions, but a journal always foremost in educational reform should rather feel rejoiced at such a change. Teachers of experience to whom I have been speaking all agree that the questions were eminently fair and practical, and indeed valuable as indicating the lines along which geography should be taught. Personally, I was much pleased with the paper, as I think it will mark a new era in the teaching of this important subject.

Sincerely, yours,

E. RYAN.