

# THE FIRST CHAMPION OF CHAMPIONS

Mr. John Solomon plays with a mallet specially made by **JAQUES** to his own design. This same lightweight Lignum Vitae Mallet is available to all Croquet players and details of this and other Mallets are obtainable free on request from **JAQUES** makers of individual Mallets for over 100 years.



COMPLETE SETS or single items of Croquet equipment for **TOURNAMENT, CLUB or GARDEN** play from all good sports shops and stores. Illustrated Catalogue from **JOHN JAQUES & SON LTD.**

**Jaques**  
AND SON LTD.

Thornton Heath, Surrey. CR4 8XP

## THE ECLIPSE CHAMPIONSHIP BALL

GUARANTEED 3 YEARS

# CROQUET

THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE CROQUET ASSOCIATION

PRICE 3s.

Number 100

June 1968

### TEST FUND APPEAL

CROCKHAM HOUSE,  
WESTERHAM,  
KENT.

In the April issue of "Croquet" the President of the Croquet Association told us of the arrangements for the Croquet Test Matches in Australia and suggested that an appeal for a "Freewill Offering" will be made to ensure that the best team available will be able to travel to Australia to defend the MacRobertson Trophy.

I have now been asked to make this appeal, and most people put in this position apologise for having to do so, but I am only too pleased as I so much enjoy Croquet and I want to do all I can to encourage our splendid game and am full of hopes for a great response to my appeal.

Our aim must be at all costs to send the best team, and at "all costs" means some cost to you and me.

Can every member who reads this be so very good as to send me a subscription to the above address, very small or very large, and I will make sure that our Council will make good use of it to uphold the prestige of British Croquet and encourage friendly and sporting relationship between ourselves, Australia and New Zealand.

GERALD WILLIAMS.

**JAQUES EQUIPMENT, WHEREVER CROQUET IS PLAYED**

## Calendar Fixtures 1968

June	8 - 15	Carrickmines—Championship of Ireland
"	10 - 15	Challenge & Gilbey
"	14 - 16	Nottingham (Week-end)
"	17 - 22	Compton
"	21 - 24	Woking
"	24 - 29	Parkstone
July	1 - 6	Budleigh Salterton (non-official)
"	8 - 13	Budleigh Salterton
"	15 - 20	Men's & Women's Championships—Roehampton
"	22 - 27	Open Championships—Hurlingham
"	29 - 3	Colchester
"	29 - 3	Cheltenham
Aug.	5 - 14	Hurlingham
"	16 - 18	Cheltenham (American non-official)
"	17 - 24	Carrickmines—Championship of Co. Dublin
"	19 - 24	Nottingham
"	26 - 31	Southwick
"	30 - 2	Colchester (Week-end)
Sept.	2 - 7	Southwick (non-official)
"	2 - 7	Hunstanton
"	9 - 13	President's Cup—Hurlingham
"	9 - 13	Chairman's Salver—Nottingham
"	9 - 13	Surrey Cup—Cheltenham
"	9 - 13	Ladies' Invitation Event
"	16 - 21	Parkstone
"	(Date not confirmed)	All England Finals
"	20 - 22	Cheltenham (American non-official)
"	23 - 28	Roehampton
"	30 -	Devonshire Park
Oct.	12	1st week: September 30th—October 5th 2nd week: October 7th—October 12th
"	18 - 20	Cheltenham (American non-official)

Know the Game

# CROQUET

Published in collaboration with

THE CROQUET ASSOCIATION

by Dr. G. L. Ormerod

A complete, fully illustrated guide to the game in pocket book form, covering the Lawn, personal equipment, contestants, object of the game, style and stance, strokes and terms, Laws, the game, etc.

**3s. 6d.**

from your local bookshop or sports dealer  
or direct from

**Educational Productions Ltd.**

East Ardsley, Wakefield, Yorkshire

## C.A. Notes

The year is nearly half gone and there are still a lot of subscriptions—which were due January 1st—**not paid!** I think everyone will agree this is really pretty bad.

Associates' attention is drawn to the ruling on Handicaps. After playing in a Tournament if your handicap is to be changed you are told by the Manager what your new handicap is to be—you play at this handicap unless you are told otherwise by the Handicapping Committee—and eventually you will see the confirmation of it in the magazine.

If any qualified person approved by the Council is interested in going to Australia in the winter for several months as a coach, please communicate with this office. The scheme is being sponsored by Rothman's (Australia) and gives (1) total contribution of travelling expenses only of coach or instructor, no remuneration; (2) supply of audio-visual producer and associated training films.

An up-to-date Law Book (2nd Edition) is now on sale—3/6, and 2/6 for Associates. This will be in force for two years and was published at the instigation of some 20 members who generously subscribed towards the cost. The C.A. is most grateful to them. The proof of the need for this book is that the first 600 copies are almost sold out and more are on order, so there may be some delay in fulfilling requests.

An abridged Handbook of names and addresses is also on sale now, price 6/-. A few printer's errors have already come to light.

- (1) Rev. Canon Creed Meredith's address is 9, **Kingsbridge** Road (not Knightsbridge).
- (2) T. F. H. Jessell, 6, Eyot Lodge, Cross Deep, Twickenham.
- (3) Mrs. V. C. Gasson's telephone No. should read: 01-788 3918 (not 778).

Will managers and secretaries of Tournaments please be most careful to see results, handicaps and reports are written **very** clearly so the printer can read them. It is quite impossible to get them typed. The report should come with results and the handbook returned very promptly. For American Tournaments only the winners of blocks and the play-offs should be given. The magazine is limited to 12 pages and it is important to save space.

In this office there are entry forms for courses in Croquet arranged by the C.C.P.R. for beginners.

1. At Edgbaston Croquet Club, Richmond Hill Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham:  
Wednesdays—June 5th, 12th, 19th and 26th.  
July 3rd and 10th.  
7-8 p.m., 8-9 p.m. practice. Coach: F. R. Meacham.
2. Leamington Spa L.T. and Croquet Club, Guy's Cliff Avenue, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire.  
Thursdays—June 6th, 13th, 20th and 27th.  
July 4th and 11th.  
7-8 p.m., 8-9 p.m. practice. Coaches: Mr. and Mrs. Lewty.
3. Stourbridge: Mary Stevens Park, Norton Road, Stourbridge.  
Wednesdays—June 5th, 12th, 19th and 26th.  
July 3rd and 10th.  
7-9 p.m. Coach: M. Burgess.

As the office has been without an assistant since mid-December it is hoped all C.A. Associates will realise delays, etc., are inevitable.

### NEW ASSOCIATES

Mrs. W. J. Millie	4 Medway Road, Ipswich.
C. R. Palmer	70 Bucklesham Road, Ipswich.
Miss E. I. Wood	65 Gleneagles Drive, Ipswich.
Mrs. H. A. Zion	8 St. Andrew's Close, Ipswich.
Mrs. P. H. Mann	The Old Rectory, Upton Newet, Reading, Berks.
Michael Stride	15 Botteville Road, Acock's Green, Birmingham, 27.
Mrs. I. Stride	18 Ranelagh Avenue, S.W.6.
Mrs. H. B. H. Carlisle	c/o Rev. A. Oliver, The Rectory, Jervis Brook, Crowborough, Sussex.
Col. & Mrs. E. D. Tims	11 St. Leonard's Avenue, Kenton, Middx.
K. S. Schofield	23 Repton Road, West Bridgford, Notts.
Mrs. C. Chamberlain	4 Mead Road, Cheltenham.
P. W. Hands	Carrick, Frensham Vale, Farnham.
Miss N. J. Hill	

### Change of Address

Mrs. E. M. Lightfoot 21 Trevor Place, S.W.7. Tel. 584-8001.

### HANDICAPS—Compton recommendations

W. H. Austin 1 to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . H. J. Devitt 9 to 8.

# NOTES by ROVER

## AMERICAN TOURNAMENTS

The President's Cup and other such events are played along the lines of an American Tournament. In the event of a tie on games, there is naturally provision for a play-off. This is quite impractical in the countless American Tournaments which are now played during the Croquet Season. What then is the appropriate method of ascertaining the winner? Should it be the player who has scored the greatest number of points? Only a handful of players could subscribe to this method. There is an overwhelming majority in favour of counting games first and only resorting to points when two or more players are equal on games. This is not the end of the problem. Let it be assumed that the competitors are playing in blocks of five and that two competitors have each won three games and lost one. An unusual method of deciding the winner would be to give first place to the winner of the match in which they met each other. This might well be used as an ultimate decisive factor when two players are equal on points as well as games. So far as this Rover knows, the issue is always decided on points, but there are three ways of doing this. The first is to total the gross points scored by the players concerned. If the results of the matches are entered as gross scores, that is, 26 against the winner and 10 against the loser as the case may be, that then seems the easy way to do it. But is this fair? In the example given above, the issue would be decided by the result of one game only, namely, the game which each player happened to lose. This disregards completely the comparative supremacy established by the players in their three winning games. One might just as logically disregard the losing game and nominate as the winner the player who had conceded the fewer number of points in the three winning games. There is a practical objection to this. There is no simple method of keeping a running score which is easy to read. Surely the more logical method is to nominate as the winner the player whose net score is the greatest and that is done by first totalling the gross score and then deducting the points scored against such player. This is very simply done by entering the scores for game as +10 or -10 as the case may be. This makes the score of all the games relevant and this is in the spirit of an American Tournament. The next question is what do the Official Regulations say about all this? The answer is "Nothing". This is a sorry state of affairs. As that is the case, the condition of the Tournament or the Event must make express provision for such a contingency. There were four American Tournaments advertised in the last issue of "Croquet" and all were silent on this matter, but no doubt the managements will have addressed their minds to the problem before play starts. In addition, Budleigh Salterton advertised that there would be such an event in both their weekly tournaments. Rather optimistically their advertisement concludes with the following words: "The Laws, Rules, etc., of the C.A. shall apply." Surely the Regulations must be amended to deal with this problem even if a discretion is allowed to managements to adopt a gross point count or a net point count; but if this discretion is given to managements, the Regulations should go on to state that the one or the other method shall apply in the event of the condition of the event being silent thereon. Further, the Regulations should provide for the contingency that two players may be equal both on games and points and this Rover Note has already given a possible solution.

## CONDITIONS OF THE MACROBERTSON TROPHY

This Rover has been sorely disappointed at the interest displayed in the Conditions for the MacRobertson Trophy, and this lack of interest possibly explains why the conditions are what they are. This Rover has approached several responsible Associates and made the following comment: "It seems utterly wrong to me that England, the holders, may win their series of test matches against Australia by two tests to one and also win their series against New Zealand by two tests to one and yet lose the trophy." Sometimes the reaction has been a straightforward disbelief that this is so. Most Associates had not taken the trouble to read Clause 7 of the Conditions, and no one of those who had read the Conditions realised that this could be the result. Three series of Test Matches have to be played and each side competes in two of the three series. There are only two possible results. The first is that one side will win both its series, another will lose both its series and the third side will win one and lose the other. The only other possible result is that each side will win one series and lose the other. But Clause 7 pays no attention to the winning or the losing of a series. The count is on the aggregate or Test Matches won. In all nine Test Matches have to be played, and the only method by which there can be a tie between two sides on Test Matches is if the score is 4, 4, 1. The only way this can be achieved is if one side wins both the series 2-1 and the other side loses one series 1-2 and wins the other series

3-0. Then there would be a play-off. Who can justify this? Clause 7 is silent about what should happen when three sides have each won one series, because it disregards series altogether. It is also silent as to what should happen when each side has won three of the nine Test Matches, which is the only way in which a triple tie could result under the conditions of Clause 7. Does one have to go back to Clause 6 to find out what happens in the event of a triple tie on Test Matches? If so, Clause 6 contradicts Clause 7. If one applies Clause 6 when the result was a tie between two sides, i.e., 4, 4, 1, there would not be a play-off as directed under Clause 7 but the winning side would be the one who had won the greatest number of games, etc., finally descending into a points count. Surely in the event of a three-cornered contest, such as we are about to play, Clause 7 should be amended to make adequate provision for this. This Rover suggests that Clause 7 should be amended along the following lines.

"If there are three nations competing, each nation shall play a series of three Test Matches against each of the other two nations. The winner in the first instance shall be the nation which wins both its series against the other two nations. But in the event of each nation winning one series and losing the other, there shall be a play-off conducted as follows. The two challenging nations shall play a Test Match against each other consisting of two single and one doubles to be played contemporaneously (or at least involving four players) and the winning nation shall then play a similar match against the holders."

The programmes for the tour should provide provisional arrangements for such a play-off. If the same venue were used this should add only two or three days to the completion of the series—certainly no more time than is involved under the present conditions of Clause 7.

The next problem is to avoid the possibility of a draw in a Test Match, thus saving the necessity to count games or points as envisaged by Clause 6 of the Conditions. This is very simple. Under the present conditions a draw can only result when a team consists of four players and the Test Match is composed of six rubbers, four singles and two doubles. If the opposing sides are at all equal in strength a draw will frequently be the result as history shows. Can one think of a more unsatisfactory result when the winning side has lost one Test Match on rubbers, drawn the other two Test Matches on rubbers and games but has won the other two Test Matches on points? It would be very simple to provide that when the sides are composed of four players and they are three rubbers all at the end of the six rubbers there shall be an extra day's play with two singles and one doubles to bring the total to nine rubbers, the exact number played when teams of six are competing.

## Venue and Frequency of Challenger.

There is no doubt that some fresh thinking is necessary on the above two matters. Surely the first thing to do is to realise that the only nations which have competed for the Trophy and the only nations who are likely to compete for the Trophy in the foreseeable future are England, Australia and New Zealand. The next thing to realise is that there never has been a three-cornered contest in England and there is never likely to be one. Both Australia and New Zealand have at times held the Trophy, but there has never been a two-cornered contest played between them throughout the life of the event. Is it likely then that either nation will wish to travel to England to play the other? In all, Australia has travelled to England on two occasions, both pre-war. New Zealand has travelled to England only once and were not willing to travel in 1969 in spite of the fact that this would be 12 years since their last visit. If there was to be a three-cornered contest in England, 1969 was the appropriate occasion. If the contests are to be kept alive, there should be some sort of agreement as to the frequency of the contests. At the moment a nation can challenge at any time, and prima facie expect the holder to travel to the country of the challenger—or, if not, forfeit the trophy. It is recognised that it takes years of preparation to organise a world tour, but this fact is not recognised in the present Conditions. Surely this is the moment to agree that Statutory challenges should take place every six years and that the next contest should be in England in 1975. Who should travel to England? If England are the holders it should be Australia, for New Zealand made the last trip. If England is not the holder it should be the duty of the holders to travel to England, and this is the moment to reach this agreement. Obviously the 1981 series should be played in New Zealand, and both England and Australia should agree to travel to New Zealand. Maybe this will be impossible. No one can force them to do so, but if any nation fails to fulfil its responsibilities it must forfeit the Trophy and drop out of the contests unless the other two nations agree to accept the

defaulters back. It is a moral certainty that they would so agree but it is equally unlikely that the other two nations would agree to visit the country of the challenging nation in the next series.

### CROQUET NOTICE BOARD

Kipling's Elephant Child and Croquet enthusiasts have one feature in common, this is their "satiated curiosity" about the activities in their microcosmic world.

How can this be satisfied and at the same time save our hard-worked Secretary from coping with endless questions? The answer may well be a notice board which could be fixed outside the C.A. Office. On this could be pinned the lists of those fortunate players chosen to compete in the Eights, marked to show whether they had accepted or refused.

The Test Team is a case in point; discussions on the merit of players likely to be considered will be numerous this year and the decision eagerly awaited.

Should the office of President and Hon. Treasurer fall vacant after the 15th March preceding the A.G.M., under our Constitution this has to be published in "The Times" as soon as possible. It might well be amended to read "exhibited on the Notice Board".

Here too could be shown the names of candidates nominated for the Council, with the number of vacancies available, so that any candidate not willing to force a ballot could withdraw. Since the publication of the last magazine, wherein it was stated that there were three vacancies—and presumably this means three vacancies on the assumption that the standing members were re-elected—there has been a further vacancy, making four in all. Should not the Associates know about this and should there not be a notice board so to inform them?

Associates should not have to wait for the publication of "Croquet", which may appear a month or more after a decision has been taken by Council.

### SHOOTING FOR CORNERS

A ball which has been sent to a corner must eventually leave it, and it often does this by being rushed out of the corner or by means of a corner cannon. In either case the exact position of the ball can be of vital importance. The fact of a ball being only one inch off a corner spot can also make a good deal of difference to the target presented as the result of a subsequent shot at the ball missing and the ball being replaced in contact with or in close proximity to it.

However, it is common practice when a player's final shot has hit a corner peg for him to replace his ball on the corner spot. It may surprise readers to learn that more often than not the ball should in fact be replaced somewhat away from the spot. The distance involved amounts at times to only a fraction of an inch and is insignificant, but at others it is considerable. Thus a shot from the first hoop to the second corner which hits the near corner peg right in the middle should be replaced more than a foot short of the corner spot, and a similar one from the fifth hoop and one from the second hoop grazing the outer edge of the peg should both be replaced too far out to be in contact with a corner ball. These calculations assume what is rarely true: that the corner pegs are accurately in position!

Every now and then the exact position of a ball near a corner has a devastating effect on the game, but this will only emerge some time after that ball has been replaced. So when replacing a corner ball it is worth checking the pegs and determining where the ball really went off—it may be important!

Footnote: This Rover has on two occasions seen first-class players shoot actually outside a corner peg, only to put the ball on the corner spot. On one of these occasions it was to the player's own disadvantage!

### LONGMAN CLUB TEAM CUP 1968 DRAW

AREA 1.  
Ellesmere  
v.  
Bowden  
.....  
v.  
Edgbaston

AREA 2.  
Cambridge  
v.  
Colchester  
Hunstanton  
v.  
Wrest Park

AREA 3.  
Oxford  
v.  
Budleigh Salterton

Two

AREA 4.  
Parsons Green  
v.  
Woking

Roehampton  
v.  
Worton Hall  
v.  
Hurlingham

AREA 5.  
Southwick  
v.  
Compton

.....  
v.  
Ryde

1st Round in AREA 4 to be played by May 30th.

1st Rounds in AREAS 1, 2 and 5, and 2nd round in AREA 4 to be played by June 21st.

Results of Area Winners must be at the Croquet Association Office by Tuesday, July 12th. Immediately after this date further arrangements will be sent to Clubs.

### OBITUARIES

#### DR. PENNY

The death of Dr. Penny on March 4th will bring great sorrow to his many friends here and in Australia. He was taken ill in August and had borne his failing health this winter with great courage. He was very keen on all games and in his younger days played tennis 13 times for South Australia in inter-State matches, in fact he only started croquet when his tennis was curtailed by an appendix operation in 1925, by playing on a private court under electric light and soon after at a club in Adelaide, where he was given a handicap of three.

Almost at once he entered for the South Australia open championships, which he won, playing twice a week for eight weeks. On coming to live in England he played in the Roehampton and other tournaments with a handicap of 1½ and had many successes.

In 1945 Dr. Penny won the Unofficial President's Cup and was also invited to play in it after the war four times. He was three times runner-up in the Open Championships, losing in turn to Mr. Hamilton Miller, Mr. Cotter and Mr. Ross; he also won the Open Tournament at Buxton several times and in recent years was runner-up in the All England, losing to John Bolton whom he had helped a year or two before. His final success was to win the Open Event at Parkstone in September, 1966.

Dr. Penny will always be remembered for his kindness and the willing help he gave to all and sundry. He was a Croquet Enthusiast and loved teaching the game; he will be missed greatly.

#### M. SPENCER-ELL

The C.A. and Roehampton Club in particular has lost a very dear and valued friend by the sad death of Mr. Spencer-Ell on March 8th, after a very trying illness. Montie, as he was known to all his friends, was a wonderful person, always cheerful, kind and generous in every way. It was really wonderful that he could play his beloved Croquet with such a terrible handicap, and a very good player on his day. He won the Peels in 1928 and after a lapse of some years returned to the game and in 1958 won the Roehampton Challenge Cup and was invited to compete for the Surrey Cup every year from 1955 to 1959, and on two occasions finished second.

After leaving Radley in 1909 with a distinguished record—a member of the Eight and also a first soccer XI—he qualified as a chartered accountant. He enlisted in the Army at the outbreak of war, was commissioned as a 2nd lieutenant and posted to the Queen's Own Royal Kent Regiment. On September 26th, 1915, he took part in the Battle of Loos, when his battalion lost 26 officers and 750 men wounded and missing in one day's fighting. Seriously wounded himself, Montie was taken prisoner by the Germans, and while in captivity it became necessary to amputate both his arms. Later he was exchanged and went to Switzerland before returning to England.

He then began to live the life which was such a shining example of how to achieve so much although so severely handicapped. He started on his own as a chartered accountant in Henley, a place for him of such happy memories; and he and his devoted wife, Irene, whom he had married during five days of embarkation leave before going to France, lived there for over 50 years.

No person was more universally loved and admired. He was the perfect example of one who "let nothing him dismay".

D. A. L. and R. W. G. M. W.

#### WALTER BELL FRANKLIN

All Croquet players who knew him must have been shocked to learn of the sudden death of Walter Franklin on the 5th March this year. He appeared to be in good health and all set for another season's Croquet.

His death occurred whilst he was "in-play" during a game. Although in recent years Walter Franklin had become a well-known figure and a much-liked one on the courts of Hurlingham and Roehampton, and also of Budleigh Salterton, Colchester and Hunstanton, his main fame as a games-player was, of course, as a cricketer. For some 30 years he was Captain of the Buckinghamshire County XI, and during that time he led them to the Minor Championship on no less than five occasions. He was still their President at the time of his death, as was he also the Minor Counties Representative on the M.C.C. Advisory Committee. He was, as many have said, the best amateur wicket-keeper to have played in English first-class cricket, and he played as such for the M.C.C. against the Australians in this country.

Many were his other activities: an outstanding barrister in his time; a past Master of the Company of Haberdashers; a talented artist in oils, and devoted to, music.

Above all, the master of a most happy and devoted family and home in East Suffolk, to the local councils of which county he gave much of his time and energy. A wise and sympathetic counsellor to many persons, great and small, in his neighbourhood.

He was not happy with other than "perfection" as a standard, and he looked for this in others as well as in himself.

He is greatly missed, and I feel sure that the sympathies of all members of the Croquet Association may here be extended to his widow and son and daughter.

One last word to those who would remember him: think of him always as "striving for perfection".

A. F. G. F.

#### AIMEE RECKITT

The passing of Aimee Reckitt robs our Association of one of its longest-standing members and deprives our beloved President of one who was an ever-present companion and support for years beyond the memory of most Associates. She had ceased active participation in the game a decade or so ago, but both before and since she rarely missed attending any major tournament in the calendar. In particular, whenever Maurice was on the lawns Aimee would be certain to be not very far away. Her gracious presence will be much missed throughout the Croquet world.

While never quite achieving any of the major honours of the game, Aimee was twice selected for the Ladies' Field Cup at a time when the overall standard of play among the ladies was at a higher level than today. It is probably not generally known that among her other activities in early life she played in the Wimbledon Tennis Championships, and indeed for many years both she and Maurice attended Wimbledon on most days during the annual fortnight.

The deepest sympathy of all goes to our President at this time.

S. S. T.

### THE MACROBERTSON TROPHY

#### Extracts from M. B. Reckitt's History

An interesting letter, signed MacRobertson, was published in the Gazette in 1917. The writer claimed to have performed a Septuple Peel, in practice, and he, not surprisingly, declared that it called for "patience and perseverance above the average". He described it as a "primary septuple peel", i.e., the putting of a partner ball through its first seven hoops while completing his break.

In 1918 an invitation was received from the Victorian Croquet Association for a team of four (minimum) players, preferably men and women combined, to take part in a series of Test Matches. The Tournament Committee reported that "all the players consulted had declined, with the exception of two who had not replied, and one who was doubtful". In these circumstances the invitation was, with regret, declined "as far as the season 1919-1920 is concerned".

It is interesting to learn that the idea of international contests already described as Test Matches had taken shape in the minds of players at the other end of the world. Four years later, the generous enthusiast Sir Macpherson Robertson was to present the famous trophy which bears his name.

The event of the year in 1925 was the initiation of contests for the International Trophy. The Victorian Association, having failed in their efforts to induce the C.A. to send a team to Australia, decided to make a start with such contests themselves. Their team of four included only two first-class players, and they proved to be no match for the splendid teams which England could put into the field. Miss D. D. Steel, D. L. G. Joseph, P. Duff Matthews, W. Longman, G. L. Reckitt and Colonel C. E. Wilson, who played in some or all of the matches, won all of them. The Australian stars,

while never at their best in the Tests, won many victories in first-class events during the Tour, J. C. Windsor winning the Gold Medal. "We all have something to learn from the Australians", wrote a commentator at the end of the season, "if it is only how to win quickly if one is fated to win, and to lose good-humouredly if it is one's lot to lose."

W. Longman initiated an appeal in February, 1926, for a Test Tour Fund for a visit to Australia in order "to make the financial strain on the members of the team as light as possible". In fact the time available was too short to produce either the players or the funds required, and the project was postponed for a year.

The closest contest for the MacRobertson Trophy that there is ever likely to be took place in 1928. At the end of the third and final Test Match the number of rubbers won by each side was equal; Australia and England had each won nine matches, but Australia had 20 games (764 points) to England's 19 games (721 points).

The Australian team was extremely strong, with Windsor, McCleery and Mr. and Mrs. Miller. The conditions were difficult, with frequent temperatures of over 90° in the shade, courts faster than any found in England and a loudspeaker commentary by the side of the court.

Sir Francis Colchester Wemyss captained the team, with Miss D. D. Steel, Windsor Richards and Du Pre; although their style was perfect and they showed occasional flashes of brilliance, they did not give a true indication of their real form at first. With the first Test Match, however, they suddenly got into their game and with the advantage of their overseas experience settled down to brilliant match play. The Australians were apparently nonplussed by their performance and, except in a couple of matches, were quite out-classed. Later they came into their own and played dashing and enterprising Croquet before large crowds of interested spectators and succeeded in winning the Trophy.

In the first series of Triangular Tests, in 1935, the English quartet defeated the New Zealand team and lost only one of its three contests against Australia, the other two being tied. The matches were all played at Melbourne and a crowd of more than 1,000 people watched from a specially-constructed stand. It was politely intimated to the Australians that England, having now twice sent teams to the Antipodes, thought it was time that she should be allowed to act as host country, and an Australian team was promised for the near future.

A great welcome was given to the Australian team of four players when they arrived in London in 1937. Their programme was strenuous—five Test Matches, four against County Unions, several Tournaments and a visit to Eire. England resisted the strong challenge and won the Trophy.

The Gazette announced, in 1939, that a "thoroughly representative team" was to travel to New Zealand in the autumn to take part in international matches which were to be a part of the celebrations of that Dominion's Centenary Year. Australia was also to send a team, so that there would again be "Triangular Tests", a type of contest which did not in fact materialise until almost 20 years later.

The season began in the early months of 1952 with the Test Matches in New Zealand which resulted in an unusually close contest, indeed, success or failure depended on the result of a single game in a single match—the first, which the "Kiwis" won by 4-3; they went on to win the second by 5-2 but England was victorious by 4-2 in the last match.

The power of New Zealand lay in the overall strength of the side; we read that "there seems to have been no suspicion of a tail". The England Captain, Dudley Hamilton-Miller, had with him Humphrey Hicks and John Solomon who did well in their matches, the latter also winning the New Zealand Championship. Mr. Ward Petley played well in the Doubles in the Test Match, but he and the English reserve, Mrs. Ozzanne, were in a shattering motor accident in which she was gravely injured, and he himself was not well enough to play in the third match.

When the New Zealand team visited England in 1956, a new feature was presented and for the first time teams of six-a-side were engaged in the matches for the Trophy. It was one of the worst summers of the century and proved very discouraging to our visitors, who were used to sunny skies and fast courts. The luck was against New Zealand owing to illness, and they were not able to field their strongest players, but they were doughty fighters and never complained. That they should win only eight encounters out of 44 played was certainly not a fair index of the relative skill of the players concerned.

For England, Patrick Cotter (Captain) and John Solomon were, of course, overwhelmingly strong in both Doubles and Singles; Humphrey Hicks was scarcely less so in the two matches in which he played and Freddy Stone was on top of his form right through the series. Others who played in one or more Test Matches were Kirk-Greene, Reckitt, Wiggins, Mrs. Rotherham and Ormerod. New Zealand was represented by Ross, Mr. and Mrs. Watkins, Rowling, Miss Wainwright and Mrs. Mackenzie-Smart.

Three

Australia and New Zealand challenged England in 1959 and it was agreed that these countries should each play three Test Matches against the other two in 1963. That preparations have to be made so far in advance of the event is a good indication of the scale of the problems which have to be faced before an International Tour for the MacRobertson Trophy can be successfully arranged. Sufficient support had been obtained from some leading players and also from C.A. funds to guarantee that a first-class team could be sent, although a general appeal for financial help was not made directly to Associates.

Our Test Team was victorious in 1963, winning all six of the matches played; they won them against New Zealand by 7-2 on all three occasions and against Australia by 7-2, 8-1 and 9-0. The seven players chosen for the team were those who finished in the first seven places in the President's Cup—Cotter (Captain), Solomon, Hicks, Ormerod, Lloyd Pratt, Wiggins and Miss Warwick. Later an eighth, Curtis, was included.

This was the first time that any visiting team had won the Trophy on an alien shore, and this in spite of the fact that the Antipodean countries number their players by thousands while England does so only by hundreds.

JOCELYN SUNDIUS-SMITH.

### VARIATION TO THE TRIPLE PEEL

An interesting variation has been sent to me by Jack Read, of Australia, on the triple peel starting from the now standard position of 2nd hoop and 4-back.

The standard leave for this is Blue (for 2nd) and Black (for 4-back) in the 4th corner, three or four yards along the East boundary so that Blue has a rush into the 3rd corner; Red is one yard South-West of the 2nd hoop and Yellow three yards East of the peg.

The normal reply is for Red to lift and shoot at Yellow from the 3rd corner so as to end up on the South boundary roughly in front of the 1st hoop.

The standard procedure now for Blue is to roquet Black gently in towards Yellow, split Black to the 3rd hoop and obtain a rush on Yellow to the 2nd. After making the 2nd, Yellow is rushed to the 3rd hoop and after making the hoop Black is peeled through 4-back and a rush obtained on Yellow to Red so that the 4th hoop can be made off Red and the break is complete. It is the picking up of Red that causes the problem, a shot that Pat Cotter describes as "really difficult".

Jack Read's suggestion to overcome this is for Blue and Black to lay the rush the wrong way round. After the lift shot has been missed, Blue rushes Black into the 4th corner and from there splits Black to the 3rd hoop and goes to Red below the 1st hoop. Red is then croqueted into the lawn and a rush obtained on Yellow by the peg. The 2nd hoop is made and a four-ball break is already established.

A lot depends on individual temperament as to which of these is to be preferred. The variation contains two shots which are vital. The first (the split from the 4th corner) is not very difficult. It should be possible to get Black reasonably near the 3rd hoop and Blue can be virtually anywhere between Red and the 1st hoop. The second vital shot is the roll on Red to obtain the rush on Yellow to the 2nd hoop. Personally, this is a shot I would detest. Red can be sent either to the 4th hoop (which involves a slight pass-roll and is a very hard shot) or to the 3rd hoop (which is not at all hard), but here the disadvantage is that if anything goes wrong Red is sitting beside Black, or it can be left "somewhere in the middle". The hardest part about this shot, to me, irrespective of where Red is sent, is obtaining the rush on Yellow to the 2nd hoop. To get an accurate rush (and it should not be longer than 1 yard in length) from 18 or 19 yards coming from right angles to the rush line is, by my reckoning, a very difficult shot.

If we consider the standard position, none of the shots are as difficult as that. The rush on Yellow is obtained from a simple split played on the rush line from 4 or 5 yards away. Thereafter the break depends on rushing, but each rush is obtained from only a few feet so that a perfect rush should be possible. Furthermore, in the variation, if the rush is not good enough on Yellow not even one hoop is made. In the standard position, if it is difficult to pick up Red before the 4th hoop, at least you have made two hoops and probably completed one peel as well.

As I have said, it all depends upon one's personal preference as to which will be found easier. Personally, I consider the rush to be the most accurate shot in the game. Others will disagree. Perhaps it boils down to the fact that if one is doing a triple peel one must expect to do some difficult shots sometime!

J. W. SOLOMON.

### THE USE OF BISQUES

An article which appeared in the April issue of "Croquet" dealt with the strategy and tactics which can be adopted by a 12-bisquer against a -2 player. It was stressed that the 14 available bisques should be used to establish and maintain 4-ball breaks, giving the opponent very few chances of hitting in and making the all-round breaks of which he is fully capable.

Let us now suppose that you are a 12-bisquer playing against a medium handicap player, say +8. The situation is now very different, for with only four bisques at your disposal you cannot hope to use these bisques to set up 4-ball breaks and continue with them. What then is to be your policy?

The first point to realise is that your opponent will, quite rightly, see your bisques as a very potent threat. His tactics will be inhibited while they still remain. For example, he will be reluctant to lay up by a hoop if one of your balls is also for that hoop. So you should not be in too much of a hurry to use the bisques. You should almost certainly avoid taking a bisque very early on in the game before your eye is in and you have the strength of the lawn.

It is usually advisable to keep a bisque (or a half bisque if you have one) to snatch the innings if a crisis arises at the end of the game with all clips on Rover or the peg. But this is not a golden rule, and the last bisque may be expended more profitably earlier on to establish a commanding lead.

You can use your bisques in two ways—to attack or to defend—to make hoops or to prevent your opponent from making hoops. But your general attitude should be one of attack. Thus you may feel compelled to use a bisque to extract the innings from your opponent when he has achieved an excellent leave from which you estimate that he will make several hoops whichever shot you take. But if you do this you should turn the situation to your advantage by contriving a leave for yourself from which you can make a hoop or two in the subsequent turn, if indeed you cannot make a hoop immediately.

To take an example, suppose that your opponent, playing Yellow, has failed to approach Hoop 4 off Red and leaves Yellow with a rush on Red from near Corner IV. Black (for Hoop 1) is by Hoop 5 and Blue (for Hoop 4) is by Hoop 6, but wired from Black.

The purely defensive play is to remove Black from Hoop 5 by despatching it to a remote boundary. But if Yellow makes Hoop 4 with reasonable control, gaining a rush to Hoop 5, a 3-ball break in which the Yellow clip advances at least to 2-back is probable.

A better line of play is for Blue to shoot at Red and Yellow, taking a bisque if the shot is missed. Yellow is roqueted gently and in the croquet stroke is sent as far as possible towards Hoop 4 with a stop shot, while a rush is obtained on Red to this hoop. If this rush puts Red close to Hoop 4 the hoop is approached and run. With Yellow also near this hoop there will then be a good chance of establishing a 4-ball break position, or at least of sending a Pioneer to Hoop 6. Black awaits at Hoop 5, and so you should make at least two hoops in this turn.

The value of sending Yellow towards Hoop 4 is apparent if this hoop is made off Red. But it lurks there as a threat to worry you as you attempt the hoop, and you will ask whether it is therefore not better to leave Yellow behind near Corner IV. You will also ask what happens if the rush on Red only sends this ball two or three yards wide of the hoop.

The answer to these two questions is that you have anticipated failure to make Hoop 4, and are planning your leave should this happen.

A hoop approach off Red from an awkward position is too speculative, for failure to run the hoop would be disastrous. In this case you should send Red to Hoop 2 in the croquet stroke, while Blue finishes near Black, preferably with a rush towards Hoop 1. Your object in the remaining strokes of the turn is to leave Black near Corner 1 with a rush on Blue to Hoop 1, with the boundary guarded against the opponent shooting with either ball, but especially with Yellow, which has the shorter shot.

The opponent will probably remove Red from Hoop 2, for otherwise Black should make at least two hoops in the subsequent turn. But what shot can be taken? If Red shoots at Blue and Black, a miss will enable Blue to play with a good chance of making at least two hoops. A shot by Red at Yellow, if missed, will leave Red near Corner IV, and again Blue could play in the subsequent turn with the expectation of making two hoops.

Red will in all probability decline to shoot, and play defensively to a boundary. This illustrates again the value of moving Yellow out from near Corner IV; had Yellow been left near this corner there would have been nothing to prevent Red from shooting at Blue and Black.

B. G. NEAL.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

There was a resourceful oarsman who was stroking a four at Henley and who discovered the way in which to steer the boat without a cox. When the gun went off, the cox jumped overboard and the crew stormed home to victory. Alas, the crew were disqualified, but the final upshot was the introduction of coxless fours. Mr. Armstrong, in Australia, has recently invented a new play to overcome a hazard in croquet which has ruined many a good break. Let it be assumed that the striker is about to take the first hoop with a third ball at the second hoop. The striker runs the first hoop and in doing so runs past the pilot ball—then the worst happens. He roquets the pilot ball and it ends up in the middle of the first hoop. What does A do next? Mr. Armstrong discovered that with the aid of the upright he could balance the striker's ball on top of the roqueted ball. From this position he could play the striker's ball towards the second hoop. He argued that the Laws were satisfied because all that the Laws required was that the two balls should be in contact. There was nothing in the Laws, so he argued, that stated that the striker's ball must be on the Court and not above the Court. Alas, the Australian Council has ruled that this stroke is not lawful. Presumably the Australian Council took the view that the striker's ball was not properly placed, and that it is inherent in the Laws that a ball must be placed on the Court in contact with the roqueted ball. Even if this ruling, with which I personally agree, had not been given, his triumph would have been short-lived, for undoubtedly the Laws would have been altered to ensure that the striker paid the proper penalty for his carelessness in roqueting the ball into the hoop. Ingenuity, however, is always refreshing and we should be grateful to Mr. Armstrong for his gallant attempt to outwit the Laws.

This rather reminds me of another croquet argument which arose during the negotiations between the Councils on the redraft of the Laws. Let it be assumed that the striker has a lift and, instead of picking up the ball with his hand, he knocks it towards baulk with his mallet. This practice is almost universal in England but not so in New Zealand and Australia, because in both Dominions there was a responsible school of thought that had ruled that this was a stroke. To overcome this clash of opinion, I provisionally amended Law 31 (b) by adding the underlined words: "A stroke is any movement of the mallet with intent to hit the ball in the game". When I explained to my Committee why I had added these words, the balloon went up. I had no idea what passionate feelings I had aroused. Presumably, sometime in the dim past, a member of this Committee had been told that he had made a stroke in such circumstances and the horror of the suggestion was still with him. My Committee was adamant in refusing to add these words. They argued that it is inherent in the Laws that the intention to hit the ball must be an intention to hit the ball in the game. After discussion with the Dominions this was agreed. Law 31 (b) was not amended and everyone in England continues happily to knock the lifted ball with the mallet.

### "THE DOMINION"

The arrival of the New Zealand Croquet Gazette for February brings news of the 52nd Dominion Tournament (as of much else) played at Christchurch in the previous month. Perhaps the most interesting feature of the fortnight was that the Men's Championship produced a record with 22 entries; there is plenty of evidence that at last "male resistance" to our game is being steadily broken down in New Zealand, and that a number of the best competitors are, as now they are with us, quite young men.

The Open Championship attracted "a magnificent field of 38 competitors", "possibly because of the approaching Shield contest". This event is now played in five sections, each headed by a seeded player, these being in order J. Prince, Mrs. Jarden, A. G. F. Ross, D. W. Curtis and G. Rowling. The prowess of the first-named is by no means unknown here, and indeed he is recorded as being "in devastating form", winning five games on the first day, including three "triples", and all seven in his section, his opponents only collecting 22 points against him. It will be gratifying to his English friends to learn that the runner-up in this event was David Curtis, who had previously won the South Island Championship, as Prince had the North Island event. Prince also won the Men's Championship, the runner-up being named Ross, but this was not the "Arthur" we know here so well but a young player whose initials are not the familiar A. G. F. but A. D. M.

Prince also won the Doubles Championship with Mrs. Jarden, but this represented the extent of the success of this distinguished lady player who, though she has won the Ladies' Championship six times since 1958 (a victory witnessed by this writer), failed on this occasion to win either Draw or Process. The final in this event proved to be a close fight between Mrs. L. M. Hight and Mrs. J. Martin in a three-game struggle which "could have gone either way".

It will be very interesting, after reading of these contests, to see who will eventually constitute the team against which our players will have to match themselves in Adelaide and Melbourne next February.

This number contains an article by John Prince on the subject of "leaves" which, though written with admirable clarity, is on more or less conventional lines, save for the addition of some suggested variants devised by Arthur Ross. It would be interesting to know what would be this young expert's reaction to the new ploys proposed for our consideration by William Ormerod and Nigel Aspinall in the April number of "Croquet".

M. B. R.

### THE RIGOUR OF THE LAW

Scene: A Tournament. A game in progress.

Dramatis Personae:

Mrs. B. Black. One of the players.

Mrs. R. Yellow. Her adversary. (A silent part. But she can draw the attention of the audience away from the speaker to herself by making faces. She can register love, hate, pleasure, pain and so on. She is seated up-stage off the court, and when we first see her she is registering smug satisfaction, having completed a break perfectly, as she supposes. How little she knows, poor woman!)

A Referee in charge of the game. (She is of kindly disposition, wishing to be as helpful to the players as a referee can be.)

The curtain rises and the duologue begins.

Mrs. B. B. (standing by her blue ball and calling the Referee): Hi! Come and have a look at this.

Referee (reluctantly abandoning her cup of tea, takes up the emblems of her authority and, approaching Mrs. B. B., asks soothingly): Well, what's the trouble now?

Mrs. B. B.: You saw HER put this ball of mine where it lies didn't you? (In fact the Referee didn't, having been occupied with her cup of tea. Nevertheless she silently nods assent and Mrs. B. B. continues.) Wired from everything, aren't I?

Referee (suddenly tight-lipped): Shan't tell you.

Mrs. B. B. (indignantly): Shan't tell me! And you call yourself a referee, and all I'm asking is whether I'm entitled to a lift!

Referee (beaming with smiles): Is it a lift you want? Let me look. (She surveys the positions of the balls for a moment.) Of course you're entitled to a lift. (We now notice that Mrs. R. Y. is chewing the end of the shaft of her mallet in chagrin.) But you must CLAIM it, you know. It's as much as my place is worth to give you a lift in a case like this, unless you CLAIM it. See here. (She shows her Law 49 (b) and Regulation 4 (d).)

Mrs. B. B. (lifting blue): The saints be praised! Is that the law? I've no patience with these law-makers; "If" this, "But" that, "Unless" the other, putting every kind of difficulty in the way of an honest player who only wants her rights!

(The Referee withdraws down-stage to her cup of tea, now cold, thankful at having escaped so lightly and murmuring an aside.) Well, I'm quite satisfied that I dealt with that little problem correctly. (Exit.)

EPILOGUE (spoken by the prompter coming quickly on to the stage as the curtain descends). BUT DID SHE?

HAROLD S. CLEMONS.

### HANDICAP PLAY IN 1967—A MATHEMATICIAN'S REPLY

In the April issue, Gordon Slater produced some statistics on all the handicap matches played last season. Two questions arise: did he use the right sample, and are his conclusions justified? It could be argued that the only matches one should take into account are random matches, that is first round matches in open handicap events. One would expect a flatter distribution (i.e., more divergence from 50%) from such a sample, so to find out I worked out the appropriate figures for 1967. To my great surprise I found that after the small size of the sample had been taken into account, the results were remarkably similar. Notable discrepancies were that -1 was first, 6½ equal fifth and -1½ twelfth. All handicaps better than 3 won at least 50% of their matches, except for 1½ (38%).

What Gordon Slater did not appreciate is that his bouquet "it is a tribute to the effectiveness of our handicappers that all but seven of the handicaps lie between the limits of 40% and 60%" was far from the truth: in fact his figures constitute a sizeable brickbat, as I shall attempt to explain.

When one tosses a coin 20 times, one expects to get 50% heads but is not particularly surprised if in fact 30% or 70% are tossed. However, if 200 tosses are made, anything outside the 40%-60% range is very surprising indeed. Statisticians express this by calculating a "standard deviation" for each experiment, and this deviation depends on the number of tosses involved. One expects 95% of all coin-tossing experiments to differ from 50% by less than twice the standard deviation.

However, if one calculates the standard deviation for an experiment with 180 tosses and compares it (3.74%) with the actual deviation (14%) of the 180 handicap games played last season by those with handicap 5, one finds that the deviation is nearly four times the standard deviation. This ratio of four (or more precisely 3.76) is incompatible with the hypothesis that the players were correctly handicapped.

A good way of testing the overall effectiveness of the handicaps is to take all these ratios and find their "root mean square". Theoretically this should be 1.0. In fact it is 1.58 or, if one follows a common statisticians' practice and excludes the "worst" result, 1.44. This may not mean much to the layman, but to the statistician it indicates that the figures just are not compatible with the hypothesis that handicap games in 1967 were even contests.

Unfortunately that is all one can deduce from the figures as Gordon Slater presented them. (Only Table II was used in my calculations.) It is a sad feature of statistics that they tell you when you are in trouble but offer you no solution to your difficulties. I hasten to add that it is probably the system of handicapping that is at fault, and not the handicappers themselves!

K. F. WYLIE.

## NOTES FROM THE CLUBS

### HURLINGHAM

On May 4th Hurlingham played their Annual Match against Roehampton. Three Doubles were played at each Club; the A Teams met at Roehampton, and Hurlingham won two of these three matches. Karmel and Lloyd Pratt lost to Neal and Reed. Godby and Buller beat Fidler and Gilbert. Townsend and Baillieu beat Camroux and Caporn. Roehampton won all their matches at Hurlingham. Miss Lintern and Banks beat Mrs. Sundius-Smith and Sanford. Mrs. Solomon and Havery beat Mrs. Karmel and Carlisle. D'Antal and Sanders beat Mrs. Davidson and Kerensky.

This is always a very happy match, but after a fine start the weather deteriorated, and the evening was less than enjoyable.

### HUNSTANTON

Mrs. Heley, who has been obliged for reasons of health to resign from being President of this historic Club, will be greatly missed by all the members and visitors to our tournaments. She has been a valued member for very many years and since the mid-50s has done as much as any Associate for the cause of Croquet by encouraging and entertaining the Cambridge undergraduate players whose influx into the game has provided an urgently-needed transfusion of young blood.

Bryan Lloyd-Pratt has been elected as the new President.

### EDINBURGH CROQUET CLUB

Founded in 1950, the Edinburgh Croquet Club lawns are in the delightful grounds of Lauriston Castle, with ever-changing views of the Firth of Forth and the Fife coast. Membership is always around the number of 40, and in recent years there has been a welcome increase of good players, one of these being Lieut.-Commander R. D. Sinclair, winner of the Centenary All England Handicap Competition. During the present season there are to be two important Scottish Tournaments—an open one and another confined to members of the four Scottish Clubs. The finals of these tournaments are to be played in Edinburgh on July 6th. Other plans for 1968 include matches with these other clubs and with Norton Hall Croquet Club, while everyone is looking forward to a week-end visit from four members of the Croquet Association.

### THE SOUTH AFRICAN CROQUET CHAMPIONSHIPS

Results of the Championships held in Pretoria in November, 1967.

<b>Open Singles Winner</b>	<b>The Belcher Cup and Association Silver Medal.</b> Clive Hambley (Rondebosch Club, Cape Town).
<b>Runner-up and Association Bronze Medal.</b>	David Cunningham (Rondebosch Club, Cape Town).
<b>Open Doubles Winners</b>	<b>Lady Steel Silver Salver.</b> Miss M. I. Simkins and G. D. Neaves (Maritzburg Club).
<b>Runners-up</b>	Mrs. B. Hough and F. Hough (Maritzburg Club).

## CHELMSFORD AND COLCHESTER CROQUET CLUB

The Club held their A.G.M. on March 30th preparatory to opening the season on April 13th. Both the Treasurer and the Secretary reported on a very successful season. Several of our members did well in tournaments, particularly Dr. Bray, Brig. Forbes, Roland Price, Gerald Hallett, Kenneth Paterson and Mrs. Raikes. In all, 12 of our members earned reductions of their Association handicaps. Several of our members also played in the Eastern Counties team which won the Championship for the first time. The week-end American Tournament had proved a great success and would become an annual event.

The membership had risen from 57 to 70. The members stood in memory of Mr. Foreman and Mr. Franklin, who both died suddenly and unexpectedly during the winter.

The officers and committee were all re-elected, except for Mrs. Raikes who is still out of the country; her place was taken by Mrs. Digby.

Improvements have been made in the grounds and clubhouse, the fixture list has been extended and everything suggests that the Club should have another very successful season.

## EPILOGUE

### To a History of Croquet Today—and Tomorrow

The compilation of this chronicle has occupied a considerable part of my time for more than six years. If I had realised that it would do so I doubt very much whether I should have embarked on so protracted a task, but having done so I felt, with however little justification, that it was a moral obligation to go through with it. It soon became evident to me, however, that what I was producing could not claim to be in any true sense the History as which I had imprudently described it on the title page of my typescript, but should more properly be called Annals, prepared as a contribution to our Association's archives. That these may in some degree serve as part of the materials useful to a future historian dealing with his subject on a reasonable scale (perhaps not much more than 80,000 words) I should like to believe. I should also like to believe that I may have already described one who will in due course undertake—and be equal to—the performance of the enterprise.

I have never supposed that anyone would set themselves the task of doggedly working their way through these seven files—or eight if the short studies of certain figures from the past of the game, which I have gathered together under the title CROQUETTES, be included. I have thought, however, that it might have a certain usefulness as what (if that is not too pompous a description in this case) is called "a work of reference". It is possible to think of reasons why certain parts of it might have a particular interest for certain readers. A Latin sentence somehow preserved in the memory from an elementary study of the language declared HAEC OLIM MEMINISSE JUVABIT, which I may, very freely, translate as "The day will come when it will bring pleasure to have been reminded of these things". This may be especially the case for those who have had some hand in them. So at any rate I am disposed to hope.

Can there be anyone now who would wish to go back to playing the four balls in sequence; to "close wiring" and the denial of any truly open shot; to game after game between first-class players ending rapidly in a victory (under the Hale setting) by 28 points for one of them? No doubt, as Horace remarked, times change and we change with them, but this does not mean that standards of play have declined or that the leading players of today are lesser men than their forefathers. Nor perhaps should it be too easily assumed that they are greater, though they may, as is said, "stand on their shoulders" and develop new specific skills out of those which their forerunners evolved and initiated. If any who can look back far enough into the dozen years before World War I wish to claim that there were giants in the world in those days, we should not too flatly contradict them, least of all if we never had opportunity to see those sometime champions perform. No argument is less profitable than the comparison of past with present to the disadvantage of either; to contend for a Corbally against a Solomon or a Beaton against a Hicks, or vice versa. Was the young man who won the Champion Cup in 1911 (it was Maxwell-Browne actually, who lost his life a few years later on the battlefield) a greater or a lesser player than that other young man who won the President's Cup in 1967? Would the Irish triumvirate (Cyril, Leslie and Duff) of the first pre-war years have beaten such modern triumvirates as Humphrey, Patrick and John, or today another John, Keith and Nigel? It is impossible to know, and for most of us not very sensible to guess.

Certainly our youngest players may serve as a strong encouragement to us as we contemplate the future of our game. But time on the court for most of them is short; "shades of the prison house begin to close" all too soon. We may hope that many of them will one day come back to us "for keeps", but no game can live on expectations of a speculative future, nor can we wait complacently for our 20-year-olds to become 50-year-olds; our tournaments require a recruitment of "full-timers" now. Refreshed by the successes of our Centenary Year we must not allow ourselves to be blind to the difficulties, indeed the grave dangers, which lie before us. The actuarial position of our Association is such that its security is far from guaranteed. Deaths and resignations are always menacing it; we can say, as the Red Queen said to Alice: "It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place here". Our enthusiastic propagandists and our devoted club secretaries will indeed have to run very fast, assuming that the increasing instability of international relations allows us to run at all.

The first essential in face of a serious situation is to be aware that it exists. It is doubtful whether most of our Associates today are so aware; perhaps it is too much to expect that they should be. The fortunes of games are primarily preserved, and still more advanced, not by the majority who only enjoy them but by the minority who serve them. And they are likely to be few. In the period with which this chronicle begins to deal they were very few. But these few had the wind with them. Croquet was suppressed at the centre; that club which the whole world now knows as "Wimbledon" (though today at Church Road and no longer Worple Road) was made the object of one of the most irresistible take-over bids in history; but it had still a few outposts and, more important perhaps than these, it had many of the great country houses, the prosperity of which had hardly begun to be nibbled at by taxation or a servant shortage. When the challenge came for a national revival, here were the sources on which the game could draw for support for the new tournaments. Often half, sometimes more, of those who flocked to them in ever-increasing numbers were the beneficiaries of the neighbourhood's hospitality. Thus enthusiasm was nourished, thence funds were often forthcoming for the establishment of new clubs. In the 70 years covered by these annals we have passed through a social revolution. Most of our sports now depend upon their "gates", and where these prove inadequate upon "sponsors" in this age of "commercials".

No such resources are open to us. This condition is not without certain advantages. It eliminates—or rather it never produces—the "shamateur". At a time when too many of our games, splendid in themselves, have their integrity undermined by rackets\* and financial considerations fundamentally irrelevant to them, we may console ourselves by knowing that Croquet, by its very nature, will only be played by those who love it. But its costs are increasingly tending to exceed its actual, and perhaps potential, resources. If we cannot gain sponsors—and it would be difficult to argue that we have any commercial justification for expecting them—we do very badly need patrons. Our ranks today do not include many in a position to act as such to any substantial degree. It may, however, be added that, in more senses than one, where there's a Will there's a way.

Our scientists are wont to speak of the "Space Time Continuum". The phrase seems to suggest a close relation to our difficulties. In the first place, serious Croquet demands space; it has never found it easy to get it, and now it is being subjected to pressures which threaten to deprive it of what space it has. This threat has lately become a dread reality at our metropolitan clubs. At the moment of writing it is uncertain how often, if ever, we shall be able to play again on Court 4 at Hurlingham. Even more seriously, it is only too certain that by 1969 we shall not be able to play again on the two upper-tier courts at Roehampton, since these beautiful lawns, among the best in England, are to be butchered to make a hard court tennis player's half holiday. Surely Colonel Brooke must now be turning in his grave.

As to time, it is a constant charge against our game that it takes too long, though the addicts of golf normally take longer reaching the 18th hole than most Croquet players do to reach the peg. What is no doubt true is that our subtle and skilful game does take longer to master than most others—though there is no lack of examples to prove that this need not be so. This is not the place to embark on the never-ending arguments about time limits (referred to in several places in this chronicle). But there can be little doubt that most Croquet addicts (apart from those who "manage" them) much dislike the general time limit applied in advance, so apt to take the pleasure out of our tournament games and not seldom to substitute unpleasantness for it.

\*A Wimbledon champion of the '30s subsequently wrote a book significantly entitled *Tennis is my racket*.

Realism—and one has sought to be realistic in saying farewell to this protracted chronicle—is not to be confused with pessimism. "If hope for the better there be," wrote Hardy, "it exacts a full look at the worst." We have our hopes for the better, and we have some ground for them. The prestige of Croquet has greatly increased in late years; the foolish and ignorant jests at the expense of the game, once so common, are seldom now to be found; when journalists can get publicity for it in the press, respect for the game, if not often very well informed, is normally shown, and the skill exhibited by our university players no doubt has been a contributory factor to this. That it is eminently a game for those of high intelligence among us is shown not only by the existence of professors and highly-rated men of law in our ranks, but by such facts as that an Oxford undergraduate lately followed up a First in Greats at Oxford with a tied place at the top of the Law Society finals, and a Cambridge one ended his studies there with a Lectureship at King's College. Other examples could be adduced, and perhaps our zealous propagandists might make good use of such facts as these.

We have in truth no lack of good publicity material. Croquet is one of the few outdoor games at which the sexes can meet on equal terms. If they do so now less often than they did in the past this is surely a state of things which the ladies who can be induced to take an interest in our game should be put on their mettle to reverse. The recent death of that great player Rene Watkins, of New Zealand, and the record of Mrs. Jarden there now, and the strength of women's Croquet in Australia should fire our up-and-coming ladies to reproduce in future years the deeds of Dorothy Steel, Liliias Beaton, Noel Gilchrist and Effie Ionides in the past, to mention but a few. Save for Miss Steel in 1937, not since 1936 has a woman (Mrs. Apps) won the President's Cup.

The golfing correspondent of a Sunday paper recently recorded that a lady, asked what it was induced her first to watch the game on television and then to take it up herself, replied: "It takes you to such lovely places". No doubt it often does, but Croquet enthusiasts could make the same point and would be wise to do so. There are—literally—good grounds for this. The entire layout of Hurlingham; the lovely gardens at Roehampton (which too few Croquet players take the opportunity to have a good look at); the glorious coast views from every point of the Budleigh Salterton club; the hilly backgrounds of Cheltenham and (one is informed) of Carrickmines, provide settings which can offer added joy in victory and consolation even in defeat. We should rejoice in our opportunities to visit them, and advise our friends who may be ignorant of them to do so, with mallet in hand.

Croquet has always known its ups and downs, but its devotees have survived the "downs" of the switchback without losing their heads or doubting that it would reach the top again. A game that has lived through two world wars, both of which exacted from us their heavy casualties, must not be intimidated by world depressions, though it cannot disregard the handicaps which these impose. At the moment of writing this what we call, vaguely enough most of us, "the economy" is affecting our game's economy; but this has not deterred the C.A. Council from its determination to make all efforts to send a Test Team right across the world for a third time since the Second World War. We hold the International Trophy and are resolved to defend it. Let the faith which has inspired this decision animate all of us, in the clubs no less than at headquarters, to maintain the prestige of what our late President, Sir Compton Mackenzie, was wont to call "The Queen of Games".

January, 1968.

MAURICE B. RECKITT.

## CHELTHENHAM

April 13th-15th, 1968

Twenty-one players enjoyed fine weather for the first American Tournament of the season. The Nottingham contingent and the Prichard family were well to the fore, though two local players, Leslie Yoxall and Dorothy Daniels, were among the prize-winners. Everyone admired the lawns, which showed the effects of the hard work of Col. Wheeler and his helpers.

The final was a most exciting game, with William Prichard hitting in when for the third and fourth hoops, and Gordon Slater for the Rover and Peg, going round and pegging out his opponent's ball. He worked round to three Back with his backward ball before Slater hit in and finished the game.

### CHELTENHAM CROQUET CLUB

#### AMERICAN HANDICAP SINGLES

April 13th-15th, 1968

#### RESULTS

BLOCK A.—Winner: Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (-2½).

BLOCK B.—Winner: W. de B. Prichard (2½).

BLOCK C.—Winner: Dr. A. L. Yoxall (1).

BLOCK D.—Winner: G. T. Taylor (1½).

Play-offs of Block Winners:

W. de B. Prichard beat Col. D. M. C. Prichard +22.

Slater beat Yoxall +5.

FINAL.—Slater beat Prichard +7.

### HUNSTANTON AMERICAN TOURNAMENT

April 19th to 22nd, 1968

This friendly American Handicap Tournament was a most auspicious start to the season in East Anglia. The winner, Mr. Wheeler, the runner-up, Miss Sessions, and Mr. Simpson who was very unlucky not to win the "A" block, are all to be congratulated on the consistency of their play so early in the year. The other competitors, who all appeared to enjoy their games in ideal weather, were, as was to be expected, more erratic in their standard. As an extra event a match was played between Hunstanton and Wrest Park against the visitors which ended in a draw.

#### HANDICAP SINGLES

BLOCK A.—Joint winners: ½ Miss K. Sessions, ½ R. A. Simpson.

Play-off: Miss K. Sessions +4.

BLOCK B.—Winner: 7 J. A. Wheeler. } Play-off:

BLOCK C.—Winner: 14 C. R. Palmer. } J. A. Wheeler +11.

FINAL.—(7) J. A. Wheeler beat (-½) Miss K. Sessions +15.

### BUDLEIGH SALTERTON

(Unofficial) May 5th-11th

Forty-two entries, 11 visitors, 120 games (including doubles) in four days' play—a tribute to the management of Gerald Cave. The block winners were all home players; the strength in depth of Croquet here is remarkable. This year's inspiration was a Crocks block for those who could only stand up to one game a day. There are welcome rumours of further reorganisation for next year to bigger blocks, fewer play-offs and thus even more play.

The unselfishness of non-Croquet members in providing hot lunches was all the more welcome as we struck a cold spell. Mrs. Meredith was the chef and her husband was equally distinguished on the courts, being the overall winner—the only person able to confound John Cooper.

### BUDLEIGH SALTERTON: MAY (UNOFFICIAL)

TOURNAMENT, May 6th-11th

A Block.—Winner: A. J. Cooper (-3), 5 wins.

B Block.—Winner: F. W. Meredith (1), 4 wins.

C Block.—Winner: Lt.-Col. T. F. Laverty (2), 4 wins.

D Block.—Winner: Sir L. Daldry, 4 wins.

E Block.—Winner: Mrs. R. C. Hawkins, 4 wins.

F Block.—Winner: M. Granger Brown, 5 wins.

G Block.—F. Henshaw, 4 wins. (Crocks Block.)

Play-off.—1st Round: A. J. Cooper beat F. Henshaw w/o.

M. Granger Brown beat Mrs. Hawkins w/o.

F. W. Meredith beat Sir L. Daldry +16.

Semi-Final: A. J. Cooper beat Lt.-Col. T. F. Laverty +17.

F. W. Meredith beat M. Granger Brown +10.

Final: F. W. Meredith beat A. J. Cooper +16.

### THE PEEL MEMORIALS, ROEHAMPTON

May, 1968

A brilliant, sunny day on the Tuesday showed Roehampton at its most beautiful, and how it could have been a most lovely week, but the weather changed to a surly mood. It was difficult to feel pleased that the keen wind blew away the smoke from the demolished stable blocks, but all were most grateful for the comfort brought by Mrs. Adler and her helpers in the form of hot drinks and for the sheltered viewpoint in the cosy pavilion. There was particular sympathy for Col. and Mrs. Tims, welcome visitors from New Zealand, and Mr. Clemons from Tasmania; but they faced our unkind weather with splendid fortitude.

Tuesday saw two minus players meeting in handicap play and a clear illustration of how the laws of advanced play came into being. Clemons cross-wired Gilbert's balls at the 1st hoop after taking his first ball round, giving his opponent almost no chance from then on.

Wednesday, doubles day, had two matches lasting five hours each. Not so lamentable as some may think, as each had one A and B partnership and both were won by a very narrow margin. Nerves strained to breaking point only could account for Mrs. Sundius-Smith's (alias Mrs. Peel) one foot roquet failing to reach its quarry by three inches. Miss Lintern was on fine form in her match with Miss E. M. Brumpton, who played steadily throughout the tournament. With both balls Rovers and her opponent for stick and Rover, she nonchalantly pegged out one from the vicinity of hoop four. "I thought it better not to let her have two balls." It was better.

The match between Clemons and Forbes was a saga of missed peg-outs of opponent balls or own balls and by either player were destined to miss on the West. It was a wonder it ever came to an end.

Illness struck on the night of Thursday, bringing scratching on Friday morning. Miss Lintern, who escaped the scourge, bravely faced the prospect of two semi-finals with Mrs. Sundius-Smith in one day. She triumphed in the first, but Croquet taxes a player's strength as well as ingenuity and she retired from the second.

Saturday brought still more cold and heavier rain—the coldest May day in London for how many years? In the final of the Process, with the contestants equally advanced, Maurice Reckitt observed that "there are some things more important than winning a game of Croquet"; he retired from the game and to warmth and dry clothing—a heresy readily forgiven. Gifford Nash, with youth on

his side, continued his triumphal career to win the play-off against Forbes on two courts, the second being less waterlogged than that on which it had started.

An interval for lunch, then tea and heroic work with brushes and scrapers, and two lawns were in play in the evening. Miss Lintern could not maintain her earlier form and lost to Mrs. Sundius-Smith by 24 in the Women's Play-off. But the Doubles Final was a close battle fought until well after sunset. Professor Neal nursed his wife round to three Back against remarkable hitting-in by both Clemons and his partner, manoeuvred for a quadruple peel but failed at four Back. Then both had got to Rover when Gifford Nash, with control of four balls, peeled Mrs. Neal's Black with the apparent intention of pegging it out. (Was it perhaps not possible to distinguish Black from Blue in the increasing darkness?) This manoeuvre failed but later the Blue was pegged out, leaving Red and Yellow to peg out, but a hit-in from the boundary near hoop two to near the 3rd corner by Mrs. Neal brought a well-earned win for her side.

### PEEL MEMORIALS TOURNAMENT

#### MEN'S HANDICAP SINGLES

DRAW

(11 entries)

#### FIRST ROUND

M. B. Reckitt (2) beat P. L. Gifford Nash (5) +6

Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) beat D. J. V. Hamilton Miller (-3½) +21

E. H. S. Shelton (0) beat A. d'Antal (4½) +14

#### SECOND ROUND

H. S. Clemons (-1) beat Lt.-Col. E. D. Tims (2½) +9

Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) beat M. B. Reckitt (2) +23

E. H. S. Shelton (0) beat Dr. T. E. Ryves (4) +19

J. B. Gilbert (-1) beat B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2½) +12

#### SEMI-FINAL

Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) beat H. S. Clemons (-1) +2

J. B. Gilbert (-1) beat E. H. S. Shelton (0) +11

#### FINAL

Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) beat J. B. Gilbert (-1) +16

PLAY-OFF

P. L. Gifford Nash beat Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) +15.

PROCESS

#### FIRST ROUND

B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2½) beat Lt.-Col. E. D. Tims (2½) +21

P. L. Gifford Nash (5) beat Dr. T. E. Ryves (4) +15

H. S. Clemons (-1) beat J. B. Gilbert (-1) +26

#### SECOND ROUND

M. B. Reckitt (2) beat E. H. S. Shelton (0) +10

D. J. V. Hamilton Miller (-3½) beat B. Lloyd Pratt (-2½) +21

P. L. Gifford Nash (5) beat Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) +3

H. S. Clemons (-1) beat A. d'Antal (4½) +2

#### SEMI-FINAL

M. B. Reckitt (2) beat w/o D. J. V. Hamilton Miller (-3½) scratched

P. L. Gifford Nash (5) beat H. S. Clemons (-1) +3

#### FINAL

P. L. Gifford Nash (5), M. M. Reckitt (2) retired

PLAY-OFF

P. L. Gifford Nash (5) beat Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes (1) +15

#### WOMEN'S HANDICAP SINGLES

DRAW

(19 entries)

#### FIRST ROUND

Miss B. Duthie (2½) beat Mrs. S. M. Adler (5) +22

Mrs. E. D. Tims (3) beat Mrs. B. G. Neal (11) +9

Mrs. E. E. Bressey (9) beat Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan (2) +24

#### SECOND ROUND

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) beat Miss L. H. Smith (4½) +6

Lady Ursula Abbey (2) beat Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) +10

Mrs. J. Speer (3½) w/o Mrs. W. Longman (-½) scratched

Miss B. Duthie (2½) beat Mrs. E. D. Tims (3) +5

Miss D. A. Lintern (1) beat Mrs. E. E. Bressey (9) +4

Miss E. M. Brumpton (4½) beat Miss M. G. Anderson (10) +12

Mrs. M. H. Carrington (6½) beat Miss M. E. Day (10) +11

Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Miss E. C. Brumpton (4) +23

#### THIRD ROUND

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) w/o Lady Ursula Abbey (2) retired

Miss B. Duthie (2½) beat Mrs. J. Speer (3½) +14

Miss D. A. Lintern (1) beat Miss E. M. Brumpton (4½) +2

Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Mrs. M. H. Carrington (6½) +18

#### SEMI-FINAL

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) beat Miss B. Duthie (2½) +6

Miss D. A. Lintern (1) beat Mrs. E. Peel (2) +9

#### FINAL

Miss D. A. Lintern (1) beat Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) +20

PLAY-OFF

Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Miss D. A. Lintern (1) +24

## PROCESS

## FIRST ROUND

- Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Lady Ursula Abbey (2) +2  
 Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) beat Miss M. E. Day (10) +11  
 Miss E. C. Brumpton (4) beat Miss L. H. Smith (4½) +20

## SECOND ROUND

- Miss E. M. Brumpton (4½) beat Mrs. S. M. Adler (5) +16  
 Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan (2) +21  
 Miss D. A. Lintern (1) w/o Mrs. W. Longman scratched  
 Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) beat Mrs. B. G. Neal (11) +9  
 Miss B. Duthie (2½) beat Mrs. M. H. Carrington (6½) +16  
 Mrs. E. E. Bressey (9) beat Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) +16  
 Mrs. J. Speer (3½) beat Miss M. G. Anderson (10) +3  
 Mrs. E. D. Tims (3) beat Miss E. C. Brumpton (4) +7

## THIRD ROUND

- Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Miss E. M. Brumpton (4½) +8  
 Miss D. A. Lintern (1) beat Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (5) +12  
 Miss B. Duthie (2½) w/o Mrs. E. E. Bressey (9) scratched  
 Mrs. J. Speer (3½) beat Mrs. E. D. Tims (3) +7

## SEMI-FINAL

- Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Miss D. A. Lintern (1) retired  
 Mrs. J. Speer (3½) beat Miss B. Duthie (2½) +19

## FINAL

- Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Mrs. J. Speer (3½) +6

## PLAY-OFF

- Mrs. E. Peel (2) beat Miss D. A. Lintern (1) +24

## HANDICAP DOUBLES

## FIRST ROUND

(12 entries)

- Mrs. E. M. Speer and Miss M. C. Anderson (13½) beat B. Lloyd Pratt and Miss M. E. Day (7½) +8  
 E. H. S. Shelton and Miss L. H. Smith (4½) beat Lt.-Col. and Mrs. E. D. Tims (5½) +6  
 D. J. V. Hamilton Miller and Mrs. E. E. Bressey (5½) beat Mrs. E. M. Lightfoot and Mrs. E. Peel (2½) +6  
 Miss E. C. and Miss E. M. Brumpton (8½) beat Mrs. M. H. Carrington and Miss B. Duthie (9) +3

Ten

## SECOND ROUND

- H. S. Clemons and P. L. Gifford Nash (4) beat Brig. the Rev. A. E. Forbes and Dr. T. E. Ryves (5) +16  
 Mrs. E. M. Speer and Miss M. C. Anderson (13½) beat E. H. S. Shelton and Miss L. H. Smith (4½) +10  
 D. J. V. Hamilton Miller and Mrs. E. E. Bressey (5½) beat Miss E. C. and Miss E. M. Brumpton (8½) +7  
 Professor and Mrs. B. G. Neal (6) beat Miss D. A. Lintern and Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan (3) +11

## SEMI-FINAL

- H. S. Clemons and P. L. Gifford Nash (4) beat Mrs. E. M. Speer and Miss M. C. Anderson (13½) +8  
 Professor and Mrs. B. G. Neal (6) beat D. J. V. Hamilton Miller and Mrs. E. E. Bressey (5½) +9

## FINAL

- Professor and Mrs. B. G. Neal (6) beat H. S. Clemons and P. L. Gifford Nash (4) +5

## THE MEN'S AND WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIPS

will be played at the

## ROEHAMPTON CLUB

on MONDAY, JULY 15th, to SATURDAY, JULY 20th.

Committee: The Tournament Committee of the Croquet Association.  
 Manager and Handicapper: E. A. Roper.  
 Referee: Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard.  
 Secretary: The Secretary, C.A., The Hurlingham Club, London, S.W.6.

## EVENTS

Open to Associates only.

1. THE MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP. Entrance Fee 15/-. Matches best of three games. Prizes: The winner holds for the year the Gold Challenge Casket, presented by the late Viscount Doneraile, and a Challenge Trophy, presented by the late Sir Francis Colchester-Wemyss, K.B.E., and the late Col. C. E. Wilson, and will receive a medal. Holder: Professor B. G. Neal.
2. THE WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP. Entrance Fee 15/-. Draw and Process. Prizes: The winner holds for the year the Gold Challenge Casket, presented by the late Viscount Doneraile, a Silver Challenge Bowl, presented by "The Ladies' Field", the Gold Challenge Badge and Gold Locket, and will receive a medal. Holder: Mrs. M. E. Lightfoot.
3. THE MIXED DOUBLES CHAMPIONSHIP. Entrance Fee 13/- each person. Matches of single games. Prizes: A pair of Silver Challenge Cups, presented by the All-England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club. Holders: Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard and Miss E. J. Warwick.
4. THE "DU PRE" CUP. Open to competitors in Events 1 and 2 who have not qualified for the third round or at the discretion of the Manager. Matches of single games throughout. Entrance Fee 10/-. Level play. Prize: A Challenge Cup, presented by the late Lt.-Col. W. B. Du Pre. Holder: B. G. Perry.

Entries to reach the Secretary, C.A. Hurlingham Club, London, S.W.6, by Tuesday, July 9th, for Events 1 and 2, and by Thursday, July 11th, for Events 3 and 4.

The Draw for Events 1 and 2 will take place at the Hurlingham Club on Wednesday, July 10th, at 11 a.m., and for Events 3 and 4 on the ground.

Competitors who are not members of the Roehampton Club will be made members for the duration of the Tournament.

## SPECIAL CONDITIONS FOR THE MEN'S AND WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIPS.

"Any Matches started first in the morning must be completed in that day's play—subject to the Courts being fit for play."

## CHAMPIONSHIP AND DOUBLES CHAMPIONSHIP

will be held at the

HURLINGHAM CLUB, on JULY 22nd, and following days.

Committee: The Tournament Committee of the Croquet Association.  
 Manager: To be appointed.

Referee and Handicapper: To be appointed.

Secretary: The Secretary, C.A., The Hurlingham Club, S.W.6.

## EVENTS

1. THE CROQUET CHAMPIONSHIP. Open to any Competitor (subject to Regulation 22). Entrance Fee 15/-. Matches best of three games. Prize: The Coronation Gold Challenge Cup. Runner-up, a Silver Challenge Cup. Holder: J. W. Solomon. Runner-up, H. A. Hicks.
2. THE DOUBLES CHAMPIONSHIP. Open to any Competitor (subject to Regulation 22). Entrance Fee 13/-. Matches of single games. Prizes: A Pair of Silver Challenge Cups. Holders, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller and P. D. Hallett.
3. THE ASSOCIATION PLATE. Open to Competitors who have entered for Event 1 and have not qualified for the third round or at the discretion of the Manager. Matches of single games throughout. Entrance Fee 10/- each entry as they qualify. Level play. Prize: A Challenge Cup. Holder, Dr. W. Ormerod.

ENTRIES.—The entries, accompanied by the Entrance Fees for Event 1, must be sent to the Secretary, C.A., so as to reach her not later than the first post on Wednesday, July 20th, and for Event 2 by noon on Tuesday, July 26th.

DRAW.—The Draw for Event 1 will take place at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, July 20th, and for Event 2 at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, July 26th, and for Event 3 as will be announced on the ground.

PLAY.—Play will begin at 10 a.m.

The semi-finals of the Championships will be so arranged that play in them will extend over the afternoons of Friday, July 26th, and Saturday, July 27th.

## CHELTENHAM OFFICIAL OPEN TOURNAMENT

JULY 29th to AUGUST 3rd, 1968.

1. OPEN SINGLES, CHELTENHAM CHAMPIONSHIP CUP, two lives. Fee 15/-.
2. LEVEL SINGLES, MONEY SALVER, 2 or more bisques, Law 36. Fee 12/6.
3. HANDICAP SINGLES, CALTHROP CUP, 6½ or more bisques. Fee 12/6.
4. OPEN HANDICAP SINGLES, DANIELS CUP. Fee 12/6.
5. HANDICAP DOUBLES, BARWELL SALVERS. Fee 11/6 per player.

All entries to be sent to the Tournament Secretary, Cheltenham Croquet Club, Old Bath Road, Cheltenham, Glos, not later than Wednesday, July 24th.

## CHELTENHAM

## An AMERICAN HANDICAP SINGLES TOURNAMENT (Unofficial)

will be held in the Club Grounds

on FRIDAY, AUGUST 16th, to SUNDAY, 18th, inclusive.

Guaranteed minimum of five games. Additional events according to entries. Entrance Fee £1.

(Non-Associates an extra 5/- tribute.)

Entries to reach the Tournament Secretary not later than first post Tuesday, August 13th.

## HURLINGHAM

## THE ANNUAL CROQUET TOURNAMENT including the "LADIES' FIELD" CANDLESTICKS

(under the direction of the C.A.)

will be held from

MONDAY, AUGUST 5th, to WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14th, 1968.

Committee: The Croquet Committee of the Club.

Manager and Handicapper: E. A. Roper.

Referee: J. G. Warwick.

Games Secretary: Cdr. D. E. Jenkins, M.B.E., R.N.

## EVENTS

1. THE HURLINGHAM CUP. Holder: J. W. Simon. Level Singles. Conditions of Advanced Play. Entrance Fee 12/6. DRAW and PROCESS.
2. THE TURNER CUP. Holder: M. J. Bushnell. Level Singles. Conditions of Advanced Play. For players handicapped at Scratch or over not entered for Event 1. Challenge Cup, presented by the late Mrs. Ernest Turner. Singles games throughout. Entrance Fee 10/-.
3. THE HURLINGHAM DOUBLES. Holders: Dr. R. W. Bray and Mrs. R. B. Smartt. Conditions of Advanced Play. Mixed Pairs. Challenge Cup, presented by the late Mrs. Henry Franc. Singles games throughout. Entrance Fee 10/- per player.
4. THE YOUNGER CUP. Holder: W. de B. Prichard. Ordinary Level Singles. For players handicapped at 3 bisques and over not entered for Events 1 or 2. Challenge Cup, presented by the late Lt.-Col. J. A. C. Younger. Singles games throughout. Entrance Fee 10/-.
5. THE LONGWORTH CUP. Holder: P. L. Gifford-Nash. Handicap Singles. For players handicapped at 6 bisques and over, not entered for Events 1, 2 or 4. Challenge Cup, presented by Mrs. R. C. Longworth. Singles games throughout. Entrance Fee 10/-.
6. THE PINCKNEY SIMPSON CUP (HANDICAP SINGLES). Holder: P. L. Gifford-Nash. This event will be run on the X.Y. principle although the Y event may have to be played as shortened games. Entrance Fee 10/-.
7. THE "LADIES' FIELD" CANDLESTICKS. (Ladies' Handicap Doubles.) Holders: Miss D. A. Lintern and Mrs. L. Riggall. Open to lady members of the C.A. only. Entrance Fee 10/- each player. All games to start at the third hoop.
8. MEN'S HANDICAP DOUBLES. Holders: Dr. R. Bray and C. H. L. Prichard. Open to pairs with a Minimum combined handicap of Minus 2. All games start at the third hoop. Entrance Fee 10/- each player.

## ENTRIES AND DRAW

All entries, with fees for Events 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6, with the addresses of the competitors (and telephone number), must reach the Games Secretary, Croquet Tournament, The Hurlingham Club, Fulham, S.W.6, by first post on Wednesday, July 31st (not C.A. Secretary).

Entries for Events 3, 7 and 8 will close at noon on Tuesday, August 6th. The Draw for Events 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 will take place at the Club on Wednesday, July 31st, at 2.30 p.m.—for other Events as announced on the ground.

Now that eight lawns are available, it is hoped that it will be unnecessary to play any games at Roehampton.

Prizes in accordance with the entries.

Tournament plant by John Jaques.

CHEQUES SHOULD BE MADE PAYABLE TO THE HURLINGHAM CLUB.

## GENERAL

Play will start at 10 a.m. daily and continue till 7.30 p.m. if necessary.

At least eight lawns will be provided.

Luncheons, teas and dinners can be obtained at the Club. There will also be a snack bar.

Eleven

**CARRICKMINES  
CROQUET AND LAWN TENNIS CLUB**

**CROQUET TOURNAMENT**

SATURDAY, 17th AUGUST, to SATURDAY, 24th, AUGUST, 1968.

Hon Secretary: Croquet Committee, Carrickmines Croquet and Lawn Tennis Club, Carrickmines, Co. Dublin.

**EVENTS**

1. CHAMPIONSHIP OF CO. DUBLIN (OPEN). Perpetual Challenge Cup. Draw and Process. Entry Fee 15/-.
2. DUFF MATHEWS CUP. (Perpetual.) Open to players of 4 bisques and over. To be played on Handicap. Entry Fee 10/- N.B.—Competitors may enter for only one of the above events.
3. BOXWELL CUP. (Perpetual.) Handicap Singles. Open to all. Entry Fee 10/-.
4. CORONATION CUPS. (Perpetual.) Handicap Doubles. Matches will begin at the 3rd hoop and will be limited to 3½ hours. Combined handicap must not be less than 4. Entry Fee 10/- each player.

Entries for all events close on Tuesday, August 13th, at 6 p.m., and the draw will then take place.

Play will start at 10 a.m. on Saturday, August 17th. Competitors who are Irish residents must be available on that day. Competitors from overseas will not be required for play until Monday, August 19th, at 10 o'clock. All competitors must be ready to play when required by the Manager.

Standard setting and Jaques "Eclipse" balls will be used. Flat-soled shoes must be worn. Competitors are encouraged to wear whites as much as possible.

The Committee reserve the right to refuse any entry without assigning a reason.

**DIRECTORY OF CLUBS**

- A.E.R.E. CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Chem. Eng. Div., Atomic Energy Research Establishment, Harwell, Didcot, Berks.  
 ALL ENGLAND LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Church Road, Wimbledon, S.W.19 (Tel. WIMbledon 2244).  
 BARNES SPORTS CLUB—Hon. Secretary (Croquet Section), Lonsdale Road, Barnes, S.W.13.  
 BARNSTAPLE (CROQUET)—Hon. Secretary, Miss Efemey, 3 Victoria Lawn, Victoria Street, Barnstaple, Devon.  
 B.C.U.R.A., CROQUET CLUB (Randalls Road, Leatherhead, Surrey)—Hon. Secretary, F. V. Bethell, 9 Blackthorne Road, Great Bookham, Surrey.  
 BEECHAM'S RESEARCH SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB (CROQUET SECTION)—Hon. Secretary, Beecham's Research Labs., Brockham Park, Betchworth, Surrey (Tel. Betchworth 3202).  
 BENTLEY (BRENTWOOD)—Hon. Secretary, F. Stanley-Smith, Hatch House, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood, Essex (Tel. Coxtie Green 456).  
 BIRMINGHAM (EDGBASTON)—Hon. Secretary, F. R. Meacham, Flat 70, Chadbrook Crest, Brook Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, 15.  
 BOWDEN—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. Joan Walker, Gadebrook, Chapel Drive, Hale Barns, Cheshire.  
 BRISTOL CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Miss B. E. Setter, 38a Westbury Road, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol.  
 BRISTOL AEROPLANE CORPORATION CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, S. W. Tonkin, 22 Downs Park East, Bristol, 6.  
 BROOKE BOND RESEARCH LABS. C.C.—Hon. Secretary, J. P. Webb, Brooke Bond Research Labs., Blounts Court, Sonning Common, Reading, Berks.  
 BUDLEIGH SALTERTON—Hon. Secretary, Lt.-Col. G. E. Cave, Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club, Budleigh Salterton. (Tel. Budleigh Salterton 2548; Private 3447).  
 BURLEY CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary: The Secretary, Burley Croquet Club, Ringwood, Hants.  
 CAMBRIDGE MUNICIPAL PARKS CROQUET—Mrs. P. E. Heley, 40 Newton Road, Cambridge.

**DEVONSHIRE PARK, EASTBOURNE**

60th SOUTH OF ENGLAND CHAMPIONSHIPS

SEPTEMBER 30th to OCTOBER 12th, 1968.

Preliminary Announcement.

**EVENTS, 1st Week**

1. OPEN SINGLES. South of England Championship. Draw and Process. 15/-.
2. LEVEL SINGLES (½ to 3 bisques). 12/6.
3. LEVEL SINGLES (3½ to 6½ bisques). 12/6.
4. RESTRICTED HANDICAP SINGLES (7 bisques and over). 12/6.
5. BIG HANDICAP "X", "Y". 15/-.
6. HANDICAP DOUBLES (Combined Handicap not less than 2). 11/6.

**EVENTS, 2nd Week**

- 1 (a). MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP. Draw and Process. 15/-.
- 2 (a). WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP. Draw and Process. 15/-.
- 3 (a). RESTRICTED HANDICAP "X", "Y", "Z". 15/-.
- 4 (a). BIG HANDICAP. 12/6.
- 5 (a). OPEN DOUBLES. 13/-.
- 6 (a). HANDICAP DOUBLES (Combined Handicap not less than 4). 11/6.

**BRIEF NOTES**

1. Competitors may enter for only one of Events 1-4.
2. Event 1 is under the Laws of Advanced Play.
3. Event 2 is under the Laws of Semi-Advanced Play.
4. Competitors may enter for only one of Events 1 (a), 2 (a) and 3 (a).
5. Competitors may not enter for 6 (a) as well as either 1 (a) or 2 (a) or 5 (a).
6. Competitors may not enter for Event 5 (a) as well as either 3 (a) or 6 (a).
7. Events 1 (a), 2 (a) and 5 (a) are under the Laws of Advanced Play.
8. All handicap doubles will start at 3rd hoop. Time limit 3½ hours. No extra half-hour.

- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY CLUB—Hon. Secretary, M. E. W. Heap, Emmanuel College, Cambridge.  
 CARMEL COLLEGE C.C.—Hon. Secretary, S. Siver, Carmel College, Mongewell Park, Wallingford, Berks.  
 CARRICKMINES CROQUET AND LAWN TENNIS CLUB—Hon. Secretary, F. Regan, 38 Silchester Road, Glenageary, Co. Dublin.  
 CASSIOBURY (WATFORD)—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. K. Clark, 113 Cassiobury Park Avenue, Watford, Herts.  
 CAVERSHAM C.C.—Hon. Secretary, Dr. C. A. Boucher, 8 Derby Road, Caversham, Reading, Berks.  
 CHELMSFORD AND COLCHESTER CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, E. Whitehead, Cherwell, Mill Lane, Danbury, Essex.  
 CHELTENHAM—Hon. Secretary, Miss W. K. Allardyce, Cheltenham Croquet Club, Old Bath Road, Cheltenham (Tel. CHEltenham 52650).  
 CLAREMONT LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, H. C. Wright, 2 Claremont Drive, West Timperley, Altrincham, Cheshire.  
 CLEVEDON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION CROQUET CLUB, Sunhill Park, Clevedon, Somerset (Tel. Clevedon 2712)—Hon. Secretary, Miss Cleveland-Smith, Highlands Cottage, Park Road, Clevedon.  
 COLWORTH CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, C. Hitchcock, Unilever Research Labs., Colworth House, Sharnbrook, Bedford.  
 COMPTON (EASTBOURNE)—Hon. Secretary, H. C. S. Perry, Hockington House, Willingdon, Eastbourne, Sussex. Tel. Eastbourne 52656).  
 CRANFORD (EXMOUTH) CROQUET AND LAWN TENNIS CLUB—Hon. Secretary, The Club House, Cranford, Exmouth.  
 CROUCH HILL RECREATION CLUB (Club House, Hillrise Road, N.19).  
 DULWICH CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary: no address.  
 EAST DORSET LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB (PARKSTONE)—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. J. A. McMordie, East Dorset Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club, Salterns Road, Parkstone, Dorset (Tel. Parkstone 2814).  
 EDINBURGH CROQUET CLUB (LAURISTON CASTLE)—Hon. Secretary, Miss A. M. Murray, 3 Bonnington Grove, Edinburgh, 6.  
 ELLESMERE BOWLING, TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. N. Tyldesey, Bonnett Cottage, 14 Greenleach Lane, Worsley, near Manchester.  
 FOLKESTONE/HYTHE LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB (Imperial Hotel, Hythe)—Hon. Secretary, P. Staines, 59 Bouverie Road West, Folkestone.  
 GLASGOW CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Miss A. B. McDonald, 18 Kingsford Avenue, Glasgow, S.4.  
 HELEY CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, J. T. Laurenson, Stidulfe Mead, Seal, Sevenoaks, Kent (Tel. Sevenoaks 61583).  
 HOVE LAWN CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, L. W. A. Brown, 5 Stanford Avenue, Brighton, 6, Sussex.  
 HULL UNIVERSITY CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, W. N. Yates, Hull University Union, The University, Hull, Yorks.  
 HUNSTANTON—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. A. N. Rolfe, "Weathercocks," Heacham, King's Lynn, Norfolk (Tel. Heacham 233).  
 HURLINGHAM—The Games Secretary, Hurlingham Club, S.W.6 (Tel. RENown 2662).  
 IPSWICH (ARBORETUM)—Hon. Secretary, Miss Edith Wood, 65 Gleneagles Drive, Ipswich, Suffolk.  
 LEAMINGTON LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB (Guys Cliffe Avenue, Leamington Spa)—Hon. Secretary, R. A. Lewty, 42 Heath Terrace, Leamington Spa (Tel. 24518).  
 LITTLEHAMPTON CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. M. A. Whillier, Ranmore, Pigeon House Lane, Rustington, Sussex (Tel. Rustington 5506).  
 LYTHAM ST. ANNES C.C.—Hon. Secretary, Colonel J. L. Walsh, 7 Ryeheys Road, St. Annes, Lancs (Tel. St. Annes 21633).  
 MARMULLANE LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. H. Gorsuch, Pembroke House, Passage West, County Cork (Tel. Marmullane 26681).  
 MONMOUTHSHIRE CROQUET AND LAWN TENNIS CLUB (Penpergwm, Abergavenny, Mon)—Hon. Secretary, Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard, Gobion Manor, Abergavenny, Monmouthshire.  
 MULLARD (SALFORDS) SPORTS CLUB (CROQUET)—Hon. Secretary, R. W. Gibson, Mullard Research Laboratories, Cross Oak Lane, Salfords, near Redhill, Surrey (Tel. Horley 5544).  
 NORTHERN LAWN TENNIS CLUB (CROQUET SECTION) (Didsbury, near Manchester)—Hon. Secretary, Palatine Road, West Didsbury, Manchester, 20.  
 NORTON HALL CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Norton Hall C.C., Norton-on-Tees, Co. Durham.  
 NORWICH—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. L. C. Bower, Field Gate, Town Close Road, Norwich.  
 NOTTINGHAM CROQUET CLUB (Highfields, University Boulevard, Nottingham)—Hon. Secretary, Miss E. C. Brumpton, 72 Davis Road, W. Bridgford, Notts (Tel. Nottingham 254937).  
 OXFORD UNIVERSITY CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, J. Simon, Jesus College, Oxford.  
 OXFORD CROQUET AND LAWN TENNIS CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Dr. K. W. Lewis, Botany School, South Parks Road, Oxford (Tel. Oxford 57857).  
 PARSONS GREEN SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB (CROQUET SECTION)—Hon. Secretary, Broomhouse Lane, London, S.W.6 (Tel. REN 1401 and 3698).  
 PETERHOUSE CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Peterhouse, Cambridge.  
 PRESTON LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB (Preston Drove, Brighton, 6)—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. M. M. Mitchell, 52 Shirley Drive, Hove, Sussex, BN3 6UF.  
 REIGATE PRIORY CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, H. E. Gould, Whittings Cottage, The Clears, Reigate.  
 ROEHAMPTON—The Games Secretary, Roehampton Club, Roehampton Lane, S.W.15 (Tel. PRO 5505).  
 RYDE LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, Miss K. A. Wade, "Norwood," 10 Partlands Avenue, Ryde, Isle of Wight (Tel. Ryde 2512).  
 SIDMOUTH CROQUET CLUB (CRICKET PAVILION, SIDMOUTH)—Hon. Secretary, M. H. Glover, Farway, Roselands, Sidmouth, Devon (Tel. Sidmouth 4148).  
 SOUTH LONDON BOWLS CLUB (CROQUET SECTION), 19 Lydford Road, S.W.18—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. P. Smith, 107 Magdalen Road, S.W.18.  
 SOUTHPORT AND BIRKDALE CROQUET CLUB (Victoria Park, Southport, Lancs)—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. J. D. Weir, 16 Virgin's Lane, Thornton, Liverpool.  
 ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE C.C.—Hon. Secretary, St. David's College, Lampeter, Cardiganshire.  
 STOKESAY C.C. (Craven Arms, Shropshire)—Hon. Secretary, P. T. Cunningham, 2 Newton Street, Craven Arms, Shropshire.  
 SUSSEX COUNTY (BRIGHTON) CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, W. H. Austin, Flat A, 3 Victoria Road, Southwick, Sussex (Tel. Southwick 2874).  
 TUNBRIDGE WELLS CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, S. G. Stoker, "The Linnets," 8 The Lane, Fordcombe, near Tunbridge Wells, Kent.  
 UNILEVER CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, R. Burrell, Unilever Research Labs., 455, London Road, Isleworth, Middlesex.  
 UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX CROQUET SOCIETY—Hon. Secretary, R. K. Price, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex.  
 UPPINGHAM C.C.—Hon. Secretary, Miss J. K. Samuel, The Beeches, 44 Ayston Road, Uppingham, Rutland.  
 UPTON—Hon. Secretary, E. Brighouse, 27 Heath Road, Upton, Wirral.  
 WESTMINSTER SCHOOL CROQUET CLUB—Deans Yard, S.W.1.  
 WINDSOR BOWLING CLUB (CROQUET SECTION)—Hon. Secretary, Mrs. D. D. Bowen, Clinton Road, Penarth.  
 WOKING LAWN TENNIS AND CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, c/o Croquet Club, Pine Road, Hook Heath, Woking, Surrey (Tel. Woking 574).  
 WORTON HALL RECREATIONAL CLUB (CROQUET SECTION)—Hon. Secretary, V. Sexton, Worton Hall, Isleworth, Middlesex (Tel. Isleworth 2166).  
 WREST PARK CROQUET CLUB—Hon. Secretary, A. C. W. Davies, c/o N. I. A. E., Wrest Park, Silsoe, Bedfordshire (Tel. Silsoe 305).