

Tailor Made
MALLETS

*FASHIONED TO YOUR OWN
SPECIFICATION*

BY JQUES CRAFTSMEN

Or choose from the JQUES range
PEEL, COLONIAL, TINGEY and others
Also Mallets with steel shafts.

ECLIPSE
CHAMPIONSHIP BALL

Guaranteed for Three Years

JAQUES
CROQUET EQUIPMENT

**KNOWN
AND USED
ALL OVER
THE WORLD**

Complete sets, or separate items of equipment are available for TOURNAMENT, CLUB or GARDEN use, from all good sports shops and stores. Full details and Illustrated Catalogue free on request.

JOHN JQUES & SON LTD
Thornton Heath, Surrey

SINCE 1795

No. 84. October 1965

Price 3s.

CROQUET

*The Official Organ
of The Croquet Association*



IONIDES CHALLENGE TROPHY

Challenge Trophy for the Open Singles Championship of the South of England, presented by the late Mrs. Ionides. Present holder: D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller.

and equipment by Jaques, of course

ALTERATIONS TO HANDICAPS

CHELTENHAM

Mrs. K. M. O. Sessions 2 to 1½.
Mrs. J. Power 12 to 10.
Mrs. J. Feaver 13 to 12.
G. Scott-Page 8 to 7.
D. Jesson-Dibley 2 to 1½.

NOTTINGHAM

(During Play)
G. A. Strutt 9 to 8.
(After Play)
Mrs. A. N. Rolfe 3 to 2½.
M. Murray 3 to 1½.
C. W. Haworth 12* to 10/D8.
G. A. Strutt 9 to 6½.
G. G. Taylor 4 to 5.

NON-ASSOCIATE

P. W. Elmes 8 to 7.

SOUTHWICK

Mrs. H. Wills 9 to 8.
Mrs. E. Thompson 8 to 7½.
J. W. Simon 0 to -½.
Mrs. L. Farlie 6½ to 6.
Mrs. R. A. Simpson 4 to 3½.
R. A. Simpson 3 to 1½.
Mrs. A. D. Karmel 7 to 6½.
Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld -½ to -1.
J. Rigiani 6 to 5½.
W. Bolton 13 to 11.

HUNSTANTON

T. O. Read 2½ to 0.
Miss S. A. Hampson 6 to 5.
Miss M. Bryan 9 to 8*.
W. de B. Prichard 15 to 10.
R. D. C. Prichard 12 to 8.
C. H. L. Prichard 9 to 8.

PRESIDENT'S CUP

J. P. R. Bolton -2½ to -3.

SURREY CUP

J. W. Simon -½ to -1.
P. J. M. Fidler -1 to -1½.

PARKSTONE

G. N. Aspinall 2 to 0.
F. Henshaw 11 to 9.
R. F. Rigiani 5½ to 5.
Mrs. C. Devitt 9 to 8.

ALL-ENGLAND

R. W. Bray 2 to 1½.
A. J. Oldham 5½ to 4½.
Mrs. L. Riggall 7 to 6½.
C. H. Prichard 8 to 7½.

WOKING CLUB RECOMMENDATIONS

Canon Pym 5 to 4.

NON-ASSOCIATES

Bennett 9 to 8.
J. Brougham 9 to 8.
T. D. Brougham 12* to 12.
Mrs. Mills 14 to 13.
Mrs. Nalder 12* to 12.
Mrs. D. T. Page 12* to 12.

LONGMAN CUP RESULTS

(Semi-final)

(Played at Nottingham)

SINGLES

D. V. H. Rees (6) beat Mrs. N. Tyldesley (8) +21.
A. C. W. Davies (7) beat Mrs. M. Jackson (10) +11.
J. Clarke (7) beat Mrs. E. Cocker (12) +15.

DOUBLES

D. V. H. Rees and A. C. W. Davies (13) lost to Mrs. N. Tyldesley and Mrs. M. Jackson (18) -5.
J. Clarke and W. T. B. Marchant (16) beat Mrs. E. Cocker and Mrs. H. Christie (25) +13.

Result: Wrest Park beat Ellesmere by 4 games to 1.

CROQUET ASSOCIATION NOTICES

Our thanks are once more due to Hurlingham Club for their kindness in giving us four lawns for the President's Cup free of charge.

* * *

Secretaries of clubs are once more reminded that their Calendar Fixtures for Tournaments must be at the Secretary's office first post Friday, October 22nd.

* * *

EXHIBITION GAMES

Sunday, October 3rd, 2.30 p.m. at Devonshire Park.

J. W. Solomon v. E. P. C. Cotter
Mrs. E. Rotherham v. Miss E. J. Warwick
J. P. R. Bolton v. J. T. Laurenson
Capt. H. G. Stoker v. J. G. Warwick

* * *

EDITORIAL PANEL

M. B. Reckitt
Miss D. A. Lintern
J. M. Rivington
Lt.-Comm. G. W. Style
D. C. Caporn
P. J. M. Fidler

V. C. GASSON, Secretary.

Questions and Answers

Question: You are called in as a referee and told that A shot with blue at black on the yard-line, missed, and announced his intention of playing a bisque, which he played with black instead of blue. It was soon noticed. How would you replace the ball and what would you decide about the bisque?

Answer: Replace the balls as they lay before the bisque was played; A is deemed to have played the bisque (Laws 30 and 38 (f)).

Question: Does the striker's turn end if, when playing with blue, he roquets red off the court so that it is replaced in contact with yellow, which blue has already roqueted, and in the subsequent stroke, yellow is sent off the court but blue and red remain on the lawn?

Answer: No; only if the croqueted ball or striker's ball is sent off. (Laws 4 (c) and 19 (c)).

CROQUET GYMKHANA AT SOUTHWICK

15th August

It was Mrs. Turketine, of Roehampton fame, now, we are glad to say, corralled at Southwick, who inaugurated our croquet gymkhana three years ago. This year's event was ably managed by Major R. Driscoll helped by a large number of willing and hard working members. It proved a tremendous success—fine weather, well over a hundred visitors and a most satisfactory financial result. Some innovations included clock golf played with a mallet and a croquet ball, a bottle table to which members contributed most generously and for which 500 tickets were sold, and three horse races where the public could pick their fancy out of six wooden horses with jockeys up. These moved according to the throw of giant dice. Mrs. Turketine ran a successful bring-and-buy stall and anything not sold was auctioned later by Major Atchley. All the other events were connected with hoops and balls, usually croquet balls, and we were glad to see the two little Solomon boys taking these events very seriously. They were among many young visitors including a number from the club's tennis section, whom we were delighted to welcome. The main prize was presented by Major Driscoll and won by Mr. Syngé who, if he ever takes up croquet, might prove a formidable rival to his father and mother!

NOTES by ROVER

John II

Many congratulations to John Bolton on his scoring his first success in one of the three major events in the C.A. calendar and becoming the youngest winner of the President's Cup, at only his second attempt, and against one of the strongest teams for many years. Last month Rover looked wistfully forward to the time when the stranglehold of the "Big Three," already 18 years old, would be broken, for indeed nobody outside that trio had won the event since before the new holder was born. He could scarcely have expected that John Solomon would be dethroned so soon, and while one is sure that John will not take offence if one is glad, for the sake of the game, that an outsider has at last carried off the cup, one would have wished for such a victor to emerge from an equal combat and not from one which our champion had to fight while suffering from a sprained wrist. We are of course used to the idea of the Surrey Cup going to comparative youth, and Peter Fidler's victory at Cheltenham was the third in recent years by a player in his twenties, but to win the President's Cup while still at school is an achievement of much greater magnitude. We can now look forward to many years of keen rivalry between our two Johns, not forgetting William Ormerod, or even a Bryan Lloyd-Pratt who has been making very significant advances this season.

A levelling process

During the recent Open Championships a spectator watching one of John Solomon's games in which he gave his opponent just one chance—the lift shot—before triple peeling and going out, was heard to remark that it was a pity something couldn't be done to give the unfortunate opponent a greater chance of participating in the game. It was explained to him that the lift shot was designed to do just this, since prior to its introduction the top class player after making an all round break would cross-wire his opponent at the first hoop and leave him the distant prospect of a 35 yard shot before finishing the game in the next turn. This explanation did not appear to soften the onlooker's objections, as he remarked that if the opponent missed the lift shot he would probably have no further opportunity against the triple peeler. On being asked what solution he might have in mind, he said that perhaps during the course of a break the opponent could be granted the privilege of calling out "Stop." At this point the turn would cease and the opponent would take over. Such a suggestion was immediately laughed to scorn by those within earshot, but on describing the conversation a few days later with Maurice Reckitt, we learned to our surprise that something similar had been experimented with for a short period before the first World War. Where in a handicap game one opponent had three or more bisques standing, he was entitled to call "Stop" at any point in his opponent's break and at the same time forfeit three bisques. We can understand the experiment being of short duration but players might find some amusement in trying it out again in friendly games where the bisque margin permits.

A guide to the laws

A bugbear of many outdoor sports is that in order to legislate for the variety of unusual contingencies that

can arise the laws of the games concerned have to spread themselves over many dozens of pages, often in language more appropriate to an Act of Parliament than meaningful to the ordinary participant. In croquet however we are fortunately spared the mental strain to which, for example, golfers are subjected should they wish to assimilate the very comprehensive laws of that popular sport. Nevertheless, although Ian Baillieu in his revision four years ago made our code more logical in its layout and more easily understood in its meaning, there were limits beyond which even he was unable to go in simplification. A number of the laws have to say in a hundred words what might have been said in fifty, but for the fact that what would remain unsaid would still leave the door open to doubt.

Tony Roper, one of our more experienced referees, has now produced a small booklet "The Laws of Croquet Simplified" (obtainable from the secretary at 1s. 6d. a copy, or on a sale or return basis by clubs), which so to speak puts into words of one syllable some of the more fundamental laws. He has concentrated on putting across the pith of the matter in language that can be understood by the novice, without losing any really important feature of the law which he is describing: a valuable addition to croquet literature.

Redress of grievances

It is at this late stage of the season that one often hears suggestions flying about which at any rate in the opinion of their promoters, would make for the improvement of our tournament programmes, or redress grievances (real or imagined), of which certain categories of players believe themselves to be victims. On this subject three things are perhaps worth saying. First, players are perfectly justified in expressing such opinions, but little good is done while such murmurs get no further than a conversational level; if there are ideas which associates feel ought to be considered these must be clearly formulated and publicised; secondly, those who want changes to be made must direct their attentions to the appropriate authorities. One is often surprised to find how much vagueness exists among associates about who in the croquet world is responsible for what. Complainants often speak as if the council (which they do not always seem to remember is elected by their votes, after a democratic form of nomination), are open to criticism about the details of every programme in the calendar. In fact it is only the half dozen C.A. events which are drawn up by our governing body. If anyone wants to get new ideas adopted, a first step should be to agitate the matter at his club's annual meeting. If he can get his ideas adopted there they may influence the development of affairs all over the country.

How to go about it

His A.G.M., however, might not be due for months, yet there is no reason why he should do nothing in the meantime. The columns in this journal are always open to correspondence, and a letter clearly (and courteously) expressed is perhaps the best of all ways to get things moving. Associates have in the past sometimes too easily concluded that because their suggestions were not adopted, no notice had been taken of them. This must not be assumed to be the case. It is the duty of each committee of the council to take

notice of every suggestion appearing in these pages relevant to its specific responsibilities. If it does not appear to have done so, a motion can be moved at the C.A.'s annual meeting in May to call attention to the matter. And from time to time (usually every alternate year) a representatives meeting is assembled at Hurlingham at which the council attends to listen to what spokesmen from the clubs have to say.

A postscript to what has been said may be added. One complaint which has come to our ears is that players outside the "A" class do not get a fair share of the time available for play at our tournaments. This is a very disputable matter which we have no intention of going into here. But it may be suggested that if this is ever true at the larger tournaments, it is certainly not the case at the smaller ones. Those who are happier on the courts than sitting beside them should enter for tournaments with few entrants. They will find themselves particularly welcome there.

Editorial Note

Delegates to this year's conference may recall that, although this topic was rapidly left on one side in favour of more interesting matters, the Editor appealed for suggestions for a new set of designs for the front cover. Since nothing has as yet come of this appeal, the request is repeated now.

The financial facts are that we can afford a complete set of seven new covers, and this set could then be used either every year, or in alternate years, with the present set of cups filling the gap in the odd years. But as the finances will only run to one such new set, we must be careful to select a subject that will meet with general approval before we burn our boats. The only suggestion offered so far is action photographs of players. There are, however, obvious difficulties if we start selecting from among our contemporaries, yet if we were to reproduce some of the old masters, such as Miss Steel or any of the great Irishmen, we might then earn the reproach of being backward-looking.

Time is running fairly short, and if any individual or club has any suggestions to make these would be most welcome. The Editor is aware that our present cups are not universally popular, and it is hoped that the critics will take advantage of this appeal by sending in many constructive ideas. And if anyone has any thoughts for other features of the gazette (or even any contributions, not necessarily on croquet topics), may he show no reluctance to send them in. It is not often that readers are given the chance of helping to determine the shape of things to come, but nothing would be more pleasing, in response to this appeal, than a large number of suggestions to consider.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIR,

May I make a plea from B, C and D players who make up the majority of croquet players and keep the tournaments going.

1. Big handicaps should have two lives, e.g. X, Y and Y should be a full game.

2. If there are too many entries, why not eliminate minus players from handicaps, since they already have two games in Draw and Process.

3. An extra, costing 3/6—and curtailed both in time and hoops—is **not** a welcome substitute for a full game.

4. Surely minus players should lose handicaps below -3, to -5 or -7, as in New Zealand.

I write this on behalf of a large number of average players, though at the moment can get only a few signatures.

Yours faithfully,

M. M. TAYLOR
K. D. HICKSON
E. M. TEMPLE

DEAR SIR,

3-hour limit

I have read the letter from Sir Leonard Daldry with great interest. As chairman of the Publicity Committee I am keen to promote the game and I am sure that its image is tarnished by the lengthy defensive games sometimes played. Indeed I have been told this by spectators on several occasions. I believe a 3-hour time limit is not only practicable but would improve matters to nearly everyone's advantage. There are very few reasons against such a step, but many in favour. For example:

1. The Manager's task would be eased for he would know he could get three games a day per court, subject to weather conditions.

2. Players would benefit by knowing in advance the time of their next game and so long waits would be avoided.

3. It would greatly encourage attacking play as against defensive.

4. In the big handicap it would benefit the long-bisquer who is the mainstay of the C.A., the person who needs encouragement.

5. There are very few games of any sport which have no time limit.

The main argument against the proposition is that it would favour the slow player. This is a matter of opinion, but surely the customs of the game could be amended to stress that an out player must not waste time, must be ready to play as soon as his opponent's turn has ended and therefore should already be on his feet on the edge of the court as his opponent plays the last shot of his turn.

No doubt the Council will shortly consider this matter. It would be of great help to have the views of all members of clubs on this. Might I suggest that this item be discussed in clubs by the members either at the end of season get-together or included on the agenda of the A.G.M., and that the results of the discussion are sent to the secretary with the opinions of the various classes of players as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,

DEREK. C. CAPORN

DEAR SIR,

Bedfordshire, in the form of Wrest Park, are hoping to organise an entry for the Inter County Championship in 1966. Would any Associates who are eligible and prepared to play please contact either the secretary of the above club or myself at "Dafen," 70 Station Road, Flitwick, Bedford. Tel. Flitwick 384.

Yours faithfully,

D. V. H. REES

DEAR SIR,

A question of law

Case: In a handicap doubles match the striker (incidentally a minus player), whose side was entitled to one further full bisque, attempted to make a hoop in order on a Continuation Stroke to which he was entitled under Law 20. He failed to make the hoop or to strike another ball in this stroke. He then shot at, and missed, a ball on a distant boundary although there was another ball within a few yards. He correctly replaced his ball on the yard line adjacent to the ball he had just missed and then proceeded to address his ball again to strike it and roquet the adjacent ball, indicating that he was taking a bisque.

The opponents intervened, claiming that the striker was entitled to no further stroke since the last bisque had been taken in the previous stroke.

The striker claimed that he had shot at the ball on the boundary under the misapprehension that he was entitled to one further stroke before taking the bisque, otherwise he would have taken his last bisque aiming at the much closer ball, therefore his ball should be replaced and the bisque deemed not to have been taken.

Question: One school of thought suggests that Law 27 applies and that the striker's ball should be replaced and the bisque deemed not to have been taken. Another school considers that the striker was entitled to an additional stroke, since at that time there was a bisque in hand and consequently that the stroke was valid, and although the stroke was made under an apparent misapprehension the ball should remain where it lay after the additional stroke had been made and the bisque should be deemed to have been taken. Law 27 states (in part) "if a player under a misapprehension makes a stroke or series of strokes when he is NOT entitled to play . . ." But he **was** entitled to play the additional stroke, since at that time he had a bisque in hand. There is no Law that specifically states that a player has to declare to the opponent when he is taking a bisque.

Which school is correct? If the ball is replaced and the bisque deemed not to have been taken can the striker then take the bisque and re-take the additional stroke in that same turn?

It would be appreciated if the official ruling upon this point could be published for the future guidance of Referees should such a situation arise again.

Yours truly,

R. F. ROTHWELL

THE PRESIDENT'S CUP

6th-10th September

It was widely foreseen that this year's contest in this historic competition would see both the youngest and most formidable array of players assembled for a long time. And a long time it certainly was in the former respect; the average age of the contestants was roughly calculated to be about 28 — and only two of them were over 35. Nothing like this has been seen in this event since the pre-1914 period, when young men like Herbert Corbally, Keith Izard, Maxwell Browne, Duff Matthews, and W. W. S. Escott appeared (for the first of what proved in some cases to be numerous occasions) between 1906 and 1913. As to strength of play, we had the Open Champion and former holder, John Solomon; Dr. Wiggins, last year's runner-up who did so well in the Open Championship until he was unfortunately prevented from playing his semi-final match; John Bolton, third last year and winner at Hurlingham this season; Bryan Lloyd-Pratt fresh from his fine victory at Brighton; William Ormerod, winner of the Association Plate and at Budleigh Salterton; Rupert Thorp who had won a notable victory over him in the Championship; Douglas Strachan, the Irish Champion, and Patrick Cotter, whose brilliant record in this event since he won it at his first appearance in 1949 has been so remarkable that it would seem impossible to think of a President's Cup without him.

If to these we add Humphrey Hicks, runner-up in the Open Championship, who did not accept an invitation this year, and Dudley Hamilton-Miller, who did not desire to play, as he might have done on the withdrawal of Mr Hicks, we have surely a "Best Ten" of a strength to compare quite favourably with any of those competing between 1901 and 1938. And the Surrey Cup indicates that there are rivals well qualified to fill any places that may fall vacant in the near future.

If there was any "sensation" on the first day it was constituted by the fact that John Solomon lost his first two games on it — though he won his third round game against Dr. Wiggins in the evening by his usual mastery play and a faultless triple. Though John would probably not like to have the fact recorded, it is the case that he had sprained his wrist shortly before the competition (a small swelling was to be seen on Monday) and a mishap of this sort to one who plays with his long-swinging style must be to some extent a handicap. His opening game with William Ormerod was a very "in-out" affair and one of the longest in the competition, lasting three hours. Near the close the Champion, having hit a tremendous long shot, failed badly with a not difficult take-off to the rover hoop which would have won him the game, but a good deal happened after this which there is no space to describe. The "man of the day" (as they call him in the Gillette Cup) was John Bolton, who was the only contestant not to lose a game. Rupert Thorp "broke his duck" (always a comforting experience for a newcomer to an event) by at once achieving a handsome victory over Douglas Strachan, who went on, however, to beat Solomon.

Bolton was the victor in perhaps the most interesting game played on the Tuesday which Strachan looked certain to win when he unexpectedly missed the rover hoop. Bolton's clips were on the 4-back and second hoop, and he soon established a break with the backward ball and began a hopeful triple. But having got the pelee in front of the penultimate he delayed what seemed like easy opportunities of peeling it, leaving Strachan with a difficult decision as to how best to exploit his lift. He chose to shoot from a position to A baulk which offered him a "double" on Bolton's balls near the second corner. This narrowly missed, and Bolton went out in the next turn. This left him as leader with five games on Tuesday night, he having lost only one at this stage—to Cotter.

So far the weather, though what our meteorologists optimistically describe as "rather cool" had treated players and spectators well enough — there were quite a lot of the latter looking on in the sunshine of Tuesday afternoon. But on Wednesday a "belt of rain" (to quote the weather clerks again) swept across the lawns and by noon, play became impossible. There remained only one game of the first series to be completed, Cotter over Thorp, Ormerod over Wiggins and Strachan over Lloyd-Pratt having won without much difficulty. But Bolton, having missed a peg out, was left with the peg to hit against Solomon, who by this time was on 4-back and 2-back. Much speculation, some of it financial, was engaged in during the next four hours as to what Bolton, with his ball on the last boundary level with the fifth hoop (i) ought to and (ii) would actually do, for Solomon had left a ball open by 2-back, five yards from corner 1. The younger John showed no signs of hesitation on the matter when play was resumed, took an unerring shot at the peg and finished at the top of the first series with six wins.

The rain stopped about 3.30 and a helpful, drying wind, which rapidly rose to a gale, allowed the second series to begin after an early tea. Cotter still more rapidly disposed

of Wiggins in what seemed little more than half an hour and moved up to an equal place with Bolton whose style and physique, as was seen in the Championship, are not well adapted to tempestuous conditions. He yielded victory to Lloyd-Pratt who, in a far from faultless game, certainly played the better of the two. Thorp lost to Strachan and Ormerod had a good win over Solomon.

By Wednesday night, a clear division between those at the top and those at the bottom of the competition had opened, the three leaders being Bolton, Cotter, and Ormerod with six games, Strachan being in close pursuit with five. The following day — a fine one, though very "cool" — confirmed this situation. Strachan won a first game from Solomon whose true form, however, was beginning to manifest itself (all trouble from his wrist being now at an end) but could do no more against a triple-peeling Lloyd-Pratt and a devastatingly accurate Ormerod. The principal feature in the evening was a crucial game between the oldest and the youngest competitors which produced some magnificent play. Bolton's second break displayed perhaps the most brilliant example of ingenious progress shown during the week and took him to the peg. But his final long roll stroke to lay up for 4-back failed to go near enough to the boundary to prevent a free shot to Cotter, then for the first and second hoops. If he had failed to hit this, he might never have had another one. But he did hit it and made his perfect breaks, and for once Bolton's splendid shooting did not avail to save the game. The old master at last went into the lead with a score of 9. On the Friday morning there was much speculation on the possibility of a tie. It is odd that such a situation should arise so often at this stage, yet in the end a tie so rarely eventuates — there has not been one since 1956, when Cotter for a third time won a play-off against Solomon. The day began with a brilliant triple (a three-baller most of the way) by the Open Champion and victories for Ormerod over Cotter and Bolton over Strachan. The three winners were now level with nine games — surely there would be a tie of some sort now. But in the next round both Cotter and Ormerod lost their games by 24, the former to Solomon (now back to his best form), the latter more unpredictably to Lloyd-Pratt, who by now was playing very well. Bolton was now out in front, and there, despite a faultless victory by Ormerod over Wiggins, he stayed. The serene confidence of this young man as he went out to do battle with a Solomon now fully recovered of his awe-inspiring skill was remarkable indeed. The younger John hit the tice, got going at once, and gave the elder one no more than two shots. Here was mastery which far more experienced players might have failed to show in so testing a situation. The attending spectators gave him the nearest thing to an ovation that their unhappily scanty numbers made possible.

He was a deserving winner in a strong year, but a word of praise must be said for the runner-up, William Ormerod has never been seen to greater advantage; there is nobody now playing who hits his own ball better; he was not observed (by your reporter at any rate) to miss a single roquet during the week at any distance which can be fairly so described. If he sometimes makes tactical decisions which cause surprise he seldom seems to lose anything thereby. It was good also to see Patrick Cotter playing more confidently than he has done for some time. He never looked likely to finish lower than third, and halfway through many thought he would be the winner; he was the only player to beat Bolton twice. Douglas Strachan was impressing most of us by his steadiness until after the beginning of the second series he "got stuck" at two games, and seemed to flag under the strain of this. By contrast Bryan Lloyd-Pratt never flagged for a moment and tripped as gaily on to the court in his final game as he did on his first. No one has ever had an equal power to communicate the joy of Croquet, even in so exacting a competition as this, as has this so truly "dedicated" player. A word of sympathy is due to Rupert Thorp who again and again found opponents playing better against him than they did against anyone else. His last game, a striking victory over Cotter, suggests that he will often be in the lists here henceforward.

In one sense only was the competition unsatisfactory, and this was the fault of this unfriendly summer in providing the contestants with courts which could not call forth their highest skills. Truly first-class play requires really fast courts, such as we seldom see nowadays. Nevertheless the skill displayed by some of the players all of the time and others most of the time was of a high standard. This particularly applied to the long-shooting upon which, on easy courts, almost too much turns in such company as this. The difference between the most and least successful of those engaged turned less upon expertise of stroke production than upon consistency. Some of the most attractive performers failed because they made—perhaps only a few—more mistakes than their adversaries. On easy courts like these such pardonable slips can be fatal.

The competition ran its full course, the last game being actually concluded in some darkness at 7.15 on a damp and chilly evening. But before this, since the result had already been arrived at, a small ceremony of presentation took place in the house. When after some words from the Chairman, in the course of which he justly commented on the

admirable spirit in which the competition had been conducted, the impressive trophy was handed by Mrs Rivington to the bashful winner. Occasion was also taken to thank Mrs Rotherham for her admirable management in a climatically depressing week. Her ready smile cheered both competitors and spectators and her long experience as a player in the contest armed her to tackle the problems with an unexcelled success.

J. P. R. Bolton won 11 games.
Dr. W. P. Ormerod won 10 games.
E. P. C. Cotter won 9 games.
B. Lloyd-Pratt won 7 games.
J. W. Solomon won 7 games.
D. F. Strachan won 6 games.
R. F. Thorp won 3 games.
Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins won 3 games.

ANALYSIS

J. P. R. Bolton beat Solomon +10 +26, Thorp +26 +24, Strachan +3 +11, Wiggins +23 +5, Lloyd-Pratt +16, Ormerod +17 +2, and lost to Cotter -13 -3, Lloyd-Pratt -15.

Dr. W. P. Ormerod beat Cotter +8, Solomon +2 +8, Thorp +10 +25, Strachan +13 +26, Wiggins +23 +25, Lloyd-Pratt +11, and lost to Cotter -11, Bolton -17 -2, Lloyd-Pratt -24.

E. P. C. Cotter beat Bolton +13 +3, Thorp +24, Strachan +15, Ormerod +11, Wiggins +20 +26, Lloyd-Pratt +15 +4, and lost to Solomon -14 -24, Thorp -16, Strachan -5, Ormerod -8.

B. Lloyd-Pratt beat Bolton +15, Solomon +12, Thorp +20 +18, Strachan +8, Ormerod +24, Wiggins +3, and lost to Cotter -15 -4, Bolton -16, Solomon -23, Strachan -19, Ormerod -11, Wiggins -16.

J. W. Solomon beat Cotter +14 +24, Thorp +17 +5, Wiggins +26 +5, Lloyd-Pratt +23, and lost to Bolton -10 -26, Strachan -17 -12, Ormerod -2 -8, Lloyd-Pratt -12.

D. F. Strachan beat Cotter +5, Solomon +17 +12, Thorp +5, Wiggins +19, Lloyd-Pratt +19, and lost to Cotter -15, Bolton -3 -11, Thorp -23, Ormerod -13 -26, Wiggins -13, Lloyd-Pratt -8.

R. F. Thorp beat Cotter +16, Strachan +23, Wiggins +14, and lost to Cotter -24, Bolton -26 -24, Solomon -17 -5, Strachan -5, Ormerod -10 -25, Wiggins -16, Lloyd-Pratt -20 -18.

Dr. W. R. D. Wiggins beat Thorp +16, Strachan +13, Lloyd-Pratt +16, and lost to Cotter -20 -26, Bolton -23 -5, Solomon -26 -5, Thorp -14, Strachan -19, Ormerod -23 -25, Lloyd-Pratt -3.

SURREY CUP

September 5th to 10th at Cheltenham

The weather on Monday was cool and cloudy, but dry after much rain. Tuesday was a very good day and the newly-mown courts looked pleasant and began to gain pace. Wednesday was unpleasant, with almost continuous rain to slow the courts and chill the marrow in the players' bones. With dull weather continuing, these were much the worst conditions the Surrey Cup has had during four meetings at Cheltenham.

James Wooding, the groundsman, was ill throughout, but anxious to help in light work whenever possible. Three part-time workers did as much mowing as the weather permitted and, at times, club members and young Surrey Cup players helped with machines and hoops. Altogether, three spare courts were pressed into service at different times.

Mrs. Daniels was Manager for the fourth time and was complimented for her assiduous attention to the players' needs in the most miserable conditions. Miss Armstrong and her helpers catered admirably at lunch-time as in previous years.

The players carried on almost without complaint against the weather and against courts which could not be given their usual daily cut. Some players, like Simon, had sufficiently powerful rushes to drive the ball across sodden courts. Others, including Mrs. Solomon, were not able to set up breaks from distant balls.

First Day. Mrs. Solomon gave Fidler a hard game which he was not always confident of winning. He was, however, hitting the ball very solidly and accurately,

as he demonstrated later against Saalfeld, when he hit the peg from 17 yards after his forward ball had been pegged out by the Colonel.

Jackson finished two games, against former Surrey Cup winners, in about 1½ hours each, including a double peel which was not completed by a peg-out. In his third game, against Neal, he seemed to have the match well in hand after completing the first peel of a "double" and being reasonably placed for the second. However, in splitting from 2-back to 3-back and centre, he finished dead against the peg, and was unable to hit a ball three feet away. Neal was given a chance which he took brilliantly. He made a very awkward break, always in difficulty, and under great pressure from 1-back to 3-back, and then moving more easily to the peg. Jackson's shooting failed him and Neal went out.

Second Day. At the end of the first day, Col. Saalfeld and Mrs. Solomon were without a win. Fidler led with three wins and four others had two each. In the Fourth Round Fidler immediately lost his lead when he went down to Neal.

The Fifth Round opened with 5 players—Fidler, Jackson, Neal, Prichard, Simon—on 3 games each and for the first time all the regular courts were fit for play. Two pairs of leaders were in opposition—Prichard and Simon, Fidler and Jackson.

Prichard went round after a missed shot by Simon when the balls had been left at a tempting medium distance. Subsequently, Prichard stuck in the 4th hoop and Simon failed to approach 6th. Later he tried without success to peg-out the opposition and was himself pegged-out. Prichard lost the game when he failed at 4-back and Simon hit in at 6 yards range to go out.

In the other game of the leaders, Fidler went round after failures by Jackson, but lost the initiative. Ultimately, he was given a "last shot", which he missed, after Jackson had failed to peg-out from a fairly short distance.

This was a sad round for Mrs. Solomon. She was laid-up by 6th hoop with a perfect rush to her last hoop. Cave shot slowly from 4-back boundary, leaving his ball a few yards away from the rush. Mrs. Solomon was tempted into making a classical finish, failed to get a good rush on opponent's ball, and Cave came along from far behind to win.

Simon and Jackson were now in the lead with Fidler, Prichard and Neal adjacent.

Sixth Round. Simon—Jackson. The opening was poor with many mistakes on both sides. Towards the end, Jackson was "in" with a prospect of finishing on a "double" but stuck in 3rd hoop. Simon went round and was soon out after a single straight peel and a failure to peg-out.

In this round, Cave and Neal had an in-and-out game with a close finish. Neal, still needing three hoops, pegged-out Cave, needing one. Cave hit and went out when Neal was creeping up.

Against Fidler, Prichard went to 2-back almost imperceptibly in his own unobtrusive way, before his opponent took croquet. Then Fidler hit in and went to peg and penultimate in two turns, and allowed his opponent only two more hoops. Both played very efficiently in one of the best games of the tournament.

Seventh Round. These matches did not produce any excitement. Prichard beat Neal comfortably after being first round to 4-back. This was virtually the end of Neal's challenge which, in the earlier games, had been based on very straight hitting, solid hooping, and a reasonable actuarial estimate of risks. Saalfeld, as always a game fighter, prolonged his game by hitting the "last shot" when Simon had put one ball out.

Eighth Round. Simon—Neal. This proved to be Simon's closest winning game. Initially, Neal was on top with the first break to 4-back. Later in the game, with Simon well behind, he failed at penultimate, enabling Simon to go round and peg-out an opposition ball. Neal hit the lift-shot but failed a difficult penultimate hoop to allow Simon to go out.

Saalfeld—Cave. Saalfeld pegged out one ball and then was unable to make a hit. Finally, Cave stuck in rover and Saalfeld hit the ball in the hoop to go out.

At the end of eight rounds, Simon was leading with Fidler and Jackson one point behind. Neal was suffering under a slight disability and Prichard seemed the only likely challenger of the top three.

The next round brought these three level when Fidler beat Simon for the second time.

Ninth Round. Jackson—Cave. This match produced the only "near triple" of the tournament. Jackson's first peel stuck and was roquetted through after 4th hoop. The second also stuck, as did the straight rover peel. A half-jump from a foot away straight in front sent partner ball through but failed to make a point for the playing ball.

In the light of future events, the crucial game of this round was between Fidler and Simon; a game played in cold rain and falling light. Simon seemed to be very

adversely affected by the cold. After an indecisive opening by both players, Fidler hit in and went to 4-back. In bad conditions after tea, no break was established, but Simon gradually crept up until he was for peg and penultimate. Then Fidler hit in and went out from 3-back.

Tenth Round. Against Fidler, Saalfeld was first away, but a take-off went over the line. Fidler stuck in 5th hoop but had two good breaks.

Simon did not have things all his own way against Cave but a double peel took him out.

Jackson had the first opportunity against Neal, but he missed a very short roquet, after making the first hoop, to give Neal an all-round break. Later, Jackson missed another short roquet, Neal played with the wrong ball, but he also hit a lift-shot when Jackson put a ball rather too near A baulk. Later, Jackson missed three not very long shots and Neal made the last three hoops with opponent close-joined on the boundary. Jackson missed a 12-yard lift-shot and lost the game.

Eleventh Round. Fidler had one ball round after a rather injudicious shot by Neal. In previous games Neal repeatedly escaped a trap by hitting in (like a mouse delicately removing the cheese without touching the trigger). Neal hit the lift-shot but missed a short roquet when he saw, from the corner of an eye, a spectator walking alongside the court. Life was difficult for Fidler after a failure to peel 4-back, but Neal solved his difficulties by shooting and giving him a ball behind the hoop. Fidler finished the game very firmly with a beautifully engineered little break and peg-out.

Against Mrs. Solomon, Simon did two immense peels in different breaks.

Jackson made heavy weather of his match with Saalfeld, who made several very good hits. Among other mistakes, Jackson missed a 12-inch roquet when trying to cut a ball which had stuck in the penultimate peel. He also went off after a 3-back with his second ball.

Twelfth Round. At this stage Simon might have gone well ahead if he could have beaten Prichard, but the Colonel performed his annual feat of beating a young player in the lead. His "tight" game offered few opportunities and, at a critical moment, a 40-yard shot gave him the turn and a break to 4-back. The rest was "routine".

Against Jackson, Fidler was first round to 4-back. His opponent hit in and had an adventurous round to 4-back. Later, Jackson continued to penultimate, and with Fidler missing the lift-shot, he attempted a very "optimistic" double. He achieved only one peel and later missed the peg-out, but was able to finish the game when Fidler croqueted a ball off court.

Thirteenth Round. The two key games were Simon v. Jackson and Fidler v. Prichard, since Simon, Jackson and Fidler shared the lead with 9 points each. The most notable feature of the Prichard—Fidler game was a break by Fidler from 2nd to peg with a ball in baulk. He lived dangerously but successfully, even when the approaches were long.

Simon—Jackson. Simon hit Jackson's tice and soon had an opening, which he missed by failing at 1st hoop. Jackson broke down at 2-back, as he did several times in the tournament, and Simon went to 4-back. Both made mistakes—missed roquets and hoops. After a long hit Simon went to 4-back, where he failed. Jackson seemed set to go out but, when peeling penultimate, after making 6th, he hit the get-away ball instead of obtaining a rush, partly recovered position, made a poor rush after 1-back, and failed the next hoop. Simon stuck through 4-back and later, Jackson stuck in 4-back off the ball requiring that hoop. Jackson missed the resulting lift-shot and two others before Simon went out.

Fourteenth Round. Simon and Fidler, in the lead at 10-all, had to meet Saalfeld and Cave respectively. Simon had a comparatively easy passage and never seemed in danger. In the other game, Fidler twice failed to get past hoop four. Later, he had a period of very good play which ended when he missed a roquet behind 4-back. Cave, who was very far behind, played steadily and tenaciously, and with Fidler missing a number of long shots, he eventually lined up for a 5-yard peg-out with Fidler for peg and rover. He missed! and Fidler hit the "last shot", made rover, collected the boundary ball, but also failed to peg-out from about five yards. Cave nominated black and was within a hairsbreadth of hitting the peg, so Fidler went into the play-off by a margin of one point and a fraction of an inch.

Play-off. The play-off was under a leaden sky in premature evening gloom. Opening play was rather tentative with no risks taken and hoops rejected or made one at a time. Simon, with two previous losses to Fidler, was justifiably cautious, but the great slowing up of tempo in his play seemed to take away his admirable fluency. After a time, Simon was "in" with a good 3-ball break

but failed after 4th hoop to hit the corner ball. After some in-and-out play with 10 yarders missed by both players, Fidler made a courageous hit and went round to 4-back with his partner ball in baulk waiting to be cleared at the end by means of a 7-yard roquet. After several misses, Simon hit in and went to penultimate, and followed with the other ball through 4th and to a missed long hoop at 5th. The next time in he went past 1-back and missed when trying to clear the baulk balls. Fidler got away from 5th hoop, followed with a long approach to 6th and went round to the peg. The shortest lift-shot was taken and missed, Fidler made 4-back and went off with a take-off. A shot at boundary balls allowed Simon to go to the peg (the other ball at 2-back and Fidler for peg and penultimate). Next time in Fidler "pegged-out" the "wrong" ball and himself. Simon regained the innings and seemed likely to win, but in the end he made only one more hoop before Fidler hit in at a distance, made the last two hoops and went out. It may be mentioned that Simon was anxious not to profit by this mistake in "pegging-out" red when yellow was the ball for the peg, but Fidler insisted on what he considered a strict application of the laws. Distant observers had some doubt as to whether Fidler "pegged-out" both balls in one stroke. Some thought that he removed red before flicking black on to the peg, in which case black would not be out of the game.

P. J. M. Fidler won 11 games.
J. W. Simon won 11 games.
G. E. P. Jackson won 10 games.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard won 9 games.
Prof. B. G. Neal won 6 games.
Lt.-Col. G. E. Cave won 5 games.
Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld won 4 games.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon won 0 games.

ANALYSIS OF SURREY CUP

(R. O. Hicks dropped out for health reasons and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (reserve) played)

P. J. M. Fidler beat Neal +20; Cave +11, +1; Prichard +10, +21; Saalfeld +11, +11; Simon +17, +4; Mrs. Solomon +5, +13, and lost to Neal -13; Jackson -6, -17.

J. W. Simon beat Neal +14, +3; Cave +20, +10; Prichard +5; Jackson +14, +6; Saalfeld +16, +21; Mrs. Solomon +16, +12; and lost to Fidler -17, -4; Prichard -12.

G. E. P. Jackson beat Fidler +6, +17; Cave +19, +13; Prichard +19, +12; Saalfeld +16, +7; Mrs. Solomon +25, +21; and lost to Neal -7, -16; Simon -14, -6.

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard beat Neal +12, +9; Cave +13, +14; Saalfeld +6, +15; Simon +12; Mrs. Solomon +24, +23; and lost to Fidler -10, -21; Jackson -19, -12; Simon -5.

Prof. B. G. Neal beat Fidler +13; Jackson +7, +16; Saalfeld +4; Mrs. Solomon +16, +20; and lost to Fidler -20, Cave -4, -22; Prichard -12, -9; Saalfeld -9; Simon -14, -3.

Lt.-Col. G. E. Cave beat Neal +4, +22; Saalfeld +12; Mrs. Solomon +3, +14; and lost to Fidler -11, -1; Prichard -13, -14; Jackson -19, -13; Saalfeld -3; Simon -20, -10.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld beat Neal +9; Cave +3; Mrs. Solomon +3, +4; and lost to Neal -4; Fidler -11, -11; Cave +12; Prichard -6, -15; Jackson -16, -7; Simon -16, -21.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon lost to Neal -16, -20; Fidler -5, -13; Cave -3, -14; Prichard -24, -23; Jackson -25, -21; Saalfeld -3, -4; Simon -16, -12.

Play-off: P. J. M. Fidler beat J. W. Simon +6.

LADIES' FIELD CUP

The competition opened this year in perfect weather and all matches started on time, much to the Manager's satisfaction. We were all sorry that Mrs. Longman was unable to play owing to her husband's indisposition, but were very pleased to see them both up at the club during the latter part of the week. It was also unfortunate that both Mrs. Elvey and Mrs. Chittenden had mild virus infections which did not help them to produce their best form, but they both recovered during the week. Mrs. Gazzard who was partially incapacitated, having had a fall and injured her chest; this undoubtedly affected her play, although her long shooting was still remarkably accurate. I understand from one of our very experienced players, and one of the oldest members of the Croquet Association, that the long shooting by many of the players was exceptionally good: another remarkable feature was the number of very close finishes, with margins of 6 or less in 16 games. The final result was in the balance almost up to the last stroke of the tournament.

