

The evidence is on the court—

EVERYWHERE YOU PLAY

JAQUES EQUIPMENT

IS THE CHOICE — TO BE SURE

MALLETS



	each	p.t.
ASSOCIATION	68/6	+ 11/-
COLONIAL	86/-	+ 13/10
TINGEY	102/9	+ 16/6
STEEL SHAFTED	147/-	+ 23/8

BALLS



ECLIPSE CHAMPIONSHIP BALL
for all matches and
tournaments



Per set of four
105/- + 16/10 p.t.

JAQUES introduced the game of croquet into England and a century of experience goes into every piece of **JAQUES** equipment for

TOURNAMENTS ★ **CLUBS** ★ **GARDENS**

Obtainable from all good sports dealers

illustrated catalogue sent free on request to

JAQUES

SINCE 1795

JOHN JAQUES & SONS, LTD. · THORNTON HEATH · SURREY

By **JAQUES**—that's good!

No. 48. October 1960

Price 1s.

CROQUET

*The Official Organ
of The Croquet Association*



East Dorset (Parkstone) Club Lawns

and equipment by Jaques, of course

CROQUET ASSOCIATION NOTICES

The Subscription of £1 10s. 0d. due on January 1st, 1960, should be sent to the Secretary, C.A., Hurlingham Club, London, S.W.6.

Will all Associates paying their subscriptions by Standing Banker's Order instruct their banks to make the same payable to the Midland Bank Ltd., 567/9 Fulham Road, Walham Green, S.W.6.

* * *

Laws of Croquet 1s. 6d. (Non-Associates 2s.).

Obtainable from the Secretary, C.A., Hurlingham Club, London, S.W.6.

* * *

HANDBOOK

The C.A. Handbook for 1960/61 is available at a price of 4s. 6d. Obtainable from the Secretary, C.A., Hurlingham Club, S.W.6.

* * *

TOURNAMENT FIXTURES, 1961

Will Club Secretaries who have not yet done so notify the Secretary, C.A., of their 1961 Tournament dates as early as possible.

* * *

OLD EQUIPMENT (Mallets, Balls, etc.)

Anyone having regulation croquet hoops, pegs or mallets to sell second-hand please write to the Secretary, C.A., Hurlingham Club, London, S.W.6.

* * *

REFEREES

Associates who wish to become Referees should send their names to the Chairman of the Laws Committee (c/o. The Secretary, C.A.), who will arrange for their examination.

* * *

ENTRY FORMS FOR TOURNAMENTS

Competitors are reminded that they must use the official entry forms when entering for C.A. tournaments and that entry fees should accompany the entry forms.

Pads of 25 price 2s., can be obtained from the Secretary, C.A., Hurlingham Club, London, S.W.6.

MANAGERS

Miss E. J. Warwick has been added to the official list of Managers.

* * *

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Rev. G. F. H. Elvey has moved to Orchard Lodge, 12 Portland Avenue, Exmouth, Devon.

* * *

The name of Mrs. W. Longman was omitted from the list of names shown in the September issue of the team representing England at Devonshire Park on October 1st. The name of H. O. Hicks was included in error.

* * *

New Associates

Major G. W. Holt

Robert Allan

Major P. Villiers

Mrs. F. Ludolph

Sir Harry Methven

G. H. Robinson

Miss M. E. Day

H. F. David

Miss E. F. Rose

Dr. F. J. Bentley

Mrs. F. J. Bentley

F. H. Pugh

Mrs. C. E. Devitt

J. C. Kay

J. E. Andrews

Dr. H. Mary Browning

Richard Otley

V. C. GASSON,
Secretary

NOTES by ROVER

Eight of the Best

In some recent years a little of the glory had been shed from the President's Cup by virtue of the non-attendance, or more correctly non-acceptance, of one or more of the players whom one had every hope of seeing among the contestants. This year, however, the eight whom the selection committee delighted to honour all responded affirmatively and as a result we had what was felt to be the best representation for some time. The greater the pleasure that Patrick Cotter must have found in winning the cup for the sixth time. It was in 1956 that he last carried off the trophy, the only year since the war that the event comprised the "Best Ten" when five of the New Zealand Test Team competed. This calls to mind the game of that year in which Ivy Wainwright triple-peeled and pegged out one of Cotter's balls, going on to win the game and thus being the cause of a play-off between Cotter and John Solomon.

Turning to the parallel but junior event that took place at Roehampton in the same week as the President's Cup, all were sorry to learn that Spencer Ell had had to scratch shortly before the start. This, however, gave an opportunity to Edward Duffield to show his worth. Curtis's win makes one wish he had more time to devote to the game but his schoolmaster duties at Ipswich perforce confine his tournament activities to the summer recess.

Solar Cycling

Round what fixed point (if any) does our Calendar of Tournaments revolve? One wonders how many tournament players could give a confident—or even a speculative—answer to this question. It is at this moment no academic one, for what is technically known as the "solar cycle" requires that every half dozen years there shall be a minor upheaval in the dating of what used to be known as "Calendar Fixtures", which in consequence may not appear to be so fixed as all that. One of these disturbances will occur next season, and local tournament committees are hereby advised to take notice of it—since no member of any such body can surely be imagined as failing to read a Rover Note! Without embarking upon the intricacies of the solar cycle, let us now inform our readers that the corresponding dates for all tournaments will be six days later in 1961 than they were this season. If any should ask why this should be, the answer will emerge from the correct reply to the question posed at the opening of this Note. The clue is to be found in the fact that it is on the August Bank Holiday, upon which date, according to a tradition existing from a time "beyond which the memory of man goeth not" (as the lawyers say), that the Hurlingham tournament begins. This falls next year upon August 7th and all other tournament dates—so far as present arrangements are adhered to—can be calculated from this. For some of us this means that we shall assemble to play in the Peel Memorials on May 15th and pack our mallets at Devonshire Park on October 14th, if our success there has been such as to induce us to stay till our season's final day.

Fair Shares in Doubles

The interesting article by Miss Roe appearing in the September number is none the less so for the fact that what she has "discovered" has—in effect if not in identical form—been discovered before. This not infrequently happens in the history of mankind, a capital example being afforded by the continent of America, the discovery of which by the Vikings early in the 11th century being so far unremarked that it had to be discovered all over again in the 15th. A game very similar to that which she outlines was in fact played, under the title of "Alternate Points Doubles" at the Peel Memorials tournament (and a few others) in 1923; its precise conditions are set out on p. 13 of Vol. XX of the *C.A. Gazette*. On p. 68 appears a critique of the game by the writer of the account of the "Peels," who having declared that "one might say a great deal" about it, proceeded to say a lot more than there is room to quote here. He noted that "the games averaged about the usual length" (the recollection of this Rover, who played in the event, is that they took rather longer), but added that what seems radically at fault with the game itself is that it defeats the very object for which in theory it was designed. It makes for selfish rather than unselfish play. This was because the stronger player tended to take all the "sporting long shots" and to enjoy himself by trying to establish breaks. "We hardly think," added the commentator, "that the variation is likely to survive," and in fact it did not. But he thought it might be "the ideal thing for country house and garden party." Not all the objections he suggested need necessarily apply to the game in the form advocated by Miss Roe, however, and we are all for experiments aimed at securing for the weaker player in a partnership a full share of the play.

Dramatic Finishes

Another example of a dramatic finish to a game comes from Captain J. B. Morgan, who describes the end of a handicap singles some years ago. One of his balls had been pegged out by his opponent, the other ball being for the first hoop. The opponent being for four-back and the peg had laid up perfectly to make four-back while Captain Morgan's ball was on the boundary in front of the first hoop, wired from his opponent's balls. With one bisque in hand the opponent could feel tolerably safe, but Captain Morgan in desperation took a hard shot from the boundary at the first hoop and ran it so well that it carried to the north boundary. He then hit the long shot across to the third corner and went out on a three-ball break. His opponent must have been considerably deflated.

This is the same Captain Morgan who had the remarkable record of appearing in the "Best Ten" only on three occasions and winning it twice. On the occasion of his first win there was the unprecedented occurrence of four players tying for first place, an unusual "play-off" situation.

OBITUARY

W. W. SWEET-ESCOTT

This accomplished player died during the week's play for the President's Cup, a competition similar to that in which he had appeared on five occasions. He was 70, and had been in indifferent health for several years. Just before and just after the first World War he was amongst the best players of the day, an example of this being afforded one year at Devonshire Park when the company then responsible for the Park temerarily advertised the Final of the Opens as being between the great Irish stars, C. L. O'Callaghan and Cyril Corbally, before the semi-finals were concluded. Escott beat Corbally, however, and the posters had to be hastily withdrawn. Few players have got nearer to the ball than Escott did, playing as was his habit with a very short mallet, and possibly for this reason he had a particularly effective roll stroke. One can remember the late Lord Tollemache exclaiming at a Sussex tournament, with characteristic hyperbole, that Escott "could roll two balls from here to London"! In recent years he was a frequent visitor to Devonshire Park where he not only played but regularly wrote for these pages the account of the annual Match there. A scholar of Bradfield, he had a distinguished career as a classicist and went up to Magdalen College, Oxford, as an exhibitioner. He was a vigorous golf and tennis player and had captained Lyme Regis Golf Club. He was liked wherever he went, and those who knew him longest will miss him most. There will be the warmest sympathy for his widow and his three sons. M.B.R.

CORRESPONDENCE

The need for more referees
Dear Sir,

Associates may have noticed that the number of Referees in the Official List has slowly been dwindling in recent years. The position is even worse than may be apparent, since not only have those referees who have left our ranks for ever not been replaced, but also the advancement of years is not conducive to the quickness of the eye, the mind and the body—attributes which are highly desirable in a good referee.

May I, through these columns, appeal for a considerable number of associates to come forward as prospective referees. More referees are urgently required for the smooth-running of our tournaments, as well as for the convenience of players, and unless these are forthcoming in the near future I fear that there will be considerable inconvenience to players at many of our tournaments.

I have heard it argued by more than one player, that they do not intend to become referees for the reason that they do not wish to have continual calls during tournaments. In practice, I believe that the number of times the average referee is called upon during a tournament is very few as the bulk of the refereeing falls upon the Referee of the Tournament. Apart from this, such an attitude can only be called selfish in the extreme. What if all our Associates took a similar view?

Finally I would suggest that it is not only from the "A" Class that Referees are required. Personal proficiency is by no means a necessity. All that is required is a thorough knowledge of the Laws, and whilst I would not suggest that a 14 bisquer should apply for a test, there is no reason why anybody who has been playing for a few years should not, with adequate knowledge, be added to the Official List.

May I suggest that with the approach of winter, a little study of the Laws in front of the fire will pay dividends, not only in the prestige accruing to an Official Referee, but also in the knowledge of what can and cannot be done in croquet.

Yours faithfully,

J. W. SOLOMON,
Deputy Chairman Laws Committee

Wrong Hoop

Dear Sir,

There appears to be a good deal of uncertainty in the minds of many players as to their duty when they see their opponent approaching a wrong hoop or incorrectly placing or failing to move a clip. The Laws are quite clear.

Law 49 lays down that an adversary may not interrupt the striker during a turn even if the striker, perhaps with his clip in his pocket, approaches the wrong hoop.

But Law 31 (d) states that a clip noticed by either side to be incorrectly placed shall be at once placed in the correct position. It not infrequently happens—particularly in shortened games—that the adversary sees the striker fail to move his clip or put it on a wrong hoop and says nothing till the wrong hoop is run; this amounts to sharp practice and I would call the attention of all players to their duty under Law 31 (d).

Yours faithfully,

W. LONGMAN

A quick variation

Dear Sir,

Some members might be glad to know a form of shortened game usually finished in under an hour.

The first six hoops and the stick are made with both balls and lifts are given after the second and fifth hoops. Contact is given if both these hoops are made before the partner ball has made the second.

It will be found that this makes an amusing "in and out" game and gives practice in giving lifts. It also gives scope for advanced players to try the double peel.

Yours faithfully,

J. G. WARWICK

The Handy Hoop and Ball Gauge

Dear Sir,

I write to say that further orders for The Handy Hoop and Ball Gauge cannot be fulfilled, as the number I had made in 1957 have been sold out and I do not feel justified in having any more made.

I would like to thank all those who have purchased this gauge and also the Editorial Panel of *Croquet* for the frequent advertisements they have inserted—often, when space was available, without making any charge.

In accordance with my undertaking to give the proceeds to charity, the whole of the gross takings amounting to £26 8s. 0d. have been handed by me to the St. John Partridge Memorial Clinic. This clinic was opened in 1937 under the auspices of the R.S.P.C.A. for the purpose of providing free treatment for the animals of the poor in the Chelsea and Fulham districts.

My wife has been Honorary Secretary of this clinic since its opening and, I think, readers of this letter will be interested to know that since its start the clinic has relieved the sufferings of over 185,000 animals.

Yours faithfully,

W. LONGMAN

Questions and Answers

Question: In September *Croquet* the following question is asked: "A referee is called to watch an Irish peel. He notices that the balls are not touching when the player is about to strike his ball, what action should he take?"

Answer: Assuming that a foul has not been made after the stroke either by not moving the croqueted ball or by the striker's ball being hit twice the striker's opponent should be given the option of having the stroke again or of the balls being played as they lie. If the referee draws attention to the balls not being in contact before the stroke is made, he is giving information to the player, and the referee does not know in the least how the striker is intending to make the shot and he may make a double tap or some other foul and so must not interfere till after the stroke. Law 48 (d) and Instructions to Referees (7). Please note that if the balls are replaced for any reason they shall be deemed to have been in contact at the beginning of the stroke and so must be replaced in contact. (See also Decisions. Case (Law 42) in the Laws.)

Question: A, playing with blue, Irish peels black through a hoop and goes through it also with blue. After going through the hoop and in the course of the same stroke blue hits black. Has blue roqueted black?

Answer: No, under Law 34 (b), unless blue and black finish up in contact at the end of the stroke.

Beau Sabreur

Mr. Lloyd Pratt wears an elegant hat
And plays with an elegant swing.
He is slender and tall
And addresses each ball
So it flies like a bird on the wing.
He plays with precision
And makes each decision
With exquisite judgment and flair.
He's good at approaches,
But never reproaches,
And always remains debonair!

M.M.T.

"CROQUET BETWEEN THE WARS"

1919 — 1939

A Backward Glance

by N. O. HICKS

A PEEP into the past is to be the purpose of these rambling recollections, the relatively recent past perhaps, albeit so seemingly remote! For there is a great gulf fixed between croquet today and croquet as it flourished in the two decades after the First World War.

The strife of 1914/18 had hit croquet grievously, and the year 1919 saw the Association woefully depleted but still a resilient body. Enthusiasm was widespread and a great measure of recovery was soon apparent, to reach its apogee about the year 1930, after which year a definite decrease set in. Actually in 1930 there were some 1,695 names on the register of associates—nor was this any unreal or non-playing list, for large numbers on it were regular tournament supporters.

There was thus a solid foundation at all levels, no lack of leading lady exponents, and innumerable players on the fringe of the top who swelled the ranks of the "A" opens. True the game no longer appealed to "youth" as, however surprisingly, it had prior to 1914 when many came to the fore who were "flappers" of debutante age, or their male counterparts.

As regards the game itself the inter-war years were essentially times of evolution and development (by trial and experiment), for the powers were not unenterprising, but forever striving to arrive at the "ideal" game, well aware of the room for improvement.

Priority was compassion for the "out-player", and a determination to render the game less one-sided and less monotonous. Yet these considerations applied virtually to the "A" class only, a body, as some contended, with prerogatives and "privileges" rather apart.

The law reformers scored a fundamental point in 1928, a year when the New Law 44, "Optional Lift in Level Play," came into operation. General feeling at first was not favourable to the change, largely because the lift rule certainly did prolong games, and so destroyed much of the merit of the concession. Thus, with the express idea of speeding up the game, and with the object of making long breaks easier of attainment for the average player, more than one attempt was made to restore the only recently discarded No. 1 (2 pegs) setting. Whether or not it is reactionary to seek to put back the clock, these overtures to the past were not generally approved.

The lift was really very revolutionary for those times, and bewilderingly "novel"; certainly it caught many an unwary combatant completely off-guard, for, in fact, it was frequently "forgotten". The golden age of the triple peel was at hand; long years were to pass before the introduction of the lift after 1-back, which by its effect of eliminating the cross-wire at hoop 1, virtually banished the "triple" until after the war G. L. Reckitt and E. P. C. Cotter evolved new ways to bring the triple peel back to life.

By far the most "popular" fixture of the year was the (now neglected) Challenge and Gilbey cups, which meeting in 1925 attracted a total entry of 172. Far too many entries for the number of lawns available were by some committees most disingenuously accepted, with a result that awkward blocking frequently occurred, and

waiting your turn for a court could become a whole-time occupation.

Doyen of the managers, and the most outstanding was Colonel Reginald Brooke, scrupulously fair and highly efficient, if stern and a natural martinet. Col. Brooke was adept at "timing"; the blemish of bad blocking and excessive waiting was not likely to occur under his management.

Not for Col. Brooke the ceremonial of Mr. E. S. Luard, a manager of a more indulgent school who presided at Ranelagh with gallantry and courtly charm. Ranelagh, as the Ascot of pre-war croquet, seemed the very venue for Mr. Luard (assisted by junior secretaries) to arrange affairs.

Sir George Murray was always in request as a manager; debonair, outwardly composed, he was by temperament somewhat nervous and excitable. This sometimes led to absurd ado.

"Contretemps" and complications were unknown at any meeting controlled by Capt. H. C. Davey, an organiser of genius and a man of tact and charm.

It was considered a rare innovation when in 1924, a woman, Mrs. F. H. White, took in hand a huge tournament with only unofficial assistance. It was a complete success and encouraged other ladies to come forward as managers, to the gain of all.

The period was exceedingly rich in striking personalities in their own right. Highly individual was the Hon. Treasurer of the Croquet Association, Lord Doneraile, who became President of the C.A. only in 1939, an honour seemingly overdue. Yet it was his work as Treasurer for over 25 years to which the Association owes so much. Lord Doneraile's whole being revolved round the croquet calendar which he himself had done so much to prepare and perfect. He was a "clubman", par excellence, with special attachments to Hurlingham. Lord Doneraile was a tireless hater of all things slack and irregular; his standards were ever of the strictest. Never primarily a player, only at the Windlesham tournaments might Lord Doneraile be tempted on the lawn and even then his huge sombrero sun hat serviced him more satisfyingly than his mallet. Windlesham, although prospering outwardly, depended wholly on visitors and house-parties for the tournaments. Local members gradually fell away, and after 1930 the annual meetings abruptly came to a full stop. It had an ominous look—for one year a meeting to appear almost at its apex and by the following summer to be extinct.

The official journal—the *C.A. Gazette*—was published weekly during the season under the able ministrations of R. Leatham Jones. "Leatham" was a very capable editor, conscientious to a fault, polished in all that he performed and of wry humour. Lengthy and contentious letters on matters of current controversy spiced the *Gazette's* correspondence columns which it was Leatham's task to tone down. If correspondents had more to say in those days, and said it harder, so too, on the courts the "rigour of the game" counted for far more than it does today, when the will to win is often conspicuously lacking.

Croquet was no less fortunate in her other salaried officials. As Association Handicapper from 1907 to 1929 Mr. C. D. Locock discharged his duties with exceptional ingenuity and perfected the whole handicapping system. He lived, it was said, "on columns of croquet knowledge"—the very letters of his name declared it. Intellectually Mr. Locock was of the highest calibre, a scholar of the Nordic languages, and a master-hand at chess. Nearing the end of the Locock regime a necessary measure of handicap revision enacted an all round 2-bisque increase to members' existing handicaps. On this occasion there was no individual contracting out from the upgrading scheme; some felt aggrieved at their new augmented status and unable to reconcile it with past performance.

Brig.-Gen. J. H. Twiss who took over from Mr. Locock possessed neither the experience nor the flair of his predecessor and lacked his firm decisiveness. But General Twiss was always painstaking and personally popular.

When in 1932 Mr. Charles Crawley at length resigned the office of Secretary of the Croquet Association the fact was noted in *The Times*; Mr. Crawley was awarded a retiring salary of £200 a year and accorded a solemn vote of thanks in council. He had served 27 years. His successor Col. P. G. Davies, keen from the first, was always cheerful and a good mixer.

The seasons of 1925 and 1937 were strengthened by Test Matches—England v. Australia. In both years results told in favour of the Mother Country, but victory was not the outcome when in 1927/28 an English team, captained by W. Windsor Richards, toured Australia and New Zealand, and by the narrowest margin possible yielded the MacRobertson International Shield. If other members of the Australian visiting teams had been on a plane with their veteran leader, J. C. Windsor, the Test Matches in England would have been incontestably closer than they were; no more doughty opponent than "Father" Windsor ever existed and extremely few to match him in any department of the game. In 1937, as a septuagenarian, he was showing some signs of strain, but not such as to affect the quality of his performance.

As to the actual "standard" of play in the inter-war years as compared with the standards prevailing today, it is idle to generalise. Then, as now there was much shameful and wilful slowness, from which no ranks were exempt, though games on the whole were far less protracted.

As is well known, the key to Miss D. D. Steel's long ascendancy lay in her phenomenal powers of concentration. From this essential element sprang that positive sureness her rivals lacked, and what rivals there were—even amidst her own fair sex! At first it was Mrs. H. A. de la Mothe, the former Noel Gilchrist, who was the closest challenger, and subsequently Mrs. A. C. Ionides. Both these ladies possessed uncommonly attractive styles of play and both were very rewarding to watch. The former was at her best when behind and excelled in crisis, and to Mrs. Ionides's natural éclat was added a profound knowledge and finesse.

Miss Mona Bryan (the Mrs. Morland of today), Miss Winifred Heap, Mrs. T. H. F. Clarkson, Mrs. Edmund Reeve, and (later) Mrs. Nevill Oddie, were all outstanding for a number of seasons, whilst another, whether known as Mrs. Strickland or as Mrs. Apps, enjoyed a near twenty years' unbroken innings of eminent success. Miss D. E. Lintern and Mrs. E. Rotherham, destined to wrestle neck and neck in many a post-war marathon, were, by 1935, up-and-coming and extremely convincing players.

A regrettable feature of the "twenties" especially, was the heavy loss suffered by the premature retirement of established stars. Inevitable as some withdrawals may have been, it was felt that not a few forsook the game for rather inadequate reasons. Much lustre departed with the disappearance from the courts of Capt. C. L. O'Callaghan in 1923, but fortunately another Irish idol in P. Duff Matthews remained to draw the gallery for many years to come. In 1926, G. L. Reckitt, alas, had his last season until his re-emergence after the war. In this year, 1926, Lt.-Col. W. B. du Pre gave proof of his latent powers, so constantly thereafter in evidence, and in 1928 the onset of H. O. Hicks added interest at the summit.

Impervious to all comings and goings W. Longman was pursuing a consistent course, so constant that for seventeen consecutive summers his name was to appear on the selected ten lists, a record needless to add, without precedent, and this throughout a period when a place in the coveted "Ten" was subject to the most searching scrutiny.

For some years the late B. G. Klein figured prominently, if intermittently, in the Beddow (now President's) Cup, gaining always an impressive place towards the top as befitted a player of his faultless poise, but for sheer consistency in this competition, a remarkable record was Capt. J. B. Morgan's commanding achievement in twice capturing the Cup out of only three appearances in all.

Mr. R. C. J. Beaton remained a truly outstanding player until his lamented death in 1925, and Mrs. R. C. J. Beaton, who, as Miss Lilian Gower, had galvanised the gallery in her youth held her place as a leading player long into widowhood.

An open champion, pre 1914, Dr. Edgar Whitaker still maintained masterly form, and by his accuracy and exact control made the art of break-making look supremely easy. Somehow Dr. Whitaker made long-shooting and all that he did look superbly simple too. Whitaker was certainly a most powerful and impressive player who never involved himself in needless difficulties.

Of all Open Championships ever held, none was more memorable than the Championship of 1924; a representative entry of fifty-two was a near record even for those days, and with the thirty or so contestants in the Ladies' Championships in progress the same week, the scene at Roehampton must have been very vibrant. But it was the open final itself, between D. L. G. Joseph and Miss D. D. Steel, that rendered it remarkable, resulting, as it did, in a triumph for Joseph +3 +3, after a contest of sensational thrills, Joseph's brilliant 2-ball break of eight points when pegged out with only one opponent ball on the court, being typical of the display.

In this notable year, 1924, the brothers G. L. and M. B. Reckitt presented challenge trophies to launch the Open Doubles Championships. These were first played for at Cheltenham, and added greatly to the attractions of that tournament.

Then the year 1925 saw the institution of the Gentlemen's Championships which meeting for the first two years was held in conjunction with the Open Championships—together with the Ladies' Championships—in one flowing fortnight. The second week of these Championships not surprisingly proved rather a strain on all concerned, even the spectators seeming to wilt under the weight of such a massive programme!

Accordingly in 1927 the Championship arrangements were altered in order to space the events more evenly, and the schedule then settled upon is still followed today.

As to the recruitment of new material, Mr. and Mrs. Apps strove hard and successfully to stimulate interest in Surrey, and many a newcomer was welcomed under the auspices of the Surrey County Union. Mr. Apps' own pre-eminence as a player of course could hardly be over-estimated, for he possessed in unique degree the precise qualities that make croquet interesting; forwardness, fearlessness, and extreme enterprise in picking up and establishing a set break, no matter from what position.

An unique feature of the Surrey Union was their holding of genuine "garden-party" croquet tournaments at private residences at Bookham. In the neighbourhood were some seven full-size lawns—in delightful settings—all with hospitable hostesses entertaining competitors to luncheons and teas!

The Middlesex County Union held tournaments at Hurlingham for their members and likewise made converts for the game.

Mr. Robert Tingey as "authorised instructor" (1938/39) was largely answerable for additional associates and in a manner very unselfish. Mr. Tingey himself in the two years before the outbreak of war was on the crest of the wave and second only to Mr. Charles Colman, who ranked first. Yet he deliberately sacrificed his time and energy and forgot his own pleasures in order to foster the game by expert tuition.

Before the war-clouds of 1939, however, developed into a stark reality, the resplendent days of croquet were already in eclipse and the diminution in members rendered the position grave.

That a universal war, extending for six endless years, did not quench our frail organism was an astonishing testimony and tribute both to the careful stewardship of the past and the wise work of the ever vigilant Councils of the day.

A Rabbit's Lament

No longer shall I flinch and quake,
When I my first long shot must take
Or lay my tice, my hoop to make.
It is the end.

I've sent my yellow off the court:
I've hit the peg before I ought:
Forgotten all that I've been taught.
I must amend.

And if I take off from the red
It never moves! I raised my head.
Yet to this wretched game I'm wed.
It is the end.

I do not feel I am inspired,
I have no lift though balls are wired.
I cannot shoot. I am so tired!
I must amend.

Yes, I will practise. I'll endeavour
To make that all-round break so clever.
Changing my tactics—missing never.
It's NOT the end.

So when my rabbit-ship is o'er,
And handicap plus three or four,
I'll never say I'll play no more.
And so I end.

A. R. ABBIT

BRIDGE

by E. P. C. Cotter, *British International*

Here is a slam hand to exercise your skill. As South you are in a contract of Six Spades.

S—A, K, Q.
H—10, 9, 8, 6, 3.
D—K, J.
C—7, 5, 3.
N
W E
S
S—J, 9, 8, 7, 3.
H—A, K, Q.
D—A, 9.
C—A, 9, 6.

North opened the bidding with one Heart and East overcalled with two Clubs, South bid three Spades and eventually landed in a small slam.

The opening lead was the Two of Clubs. How do you play? The Two of Clubs is clearly a singleton so you must win trick one with your Ace. Now you draw the trumps. But on the second round West fails. The third trump honour is played and you enter your own hand by leading a Heart and you draw East's Ten of Spades with your Knave. Now you lay down a second Heart honour and East fails. The going is certainly tough! You can of course ruff the last Heart good but you are an entry short. What is to be done? The time has come to do a bit of counting. West is known to have started with one Spade, four Hearts, and one Club. Therefore he must have seven Diamonds. Then the odds are 7/2 that he holds the Queen. So you play a third round of Hearts and lead your Nine of Diamonds and finesse dummy's Knave. What good does that do as you hold the Ace alone? Wait and see. Now you lead a heart from dummy and discard your Ace of Diamonds! West wins but can only lead back a Diamond and you have your twelve tricks—five Spades, four Hearts, two Diamonds and a Club.

Now let me try you out on defence. You are West on lead against 3NT reached as follows: South—One Diamond; North—Two Clubs; South—2NT; North—3NT.

You decide to open the King of Hearts and you see:—

S—7, 4, 3.
H—8, 2.
D—J, 6, 3.
C—A, K, J, 10, 5.
S—K, J, 5.
H—K, Q, 6. N
D—A, Q, 2. W E
C—9, 7, 6, 3. S

Your partner drops the nine and you hold the trick. You follow with the Queen and your partner completes the peter, and you again hold the trick.

Now what about having a look at South's hand—not literally, but let us work it out. He must hold Spade Ace, Heart Ace, Club Queen and four or five Diamonds to the King. Therefore if you play a third heart and establish your partner's suit how does he get in. The declarer will with two tempos set up two Diamond tricks. The only way to defeat him is to rob him of one of his tempos, by making another one for yourself. You must set up a Spade trick before the Diamonds are established. You must rely on your partner for the Ten of Spades. So you lead the King or Knave of Spades. The small one won't do—you'll be end-played! By logical reasoning you hold the declarer to eight tricks. Any lead but a Spade honour to trick three gives the declarer his contract on a plate. (Copyright

FAIR SHARES FOR ALL

1. I view with deep feelings the apparent general fall-away in membership, etc., of croquet in the U.K. In Australia, one is told, there are at least 10,000 players and some 200 clubs; and a similar healthy picture exists in New Zealand.

In the U.K. there is a very different picture which appears to be moving in a retrograde direction. Thus, in the C.A. Handbook there are under sixty clubs, and recently two or three well known ones have had to "pack up": also Roehampton has in recent years had three of its famous lawns taken away, for obvious reasons! Again, membership of the C.A. which was about 560 in the 1958/59 Handbook has fallen to about 530 in the 1960/61 Handbook.

2. One strong reason, I submit, for the fall-away in croquet numbers, etc., in the U.K. is that croquet is largely now run "by the experts for the experts." Here are certain statistics on this matter, taken from *Croquet* and from the C.A. Handbook; the qualification for expert has been taken at 1½ bisques or better.

- (a) In the 1960/61 C.A. Handbook there were about 50 experts (excluding two or three from New Zealand and Australia) and there were about 475 non-experts, ranging from near-experts to rabbits and beginners. Thus there is only one expert (10%) to nine others (90%).
- (b) Turning to Club Tournaments (which many players regard as the "high-light" of their croquet season and even take their holidays at such Tournaments), these are organised so that the experts get, in effect, about 50% more games than the non-expert. This is due partly to:—
- (i) the expert being able to take part in the main "handicap event": the reverse does not in practice apply to the bulk of average or poor players, i.e. playing in open events;
- (ii) open events being often the best of three games,
- or (iii) level events being on the Draw and Process system which thus doubles the number of games played by the experts.

Figures which I have analysed from three leading Tournaments (and which have been authoritatively verified) illustrate with remarkable consistency that the expert gets in Club Tournaments 50% more games than the non-experts. It can, of course, be argued that the experts deserve this, as they have achieved it by hard practice and by the "sweat of their brows": and that seems fair comment.

During the Hurlingham Club Tournament one saw, from the first day onwards, experts enjoying hour after hour of play each day, whereas the "rabbits" had often to wait about for two, or even three, days without a game. After all, the experts have two open events so why not "cut out" of the popular handicap singles any expert of, say, 1 bisque or better. This would be an appreciated gesture and also help the charming Manager in his heavy task.

- (c) But the truer picture of the experts' huge preponderance only comes out when one analyses the big championship events (singles events only), viz.
- (i) The Men's and Women's championship and du Pre cup.
- (ii) The championships (and Association Plate).
- (iii) The President's Cup.
- (iv) The Ladies' Field Cup.
- (v) The Inter-County championships.
- (vi) The Surrey Cup.

An analysis of one year of the above six events shows that the experts played in some 500 games and the other players almost all near-experts, in some 65 games. These are formidable figures which merit consideration of whether ALL these very high-level events are necessary or even useful for the good of croquet, as a whole in the U.K.

3. Clearly events (i), (ii), (iii) above are essential; besides, they provide a brilliant exposition of the game for the enjoyment and even benefit of large numbers of spectators. But what about the Surrey Cup and the "Inter Counties" or the Ladies' Field Cup?

(a) The Surrey Cup is a fairly new event, intended to encourage those coming on for selection for the President's Cup, especially younger players. This was certainly not the case this year or last, when most of the eight charming and happy players who were of middle age, to say the least, enjoyed a solid week's croquet at Roehampton—at the expense of the unfortunate members of that Club. Worse still, the following week, these lawns had to be watered, etc. for the impending Club's Autumn Tournament and thus seldom were more than two lawns available for members, whose encouragement, and not discouragement, should be a primary object.

(b) The "Inter-Counties". This event is really just a "jolly" for its players—no real competitive worries, no responsibilities, but just a delightful week's croquet, with old friends, free of charge, on the lovely Hurlingham lawns—to the discomfiture of Club members! The "Inter-Counties" has little similarity to other inter-county games—Cricket, Rugger, Hockey, Lawn Tennis, Bowls, etc.—in which trial games, Selection Committees and strong general interest in the County—all feature as essentials.

Here again the question arises as to whether the "Inter-Counties" serves a really useful purpose for croquet.

(c) I have also more than once heard that if any such event be "cut out" it should be the Ladies' Field Cup!

4. Before further considering whether the Surrey Cup, Ladies' Field Cup or the "Inter-Counties" merit continuation, in the general interest of croquet, let us first see if any useful substitute Tournament(s) can be found. In many games there are "old-Boys" Public School Competitions—in Golf—Tennis—Soccer, etc. All these competitions get widespread Press publicity and, of course, feature in the School magazines and are followed with great interest by the boys—and surely it is the younger generation which badly needs bringing into the orbit of croquet. I know that Marlborough—and Eton, I believe—could easily raise good teams; and presumably many other Public Schools. And let the Ladies' Schools, such as Roedean, etc., also come in.

I do submit that this scheme be examined by the C.A. Council with energy and vision. If successful, as it should be, it might well lead to bringing in numbers of the younger generation into playing croquet.

5. May I venture to suggest also the following ideas for popularising croquet and increasing its players—

- (a) To urge parents who play croquet to encourage their sons and daughters, at least to "have a try". (That two championship young players are the sons of croquet playing parents is a pointer of what can be done.)
- (b) To arrange classes for beginners, especially young players and particularly during holidays. (The classes of often 15-20 young golfers which Mr. S. S. Scott runs at Roehampton shows what indeed can be done.) As a beginner I never got any help or instruction, but things are better now, I think!
- (c) To develop a scheme of Junior Associates, at a NIL or nominal entrance fee and "catch them young".
- (d) For Clubs to hold simple and short competitions confined to beginners—to encourage them and whet their appetites towards taking part in proper Tournaments—and to join the C.A. of course.

6. Summary and conclusions:

- (a) The recent general fall away in C.A. membership and the demise of certain Clubs is indeed a serious matter.
- (b) A major reason for this appears to be that croquet is now largely organised by the experts (10%) for the experts, who get a huge preponderance in Tournament games. This cannot be in the interests of the 90% of non-experts and demands the urgent attention of the experts who control croquet.
- (c) Thus high level experts should not be allowed to enter, normally, in Tournament Handicap events.

(d) Whereas many of the championship-level events are essential, it would appear that (i) the Surrey Cup serves no really useful purpose and is detrimental to the well-being of Roehampton and should therefore be abolished; (ii) it is doubtful if the Ladies' Field serves a really useful purpose; (iii) this would seem to apply also to the "Inter-Counties"! But it has such deep past associations that any suggestion of its abolition would produce a "roar of rage"!

(e) The strong possibility of an "old Boys" (and Girls) inter-School Competition should be examined with intensity and vision by the C.A. Council. It merits the fullest trial, for reasons given. And it should replace the Ladies' Field Cup which fortunately often takes place at the end of July when School holidays have begun.

(f) Certain other lesser suggestions have been added to attract and encourage new players, especially the young, the rabbits and the "hungry sheep".

F. H. N. DAVIDSON

Notes from the Clubs

Budleigh Salterton

The Club has had another very successful season in every way except for the weather, which started to become wet on the Monday of the July tournament, and has been raining more or less ever since.

Both our tournaments had more entries than at any time since the war. Six new players played in the novices competition, and we have had two further recruits resulting from the London match. Also we welcome Rev. and Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey and J. K. Brown, who will be joining our ranks next year.

Individual successes

Mrs. E. Rotherham won the Open Championship.
Miss E. J. Warwick won the Ladies' Championship and the Ladies' Field Cup.

J. G. Warwick won his Silver Medal by winning our July tournament.

Lt.-Col. G. E. Cave was second in the Surrey Cup.
Miss A. E. Mills, Dr. and Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt, Major E. C. Heathcote and G. A. Black did well at home and away tournaments.

The London Match

This was won by Budleigh Salterton by 8-2, but the London team, although possessing several first class players was not as strong as usual. This annual match produces strong local interest, and is excellent in its recruiting value. If, for Budleigh Salterton H. O. Hicks could see his way to play again and Major G. F. Stone could recover from his leg trouble, and reinforced by our latest arrivals the Elveys and J. K. Brown; and if for London J. W. Solomon, J. A. Hollweg and D. J. V. Hamilton Miller could reinforce their team, what a match it would be. We sincerely hope to have a match up to this standard next year.

Novices Competition

Out of eight entries this was won by P. J. Cooper, who is in his second year at Marlborough, and is the son of A. J. Cooper. Peter is a real chip of the old block, and is developing into a very useful player.

Gymkhana

A successful gymkhana was held early in August, which was much enjoyed by all who took part.

Hurlingham

This has been a fairly quiet month, after the exertions of the August tournament and the dinner. Members have had their customary privilege of seeing the "Best Eight" competing among themselves. If the spectators absorbed half of what they saw their game should show a notable improvement.

We are holding our annual end of season get together in October to exchange views on the season's workings. Criticisms can be aired and the committee usually go away with a number of suggestions for them to ponder over before the opening of the following season.

Hunstanton

In spite of the worst weather week of the year, everybody seemed to enjoy the tournament which has just ended. We had visits both from the B.B.C. Television and the I.T.A. and we all saw ourselves in the sports news.

We are hoping to fix our Spring American Tournament weekend from April 14th-17th, and hope that we shall have a record entry.

HANDICAPS CONFIRMED OR ALTERED BY THE HANDICAP CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

September 22nd, 1960

BRIGHTON (Official)

Miss Hickson 8½ to 8.
Dr. Ormerod 3 to 2½.
Mrs. Temple 9 to 7½.
E. Whitehead 3½ to 2½.
Lt.-Col. Prichard 2½ to 1½.
W. H. Austin 10 to 9½.

BRIGHTON (Unofficial)

Major R. Driscoll 10 to 9.
D. R. Watson 10 to 9.
Mrs. W. H. P. Roe 10 to 9.
Miss C. Templeton 10½ to 9½.
Mrs. N. E. Wallwork 4½ to 3½.
N. F. Blackwood 3½ to 2½.
Brig. J. S. Omond 7½ to 7.
Miss E. Newman 7½ to 7.
Miss Forbes Cowan 5 to 4.
Miss E. Johnson 6 to 5½.
H. A. Green 3½ to 2½.

HUNSTANTON

Miss S. G. Hampson 12 to 9.
Mrs. A. N. Rolf 10 to 8½.
G. A. Black 7½ to 7.
Capt. V. G. Gibbey 8½ to 10.

PARKSTONE

Mrs. W. H. P. Roe 9 to 8½.
P. Thompson 5 to 4½.
Dr. Ormerod 2½ to 2.
C. H. R. Penny 3½ to 2½.
B. Lloyd Pratt —1 to —1½.
Mrs. E. E. Clarke 10.
Miss M. M. Fickling 15.

CHELTENHAM (Unofficial)

BEFORE PLAY
Miss B. de C. Mathews 4½ to 4.
Miss R. M. Allen 6 to 5.

AFTER PLAY
F. H. Pugh *10 to 10.
W. H. Thorp *8 to 6.
Cmdr. D. W. Roe 5 to 4.
E. G. Bantock 5 to 4½.
Miss K. Sessions *11 to 11.
H. A. Sheppard 12 to 11.
Miss F. Bulley 14.
K. Friday *14.

HURLINGHAM CLUB

Mrs. M. L. Thom 6½ to 5½.
Mrs. A. D. Karmel 12 to 11 (D 10).
Brig. C. C. Russell 14 to 12.

SOUTHWICK CLUB

Miss M. Morgan 8 to 7.
W. P. H. Roe 6½ to 5½.
Mrs. E. M. Truett 12 to 11.
Mrs. Gibson 14 to 12.
E. C. Mogridge 9½ to 7.
W. E. Moore 4½ to 4.

COMPTON CLUB

W. H. Austin 8½.

NEW HANDICAP

N. V. Snell *9 to 9.

THE PRESIDENT'S CUP

HURLINGHAM

September 5th—9th

This famous competition can only be regarded as a lineal successor of the former Champion Cup presented by A. E. Beddow in 1901, and as such it reached this season its 49th year. The Eight selected in this instance were all able to accept the invitation extended to them, the first occasion for many years in which this has been so, and the contest was naturally expected to be a particularly interesting one. So indeed it proved to be, though the gap between the three who finished at the top and the rest was somewhat wider than might have been forecast. It was good to see Patrick Cotter returning to the fine form below which he had fallen a little of late and so becoming a winner for the sixth time in the twelve years he has competed for the trophy. This equals the record of Miss D. D. Steel, though this of course extended over a longer period (1922-1937); there were in these years ten competitors in the event which may be reckoned to have made victory somewhat more difficult to achieve. Cotter arrived at this contest with a new, longer and slightly heavier mallet, which seemed to give him greater confidence than he has displayed recently. After a narrow escape in the first round from Dudley Hamilton-Miller he went ahead, winning his first five games; but in the sixth round, missing an easy rover hoop (did he take it too quickly perhaps?) he allowed John Solomon to catch him up and win a crucial game. John had lost a game in an earlier round to Joan Warwick, more by the excellent play of the lady than by any failure of his own. In the following round he brought off a "straight triple" against Mrs. Rotherham and was playing with his characteristic brilliance and enterprise; but on meeting Humphrey Hicks in the 7th round, having looked a certain winner, he mishit a rush to the peg, put one ball out and having taken a somewhat incautious shot with the other, allowed his opponent to pick up a beautifully made all-round break and win the game by the single point. At the half-way stage, therefore, Cotter had six games, Solomon five, Ormerod and Wiggins four each.

Both Cotter and Solomon won their games in round 8—John with a faultless triple against Wiggins, but in the next round, after one of the most interesting games of the week, he lost a close contest with Ormerod, in which William's wonderfully consistent shooting gained him the day. In this second series the Bristol player began to come right into the picture. In round 12 he won a close game against Cotter despite missing a long peg-out, Patrick making a strong challenge from this point but missing a crucial roquet when within a few points of victory.

On the final morning an intriguing position had arisen. With Cotter at ten games and Solomon and Ormerod at nine each, the possibility of a triple tie existed. (Such a situation has never actually materialised in this competition, though there was a quadruple tie in 1929, which Capt. J. B. Morgan won). A critical match was due between Patrick and John and a most interesting game developed, as is so often the case when these masters encounter each other. The issue swayed from one side to the other: first Patrick, then John, then Patrick again, then John, and at the last moment Patrick snatching victory with a 25-yard shot. Ormerod having won his game against Hamilton-Miller, the situation as the last round began was that unless Cotter lost his game (which was thought unlikely) he must win, even though (as seemed probable) Ormerod defeated Miss Warwick. But the ladies upset both these appercarts, first when Mrs. Rotherham won a close game from Cotter, and then when the largest "gallery" of the week was counting upon a tie, William faltered and, his shooting deserting him, Joan improved her score at his expense.

So it was Patrick who, spared any further exertions, won the Cup again after an interval of three years, and on the whole deservedly so. The top Three had certainly given the spectators good value, and one wonders why there were not more of them to enjoy and profit by the splendid skill they showed. Among the others perhaps the most notable showing was made by Joan Warwick who has come on so remarkably this year and did well to score six games in such company at her first attempt. She coped with the narrow hoops better than several of her rivals, no one hits their roquets more firmly in the middle, and it is only in leaving the balls at the end of the turn that she still perhaps has something to learn.

The weather began well, but on the Tuesday it poured all through the day. When we had resigned ourselves to this year's customary gloom "ridges of high pressure" began to appear in the forecasts, no doubt relieving the pressure on the contending Eight, and bathing us all in radiant sunshine on the closing days.

It was good indeed to see Mrs. Elvey managing her first London tournament, successfully coping with an unforeseeable—and unprecedented—problem, and winning particularly warm tributes from all her charges at the end. We shall hope to find her often again installed in tent or pavilion at our metropolitan fixtures.

Analysis of Play

E. P. C. Cotter won 11 games: namely against Mrs. E. Rotherham +13, J. W. Solomon +4, H. O. Hicks +14 +19, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +2 +15, Miss E. J. Warwick +23 +9, W. P. Ormerod +26, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins +26 +26; and lost 3 games to Mrs. E. Rotherham -3, J. W. Solomon -5, W. P. Ormerod -4.

J. W. Solomon won 10 games: namely, against Mrs. E. Rotherham +19 +5, H. O. Hicks +7, E. P. C. Cotter +5, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +24 +17, Miss E. J. Warwick +19, W. P. Ormerod +2, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins +23 +26; and lost 4 games to H. O. Hicks -1, E. P. C. Cotter -4, Miss E. J. Warwick -15, W. P. Ormerod -9.

W. P. Ormerod won 10 games: namely, against Mrs. E. Rotherham +22 +23, J. W. Solomon +9, H. O. Hicks +16 +8, E. P. C. Cotter +4, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +21 +9, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins +13 +17; and lost 4 games to J. W. Solomon -2, E. P. C. Cotter -26, Miss E. J. Warwick -10 -5.

H. O. Hicks won 7 games: namely, against Mrs. E. Rotherham +2 +22, J. W. Solomon +1, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +9, Miss E. J. Warwick +18 +15, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins +25; and lost 7 games to J. W. Solomon -7, E. P. C. Cotter -14 -19, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller -11, W. P. Ormerod -16 -18, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins -15.

Miss E. J. Warwick won 6 games: namely, against Mrs. E. Rotherham +10, J. W. Solomon +15, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +3, W. P. Ormerod +10 +5, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins +23; and lost 8 games to Mrs. E. Rotherham -4, J. W. Solomon -19, H. O. Hicks -18 -15, E. P. C. Cotter -23 -9, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller -10, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins -26.

Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins won 5 games: namely, against Mrs. E. Rotherham +26, H. O. Hicks +15, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +15 +15, Miss E. J. Warwick +26; and lost 9 games to Mrs. E. Rotherham -3, J. W. Solomon -23 -26, H. O. Hicks -25, E. P. C. Cotter -26 -26, Miss E. J. Warwick -23, W. P. Ormerod -13 -17.

Mrs. E. Rotherham won 4 games: namely, against E. P. C. Cotter +3, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller +9, Miss E. J. Warwick +4, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins +3; and lost 10 games to J. W. Solomon -19 -5, H. O. Hicks -2 -22, E. P. C. Cotter -13, D. J. V. Hamilton Miller -13, Miss E. J. Warwick -10, W. P. Ormerod -22 -23, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins -26.

D. J. V. Hamilton Miller won 3 games: namely, against Mrs. E. Rotherham +13, H. O. Hicks +11, Miss E. J. Warwick +10; and lost 11 games to Mrs. E. Rotherham -9, J. W. Solomon -24 -17, H. O. Hicks -9, E. P. C. Cotter -2 -15, Miss E. J. Warwick -3, W. P. Ormerod -21 -9, Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins -15 -15.

THE SURREY CUP

ROEHAMPTON

September 5th—9th

This year, the sixth in the series of competitions for the Surrey Cup, saw a radical change in the representation from that of last year. Only two of last year's selections, Colonel Cave, the holder, and Guy Warwick, were in the field, the remaining six being absent for a doubtlessly wide range of reasons. Joan Warwick had been translated to the higher realms two miles east of Roehampton; Canon Creed Meredith was unable to accept on account of health while Della who has had a particularly strenuous (and successful) season probably found the prospect of fourteen games too much even for this sprightly mid-septuagenarian. Monty Spencer Ell, without whom this event seems incomplete, had unfortunately to cry off because of gripple a day or two before the start. Of the newcomers, Curtis and Karmel were obviously knocking on the door in view of their much improved form this year, while Paynter was an obvious choice in view of his successes up and down the country in his all too brief sojourn on our shores. Beamish, Duffield and Stobart made up the rest of the eight, a reward for their consistent play over many years.

Cave having won the event on two previous occasions was fancied to be the victor, if only because of his vaster experience in the rigours of continuous play over five days. Warwick who has had a rather in and out season was the doyen of the party and had in fact taken part in a play-off in this event with Cave three years ago. An affection of his digestive system contributed, however, to his chances dwindling in the second half of the week since, having won five of his first six games on Monday and Tuesday, he only succeeded in notching one further victory in his remaining eight games.

Paynter and Stobart started somewhat quietly, winning only two games and one game respectively in the first series, but both showed much improved form later in the week. Beamish and Duffield can feel reasonably content with their record, both participating in many tight finishes. Karmel who had been playing in tournaments for five consecutive weeks looked a little stale in his early encounters but his record in the second series, six wins out of seven games, was second to none.

This leaves Curtis, who from the start looked a potential winner, as indeed it proved. He had been noted by the more discerning at Hurlingham early in August to have come on a great deal, and his play in this event abundantly confirmed this impression. The only occasion during the week when the ultimate issue might have been affected was his second game against Cave. In this he was at the peg with both balls with Cave trailing some way behind. Cave then hit in and took one ball from the second hoop to the rover; shortly after he failed to get a good position for four-back with his other ball, tried rather adventurously for his hoop but failed and the game went to Curtis.

Mention may also be made of another game in which Cave participated, this time against Duffield. The latter being for penultimate and peg had pegged out one of his opponent's balls, the other being for the rover hoop. A little later the issue seemed to be clear-cut, for Cave, having made the rover, had hit one of Duffield's balls; however, in using the other ball to assist in the peg out he rushed it on to the stick, thus depriving himself of a further shot. Duffield then failed to peg out with his remaining ball, as indeed did Cave with his next shot. Duffield then mercifully brought the proceedings to a close by hitting the peg.

Mrs. Turketine graced the event from the Manager's Chair and made her now customary exordium to the competitors at the outset of the tournament. Beyond being a little exercised over a pegged down game on Monday, she found things running more smoothly than last year which was just as well since she was in the throes of moving house during the week.

Analysis of Play

D. W. Curtis won 11 games: namely, against G. E. Cave +25 +6, J. G. Warwick +2 +9, W. B. C. Paynter +10 +23, G. V. G. Beamish +6 +4, A. D. Karmel +16, F. E. Stobart +10, E. P. Duffield +9; and lost 3 games to A. D. Karmel -14, F. E. Stobart -3, E. P. Duffield -2.

G. E. Cave won 9 games: namely, against J. G. Warwick +11 +5, G. V. G. Beamish +6 +13, F. E. Stobart +11 +15, W. B. C. Paynter +22, A. D. Karmel +22, E. P. Duffield +19; and lost 5 games to D. W. Curtis -25 -6, W. B. C. Paynter -18, A. D. Karmel -4, E. P. Duffield -1.

A. D. Karmel won 8 games: namely, against G. V. G. Beamish +11 +4, G. E. Cave +4, J. G. Warwick +11, W. B. C. Paynter +8, D. W. Curtis +14, F. E. Stobart +2, E. P. Duffield +12; and lost 6 games to G. E. Cave -22, J. G. Warwick -19, W. B. C. Paynter -12, D. W. Curtis -16, F. E. Stobart -7, E. P. Duffield -10.

G. V. G. Beamish won 7 games: namely, against J. G. Warwick +21, W. B. C. Paynter +3 +13, F. E. Stobart +16 +9, E. P. Duffield +23 +2; and lost 7 games to G. E. Cave -6 -13, J. G. Warwick -10, D. W. Curtis -6 -4, A. D. Karmel -11 -4.

W. B. C. Paynter won 6 games: namely, against G. E. Cave +18, J. G. Warwick +14, A. D. Karmel +12, F. E. Stobart +12 +15, E. P. Duffield +13; and lost 8 games to G. E. Cave -22, J. G. Warwick -7, G. V. G. Beamish -3 -13, D. W. Curtis -10 -23, A. D. Karmel -8, E. P. Duffield -1.

J. G. Warwick won 6 games: namely, against W. B. C. Paynter +7, G. V. G. Beamish +10, A. D. Karmel +19, F. E. Stobart +13, E. P. Duffield +4 +12; and lost 8 games to G. E. Cave -11 -5, W. B. C. Paynter -14, G. V. G. Beamish -21, D. W. Curtis -2 -9, A. D. Karmel -11, F. E. Stobart -2.

E. P. Duffield won 5 games: namely, against G. E. Cave +1, W. B. C. Paynter +1, D. W. Curtis +2, A. D. Karmel +10, F. E. Stobart +4; and lost 9 games to G. E. Cave -19, J. G. Warwick -4 -12, W. B. C. Paynter -13, G. V. G. Beamish -23 -2, D. W. Curtis -9, A. D. Karmel -12, F. E. Stobart -10.

F. E. Stobart won 4 games: namely, against J. G. Warwick +2, D. W. Curtis +3, A. D. Karmel +7, E. P. Duffield +10; and lost 10 games to G. E. Cave -11 -15, J. G. Warwick -13, W. B. C. Paynter -12 -15, G. V. G. Beamish -16 -9, D. W. Curtis -10, A. D. Karmel -2, E. P. Duffield -4.

BRIGHTON

August 22nd—27th

For once the breezy young men of the "Met" office were wrong the right way round: only Tuesday lived up to their dire expectations—and who then cared tuppence about the deluge, since the evening promised—I should say, the Club's Chairman, Mr. Blackwood, promised us all—a champagne party? The occasion was indeed made worthy of the two notable anniversaries

we were invited to celebrate: the Diamond Jubilee of the Club, of which, we were happily reminded, Major Abbey's father was a founder-member, and the ninety-fifth birthday of Miss Elphinstone-Stone, who stood at the door to greet us, as alert and composed as ever. We were fortunate in having Mr. Reckitt present to express with gracious accomplishment our good wishes to Miss Elphinstone-Stone, to the members of the Club, and our gratitude to Mr. Blackwood.

Our hosts, as always, rose handsomely to the occasion of the tournament. At all times, there was the Hon. Secretary, Miss Daldy (not, alas, a competitor, since her multifarious duties would not permit), to answer our needs and deal with our queries and incompetencies with cheerful efficiency; at lunch and tea, there, as usual, was Mrs. Kirk-Greene at the seat of custom to make payment a pleasure for the wonderful meals that Mrs. Chittenden and her helpers had devised for us. And to refresh us before and after play (do I hear someone add "during"?) Mrs. Truett was bottletopping with unflinching zest, surrounded by a veritable festival of flowers, taken from Mr. Corke's garden and gloriously arranged by Mrs. Naylor.

No wonder the Southwick tournaments are popular. This popularity, however, cannot have been regarded with unmixed feelings by our Manager, Mr. Brackenbury. At one time, it seemed, he must have been hoping that all the finalists would prove to be "locals" or at least visitors intending to stay for the following "unofficial" tournament. But with unperturbed foresight he steered us through, providing us, moreover, with a shortened extra event for good measure.

In the groundsman, Adams, he had an indispensable ally, whose untiring energy and care of the ten lawns made our games a delight. The indelible whitening that he used for the boundary lines stood up well to the heavy rain during one or two nights.

Saturday's finals were dominated by the men, a worthy exception being Mrs. Temple, who won her class and was the only lady to reach the semi-final of the Doubles. Mr. Kirk-Greene deservedly won back the Gold Cup, and with the help of an accurately long-shooting and equally self-possessed partner, Mr. David Curtis, won the Doubles. All this he achieved despite the accompanying blare of incongruous "pop" music from a nearby fete. But then it is doubtful if the Last Trump itself would penetrate Mr. Kirk-Greene's concentration upon the execution of a well-prepared break!

The final of the big handicap had to be pegged down. But the Club's publicity department made sure that on Monday we should read that Colonel Prichard had achieved the notable feat of a victory over the seemingly indefatigable winner of the All-England Handicap, Mr. Whitehead, and in so doing, had retained the cup that he had come to Southwick to defend.

THE GOLD CUP.

DRAW.

(20 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. W. Longman bt Major G. F. Stone by 8.
Col. D. M. Prichard bt Major J. R. Abbey by 3.
W. B. C. Paynter bt Col. E. F. Stobart by 8.
W. Longman bt D. Jesson Dibley by 12.

SECOND ROUND.

G. E. W. Hitchcock bt Major J. H. Dibley by 5.
A. D. Karmel bt Mrs. N. Oddie by 21.
L. Kirk Greene bt Mrs. A. M. Daniels by 25.
Mrs. W. Longman bt Col. D. M. C. Prichard by 11.
W. B. C. Paynter bt W. Longman by 18.
Mrs. H. F. Chittenden bt M. B. Reckitt by 7.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey by 5.
E. P. C. Cotter bt D. W. Curtis by 10.

THIRD ROUND.

A. D. Karmel w.o. G. E. W. Hitchcock opponent scratched.
L. Kirk Greene bt Mrs. W. Longman by 14.
W. B. C. Paynter bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden by 7.
E. P. C. Cotter bt B. Lloyd Pratt by 14.

SEMI-FINAL.

L. Kirk Greene bt A. D. Karmel by 14.
E. P. C. Cotter bt W. B. C. Paynter by 24.

FINAL.

L. Kirk Greene bt E. P. C. Cotter by 10.

PROCESS.

(20 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

E. P. C. Cotter bt A. D. Karmel by 21.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Major J. H. Dibley by 13.
D. W. Curtis bt Mrs. N. Oddie by 7.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. W. Longman bt M. B. Reckitt by 12.
E. P. C. Cotter bt W. B. C. Paynter by 24.
Mrs. A. M. Daniels bt W. Longman by 2.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Major J. R. Abbey by 7.
Major G. F. Stone bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden by 24.
Col. F. E. Stobart bt D. W. Curtis by 7.
L. Kirk Greene bt D. Jesson Dibley by 24.
Col. D. C. M. Prichard w.o. Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey opponent retired.

THIRD ROUND.

Mrs. W. Longman bt E. P. C. Cotter by 15.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Mrs. A. M. Daniels by 16.
Major G. F. Stone bt Col. F. E. Stobart by 9.
L. Kirk Greene bt Col. D. C. M. Prichard by 20.

SEMI-FINAL.

B. Lloyd Pratt bt Mrs. W. Longman by 12.
L. Kirk Greene bt Major G. F. Stone by 26.

FINAL.

L. Kirk Greene bt B. Lloyd Pratt by 10.

LEVEL SINGLES (CLASS "B").

THE FRANC CUP.

(3 to 5½ bisques).
(18 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Dr. H. J. Penny bt Mrs. C. R. Farnsworth by 10.
H. A. Green bt Lady Ursula Abbey by 9.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. F. N. Latham bt E. Whitehead by 7.
T. A. Chignell bt Miss G. Forbes Cowan by 8.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod bt Capt. K. D. Millar by 22.
Miss H. D. Parker bt Dr. H. J. Penny by 9.
H. A. Green bt Miss K. Ault by 9.
N. F. Blackwood bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon by 11.
E. G. Bantock bt E. A. Roper by 6.
R. H. Newton bt Mrs. M. Stuart by 15.

THIRD ROUND.

T. A. Chignell bt Mrs. F. N. Latham by 15.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod bt Miss H. D. Parker by 25.
H. A. Green bt N. F. Blackwood by 10.
E. G. Bantock bt R. H. Newton by 11.

SEMI-FINAL.

Dr. G. L. Ormerod w.o. T. A. Chignell opponent retired.
H. A. Green bt E. G. Bantock by 8.

FINAL.

Dr. G. L. Ormerod bt H. A. Green by 3.

HANDICAP SINGLES.

MONTEITH BOWL.

(6 Bisques and over).
(26 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Major R. Driscoll (12) bt Mrs. F. H. Curtis (14) by 23.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (10) bt Mrs. G. L. Ormerod (14) by 5 on time.
Major A. M. Hicks (8½) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (12) by 5.
Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Miss L. Elphinstone Stone (7) by 19.
Miss G. Bennett (9½) bt Miss M. M. Taylor (8) by 14.
W. H. Austin (10) bt Miss L. Tallemach (7) by 5.
Mrs. H. D. Wooster (8) bt F. H. Curtis (9) by 9.
W. P. H. Roe (6½) bt G. A. H. Alexander (9) by 15.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) bt E. C. Mogridge (9½) by 11.
G. F. Paxon (7) bt Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) by 2.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. E. A. Roper (7½) bt Mrs. A. D. Karmel (12) by 1 on time.
Major R. Driscoll (12) bt Miss S. G. Hampson (12) by 8.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (10) w.o. Major A. M. Hicks (8½) opponent retired.

Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Miss E. Bennett (9½) by 13.
Mrs. H. D. Wooster (8) bt W. H. Austin (10) by 1 on time.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) bt W. P. H. Roe (6½) by 16.
G. F. Paxon (7) bt Miss E. Johnston (6) by 11 on time.
Dr. C. A. Boucher (8) bt Mrs. I. A. Paxon (8) by 10.

THIRD ROUND.

Mrs. E. A. Roper (7½) bt Major R. Driscoll (12) by 5 on time.
Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (10) by 14.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) bt Mrs. H. D. Wooster (8) by 4.
Dr. C. A. Boucher (8) bt G. F. Paxon (7) by 17.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Mrs. E. A. Roper (7½) by 3.
Dr. C. A. Boucher (8) bt Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) by 3.

FINAL.

Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Dr. C. A. Boucher (8) by 6.

HANDICAP SINGLES.

MAURICE RECKITT BOWL.

(Unrestricted).

(58 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

W. H. Austin (10) bt Mrs. C. R. Farnsworth (5) by 12.
Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) by 3.
Lady Ursula Abbey (3½) bt G. A. H. Alexander (9) by 7.
Mrs. F. N. Latham (3) bt Major J. H. Dibley (2½) by 25.
A. D. Karmel (1½) bt Miss E. Bennett (9½) by 13.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) bt Dr. C. A. Boucher (8) by 12.
E. A. Roper (3) bt Mrs. M. Stuart (3½) by 7.
Miss S. G. Hampson (12) bt M. B. Reckitt (-1) by 21.
Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) bt W. B. C. Paynter (0) by 8.
Col. D. C. M. Prichard (2½) bt Miss M. M. Taylor (8) by 23.
R. H. Newton (3) bt W. P. H. Roe (6½) by 12.
E. G. Bantock (5) bt W. Longman (1) by 20.
Miss K. Ault (4½) bt Mrs. A. M. Daniels (2) by 10.
Major A. M. Hicks (8½) bt G. E. W. Hitchcock (2½) by 8.
H. A. Green (3½) bt Mrs. F. E. Stobart (16) by 17.
N. F. Blackwood (3½) bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon (4½) by 6.
B. Lloyd Pratt (-1) bt Mrs. N. Oddie (-1) by 21.
D. W. Curtis (8) bt Col. F. E. Stobart (2½) by 10.
Mrs. W. Longman (-1) bt Mrs. H. D. Wooster (8) by 14.
Capt. K. B. Millar (3) bt Miss L. Tallemach (7) by 11.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod (3) bt Miss H. D. Parker (3½) by 1.
Mrs. E. A. Roper (7½) bt F. H. Curtis (9) by 11.
E. Whitehead (3½) bt T. A. Chignell (4) by 2.
D. Jesson Dibley (3) bt G. F. Paxon (7) by 15.
E. C. Mogridge (9½) bt Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey (0) by 9.
Miss E. Johnston (6) bt Miss L. Elphinstone Stone (7) by 11.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. H. F. Curtis (14) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (12) by 4.
Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) bt W. H. Austin (10) by 4.
Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Lady Ursula Abbey (3½) by 14.
Mrs. F. N. Latham (3) bt A. D. Karmel (1½) by 7.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) bt E. A. Roper (3) by 17.
Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) bt Miss S. G. Hampson (12) by 2.
Col. D. C. M. Prichard (2½) bt R. H. Newton (3) by 15.
Miss K. Ault (4½) bt E. G. Bantock (5) by 8.
H. A. Green (3½) bt Major A. M. Hicks (8½) by 6.
B. Lloyd Pratt (-1) bt N. F. Blackwood (3½) by 10.
D. W. Curtis (8) bt Mrs. W. Longman (-1) by 4.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod (3) bt Capt. K. B. Millar (3) by 14.
E. Whitehead (3½) bt Mrs. E. A. Roper (7½) by 7.
D. Jesson Dibley (3) bt E. C. Mogridge (9½) by 12.
Miss E. Johnston (6) bt Mrs. G. L. Ormerod (14) by 13.
Major J. R. Abbey (1½) bt Mrs. G. Forbes Cowan (5) by 2.

THIRD ROUND.

Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) bt Mrs. F. H. Curtis (14) by 8.
Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) bt Mrs. F. N. Latham (3) by 16.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) bt Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) by 20.
Col. D. C. M. Prichard (2½) bt Miss K. Ault (4½) by 16.
B. Lloyd Pratt (-1) bt H. A. Green (3½) by 6.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod (3) bt D. W. Curtis (8) by 5.
E. Whitehead (3½) bt D. Jesson Dibley (3) by 3.
Miss E. Johnston (6) bt Major J. R. Abbey (1½) by 4.

FOURTH ROUND.

Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) w.o. Mrs. E. M. Temple (9) opponent scratched.
Col. D. C. M. Prichard (2½) bt Miss K. D. Hickson (8½) by 6.
B. Lloyd Pratt (-1) bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod (3) by 8.
E. Whitehead (3½) bt Miss E. Johnston (6) by 14.

SEMI-FINAL.

Col. D. C. M. Prichard (2½) bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) by 24.
E. Whitehead (3½) bt B. Lloyd Pratt (-1) by 7.

FINAL.

Col. D. C. M. Prichard (2½) bt E. Whitehead (3½) by 3.

HANDICAP DOUBLES.

(Unrestricted). (26 Pairs).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. F. N. Latham and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (13) bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod and Mrs. G. L. Ormerod (17) by 2 on time.
H. A. Green and N. F. Blackwood (7) bt Major G. F. Stone and Mrs. E. A. Roper (4½) by 1 on time.
B. Lloyd Pratt and Miss S. G. Hampson (11) bt F. H. Curtis and Mrs. F. H. Curtis (23) by 7.
Col. F. G. Stobart and Miss K. Ault (7) bt Dr. H. J. Penny and Miss K. D. Hickson (12) by 13.
D. Jesson Dibley and W. E. Moore (7½) bt Col. D. C. M. Prichard and Mrs. A. M. Daniels (4½) by 1.
E. A. Roper and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (7½) bt Miss H. D. Parker and Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey (3½) by 11.
Capt. F. B. Millar and Miss G. Forbes Cowan (8) bt Major J. H. Dibley and E. G. Bantock (7½) by 11.
Mrs. N. Oddie and Miss E. Johnston (5½) bt W. Longman and Mrs. W. Longman (½) by 11.
Mrs. E. M. Temple and W. H. Austin (19) bt Mrs. C. R. Farnsworth and Miss E. Bennett (14½) by 9.
R. H. Newton and Mrs. H. D. Wooster (11) bt G. F. Paxon and Mrs. I. A. Paxon (15) by 15 on time.

SECOND ROUND.

L. Kirk Greene and D. W. Curtis (1) bt M. B. Reckitt and Major R. Driscoll (10) by 17.
Mrs. N. F. Latham and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (13) bt Dr. C. A. Boucher and Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (10) by 7.
B. Lloyd Pratt and Miss S. G. Hampson (11) bt H. A. Green and N. F. Blackwood (7) by 4.
D. Jesson Dibley and W. E. Moore (7½) bt Col. F. G. Stobart and Miss K. Ault (7) by 9.
E. A. Roper and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (7½) bt Capt. K. B. Millar and Miss Forbes Cowan (8) by 17.
Mrs. E. M. Temple and W. H. Austin (19) bt Mrs. N. Oddie and Miss E. Johnston (5½) by 5.
W. B. C. Paynter and Miss M. M. Taylor (8) bt R. H. Newton and Mrs. H. D. Wooster (11) by 4.
E. P. C. Cotter and A. D. Karmel (-1½) bt E. Whitehead and Mrs. E. Whitehead (19½) by 2.

THIRD ROUND.

L. Kirk Greene and D. W. Curtis (1) bt Mrs. F. N. Latham and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (13) by 14.
D. Jesson Dibley and W. E. Moore (7½) bt B. Lloyd Pratt and Miss S. G. Hampson (11) by 3 on time.
Mrs. E. M. Temple and H. A. Austin (19) bt E. A. Roper and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (7½) by 4 on time.
E. P. C. Cotter and A. D. Karmel (-1½) bt W. B. C. Paynter and Miss M. M. Taylor (8) by 16.

SEMI-FINAL.

L. Kirk Greene and D. W. Curtis (1) bt D. Jesson Dibley and W. E. Moore (7½) by 18.
E. P. C. Cotter and A. D. Karmel (-1½) bt Mrs. E. M. Temple and W. A. Austin (19) by 8.

FINAL.

L. Kirk Greene and D. W. Curtis (1) bt E. P. C. Cotter and A. D. Karmel (-1½) by 7.

BRIGHTON

(Unofficial)

August 29th - September 3rd

Southwick has scored again. While a tornado struck and floods were out elsewhere, our tournament wept her girlish tears (60 years of 'em) in the morning then laughed for the rest of the day.

A large entry again gave Major Dibley a chance to show his mettle; and despite the huge "official" affair of the week before, all helpers turned up bright and smiling.

The catering was excellent as usual. One visitor remarked that she could not get such an assortment of lovely cakes in all Brighton—and she was a bidder for "left-overs!"

The courts played beautifully and Mr. Adam is to be highly commended. Mrs. Naylor's flower displays were much admired. Somebody's garden must look depleted to account for those lovely creations in colour.

At the bar Mrs. Truett was adept and unfailingly cheerful. A "very present" help? The bridge room, under the kindly management of Mrs. Carew proved a solace and relaxation when, having "given the game away" at croquet one felt the need of "getting away from it all."

Mr. Blackwood won his class event and "Y" and Mr. Green won "X" playing with uncanny skill and a good effort was put up by Miss N. Wallwork who beat her opponent by 26. Mrs. Roe and Major Driscoll also played consistently well whilst a 6ft. 5in and-a-bit Cambridge Undergraduate in his first croquet year was something to be reckoned with. He had everything—youth, skill, imagination.

Cheers for Southwick! It's a tonic!

HANDICAP SINGLES.

(3½ bisques and under).

(16 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

W. B. C. Paynter (0) bt D. Jesson Dibley (3) by 3.
Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) bt R. H. Newton (3) by 13.
H. A. Green (3½) bt Brig. A. E. Stokes-Roberts (2) by 8.
Miss A. E. Mills (2) bt W. Longman (1) by 4.
N. F. Blackwood (3½) bt Mrs. F. N. Latham (3) by 8.
E. Whitehead (2½) bt Miss H. D. Parker (3½) by 9.
Col. F. E. Stobart (2½) bt Mrs. W. Longman (-1) by 3.
Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) bt E. A. Roper (3) by 7.

SECOND ROUND.

Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) bt W. B. C. Paynter (0) by 14.
Miss A. E. Mills (2) bt H. A. Green (3½) by 16.
N. F. Blackwood (3½) bt E. Whitehead (2½) by 11.
Col. F. E. Stobart (2½) bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) by 7.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss A. E. Mills (2) bt Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) by 21.
N. F. Blackwood (3½) bt Col. F. E. Stobart (2½) by 13.

FINAL.

N. F. Blackwood (3½) bt Miss A. E. Mills (2) by 13.

HANDICAP SINGLES.

(4 to 7 Bisques).

(10 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Miss E. Johnston (6) bt Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) by 9.
W. E. Moore (4½) bt Miss M. Posford (6½) by 2.

SECOND ROUND.

Miss L. Tallemach (7) bt Miss L. Elphinstone-Stone (7) by 17.
Miss E. Johnston (6) bt Mrs. C. F. Rand (5½) by 12.
Miss G. Forbes Cowan (5) bt W. E. Moore (4½) by 11.
W. P. H. Roe (6½) bt Mrs. N. Wallwork (4½) by 8.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss E. Johnston (6) bt Miss L. Tallemach (7) by 11.
Miss G. Forbes Cowan (5) bt W. P. H. Roe (6½) by 18.

FINAL.

Miss G. Forbes Cowan (5) bt Miss E. Johnston (6) by 3.

HANDICAP SINGLES ("X.Y.").

EVENT "X".

(56 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

G. A. H. Alexander (9) bt Miss L. Tallemach (7) by 12.
Mrs. N. Wallwork (4½) bt N. F. Blackwood (3½) by 10.
Group Capt. R. Clarke (12*) bt Mrs. F. E. Stobart (16) by 13.
D. M. Horne (8*) bt E. A. Roper (3) by 12.
Miss H. D. Parker (3½) bt Miss C. Templeton (10½) by 13.
Col. F. E. Stobart (2½) bt Miss A. E. Mills (2) by 18.
D. R. Watson (10) bt Miss E. Johnston (6) by 8.
Mrs. N. Oddie (-1) bt Miss H. McKean (10) by 11.
Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (12) by 3.
W. E. Moore (4½) bt Miss L. Newman (7½) by 9.
Brig. A. E. Stokes-Roberts (2) bt Mrs. C. N. Gibson (12*) by 13.
Mrs. A. E. Carter (12) bt Miss M. Lacey (13) by 15.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (10) bt E. Whitehead (2½) by 24.
Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) bt Mrs. K. Lowein (15) by 3.
Miss M. Posford (6½) bt Brig. J. S. Omond (7½) by 4.
Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) bt Miss L. Isaac (14) by 15.
Miss G. Forbes Cowan (5) bt W. Longman (1) by 13.
Miss M. M. Taylor (8) bt Mrs. I. A. Paxon (8) by 17.
Major R. Driscoll (10) bt Mrs. C. F. Rand (5½) by 2.
Miss M. Towers (14) bt Miss D. Toms (14) by 3 on time.
Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) bt Miss L. Elphinstone-Stone (7) by 17.
E. C. Mogridge (9½) bt Mrs. E. Whitehead (16*) by 17.
Mrs. K. Baker (12) bt Mrs. M. D. Horton (12*) by 1 on time.
H. A. Green (3½) bt Mrs. W. Longman (-1) by 9.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. F. N. Latham (3) bt Mrs. E. A. Roper (7½) by 14.
W. B. C. Paynter (0) bt R. H. Newton (3) by 2.
Mrs. N. Wallwork (4½) bt G. A. H. Alexander (9) by 5.
D. M. Horne (8*) bt Group-Capt. R. Clarke (12*) by 5 on time.
Col. F. E. Stobart (2½) bt Miss H. D. Parker (3½) by 8.
Mrs. N. Oddie (-1) bt D. R. Watson (10) by 8.
Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) bt W. E. Moore (4½) by 11.
Brig. A. E. Stokes-Roberts (2) bt Mrs. A. E. Carter (12) by 10.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (10) bt Mrs. J. H. Dibley (6) by 17.
Miss M. Posford (6½) bt Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) by 15.
Miss G. Forbes Cowan (5) bt Miss M. Taylor (8) by 3.
Major R. Driscoll (10) bt Miss M. Towers (14) by 10.
Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2) bt E. C. Mogridge (9½) by 5.
H. A. Green (3½) bt Mrs. K. Baker (12) by 13.
Mrs. H. D. Wooster (8) bt Mrs. F. E. L. Griffiths (8) by 2.
Miss E. Bennett (9½) bt W. P. H. Roe (6½) by 3 on time.

PARKSTONE

September 12th—17th

Heavy rain on alternate days of the Parkstone tournament unsuccessfully did its best to spoil this popular event of the croquet season. In spite of three lawns becoming unplayable for the latter part of one day, our ever benevolent manager "Della" brought the proceedings to a successful conclusion.

The prizes were presented by the Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith. Other clubs were well represented and newcomers included Mr. and Mrs. Roe of Brighton, Mr. and Mrs. Pickett of London, and Mrs. Wallwork of Anglesey.

Owing to the weather the usual extra event had to be curtailed, but a novel one took place. In the warmth and comfort of the blacked out bridge room, Dr. Penny showed ourselves and other stars of the croquet world, whom the moving eye of his cine camera spied out at Brighton, Eastbourne and the recent President's Cup.

The results of the matches are all shown below and readers may deduce what they like from them. The shortest game was that between the Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith and Mr. Christopher Penny, which was won by the latter with the help of 2½ bisques and the stimulus of pouring rain, in 40 minutes. The steady play of Mr. George Mills and Miss K. Ault are also to be noted.

Mr. B. Lloyd-Pratt played well in the play-off of the Opens and beat Col. D. W. Beamish. In the "B" finals, Mr. C. Penny quickly won his game with two good breaks and a single peel. The final of the Open Handicap was a typical example of an in and out game. Mr. Thompson's bisques had gone by the time he had reached 4-back and the 5th. Mr. Lloyd-Pratt won eventually in a close finish.

The best thanks of all competitors go to the Manager, the Hon. Secretary and the groundsman who provided the excellent lawns, and to Mrs. Allen and the ladies of the tennis section who were responsible for the excellent catering. Finally, we have not forgotten those not mentioned by name, winners, losers and non-players, who helped to make this a most enjoyable week.

OPEN SINGLES.

DRAW.

(8 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Col. D. W. Beamish bt Mrs. L. H. Ashton by 9.
Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith bt Miss A. E. Mills by 12.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Major J. R. Abbey by 15.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod bt Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish by 5.

SEMI-FINAL.

Col. D. W. Beamish bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith by 16.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod bt B. Lloyd Pratt by 13.

FINAL.

Col. D. W. Beamish bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod by 9.

PLAY-OFF.

B. Lloyd Pratt bt Col. D. W. Beamish by 9.

PROCESS.

(8 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Dr. G. L. Ormerod bt Miss A. E. Mills by 10.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Col. D. W. Beamish by 3.
Major J. R. Abbey bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith by 12.
Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish bt Mrs. L. H. Ashton by 26.

SEMI-FINAL.

B. Lloyd Pratt bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod by 3.

Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish bt Major J. R. Abbey by 12.

FINAL.

B. Lloyd Pratt bt Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish by 9.

LEVEL SINGLES (CLASS "B").

DESHON CUP.

(2½ to 6½ bisques).

(Law 44 suspended).

(12 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Miss K. Ault bt Major F. Hill Bernhard by 4.
Lady Ursula Abbey bt W. P. H. Roe by 20.
Miss V. E. Mills bt Dr. H. J. Penny by 8.
Mrs. N. E. Wallwork bt Mrs. E. M. Kay by 15.

SECOND ROUND.

C. H. R. Penny bt Mrs. R. A. Hill by 19.
Miss K. Ault bt Lady Ursula Abbey by 6.
Miss V. E. Mills bt Mrs. N. E. Wallwork by 5.
P. Thompson bt Mrs. N. McMordie by 1.

SEMI-FINAL.

C. H. R. Penny bt Miss K. Ault by 12.
Miss V. E. Mills bt P. Thompson by 20.

FINAL.

C. H. R. Penny bt Miss V. E. Mills by 20.

HANDICAP SINGLES (CLASS "C").

HALSE CUP.

(7 bisques and over).

(17 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

G. R. Mills (8) bt A. F. Rash (8) by 9.

SECOND ROUND.

R. J. Pickett (9) bt Mrs. C. Devitt (13) by 13.
Miss G. L. Weston (11) bt Mrs. E. E. Clark (10) by 7.
Mrs. C. E. Gatehouse (8) bt Mrs. G. N. Robertson (14) by 21.
G. R. Mills (8) bt Mrs. G. L. Ormerod (14) by 19.
Mrs. G. Fitter (10) bt Miss M. C. Macaulay (7) by 16.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (9) bt Mrs. A. L. Drake Brockman (7½) by 8 on time.

Miss K. D. Hickson (8) bt Mrs. R. J. Pickett (9) by 10.
Miss N. N. Fickling (16) bt Mrs. N. D. Cork (9) by 2.

THIRD ROUND.

R. J. Pickett (9) Miss G. L. Weston (11) by 18.
G. R. Mills (8) w.o. Mrs. C. E. Gatehouse (8) opponent scratched.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (9) bt Mrs. G. Fitter (10) by 12.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8) w.o. Miss N. N. Fickling (16) opponent retired.

SEMI-FINAL.

G. R. Mills (8) bt R. J. Pickett (9) by 15.
Miss K. D. Hickson (8) bt Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (9) by 6.

FINAL.

Miss K. D. Hickson (8) bt G. R. Mills (8) by 11.

HANDICAP SINGLES.

GOLD CUP.

(Unrestricted).

(35 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Miss H. F. Woolley (8) bt Mrs. M. D. Cork (9) by 5.
R. J. Pickett (9) bt Lady Ursula Abbey (3½) by 13.
B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) bt Mrs. G. N. Robertson (14) by 6 on time.

SECOND ROUND.

Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) bt Mrs. C. E. Gatehouse (8) by 11.
Major J. R. Abbey (1½) bt Miss V. E. Mills (3½) by 3.
A. F. Rash (8) bt Mrs. G. L. Ormerod (14) by 9 on time.
P. Thompson (5) bt Mrs. L. H. Ashton (2) by 7.
Miss K. Ault (4½) bt Miss K. D. Hickson (8) by 9.
Mrs. R. A. Hill (6) bt Miss N. C. Macaulay (7) by 9.
Col. D. W. Beamish (—½) bt Miss N. N. Fickling (16) by 4 on time.

Miss H. F. Woolley (8) bt R. J. Pickett (9) by 4.
B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) bt W. P. H. Roe (6½) by 15 on time.
Mrs. E. E. Clark (9) bt Major F. Hill Bernhard (5) by 7 on time.
Mrs. N. McMordie (5) bt Mrs. R. J. Pickett (9) by 6.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod (2½) bt Miss G. L. Weston (11) by 16.
Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith (0) bt Mrs. N. E. Wallwork (4) by 3.
C. H. R. Penny (3½) bt Mrs. E. N. Kay (6) by 16.
Miss A. E. Mills (2) w.o. Mrs. G. Fitter (10) opponent scratched.

G. R. Mills (8) bt Mrs. A. L. Drake Brockman (7½) by 13.

THIRD ROUND.

Major J. R. Abbey (1½) bt Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) by 17.
P. Thompson (5) bt A. F. Rash (8) by 11.
Miss K. Ault (4½) w.o. Mrs. R. A. Hill (6) opponent scratched.
Miss H. F. Woolley (8) w.o. Col. D. W. Beamish (—½) opponent scratched.

B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) bt Mrs. E. E. Clark (9) by 7.
Dr. G. L. Ormerod (2½) bt Mrs. M. McMordie (5) by 7.
C. H. R. Penny (3½) bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith (0) by 25.
G. R. Mills (8) bt Miss A. E. Mills (2) by 7.

FOURTH ROUND.

P. Thompson (5) bt Major J. R. Abbey (1½) by 12.
Miss H. F. Woolley (8) w.o. Miss K. Ault (4½) opponent retired.
B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod (2½) by 5.
G. R. Mills (8) bt C. H. R. Penny (3½) by 12.

SEMI-FINAL.

P. Thompson (5) bt Miss H. F. Woolley (8) by 15.
B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) bt G. R. Mills (8) by 9.

FINAL.

B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) bt P. Thompson (5) by 7.

HANDICAP DOUBLES.

(14 Pairs).

FIRST ROUND.

Miss K. Ault and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (13½) bt Mrs. L. H. Ashton and A. F. Rash (10) by 8.
Mrs. M. D. Cork and Mrs. E. E. Clark (19½) bt Mrs. E. M. Kay and Mrs. R. A. Hill (12) by 3.
B. Lloyd Pratt and G. R. Mills (7) bt Dr. H. J. Penny and C. H. R. Penny (7) by 13.
Col. D. W. Beamish and Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish (½) bt P. Thompson and Major F. Hill Bernhard (10) by 11.
Miss A. E. Mills and Miss V. E. Mills (5½) bt Miss K. D. Hickson and Mrs. G. Fitter (18) by 18.
R. J. Pickett and Mrs. R. J. Pickett (18) bt Mrs. M. McMordie and Mrs. C. Devitt (17) by 1 on time.

SECOND ROUND.

Miss K. Ault and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (13½) bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod and Mrs. G. L. Ormerod (16½) by 8.
Mrs. M. D. Cork and Mrs. E. E. Clark (19½) bt B. Lloyd Pratt and G. R. Mills (7) by 13.
Col. D. W. Beamish and Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish (½) bt Miss A. E. Mills and Miss V. E. Mills (5½) by 9.
Mrs. N. E. Wallwork and Mrs. C. E. Gatehouse (12½) w.o. R. J. Pickett and Mrs. R. J. Pickett (18) opponent scratched.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss K. Ault and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (13½) bt Mrs. M. D. Cork and Mrs. E. E. Clark (19½) by 7.
Col. D. W. Beamish and Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish (½) bt Mrs. N. E. Wallwork and Mrs. C. E. Gatehouse (12½) by 9.

FINAL.

Col. D. W. Beamish and Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish (½) bt Miss K. Ault and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (13½) by 8.

CHELTENHAM

(Non-official).

September 12th—19th

Mrs. Edmund Reeve having asked to be excused the long journey, owing to a bad cold, the management was placed in the able hands of Miss Pauley. We were very pleased to see "D.D.", but alas only as a spectator. She has played in almost every tournament here since she won the Cheltenham Challenge Cup in 1922, and she pronounced it "a very enjoyable tournament". The rain on Wednesday and Friday delayed the programme, but there were some very pleasant days and the attendance was good.

There were some nerve-wracking games. Miss Roe, in a seemingly hopeless position against Jackson, came through from the first hoop, peeled her partner ball, but just failed to get position for her own.

In the play-off in the Open, Jackson mastered Mrs. Daniels, who had played some sparkling games. Comdr. Roe won the Open Handicap, and a new trophy, the Daniels Cup. The Doubles were an inter-family contest between the Prichards and the Jacksons. New recruits and long-bisqueurs have benefited from the instruction parties given by Mr. Jackson which were highly appreciated. Thorp (8) won Event III, and Miss Sessions (11) was runner-up in "X". Miss Leonard retained the Calthrop Cup.

At the conclusion of the prize-giving, a silver mug was presented to Alex, as a token of the club's appreciation of the work he had done for it.

OPEN SINGLES.

(Two Lives).

PROCESS.

(8 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

G. E. P. Jackson bt Mrs. B. de C. Mathews by 25.
Mrs. A. M. Daniels bt T. G. S. Colls by 11.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt E. G. Bantock by 11.
Miss I. M. Roe bt Cdr. D. W. Roe by 16.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. A. M. Daniels bt G. E. P. Jackson by 19.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt Miss I. M. Roe by 14.

FINAL.

Mrs. A. M. Daniels bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard by 18.

PLAY-OFF.

G. E. P. Jackson bt Mrs. A. M. Daniels by 21.

DRAW.

(8 Entries).

Mrs. A. M. Daniels bt Cdr. D. W. Roe by 18.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt Mrs. B. de C. Mathews by 6.
E. G. Bantock bt T. G. S. Colls by 13.
G. E. P. Jackson bt Miss I. M. Roe by 3.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. A. M. Daniels bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard by 15.
G. E. P. Jackson bt E. G. Bantock by 15.

FINAL.

G. E. P. Jackson bt Mrs. A. M. Daniels by 7.

HANDICAP SINGLES.

(3½ to 10½ bisques).

(9 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (10) bt Miss L. Hulton by 5.

SECOND ROUND.

Miss E. P. Carmouche (7) bt F. Langley (4½) by 6.
Miss M. Posford (6½) bt Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (10) by 5.
W. H. Thorp (8) bt F. H. Pugh (10) by 17.
E. Sidwell (6) bt G. A. H. Alexander (9) by 13.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss M. Posford (6½) bt Miss E. P. Carmouche (7) by 22.
W. H. Thorp (8) bt E. Sidwell (6) by 15.

FINAL.

W. H. Thorp (8) bt Miss M. Posford (6½) by 8.

HANDICAP SINGLES.

CALTHROP CUP.

(11 bisques or more).

(7 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

H. A. Sheppard (12) bt Miss K. Sessions (11) by 8.
Miss E. M. Leonard (11) bt A. K. Priddy (14) by 18.
Miss V. Bolton (12) bt Miss P. Bulley (14) by 15.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss E. M. Leonard (11) bt H. A. Sheppard (12) by 10.
Miss L. Wilkinson (12) bt Miss V. Bolton (12) by 15.

FINAL.

Miss E. M. Leonard (11) bt Miss L. Wilkinson (12) by 7.

HANDICAP SINGLES ("X.Y.").

(Unrestricted).

EVENT "X."

FIRST ROUND.

Cdr. D. W. Roe (5) bt Mrs. B. de C. Mathews (4) by 12.
Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (10) bt W. H. Thorp (8) by 4.
G. E. P. Jackson (0) bt F. Langley (4½) by 9.
Mrs. A. M. Daniels (2) bt Miss L. Hulton (6) by 5.
Miss I. M. Roe (3½) bt E. G. Bantock (5) by 5.
F. H. Pugh (10) bt G. A. H. Alexander (9) by 5.
Miss L. Wilkinson (12) bt Miss P. Bulley (14) by 15.
E. Sidwell (6) bt T. G. S. Colls (2½) by 14.

SECOND ROUND.

H. A. Sheppard (12) bt Mrs. D. W. Roe (8) by 21.
Miss M. Posford (6½) bt Miss V. Bolton (12) by 16.
Cdr. D. W. Roe (5) bt Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (10) by 16.
G. E. P. Jackson (0) bt Mrs. A. M. Daniels (2) by 3.
Miss I. M. Roe (3½) bt F. H. Pugh (10) by 9.
E. Sidwell (6) bt Miss L. Wilkinson (12) by 6.
Miss K. Sessions (11) bt Miss E. P. Carmouche (7) by 2.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (1½) bt Miss E. M. Leonard (11) by 5.

THIRD ROUND.

H. A. Sheppard (12) bt Miss M. Posford (6½) by 20.
Cdr. D. W. Roe (5) bt G. E. P. Jackson (0) by 13.
E. Sidwell (6) bt Miss I. M. Roe (3½) by 14.
Miss K. Sessions (11) bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (1½) by 4.

SEMI-FINAL.

Cdr. D. W. Roe (5) bt H. A. Sheppard (12) by 4.
Miss K. Sessions (11) bt E. Sidwell (6) by 8.

FINAL.

Cdr. D. W. Roe (5) bt Miss K. Sessions (11) by 5.

EVENT "Y."

(24 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. B. de C. Mathews (4) w.o. W. H. Thorp (8) by 1 opponent retired on peg.
Miss L. Hulton (6) bt F. Langley (4½) by 16.
E. G. Bantock (5) bt G. A. H. Alexander (9) by 6.
T. G. S. Colls (2½) bt Miss P. Bulley (14) by 8.

SECOND ROUND.

Miss V. Bolton (12) bt Mrs. D. W. Roe (8) by 10.
Miss L. Hulton (6) w.o. Mrs. B. de C. Mathews (4) opponent retired.
E. G. Bantock (5) bt T. G. S. Colls (2½) by 8.
Miss E. M. Leonard (11) bt Miss E. P. Carmouche (7) by 17.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss L. Hulton (6) bt Miss V. Bolton (12) by 6.
E. G. Bantock (5) bt Miss E. M. Leonard (11) by 4.

FINAL.

E. G. Bantock (5) bt Miss L. Hulton (6) by 6.

HANDICAP DOUBLES.
(10 Pairs).

FIRST ROUND.

E. Sidwell and Cdr. D. W. Roe (11) bt Mrs. B. de C. Mathews and Miss K. Sessions (15) by
H. A. Sheppard and Mrs. A. M. Daniels (14) bt Miss E. P. Carmouche and Capt. L. C. Ayle (14) by

SECOND ROUND.
E. G. Bantock and Miss E. M. Leonard (16) bt Miss I. M. Roe and Miss V. Botton (15½) by 20.
Mr. and Mrs. G. E. P. Jackson (10) bt E. Sidwell and Cdr. D. W. Roe (11) by 17.
H. A. Sheppard and Mrs. A. M. Daniels (14) bt Miss L. Wilkinson and G. A. H. Alexander (21) by 10.
Lt.-Col. and Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (11½) bt Miss L. Hulton and Miss M. Posford (12½) by 9.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mr. and Mrs. G. E. P. Jackson (10) bt E. G. Bantock and Miss E. M. Leonard (16) by 4.
Lt.-Col. and Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (11½) bt H. A. Sheppard and Mrs. A. M. Daniels (14) by 4.

FINAL.

Lt.-Col. and Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (11½) bt Mr. and Mrs. G. E. P. Jackson (10) by 20.

THE CHALLENGE AND GILBEY CUPS

August 10th—20th

CHALLENGE CUPS.

THE ROEHAMPTON CHALLENGE CUP.

("Two Lives").

DIVISION I.

THE DRAW.

(10 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Major R. Tingey bt G. Victor Evans by 24.
W. B. C. Paynter bt A. D. Karmel by 2.

SECOND ROUND.

M. Spencer Ell bt Brig. A. E. Stokes Roberts by 15.
Major R. Tingey bt Capt. H. G. Stoker by 11.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt W. B. C. Paynter by 11.
D. J. V. Hamilton Miller bt D. W. Curtis by 20.

SEMI-FINAL.

Major R. Tingey bt M. Spencer Ell by 12.
D. J. V. Hamilton Miller bt B. Lloyd Pratt by 16.

FINAL.

Major R. Tingey bt D. J. V. Hamilton Miller by 17.

PLAY-OFF.

Major R. Tingey bt D. J. V. Hamilton Miller by 6.

PROCESS.

(10 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

D. J. V. Hamilton Miller bt M. Spencer Ell by 17.
Capt. H. G. Stoker bt W. B. C. Paynter by 18.
D. J. V. Hamilton Miller bt G. Victor Evans.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt Major R. Tingey by 17.
A. D. Karmel bt D. W. Curtis by 9.

SEMI-FINAL.

D. J. V. Hamilton Miller bt Capt. H. G. Stoker by 16.
B. Lloyd Pratt bt A. D. Karmel by 15.

FINAL.

D. J. V. Hamilton Miller bt B. Lloyd Pratt by 8.

DIVISION II.

THE COUNCIL CHALLENGE CUP.

(2½ to 5½ bisques).

(12 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon bt Dr. H. J. Penny by 7.
Dr. B. R. Sandiford bt Miss E. E. Fisher by 22.
Mrs. R. Tingey bt Major J. H. Dibley by 23.
Miss A. E. Mills bt R. G. Belcher by 12.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. V. C. Gasson bt Mrs. P. E. Heley by 8.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon bt Dr. B. R. Sandiford by 8.
Miss A. E. Mills bt Mrs. R. Tingey by 8.
Mrs. S. M. Adler bt G. E. W. Hitchcock by 15.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon bt Mrs. V. C. Gasson by 17.
Mrs. S. M. Adler bt Miss A. E. Mills by 8.

FINAL.

Mrs. S. M. Adler bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon by 12.

DIVISION III.

THE RECKITT CHALLENGE CUP.

(6 to 8½ bisques).

(8 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. J. Pavia bt Rev. C. W. Wordsworth by 7.
Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson bt Mrs. M. H. Carrington by 16.
Mrs. H. J. Collins bt Brig. J. S. Omond by 12.
Major-Gen. F. H. N. Davidson w.o.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson bt Mrs. J. Pavia by 16.
Mrs. H. J. Collins bt Major-Gen. F. H. N. Davidson by 17.

FINAL.

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson bt Mrs. H. J. Collins by 7.

THE GILBEY CUPS.

BLOCK "A".

(—1½ to 2 bisques).

(10 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Major R. Tingey (—1) bt B. Lloyd Pratt (—1) by 16.
D. J. V. Hamilton Miller (—1½) w.o. Brig. A. E. Stokes Roberts (2) opponent scratched.

SECOND ROUND.

A. D. Karmel (1½) bt G. V. Evans (1½) by 17.
Major R. Tingey (—1) bt W. B. C. Paynter (0) by 3.
Capt. H. G. Stoker (1) bt D. J. V. Hamilton Miller (—1½) by 25.
M. Spencer Ell (0) w.o. G. W. Williams (1) opponent scratched.

SEMI-FINAL.

Major R. Tingey (—1) bt A. D. Karmel (1½) by 9.
M. Spencer Ell (0) bt Capt. H. G. Stoker (1) by 13.

FINAL.

Major R. Tingey (—1) bt M. Spencer Ell (0) by 23.

PLAY-OFF.

Miss A. E. Mills (2½) bt Major R. Tingey (—1) by 11.
F. H. Curtis (12) bt J. E. Andrews (6½) by 18.

F. H. Curtis (12) bt Miss A. E. Mills (2½) by 16.

BLOCK "B".

(2½ to 4½ bisques).

(9 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. R. Tingey (2½) bt Dr. H. J. Penny (3½) by 3.

SECOND ROUND.

Miss A. E. Mills (2½) bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon (4½) by 14.
Mrs. S. M. Adler (3½) bt Mrs. R. Tingey (2½) by 4.
Mrs. V. C. Gasson (3) bt Miss E. E. Fisher (2½) by 12.
Mrs. P. E. Heley (4) bt Major J. H. Dibley (2½) by 24.

SEMI-FINAL.

Miss A. E. Mills (2½) bt Mrs. S. M. Adler (3½) by 6.
Mrs. P. E. Heley (4) bt Mrs. V. C. Gasson (3) by 17.

FINAL.

Miss A. E. Mills (2½) bt Mrs. P. E. Heley (4) by 7.

BLOCK "C".

(5 to 8½ bisques).

(9 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

J. E. Andrews (6½) w.o. Miss J. L. Preston (8½) opponent scratched.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. J. Pavia (6½) bt Major-Gen. F. H. N. Davidson (8) by 13.
J. E. Andrews (6½) bt Mrs. M. H. Carrington (8) by 6.
Mrs. H. J. Collins (6½) bt Rev. C. W. Wordsworth (8) by 7.
Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (8) bt Brig. J. S. Omond (7½) by 13.

SEMI-FINAL.

J. E. Andrews (6½) bt Mrs. J. Pavia (6½) by 3.
Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (8) bt Mrs. H. J. Collins (6½) by 18.

FINAL.

J. E. Andrews (6½) bt Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (8) by 3.

BLOCK "D".

(9 bisques and over).

(10 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

D. C. Caporn (9) bt Mrs. B. L. P. Caillard (14) by 12.
B. L. P. Caillard (14) bt Mrs. C. W. Wordsworth (12) by 17.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) w.o. J. E. Andrews (9*) opponent withdrawn.
Mrs. C. L. Robertson (9½) bt D. C. Caporn (9) by 14.
F. H. Curtis (12) bt B. L. P. Caillard (14) by 11.
C. L. Robertson (10) bt Mrs. F. H. Curtis (14) by 14.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) bt Mrs. C. L. Robertson (9½) by 3.
F. H. Curtis (12) bt C. L. Robertson (10) by 3.

FINAL.

F. H. Curtis (12) bt Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) by 15.

HANDICAP DOUBLES.

(Combined handicap of 4 or over).

(14 Pairs).

FIRST ROUND.

Dr. H. J. Penny and Mrs. P. E. Heley (7½) bt Rev. C. W. Wordsworth and Mrs. C. W. Wordsworth (20) by 5.
Brig. A. E. Stokes Roberts and Mrs. C. L. Robertson (11½) bt W. B. C. Paynter and Mrs. F. H. Curtis (14) by 8 on time.
Mrs. R. Tingey and Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (10½) bt D. C. Caporn and Mrs. J. Omond (18) by 8.
Gen. F. H. N. Davidson and Miss D. A. Lintern (7) bt Miss A. E. Mills and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (7) by 7 on time.
A. D. Karmel and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (13½) bt R. G. Belcher and F. H. Curtis (16½) by 10.
Major R. Tingey and Major-Gen. Wilson Haffenden (7) bt Capt. H. G. Stoker and C. L. Robertson (11) by 10.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. V. C. Gasson and Mrs. J. W. Speer (10½) bt Dr. H. J. Penny and Mrs. P. E. Heley (7½).
Mrs. R. Tingey and Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson 10½ bt Brig. A. E. Stokes Roberts and Mrs. C. L. Robertson (11½) by 3.
A. D. Karmel and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (13½) bt Gen. F. H. N. Davidson and Miss D. A. Lintern (7) by 23.
Major R. Tingey and Major-Gen. Wilson Haffenden (7) bt Major R. Dibley and G. V. Evans (4) by 7.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. R. Tingey and Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (10½) bt Mrs. V. C. Gasson and Mrs. J. W. Speer (10½) by 4.
Major R. Tingey and Major-Gen. Wilson Haffenden (7) bt A. D. Karmel and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (13½) by 4.

FINAL.

Mrs. R. Tingey and Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (10½) bt Major R. Tingey and Major-Gen. Wilson Haffenden (7) by 12.

GOLF CROQUET.

THE ASCOT CHALLENGE CUP.

(0 to 1 bisques).

(12 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

A. D. Karmel (0) bt Mrs. S. Phillips (1) by 3 and 1.
Capt. H. G. Stoker (0) bt W. B. C. Paynter (0) by 4 and 2.
Major R. Tingey (0) bt Miss A. E. Mills (1) by 2 up.
Mrs. S. M. Adler (1) bt Mrs. V. C. Gasson (1) by 2 up.
M. Spencer Ell (0) bt B. Lloyd Pratt (0) by 2 up.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. P. E. Heley (1) by 1 up.
G. V. Evans (0) bt Mrs. R. Tingey (1) by 1 up.

SECOND ROUND.

Capt. H. G. Stoker (0) bt A. D. Karmel (0) by 4 and 2.
Major R. Tingey (0) bt Mrs. S. M. Adler (1) by 3 and 1.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt M. Spencer Ell (0) by 3 and 1.
G. V. Evans (0) bt Miss E. E. Fisher (1) by 4 and 2.

SEMI-FINAL.

Major R. Tingey (0) bt Capt. H. G. Stoker (0) by 3 and 1.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt G. V. Evans (0) by 1 up.

FINAL.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) w.o. opponent scratched.

PLAY-OFF.

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson 2 bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon 2 up

BLOCK "B".

(11 Entries).

SECOND ROUND.

Gen. F. H. N. Davidson (2) bt Mrs. P. Kozhevar (3) by 5 and 3.
F. H. Curtis (2) bt W. A. FitzGerald (3) by 1 up.
Mrs. F. H. Curtis (3) bt S. M. Adler (2) by 3 and 2.

THIRD ROUND.

Mrs. L. E. Frenken (3) bt Mrs. M. Carrington (2) by 2 up.
Gen. F. H. N. Davidson (2) bt F. H. Curtis (2) by 1 up.
Mrs. L. M. Armstrong (3) bt Mrs. F. H. Curtis (3) by 3 and 2.
Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (2) bt Mrs. Beck (3) by 2 up.

SEMI-FINAL.

Mrs. L. E. Frenken (3) bt Gen. F. H. N. Davidson (2) by 1 up.
Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (2) bt Mrs. L. M. Armstrong (3) by 2 up.

FINAL.

Mrs. F. H. N. Davidson (2) bt Mrs. L. E. Frenken (3) by 1 up.

DELVES BROUGHTON CHALLENGE CUP.

HANDICAP DOUBLES.

(12 Pairs).

FIRST ROUND.

A. D. Karmel and Mrs. Karmel (3) bt Mrs. Kozhevar and Mrs. Frenken (6) by 2 and 1.

SECOND ROUND.

Mrs. Heley and Mrs. Curtis (4) bt M. Spencer Ell and Mrs. Solomon (1) by 5 and 3.
Major Tingey and Mrs. Tingey (1) bt A. D. Karmel and Mrs. Karmel (3) by 2 and 1.
Miss Lintern and Mrs. Davidson (2) bt W. B. C. Paynter and W. A. FitzGerald (3) by 9 and 8.
Gen. Davidson and F. H. Curtis (4) bt Mrs. Beck and Mrs. Armstrong (6) by 4 and 2.

SEMI-FINAL.

Major and Mrs. Tingey (1) bt Mrs. Heley and Mrs. Curtis (4) by 5 and 3.
Miss Lintern and Mrs. Davidson (2) bt Gen. Davidson and F. H. Curtis (4) by 1 up.

FINAL.

Major Tingey and Mrs. R. Tingey (1) bt Miss Lintern and Mrs. Davidson (2) by 5 and 3.

ALL ENGLAND HANDICAP SINGLES.

(18 Entries).

FIRST ROUND.

Mrs. A. Neville Rolfe (Hunstanton) (10) bt Mrs. J. L. Preston (Ryde) (8½) by 3.
Dr. B. R. Sandiford (Edgbaston) (3½) bt D. M. Anderson (Cheltenham) (2½) by 20.

SECOND ROUND.

L. B. Buckley (Reigate) (10) bt Mrs. M. L. Thom (Hurlingham) (6½) by 15.
V. A. de la Nougerede (Parkstone) (—1) bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (Brighton) (2) by 6.
Mrs. S. M. Adler (Roehampton) (3½) bt Dr. G. L. Ormerod (Bristol) (3) by 3.
Miss E. J. Warwick (Budleigh) (—1) bt Mrs. A. Neville Rolfe (Hunstanton) (10) by 13.
W. B. C. Paynter (Brighton) (0) bt Dr. B. R. Sandiford (Edgbaston) (3½) by 8.
Major-Gen. Wilson Haffenden (Hurlingham) (8) bt D. W. Curtis (Ipswich) (3) by 6.
E. Whitehead (Colchester) (5½) bt J. B. Gilbert (Roehampton) (½) by 25.
Major E. C. Heathcote (Budleigh) (5½) w.o. opponent scratched.

THIRD ROUND.

V. A. de la Nougerede (—1) bt L. B. Buckley (10) by 14.
Mrs. S. M. Adler (3½) bt Miss E. J. Warwick (—1) by 6.
W. B. C. Paynter (0) bt Major-Gen. Wilson Haffenden (8) by 4.
E. Whitehead (5½) bt Major Heathcote (5½) by 16.

SEMI-FINAL.

V. A. de la Nougerede (—1) bt Mrs. S. M. Adler (3½) by 8.
E. Whitehead (5½) bt W. B. C. Paynter (0) by 26.

FINAL.

E. Whitehead (5½) bt V. A. de la Nougerede (—1) by 21.

The account of the Challenge and Gilbey Cups, and of the All England Handicap, appeared in the September issue.

GOLF CROQUET MATCH

INTER-CLUB MATCH

Roehampton versus Dulwich. Played at Roehampton on Thursday, August 25th, 1960. Roehampton players named first

AMERICAN DOUBLES

Mrs. J. Pavia and Mrs. M. H. Carrington
lost to Mrs. Armstrong and Mrs. Pethebridge by 6-7
lost to Mrs. Frenken and Mrs. Kozhevar by 6-7
lost to Mrs. Beck and Miss Young by 6-7
Mrs. S. Phillips and Mrs. D. M. Staub
lost to Mrs. Armstrong and Mrs. Pethebridge by 5-8
lost to Mrs. Frenken and Mrs. Kozhevar by 6-7
beat Mrs. Beck and Miss Young by 8-5
Mrs. D. F. Caporn and Miss G. W. Bartlett
lost to Mrs. Armstrong and Mrs. Pethebridge by 6-7
lost to Mrs. Frenken and Mrs. Kozhevar by 4-9
lost to Mrs. Beck and Miss Young by 6-7
RESULT.—Dulwich bt Roehampton by 8 games to 1.