Tailor Made

# MALLETS

FASHIONED TO YOUR OWN
SPECIFICATION
BY JAQUES CRAFTSMEN

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

**ECLIPSE** 

CHAMPIONSHIP BALL

**Guaranteed for Three Years** 

# IMALIJAQUES 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 JAQUES & 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.

P. W. Elmes 8 to 7.

SOUTHWICK

Mrs. H. Wills 9 to 8.

Mrs. E. Thompson 8 to  $7\frac{1}{2}$ .

J. W. Simon 0 to  $-\frac{1}{2}$ .

Mrs. L. Farlie  $6\frac{1}{2}$  to 6.

Mrs. R. A. Simpson 4 to  $3\frac{1}{2}$ .

R. A. Simpson 3 to  $1\frac{1}{2}$ .

Mrs. A. D. Karmel 7 to  $6\frac{1}{2}$ .

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld  $-\frac{1}{2}$  to -1.

J. Rigiani 6 to  $5\frac{1}{2}$ .

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  $-2\frac{1}{2}$  to -3.

SURREY CUP

J. W. Simon  $-\frac{1}{2}$  to -1. P. J. M. Fidler -1 to  $-1\frac{1}{2}$ .

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.

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 your replace the ball and what would you decide about the bisque? 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  $^{\circ}$ 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 tions 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 accord-ing to the throw of giant dice. Mrs. Turketine ran a success-tul bring and buy, stall and anything not sold was augitioned ful 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. Synge 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 per-

#### 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

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 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

Time is running fairly short, and if any individual or 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

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

- 1. Big handicaps should have two lives, e.g. X, Y and Y
- 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, o -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 signa-

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 a several occasions. cable 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

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

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

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 applied

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 gettogether 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

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

A question of law

Case: In a handicap doubles match the striker (incidently Case: In a handicap doubles match the striker (incidently 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.

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. 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 on experient with the stroke was made under on experient with the stroke was made under one experient with the stroke was made under the stroke was made under the stroke was made under the stroke was stroke was successful to the stroke was 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?

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 vear'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.

out 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. in the near future.

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 masterly play and a faultless triple. Though John would probably not like to have the fact recorded, it is the case that he had sprained by the best the convention (a small swelling to have the fact recorded, it is the case that he had sprainted 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 his a transport long shot failed hadly Champion, having hit a tremendous long shot, failed badly with a not difficult take-off to the rover hoop which would with a not difficult take-off to the rover hoop which which 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 brackers without over Douglas Straghan, who went on a handsome victory over Douglas Strachan, who went on, however, to beat Solomon.

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 peelee 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 I. 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 tation on the matter when play was resumed, took an un-erring 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 brilling evenue of ingenious progress shown during the 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 at 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 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 here seen to greater advantage; there is nobody

has never been seen to greater advantage; there is nobody now playing who hits his own ball better; he was not now playing who hits his own ball better; he was not robserved (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 best Bolton twice Douglas Strackan was impressplayer 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 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. henceforward.

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 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 was its full course the last game being

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 uncoverled waters. unexcelled success.

> J. P. R. Bolton won 11 games. 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-

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,

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,

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

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.

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

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

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 Cupwinners, 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.

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.

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, peggedout Cave, needing one. Cave hit and went out when Neal was creening up.

was creeping up.
Against Fidler, Prichard went to 2-back almost imperreptibly 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 hell out 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

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.

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 halfjump 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 failing 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 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.

Lackson made heavy weather of his match with Saalfald.

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"

"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.

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. 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. 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. not be out of the game.

P. J. M. Fidler won 11 games. 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

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.

Mrs. Rotherham proved herself to be a worthy winner, and we were all pleased to see her return to her championship form. We congratulate her on winning the Cup for the third successive year, a feat she had also accomplished in 1955, 1956 and 1957. She won all her games except one against the Australian, Mrs. Gazzard.

Miss Warwick was a good second with 10 wins and was the only competitor to beat Mrs. Gazzard both times. The key game of the competition was her return match against Mrs. Rotherham, which, if she had won, would have reversed the ultimate result.

Mrs. Gazzard, who was third with eight wins, had a good competition and although she may have something to learn in the way of tactics, she introduced a lively and forward attacking game which was a joy to watch, and might with benefit be adopted in this country.

Mrs. Elvey had several very close and exciting finishes, and some losses might have been wins if her indisposition had not impaired her best form.

Mrs. Solomon also played well. She had also several very close and keenly contested matches. One of these was her win over Mrs. Gazzard and another was against Mrs. Smartt which started late and finished almost in the dark with the final result being in doubt until the last stroke. Mrs. Solomon eventually won by 3.

Mrs Chittenden also had many very close games and might, no doubt, have had more wins if she had been quite fit.

Mrs. Smartt, on her first appearance in this competition.

quite fit.

Mrs. Smartt, on her first appearance in this competition, had a satisfactory record although only winning one match. She showed exceptional determination in recovery from apparently impossible positions, and almost reversing the

Finally we have pleasure in offering our sincerest thanks to Mrs. Thom, who managed the competition so successfully, and also our grateful thanks to Mr. Ian Baillieu for acting as official referee, and to our Chairman, Mr. Rivington, who, with a few apt remarks, duly presented the cup to Mrs. Rotherham.

Mrs. E. Rotherham won 11 games.
Miss E. J. Warwick won 10 games.
Mrs. N. J. Gazzard won 8 games.
Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey won 5 games.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon won 4 games.
Mrs. H. F. Chittenden won 3 games. Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt won 1 game.

#### ANALYSIS

Mrs. E. Rotherham beat Mrs. G. W. Solomon +8 +20, Miss E. J. Warwick +14 +11, Mrs. Gazzard +24, Mrs. Smartt +21 +21, Mrs Chittenden +2 +24, Mrs. Elvey +21 +15, and lost to Mrs. Gazzard -10.

Miss E. G. Warwick beat Mrs. Solomon +6 +11, Mrs. Gazzard +18 +3, Mrs. Smartt +15 +6, Mrs. Chittenden +20 +16, Mrs. Elvey +6 +8, and lost to Mrs. Rotherham -14 -11.

Mrs. N. J. Gazzard beat Mrs. Solomon +14, Mrs. Smartt +19 +11, Mrs. Rotherham +10, Mrs Chittenden +12 +6, Mrs. Elvey +4 +8, and lost to Mrs. Solomon -3, Miss Warwick -18 -3, Mrs. Rotherham -24.

Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey beat Mrs. Solomon +15 +6, Mrs. Smartt +10 +5, Mrs. Chittenden +8, and lost to Miss Warwick -6 -8, Mrs. Gazzard -4 -8, Mrs. Rotherham -21 -15, Mrs. Chittenden -5.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon beat Mrs. Gazzard +3, Mrs. Smartt +3 +3, Mrs. Chittenden +4, and lost to Miss Warwick -6 -11, Mrs. Gazzard -14, Mrs. Rotherham -8 -20, Mrs. Chittenden -7, Mrs. Elvey -15 -6.

Mrs. H. F. Chittenden beat Mrs. Solomon +7, Mrs. Smartt +2, Mrs. Elvey +5, and lost to Mrs. Solomon -4, Miss Warwick -20 -16, Mrs. Gazzard -12 -6, Mrs. Smartt -15, Mrs. Rotherham -2 -24, Mrs. Elvey -8.

Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt beat Mrs. Chittenden +15, and lost to Mrs. Solomon -3 -3, Miss Warwick -15 -6, Mrs. Gazzard -19 -11, Mrs. Rotherham -21 -21, Mrs. Chittenden -2, Mrs. Elvey -10 -5.

#### LONGMAN CUP FINAL

(Played 4th September)

ROEHAMPTON V WREST PARK

SINGLES

D. C. Caporn  $(2\frac{1}{2})$  beat D. V. H. Rees (6) +4. A. J. Oldham  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  lost to J. Clarke (7) -18. L. Riggall  $(7\frac{1}{2})$  lost to A. C. W. Davies (7) -8.

#### DOUBLES

D. C. Caporn and L. Riggall (10) beat D. V. H. Rees and A. C. W. Davies (13) +11.
A. J. Oldham and Mrs. L. Riggall (12½) beat J. Clarke and W. T. B. Marchant (16) +14.

Result: Roehampton beat Wrest Park by 3 games to 2.

For the first time since 1956 the Roehampton Club won this cup beating Wrest Park, the holders, in the final on Saturday, 4th September, 1965. In the morning they won both doubles fairly easily but in the afternoon they lost two singles due to the splendid play of their opponents, and Caporn was left in play against Rees, their captain, in the deciding game. At that time things looked black for Roehampton for Rees had reached 4-back and 5th with 1½ bisques in hand, whilst Caporn was for 3 and 4. Fortunately for Roehampton Caporn got in and made a good break from 4 to 4-back and laid up behind the 3rd hoop which forced a½ bisque. He immediately shot in again and eventually got his rear ball round to the peg, and laid up at 4-back which forced the last bisque. His opponent reached 4-back with his backward ball, and before Caporn got in again got both balls for rover. Caporn then hit a wonderful shot from A baulk to the 2nd corner and this saved the match for Roehampton. He laid up but failed twice in rushes to rover but succeeded in keeping the innings, and on the 3rd attempt was successful. After dividing the enemy he failed to get a rush to the peg, but as Rees's balls were inside the area of hoops 2 and 3, he decided on a long peg-out which succeeded. This was a fitting end to a thrilling match, which left the spectators exhausted! Rees had shot so well earlier in the match it was a pity for him that one of the last long shots did not hit — they were all good ones.

Roehampton were fortunate in being able to play the were all good ones.

were all good ones.

Roehampton were fortunate in being able to play the same team for all their matches. They were particularly successful in the doubles and, in fact, did not lose a game in any of the four rounds. It was said they owed much to the instruction and help they received in doubles play throughout the season from that doubles expert Miss Lintern. Many clubs would do much better if they concentrated on tactics, particularly in doubles, the lack of which lost them many games against Roehampton. We congratuate Roehampton on their success, also the C.A. for running the event on an area basis, which enabled so many clubs to enter this year, and we hope next year we shall see even more in this interesting event. Our congratulations also to Wrest Park for their splendid attempt to retain the cup.

#### **OBITUARY**

MISS A. B. MORRISON

News has just reached us of the death of this lady in her home town of Melbourne during August—a heavy loss, not only for Australian croquet, but to the game in this island also. For Agnes Morrison was one of the greatest enthusiasts for preserving and strengthening the links between the Australian Croquet Council, of which she was for a long period Chairman, and the Council of the C.A. The prospect of a visit of an English team to Australian courts would have been one which would always have had her most enthusiastic support.

most enthusiastic support.

There are not many left now to remember her as a player here, where she arrived in 1937 as one of the strong Australian side which challenged a (yet stronger) British team for possession of the Mac-Robertson Trophy. She made many friends here then, and the writer of this note is over who has power less true with her exchanging letters. is one who has never lost touch with her, exchanging letters with her for a full two dozen years. She was a lady of strong opinions with which almost all who met her might wholly agree, but she was one of those, of whom our game can never have too many, who cared for the fortunes of croquet everywhere—its past, present, and future—in every land in which it is played. To such we all owe more than is generally realised, whether in our own country or at the other end of the world.

M.B.R.

# CARRICKMINES

14th-21st August

Lack of visitors (Ray Duff can hardly be called a visitor at Carrickmines) did not prevent the August tournament from being highly successful and eventful as ever. The Grounds Committee and Staff excelled themselves in providing beautiful lawns of such lightning speed that your correspondent, lately returned from playing on much more hallowed but vastly slower English surfaces, found the greatest difficulty in keeping his balls on the court. Long

take-offs were the end of many an innings during the week, one experienced player being observed to run off three times in succession during the course of one game. Perhaps one of the most dismaying experiences in croquet is to wonder whether one's ball will ever get there, only to find it a few moments later coasting effortlessly towards and over the boundary as if the surface were one of polished marphet.

Douglas Figgis earned his victory in the Championship of Co. Dublin with some rock-steady, unruffled croquet in which the occasional long roquet or hazardous take-off appeared to present no difficulties at all. The runner-up, Geraldine Fitzgerald, had begun the week on fine form, also playing extremely steadily and accurately, but could not quite keep it up and saw little of the game during the play-off. Earlier, in the semi-final of the Draw, the same pair had had a very close match, Douglas being lucky to win after Geraldine had crept up from 3rd hoop and 4-back, her opponent being both for the peg, only to miss a vital short roquet, when in sight of victory, while temporarily blinded by a low sun.

Reggie Leonard and Ray Duff were both playing well,

blinded by a low sun.

Reggie Leonard and Ray Duff were both playing well, the former perhaps more consistently: but too many other players appeared to rely on long roll approaches to hoops and spectacular recovery shots rather than taking trouble to lay out their breaks tidily so as to try and give themselves a succession of easy shots.

Most tournaments seem to have some theme or recurring feature, and in this tournament again and again the question of how and when to take bisques cropped up (when does it not!). At least two matches were lost purely by faulty bisque play; one by the higher bisquer playing a bad shot and walking in disappointment too quickly off the court, without really thinking (two of the bisques ending up unused as a result); and another by the last bisque ing up unused as a result); and another by the last bisque being used without success to try and peg out the player's single remaining ball from beside the rover hoop— the ball having just run the rover and become hoop-bound, and the continuation stroke used only to get it out from behind the hoop, rather than to get behind an enemy ball 10 yards away and then take the bisque to rush it somewhere near the peg. It was left to Leslie Webb, a young player improving at as tremendous a rate as his contemporary. David O'Connor, to show everyone how to do it. He swept aside Reggie Leonard and Douglas Strachan, receiving 4½ and 8 bisques from them respectively, by using his bisques aggressively and right from the start to manufacture three-ball and ultimately four-ball breaks. In the final of the handicap he only permitted Douglas Strachan to strike a ball twice.

But the most popular player of the tournament was undoubtedly Paddy Haire, who made her way to the final of the doubles playing magnificently and ably supported not only by her partner Geraldine Fitzgerald, but also by an ardent and vociferous band of admirers on the bank and in the bar. Paddy radiates such enormous pleasure in her game the bar. Paddy radiates such enormous pleasure in her game that all who watch her cannot help sharing in it. Perhaps a certain regular visitor and male admirer of hers can steer her to triumphant victory next June? But on this occasion the cups went most deservedly to Frances Joly and Grace Hopkins, neither of whom (unbelievably) had ever won a cup before, but are likely to win many more in the future whether playing individually or in partnership. Finally it was a great pleasure to see Mary O'Reilly playing again, and even if her efforts on the courts brought her only moderate success her efforts off the courts, undertaken with her usual quiet efficiency and un-Managerial charm, ensured in a very real way the success and enjoyability of the whole tournament.

OPEN SINGLES (Championship of Co. Dublin) (9 Entries)

DRAW

FIRST ROUND

Lady Fitzgerald bt Miss F. Joly +1.

SECOND ROUND S. R. Duff bt A. Robinson +15.
R. J. Leonard bt Mrs. H. M. Read +15.
Lady Fitzgerald bt G. M. Fitzpatrick +22.
D. Figgis w.o. R. E. Steen opp. scr.

SEMI-FINAL R. J. Leonard bt S. R. Duff +15. D. Figgis bt Lady Fitzgerald +2. FINAL D. Figgis bt R. J. Leonard +5.

PROCESS

FIRST ROUND

S. R. Duff bt R. E. Steen +14.

SECOND ROUND R. J. Leonard bt G. M. Fitzpatrick +22. S. R. Duff bt Miss F. Joly +10. Mrs. H. M. Read bt D. Figgis +3. Lady Fitzgerald bt A. Robinson +4.

S. R. Duff bt R. J. Leonard +12. Lady Fitzgerald bt Mrs. H. M. Read +12.

Lady Fitzgerald bt S. R. Duff +9.

PLAY-OFF D. Figgis bt Lady Fitzgerald +15.

> LEVEL SINGLES (Duff Mathews Cup) (5 bisques and over) (10 Entries)

SEMI-FINAL

Miss G. Hopkins bt A. D. Craig +11. F. Regan bt Miss I. Haire +20.

SECOND ROUND J. H. Wilson bt Mrs Corbally +10. Miss G. Hopkins bt Mrs D. Figgis +10. F. Regan bt Mrs. L. Wilson +17. L. J. Webb bt Mrs. F. Regan +11.

Miss G. Hopkins bt J. H. Wilson +6. L. J. Webb bt F. Regan +20.

FINAL L. J. Webb bt Miss G. Hopkins +9.

> HANDICAP SINGLES (Boxwell Cup) (23 Entries)

FIRST ROUND FIRST ROUND

Miss F. Joly (2) bt Mrs. L. Wilson (10) +21.

D. F. Strachan (-2) bt D. Figgis (1½) +3.

H. M. Read (4) bt A. D. Craig (6) +5.

R. E. Steen (3) w.o. A. E. Sweetman (12\*) opp. scr.

Lady Fitzgerald (2) bt D. Campbell (4½) +21.

L. J. Webb (6) bt F. Regan (6½) +26.

Mrs. H. M. Read (3) bt Mrs. L. O'Reilly (6) +18.

A. Robinson (2) bt Mrs Corbally (9) +17.

Miss G. Hopkins (5) bt Mrs F. Regan (8) +9.

D. F. Strachan (-2) bt Miss F. Joly (2) +23.

H. M. Read (4) bt R. E. Steen (3) +3.

L. J. Webb (6) bt Lady Fitzgerald (2) +9.

Mrs. D. Figgis (6½) bt Mrs. H. M. Read (3) +1.

R. J. Leonard (1½) bt S. R. Duff (1½) +26.

J. H. Wilson (9) bt M. J. Killeen (12\*) +6.

THIRD ROUND A. Robinson (2) bt Miss G. Hopkins (5) +18. D. F. Strachan (-2) bt H. M. Read (4) +15. L. J. Webb (6) bt Mrs D. Figgis (6½) +22. R. J. Leonard (1½) bt J. H. Wilson (9) +12.

D. F. Strachan (-2) bt A. Robinson (2) +1. L. J. Webb (6) bt R. J. Leonard  $(1\frac{1}{2})$  +23.

L. J. Webb (6) bt D. F. Strachan (-2) +26. \*Provisional Handicaps

> DOUBLES HANDICAP (Coronation Cups) (Combined handicaps not less than 4)

(10 Pairs)

FIRST ROUND R. J. Leonard and Mrs. M. O'Reilly (5½) bt F. Regan and Mrs. F. Regan (1½) +1\*.

R. E. Steen and G. Gilpin (12) w.o. A. E. Sweetman and M. J. Killeen (24) opp. scr.

Miss F. Joly and Miss G. Hopkins (7) bt J. H. Wilson and A. Robinson (91) + 7A. Robinson (92) +7.

H. M. Read and Mrs. H. M. Read (7) bt S. R. Duff and J. A. Carey (7½) +11.

Lady Fitzgerald and Miss I. Haire (9) bt D. F. Strachan and M. G. Smith (4) +11.

SECOND ROUND

R. J. Leonard and Mrs. M. O'Reilly (5½) bt A. D. Craig and Mrs. L. Wilson (16) +15.

Miss F. Joly and Miss G. Hopkins (7) bt R. E. Steen and G. Gilpin (12) +2.

Lady Fitzgerald and Miss I. Haire (9) bt H. M. Read and Mrs. H. M. Read (7) +8.

G. M. Fitzpatrick and L. J. Webb (8) bt D. Figgis and Mrs D. Figgis (8) +4.

Miss F. Joly and Miss G. Hopkins (7) bt R. J. Leonard and Mrs. M. O'Reilly (5½) +6.
Lady Fitzgerald and Miss I, Haire (9) bt G. M. Fitzpatrick and L. J. Webb (8) +12. FINAL

Miss F. Joly and Miss G. Hopkins (7) bt Lady Fitzgerald and Miss I. Haire (9) +9. \*On Time

#### PROCESS

FIRST ROUND M. B. Reckitt bt R. O. Hicks +9.
Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt H. A. Green +20.
Dr. H. J. Penny bt W. H. Austin +21.
J. P. R. Bolton bt A. D. Karmel +11. J. P. R. Bolton bt A. D. Karmel +11.

R. F. Rothwell bt Lt.-Col. F. E. Stobart +13.

M. B. Reckitt bt J. W. Simon +13.

B. Lloyd-Pratt bt D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller +18.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden +7.

D. Jesson-Dibley bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon +23.

E. P. C. Cotter bt Dr. H. J. Penny +10.

G. Williams bt M. F. Buller +16.

J. P. R. Bolton w.o. Mrs. W. Longman (opponent scratched).

Third Round THIRD ROUND R. F. Rothwell bt M. B. Reckitt +23.
B. Lloyd-Pratt bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld +26.
E. P. C. Cotter bt D. Jesson-Dibley +26.
J. P. R. Bolton bt G. Williams +26.

B. Lloyd-Pratt bt R. F. Rothwell +3. J. P. R. Bolton bt E. P. C. Cotter +24.

B. Lloyd-Pratt bt J. P. R. Bolton +17. B. Lloyd-Pratt bt E. P. C. Cotter +8.

LEVEL SINGLES (Qualification 2½ to 6 bisques, inclusive) (17 Entries)

FRANC CUP FIRST ROUND

D. E. Buckland bt Mrs. J. Speer +4.

SECOND ROUND

Maj. R. Driscoll bt Miss E. F. Rose +22.

Mrs. E. M. Temple bt G. F. Paxon +20.

Mrs. R. A. Simpson bt Capt. W. A. T. Synge +7.

Miss K. Ault bt D. E. Buckland +10.

R. A. Simpson bt D. M. Horne +3.

H. F. Sanderson bt R. J. Pickett +16.

T. F. H. Jessel w.o. Mrs. E. M. Kay (opponent scratched).

Mrs. W. A. T. Synge bt Miss K. D. Hickson +13.

THIRD ROUND THIRD ROUND Mrs. E. M. Temple bt Maj. R. Driscoll +15. Mrs. R. A. Simpson bt Miss K. Ault +9. R. A. Simpson bt H. F. Sanderson +14. T. F. H. Jessel bt Mrs. W. A. T. Synge +18. Mrs. R. A. Simpson bt Mrs. E. M. Temple +7. R. A. Simpson bt T. F. H. Jessel +11.

> HANDICAP SINGLES
> (Qualification 6½ bisques or over) (20 Entries)

R. A. Simpson bt Mrs. R. A. Simpson +18.

FINAL

MONTEITH CUP

Mrs. H. D. Wooster (6) bt Mrs. R. D. Griffiths (7½) +6. W. Bolton (13) bt Mrs. L. V. Layton (13) +15. Mrs. H. Wells (10) bt Maj. R. St. G. Atchley (10) +7. W. G. B. Scott (9) bt Mrs. G. Trull (7) +8.

Mrs. E. Thompson (8) bt Mrs. R. J. Pickett (7½) +9.

Mrs. H. Dehn (13) bt Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) +17.

Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) w.o. Mrs. V. M. Webb (12) (opponent scratched).

scratched).
W. Bolton (13) bt Mrs. H. D. Wooster (6) +8.
Mrs. H. Wells (10) bt W. G. B. Scott (9) +2.
Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Miss M. K. Towers (7) +1.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (7) bt Brig. J. S. Omond (6½) +8.
Miss M. M. Taylor (7) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (6½) +21.

Mrs. E. Thompson (8) bt Mrs. H. Dehn (13) +2.
Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) w.o. W. Bolton (13) opponent scratched).
Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. H. Wells (10) +5.
Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (7) bt Miss M. M. Taylor (7) +2

Mrs. E. Thompson (8) bt Mrs. L. Farlie (61/2) +19. Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (7) +3. Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. E. Thompson (8) +17.

## HANDICAP SINGLES (54 Entries) MAURICE RECKITT BOWL

J. P. R. Bolton (-2½) w.o. Mrs. W. Longman (opponent scratched).
D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller (-2½) bt A. D. Karmel (-1) +12.
G. Williams (-1) bt Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (4) +18.
Mrs. H. D. Wooster (7) bt Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) +11.
G. F. Paxon (6) w.o. Mrs. E. M. Kay (5) (opponent scratched).

Dr. H. J. Penny (1) bt Maj. R. Driscoll (3) +4. D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  bt Mrs. J. Spear (5) +2. Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld (1) bt M. F. Buller (1) +24. E. A. Roper (1) bt Lt-Col. F. E. Stobart (1) +16. H. A. Green (1) bt Miss K. Ault (3) +13. Mrs. A. D. Karmel (7) bt Miss M. K. Towers (7) +16. Mrs. J. R. Simpson (4) w.o. H. F. Sanderson (6) (opponent scratched) scratched). Mrs. R. D. Griffiths  $(7\frac{1}{2})$  bt R. F. Rothwell (-1) +6. W. G. B. Scott (9) w.o. Brig. J. S. Omond  $(6\frac{1}{2})$  (opponent W. G. B. Scott (9) W.O. Brig. J. S. Omont (62) (oppose scratched).

J. W. Simon (0) bt R. O. Hicks  $(-1\frac{1}{2}) + 6$ .
Capt. W. A. T. Synge  $(4\frac{1}{2})$  bt M. B. Reckitt (-1) + 22.
Mrs. L. Farlie  $(6\frac{1}{2})$  bt Miss E. F. Rose  $(4\frac{1}{2}) + 18$ .
Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor  $(6\frac{1}{2}) + 10$ .
Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. G. Trull (7) +7.
R. J. Pickett (6) bt Miss K. D. Hickson (3) +15.
D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt Miss M. M. Taylor (7) +15.
D. E. Buckland (3) bt R. St. G. Atchley (10) +6.

SECOND ROUND R. A. Simpson (3) bt Mrs. R. J. Pickett (7½) +14.
T. F. H. Jessel (2½) w.o. Mrs. V. M. Webb (12) (opponent scratched).

J. P. R. Bolton  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden  $(-\frac{1}{2})$  +15.

D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  bt G. Williams (-1) +15.

G. F. Paxon (6) bt Mrs. H. D. Wooster (7) +5.

D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  bt Dr. H. J. Penny (1) +5.

E. A. Roper (1) bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld  $(-\frac{1}{2})$  (opponent E. A. Roper (1) bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalield (-2) (oppose retired on peg).

Mrs. A. D. Karmel (7) bt H. A. Green (1) +3.

Mrs. R. D. Griffiths (7½) bt Mrs. J. R. Simpson (4) +15.

J. W. Simon (0) bt W. G. B. Scott (9) +17.

Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) bt Capt. W. A. T. Synge (4½) +10.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. H. Wills (9) +14.

D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt R. J. Pickett (6) +16.

W. P. H. Roe (5½) bt D. E. Buckland (3) +10.

B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) bt Mrs. E. M. Temple (4) +23.

W. H. Austin (2) bt Mrs. L. V. Layton (13) +7.

Third Round R. A. Simpson (3) bt T. F. H. Jessel  $(2\frac{1}{2})$  +15. J. P. R. Bolton  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  bt D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +5.  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +5. D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  bt G. F. Paxon (6) +11 (on time). E. A. Roper (1) bt Mrs. A. D. Karmel (7) +4. J. W. Simon (0) bt Mrs. R. D. Griffiths  $(7\frac{1}{2})$  +14. Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. L. Farlie  $(6\frac{1}{2})$  +7. D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt W. P. H. Roe  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  +25. B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) bt W. H. Austin (2) +23. R. A. Simpson (3) bt J. P. R. Bolton  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +25. E. A. Roper (1) bt D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  +10. J. W. Simon (0) bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) +24. D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) +18. R. A. Simpson (3) bt E. A. Roper (1) +2.

J. W. Simon (0) bt D. Jesson-Dibley (2) +23. FINAL R. A. Simpson (3) bt J. W. Simon (0) +15.

# MIXED DOUBLES HANDICAP (23 Pairs)

(a) Start third hoop.(b) 3½ hours limit.

(a) State third inster.

(b) 3½ hours limit.

FIRST ROUND

Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6) bt E. P. C. Cotter and Mrs. E. A. Roper (3) +8.

D. Jesson-Dibley and R. St. G. Atchley (12) bt M. B. Reckitt and Mrs. E. M. Temple (3) +10.

J. P. R. Bolton and W. Bolton (10½) bt D. E. Buckland and Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2½) +7.

Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt T. F. H. Jessel and Mrs. J. Speer (7½) +3.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt W. H. Austin and Miss M. M. Taylor (9) +2 (on time).

D. M. Horne and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (12½) bt D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller and Mrs. H. D. Wooster (4½) +7.

Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (7) bt R. O. Hicks and Mrs. H. Wills (7½) +7.

H. Wills  $(7\frac{1}{2})$  +7.

SECOND ROUND

R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) bt Dr. H. J. Penny and Miss K. D. Hickson (4) +17.

H. A. Green and Mrs. H. Wells (11) bt G. F. Paxon and Mrs. L. V. Leyton (19) +19.

Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6) bt D. Jesson-Dibley and R. St. G. Atchley (12) +9.

Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge  $(8\frac{1}{2})$  bt J. P. R. Bolton and W. Bolton  $(10\frac{1}{2})$  +5.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt D. M. Horne and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe  $(12\frac{1}{2})$  +14.

Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (7) bt E. A. Roper and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (2) +13.

Miss K. Ault and J. W. Simon (3) bt Maj. R. Driscoll and Mrs. E. Thompson (11) +10.

M. F. Buller and Mrs. G. Trull (8) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt and J. Rigiani (4) +2. THIRD ROUND

R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) bt H. A. Green and Mrs. H. Wells (11) +6.
Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6) +14.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (7) +2.
Miss K. Ault and J. W. Simon (3) bt M. F. Buller and Mrs. G. Trull (8) +7.

R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) bt Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) +12.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt Miss K. Ault and J. W. Simon (3) +7.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) +8.

#### HUNSTANTON

The sixty-seventh annual tournament at Hunstanton is over once again and those privileged to take part in it had a wonderful week despite really appalling weather. Entries had to be limited as has been the case now for several years. Such is the popularity of this tournament and the limitation of only five regular club lawns with a sixth, normally two tennis courts, brought in for the week. Competitors cheerfully accepted the time limit set upon all games (3 hours for singles and 3½ hours for doubles) but, as the score sheets show, in fact such measures were seldom required to produce a result. Those unlucky people refused for this year or those who have never sampled the friendliness and atmosphere of Hunstanton as well as the regulars should make a note now that the 68th tournament starts on August Bank Holiday in 1966, on Monday, 27th August, and be warned of the fact that many have already booked.

The natural turf at Hunstanton must be amongst the best in the country and could the club afford to spend money on improving some of the boundaries (maybe starting on the fourth corner of Court No. 3) the lawns would soon rival those at Hurlingham or Roehampton—but perhaps this would take away something of Hunstanton's charm. Alas! the number of club members is small and with the problem of raising over £100 to repair and repaint the pavilions this autumn there is unlikely to be any money for major lawn improvements in the coming year. The sixty-seventh annual tournament at Hunstanton is

the pavilions this autumn there is unlikely to be any money for major lawn improvements in the coming year.

Mrs. Reeve, owing to a recent illness, was unable to undertake her usual duties as Manager but was sufficiently undertake her usual duties as Manager but was sufficiently recovered to be well enough to watch each day's play with interest from the comfort of the pavilions and I know I write on behalf of the whole croquet world in wishing her complete recovery. Joan Warwick stepped into the breech with her usual charm and efficiency. Not only did she manage to bring the tight schedule to a successful conclusion on Saturday afternoon without any enforced scratchings and despite atrocious weather but she played herself in three events not without considerable success

scratchings and despite atrocious weather but she played herself in three events not without considerable success. Up to lunch time on Saturday the sun only appeared for fleeting moments, otherwise it was rain (torrential at times) and/or strong (and cold) winds. The apparent local claim that no land stands between Hunstanton and the North Pole would not be disputed by those who took part in this year's tournament. The natural drainage of the ground, however, is such that there was never a time when we had to abandon play because of waterlogged courts. The comfort, or rather discomfort, of those playing in such conditions appeared not to be considered by the Manager, at least play was continuous throughout the week as really it had to be to complete all events on the Saturday. as really Saturday.

Saturday.

The dark horse of the tournament was undoubtedly Terence Read, who arrived quietly from Ireland with his parents armed with 2½ bisques and claiming that he was out of practice and that this was his first tournament of the season. I would like to see him in practice! He has a nice easy natural style and all the shots, and looks like becoming a menace to those at the top with or without practice. He won both Draw and Process despite very considerable opposition. On his play throughout the week nobody would dispute the handicapper's recommendation that he should return to Ireland as a scratch player. Joan and Guy Warwick, the defeated finalists, played-off for second place after tea on Saturday in brilliant sunshine, and provided the many spectators with a close and interesting match to conclude the tournament, won by Guy by a mere three points.

interesting match to conclude the tournament, won by Guy by a mere three points.

Another invader from abroad, Colonel Saalfeld from Australia, was not so successful on his first visit to Hunstanton, but the five-strong family of Prichards took back to Wales with them no fewer than five cups. Most players contemplating a return to Hunstanton next year were relieved that the three young Prichards between them returned with ten fewer bisques than they arrived with. The "C" Handicap Singles was won by Colin, who defeated his younger brother William, aged 12, in the final. William had previously won the semi-final and final of the "Y" handicap both by 26 points and completed the three games on Saturday morning before lunch. One got the feeling towards the end of the final of the "Ys" that

young William was feeling sorry for his elder brother, who had he not won would have been the only young Prichard to return home without cup, so honour was done. The eldest Prichard son, Robert, had already won the "X" Handicap Singles in convincing style. Armed with obviously too many bisques, he was too good for the other finalist, Sarah Hampson, who nevertheless played well during the week, beating on her way to the final both Colin Prichard and Terence Read.

In the final of the "B" Level Singles yet another Prichard took part. Mrs. Rolfe seemed to have thrown away a close game when she failed to move the croqueted ball when taking off to separate her opponents, then with both balls for the peg, but a few minutes later Mrs. Prichard, having safely negotiated her backward ball through the rover, so that all four balls were then for the peg, made a bad take-off and missed the ensuing longish roquet to give Mrs. Rolfe the innings and the match. Needless to say this victory by the club's energetic and efficient Secretary was a very popular win and ensured that one of the many cups stayed at Hunstanton.

In the Doubles final there were yet two more Prichards. Father and Robert, the holders, had an easy passage to the final. In their semi-final they had defeated that formidable pair Mr. and Mrs. Simpson, paying their first visit to Hunstanton, by the maximum points. The Simpsons suffered for them an unusual experience in that neither took croquet in a game that lasted little over half an hour. In the final they had a hard and interesting struggle against Richard Rothwell and Miss Garrett, the latter one of a welcome contingent from Nottingham. After Colonel Prichard's ball had been pegged out by Rothwell, Miss Garrett made the rover and pegged out her partner's ball but failed by two inches to put out her own ball also. Robert hit this ball from the side boundary and thus snatched the match by one point and thus another two cups returned to Wales with the Prichard family.

The teas and morning coffees were ably d

OPEN SINGLES (13 Entries) (3 hour time limit) DRAW

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt R. A. Simpson +17. Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt A. D. Karmel +9. Mrs. E. Rotherham bt Miss E. J. Warwick +13. J. G. Warwick bt R. Rothwell +1. Lt.-Col. F. Stobart bt I. C. Baillieu +20.

T. O. Read bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard +5. Mrs. E. Rotherham bt Lt.-Col. A. Saalfeld +17. J. G. Warwick bt Lt.-Col. F. Stobart +12. B. Lloyd-Pratt bt H. O. Hodgson +14.

T. O. Read bt Mrs. E. Rotherham +3. J. G. Warwick bt B. Lloyd-Pratt +12.

T. O. Read bt J. G. Warwick +11.

#### PROCESS

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt H. O. Hodgson (opponent retired on peg).
T. O. Read beat I. C. Baillieu +1 on time.
R. Rothwell w.o. B. Lloyd-Pratt (scratched).
A. D. Karmel bt R. A. Simpson +26.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt Lt.-Col. F. Stobart +26.

SECOND ROUND SECOND ROUND

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt J. G. Warwick +18.
T. O. Read bt Mrs. E. Rotherham +10.
R. Rothwell bt A. D. Karmel +8.
Miss E. J. Warwick bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard +23.

T. O. Read bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld +16. Miss E. J. Warwick bt R. Rothwell +7.

T. O. Read bt Miss E. J. Warwick +13. J. G. Warwick bt Miss E. J. Warwick +3.

LEVEL SINGLES (2½ to 6 bisques, inclusive) (10 Entries)

(3 hour time limit) Miss E. M. Brumpton bt Mrs. R. A. Simpson +3 on time. W. B. Franklin bt H. M. Read +13.
Miss E. C. Brumpton w.o. (opponent transferred to Class A).

#### PROCESS

FIRST ROUND M. B. Reckitt bt R. O. Hicks +9.
Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt H. A. Green +20.
Dr. H. J. Penny bt W. H. Austin +21.
J. P. R. Bolton bt A. D. Karmel +11. SECOND ROUND

R. F. Rothwell bt Lt.-Col. F. E. Stobart +13.

M. B. Reckitt bt J. W. Simon +13.

B. Lloyd-Pratt bt D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller +18.
Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden +7.

D. Jesson-Dibley bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon +23.

E. P. C. Cotter bt Dr. H. J. Penny +10.

G. Williams bt M. F. Buller +16.

J. P. R. Bolton w.o. Mrs. W. Longman (opponent scratched).

THIRD ROUND

R. F. Rothwell bt M. B. Reckitt +23.

B. Lloyd-Pratt bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld +26.

E. P. C. Cotter bt D. Jesson-Dibley +26.

J. P. R. Bolton bt G. Williams +26.

SEMI-FINAL

SEMI-FINAL B. Lloyd-Pratt bt R. F. Rothwell +3. J. P. R. Bolton bt E. P. C. Cotter +24.

B. Lloyd-Pratt bt J. P. R. Bolton +17. B. Lloyd-Pratt bt E. P. C. Cotter +8.

> LEVEL SINGLES (Qualification 21 to 6 bisques, inclusive) (17 Entries) FRANC CUP

FIRST ROUND Maj. R. Driscoll bt Mrs. J. Speer +4.

SECOND ROUND

Mrs. E. M. Temple bt G. F. Paxon +20.

Mrs. R. A. Simpson bt Capt. W. A. T. Synge +7.

Miss K. Ault bt D. E. Buckland +10.

R. A. Simpson bt D. M. Horne +3.

H. F. Sanderson bt R. J. Pickett +16.

T. F. H. Jessel w.o. Mrs. E. M. Kay (opponent scratched).

Mrs. W. A. T. Synge bt Miss K. D. Hickson +13.

THIRD ROUND D. E. Buckland bt Mrs. J. Speer +4.

Mrs. E. M. Temple bt Maj. R. Driscoll +15.
Mrs. R. A. Simpson bt Miss K. Ault +9.
R. A. Simpson bt H. F. Sanderson +14.
T. F. H. Jessel bt Mrs. W. A. T. Synge +18. Mrs. R. A. Simpson bt Mrs. E. M. Temple +7. R. A. Simpson bt T. F. H. Jessel +11.

R. A. Simpson bt Mrs. R. A. Simpson +18.

HANDICAP SINGLES (Qualification 6½ bisques or over)

(20 Entries) MONTEITH CUP

Mrs. H. D. Wooster (6) bt Mrs. R. D. Griffiths  $(7\frac{1}{2})$  +6. W. Bolton (13) bt Mrs. L. V. Layton (13) +15. Mrs. H. Wells (10) bt Maj. R. St. G. Atchley (10) +7. W. G. B. Scott (9) bt Mrs. G. Trull (7) +8.

Mrs. E. Thompson (8) bt Mrs. R. J. Pickett (7½) +9.

Mrs. H. Dehn (13) bt Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) +17.

Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) w.o. Mrs. V. M. Webb (12) (opponent scratched).

Scratched).

W. Bolton (13) bt Mrs. H. D. Wooster (6) +8.

Mrs. H. Wells (10) bt W. G. B. Scott (9) +2.

Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Miss M. K. Towers (7) +1.

Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (7) bt Brig. J. S. Omond (6½) +8.

Miss M. M. Taylor (7) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (6½) +21.

Mrs. M. M. Taylor (7) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (62) +21.

THIRD ROUND

Mrs. E. Thompson (8) bt Mrs. H. Dehn (13) +2.

Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) w.o. W. Bolton (13) opponent scratched).

Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. H. Wells (10) +5.

Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (7) bt Miss M. M. Taylor (7) +2

Mrs. E. Thompson (8) bt Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) +19. Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (7) +3.

Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. E. Thompson (8) +17.

## HANDICAP SINGLES (54 Entries) MAURICE RECKITT BOWL

J. P. R. Bolton  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  w.o. Mrs. W. Longman (opponent scratched).

D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller (-2½) bt A. D. Karmel (-1) +12.

G. Williams (-1) bt Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (4) +18.

Mrs. H. D. Wooster (7) bt Mrs. J. S. Omond (9) +11.

G. F. Paxon (6) w.o. Mrs. E. M. Kay (5) (opponent scratched).

Dr. H. J. Penny (1) bt Maj. R. Driscoll (3) +4. D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  bt Mrs. J. Spear (5) +2. Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld (1) bt M. F. Buller (1) +24. E. A. Roper (1) bt Lt-Col. F. E. Stobart (1) +16. H. A. Green (1) bt Miss K. Ault (3) +13. Mrs. A. D. Karmel (7) bt Miss M. K. Towers (7) +16. Mrs. J. R. Simpson (4) w.o. H. F. Sanderson (6) (opponent scratched). Mrs. J. R. Simpson (4) w.o. H. F. Sanderson (6) (opponent scratched).

Mrs. R. D. Griffiths (7½) bt R. F. Rothwell (-1) +6.

W. G. B. Scott (9) w.o. Brig. J. S. Omond (6½) (opponent scratched).

J. W. Simon (0) bt R. O. Hicks (-1½) +6.

Capt. W. A. T. Synge (4½) bt M. B. Reckitt (-1) +22.

Mrs. L. Farlie (6½) bt Miss E. F. Rose (4½) +18.

Mrs. H. Wills (9) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (6½) +10.

Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. G. Trull (7) +7.

R. J. Pickett (6) bt Miss K. D. Hickson (3) +15.

D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt Miss M. M. Taylor (7) +15.

D. E. Buckland (3) bt R. St. G. Atchley (10) +6.

SECOND ROUND

R. A. Simpson (3) bt Mrs. R. J. Pickett (7½) +14.

T. F. H. Jessel (2½) w.o. Mrs. V. M. Webb (12) (opponent scratched).

J. P. R. Bolton (-2½) bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (-½) +15.

D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller (-2½) bt G. Williams (-1) +15.

G. F. Paxon (6) bt Mrs. H. D. Wooster (7) +5.

D. M. Horne (5½) bt Dr. H. J. Penny (1) +5.

E. A. Roper (1) bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld (-½) (opponent retired on peg).

Mrs. R. D. Griffiths (7½) bt Mrs. J. R. Simpson (4) +15.

J. W. Simon (0) bt W. G. B. Scott (9) +17.

Mrs. C. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. H. Wills (9) +14.

D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt R. J. Pickett (6) +16.

W. P. H. Roe (5½) bt D. E. Buckland (3) +10.

B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) bt Mrs. E. M. Temple (4) +23.

W. H. Austin (2) bt Mrs. L. V. Layton (13) +7.

THIRD ROUND

R. A. Simpson (3) bt T. F. H. Jessel (2½) +15. R. A. Simpson (3) bt T. F. H. Jessel  $(2\frac{1}{2})$  +15. J. P. R. Bolton  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  bt D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +5.  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +5. D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  bt G. F. Paxon (6) +11 (on time). E. A. Roper (1) bt Mrs. A. D. Karmel (7) +4. J. W. Simon (0) bt Mrs. R. D. Griffiths  $(7\frac{1}{2})$  +14. Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt Mrs. L. Farlie  $(6\frac{1}{2})$  +7. D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt W. P. H. Roe  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  +25. B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) bt W. H. Austin (2) +23. B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) bt W. H. RUSHI (2) FOURTH ROUND R. A. Simpson (3) bt J. P. R. Bolton  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +25. E. A. Roper (1) bt D. M. Horne  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  +10. J. W. Simon (0) bt Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) +24. D. Jesson-Dibley (2) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) +18.

R. A. Simpson (3) bt E. A. Roper (1) +2. J. W. Simon (0) bt D. Jesson-Dibley (2) +23.

R. A. Simpson (3) bt J. W. Simon (0) +15.

# MIXED DOUBLES HANDICAP (23 Pairs)

(a) Start third hoop.
(b) 3½ hours limit.

(a) Start thrid motion.

(b) 3½ hours limit.

FIRST ROUND

Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6) bt E. P. C. Cotter and Mrs. E. A. Roper (3) +8.

D. Jesson-Dibley and R. St. G. Atchley (12) bt M. B. Reckitt and Mrs. E. M. Temple (3) +10.

J. P. R. Bolton and W. Bolton (10½) bt D. E. Buckland and Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (2½) +7.

Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt T. F. H. Jessel and Mrs. J. Speer (7½) +3.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt W. H. Austin and Miss M. M. Taylor (9) +2 (on time).

D. M. Horne and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (12½) bt D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller and Mrs. H. D. Wooster (4½) +7.

Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (7) bt R. O. Hicks and Mrs. H. Wills (7½) +7.

H. Wills (7½) +7.

R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) bt Dr. H. J. Penny and Miss K. D. Hickson (4) +17.

H. A. Green and Mrs. H. Wells (11) bt G. F. Paxon and Mrs. L. V. Leyton (19) +19.

Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6) bt D. Jesson-Dibley and R. St. G. Atchley (12) +9.

Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt J. P. R. Bolton and W. Bolton (10½) +5.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt D. M. Horne and Mrs. W. P. H. Roe (12½) +14.

Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (7) bt E. A. Roper and Mrs. G. W. Solomon (2) +13.

Miss K. Ault and J. W. Simon (3) bt Maj. R. Driscoll and Mrs. E. Thompson (11) +10.

M. F. Buller and Mrs. G. Trull (8) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt and J. Rigiani (4) +2.

R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) bt H. A. Green and Mrs. H. Wells (11) +6. Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt Mr. and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6) +14.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (7) +2.

Miss K. Ault and J. W. Simon (3) bt M. F. Buller and Mrs. G. Trull (8) +7.

R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) bt Capt. and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) +12.
Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt Miss K. Ault and J. W. Simon (3) +7.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld and Mrs. L. Farlie (6) bt R. F. Rothwell and Mrs. J. S. Omond (8) +8.

#### HUNSTANTON

The sixty-seventh annual tournament at Hunstanton is over once again and those privileged to take part in it had a wonderful week despite really appalling weather. Entries had to be limited as has been the case now for several years. Such is the popularity of this tournament and the limitation of only five regular club lawns with a sixth, normally two tennis courts, brought in for the week. Competitors cheerfully accepted the time limit set upon all games (3 hours for singles and 3½ hours for doubles) but, as the score sheets show, in fact such measures were seldom required to produce a result. Those unlucky people refused for this year or those who have never sampled the friendliness and atmosphere of Hunstanton as well as the regulars should make a note now that the 68th tournament starts on August Bank Holiday in 1966, on Monday, 27th August, and be warned of the fact that many have already booked.

The natural turf at Hunstanton must be amongst the best in the country and could the club afford to spend money on improving some of the boundaries (maybe starting on the fourth corner of Court No. 3) the lawns would soon rival those at Hurlingham or Roehampton—but perhaps this would take away something of Hunstanton's charm. Alas! the number of club members is small and with the problem of raising over £100 to repair and repaint the pavilions this autumn there is unlikely to be any money for major lawn improvements in the coming year.

Mrs. Reeve, owing to a recent illness, was unable to undertake her usual duties as Manager but was sufficiently recovered to be well enough to watch each day's play with interest from the comfort of the pavilions and I know I write on behalf of the whole croquet world in wishing her complete recovery. Joan Warwick stepped into the breech with her usual charm and efficiency. Not only did she manage to bring the tight schedule to a successful conclusion on Saturday afternoon without any enforced scratchings and despite atrocious weather but she played herself in three events not without considerable success.

Up to lunch time on Satur over once again and those privileged to take part in it had a wonderful week despite really appalling weather.

for fleeting moments, otherwise it was rain (torrential at times) and/or strong (and cold) winds. The apparent local claim that no land stands between Hunstanton and the North Pole would not be disputed by those who took part in this year's tournament. The natural drainage of the ground, however, is such that there was never a time when we had to abandon play because of waterlogged courts. The comfort, or rather discomfort, of those playing in such conditions appeared not to be considered by the Manager, at least play was continuous throughout the week as really it had to be to complete all events on the Saturday.

as really it had to be to complete all events on the Saturday.

The dark horse of the tournament was undoubtedly Terence Read, who arrived quietly from Ireland with his parents armed with 2½ bisques and claiming that he was out of practice and that this was his first tournament of the season. I would like to see him in practice! He has a nice easy natural style and all the shots, and looks like becoming a menace to those at the top with or without practice. He won both Draw and Process despite very considerable opposition. On his play throughout the week nobody would dispute the handicapper's recommendation that he should return to Ireland as a scratch player. Joan and Guy Warwick, the defeated finalists, played-off for second place after tea on Saturday in brilliant sunshine, and provided the many spectators with a close and interesting match to conclude the tournament, won by Guy by a mere three points.

Another invader from abroad, Colonel Saalfeld from Australia, was not so successful on his first visit to Hunstanton, but the five-strong family of Prichards took back to Wales with them no fewer than five cups. Most players contemplating a return to Hunstanton next year were relieved that the three young Prichards between them returned with ten fewer bisques than they arrived with. The "C" Handicap Singles was won by Colin, who defeated his younger brother William, aged 12, in the final. William had previously won the semi-final and final of the "Y" handicap both by 26 points and completed the three games on Saturday morning before lunch. One got the feeling towards the end of the final of the "Ys" that

young William was feeling sorry for his elder brother, who had he not won would have been the only young Prichard to return home without cup, so honour was done. The eldest Prichard son, Robert, had already won the "X" Handicap Singles in convincing style. Armed with obviously too many bisques, he was too good for the other finalist, Sarah Hampson, who nevertheless played well during the week, beating on her way to the final both Colin Prichard and Terence Read.

In the final of the "B" Level Singles yet another Prichard took part. Mrs. Rolfe seemed to have thrown away a close game when she failed to move the croqueted ball when taking off to separate her opponents, then with both balls for the peg, but a few minutes later Mrs. Prichard, having safely negotiated her backward ball through the rover, so that all four balls were then for the peg, made a bad take-off and missed the ensuing longish roquet to give Mrs. Rolfe the innings and the match. Needless to say this victory by the club's energetic and efficient Secretary was a very popular win and ensured that one of the many cups stayed at Hunstanton. In the Doubles final there were yet two more Prichards. Father and Robert, the holders, had an easy passage to the final. In their semi-final they had defeated that formidable pair Mr. and Mrs. Simpson, paying their first visit to Hunstanton, by the maximum points. The Simpsons suffered for them an unusual experience in that neither took croquet in a game that lasted little over half an hour. In the final they had a hard and interesting struggle against Richard Rothwell and Miss Garrett, the latter one of a welcome contingent from Nottingham. After Colonel Prichard's ball had been pegged out by Rothwell, Miss Garrett made the rover and pegged out her partner's ball but failed by two inches to put out her own ball also. Robert hit this ball from the side boundary and thus snatched the match by one point and thus another two cups returned to Wales with the Prichard family.

The teas and morning coffees were ably di

them that we will come again.

OPEN SINGLES (13 Entries) (3 hour time limit) DRAW

FIRST ROUND Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt R. A. Simpson +17. Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt A. D. Karmel +9. Mrs. E. Rotherham bt Miss E. J. Warwick +13. J. G. Warwick bt R. Rothwell +1. Lt.-Col. F. Stobart bt I. C. Baillieu +20.

T. O. Read bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard +5. Mrs. E. Rotherham bt Lt.-Col. A. Saalfeld +17. J. G. Warwick bt Lt.-Col. F. Stobart +12. B. Lloyd-Pratt bt H. O. Hodgson +14.

SEMI-FINAL T. O. Read bt Mrs. E. Rotherham +3. J. G. Warwick bt B. Lloyd-Pratt +12.

T. O. Read bt J. G. Warwick, +11.

PROCESS

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt H. O. Hodgson (opponent retired

on peg).
T. O. Read beat I. C. Baillieu +1 on time.
R. Rothwell w.o. B. Lloyd-Pratt (scratched).
A. D. Karmel bt R. A. Simpson +26.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard bt Lt.-Col. F. Stobart +26.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld bt J. G. Warwick +18.
T. O. Read bt Mrs. E. Rotherham +10.
R. Rothwell bt A. D. Karmel +8.
Miss E. J. Warwick bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard +23.

T. O. Read bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld +16. Miss E. J. Warwick bt R. Rothwell +7.

FINAL T. O. Read bt Miss E. J. Warwick +13.

J. G. Warwick bt Miss E. J. Warwick +3.

LEVEL SINGLES
(2½ to 6 bisques, inclusive)
(10 Entries) (3 hour time limit)

Miss E. M. Brumpton bt Mrs. R. A. Simpson +3 on time. W. B. Franklin bt H. M. Read +13.
Miss E. C. Brumpton w.o. (opponent transferred to Class A).

Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard bt Miss S. G. Hampson +12. W. B. Franklin bt Miss E. M. Brumpton +14. Miss E. C. Brumpton bt Mrs. G. D. Perowne +11. Mrs. A. N. Rolfe bt Mrs. H. Read +25. Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard bt W. B. Franklin +12. Mrs. A. N. Rolfe bt Miss E. C. Brumpton +11. Mrs. A. N. Rolfe bt Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard +2.

HANDICAP SINGLES

(6½ to 16 bisques, inclusive)
(11 Entries) (3 hour time limit)

FIRST ROUND W. Prichard (15) bt Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6½) +14. D. J. Bird (12) bt Dr. H. M. Browning (12) +7. W. W. Haynes (7½) bt Maj. E. J. Bromley-Fox (12) +7.

SECOND ROUND

R. D. C. Prichard (12) bt Miss M. F. Maclin (16) +16.

W. Prichard (15) bt D. J. Bird (12) +5 on time.

Miss M. Bryan (9) bt W. W. Haynes (7½) +1.

C. H. L. Prichard (9) bt Mrs. F. E. Stobart (16) +5 on time.

W. Prichard (15) bt R. D. C. Prichard (12) +21. C. H. L. Prichard (9) w.o. Miss M. Bryan. C. H. L. Prichard (9) bt W. Prichard (15) +6.

#### HANDICAP SINGLES (CLASS X)

(Unrestricted) (32 Entries) (3½ hours time limit)

R. A. Simpson (1½) bt Mrs. H. Read (4) +20.

Mrs. A. N. Rolfe (2½) bt Mrs. E. Rotherham (-3) +26.

R. D. C. Prichard (12) bt H. M. Read (4) +26.

Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (4) bt Miss E. C. Brumpton (5) +12.

D. J. Bird (12) w.o. Mrs. G. D. Perowne (5½).

R. Rothwell (-1) bt W. W. Haynes (7½) +19.

W. B. Franklin (3½) bt W. Prichard (15) +3.

Maj. E. J. Bromley-Fox (12) bt Dr. H. M. Browning (10) +2 on time. Maj. E. J. Bromiey-Fox (12) bt Dr. II. M. Broming +2 on time.

C. H. L. Prichard (9) bt Mrs. R. A. Simpson (3½) +24.

B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) bt Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6½) +3.

Lt.-Col. F. E. Stobart (1) w.o. H. O. Hodgson (2).

Miss S. G. Hampson (6) bt I. C. Baillieu (1) +7.

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (-2½) bt Miss M. F. Mactier (16) +14.

Miss M. Bryan (9) bt A. D. Karmel (-1) +7.

Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld (-1) bt Miss E. M. Brumpton (5) Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld (-1) bt Miss E. M. Brumpton (5) T. O. Read  $(2\frac{1}{2})$  bt J. G. Warwick (-2) + 25. R. A. Simpson (1½) bt Mrs. A. N. Rolfe (2½) +10.
R. D. C. Prichard (12) bt Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (4) +26.
D. J. Bird (12) bt R. Rothwell (-1) +3.
W. B. Franklin (3½) bt Maj. E. J. Bromley-Fox (12) +12.
C. H. L. Prichard (9) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt (-2) +26.
Miss S. G. Hampson (6) bt Lt.-Col. F. E. Stobart (1) +23.
Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (-2½) bt Miss M. F. Bryan (9)

T. O. Read  $(2\frac{1}{2})$  bt Lt.-Col. A. E. Saalfeld (-1) +11. R. D. C. Prichard (12) bt R. A. Simpson (1½) +8.
W. B. Franklin (3½) bt D. J. Bird (12) +10.
Miss S. G. Hampson (6) bt C. H. L. Prichard (9) +2.
T. O. Read (2½) bt Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (-2½) +24.

R. D. C. Prichard (12) bt W. B. Franklin (3½) +16. Miss S. G. Hampson (6) bt T. O. Read (2½) +14.

R. D. C. Prichard (12) bt Miss S. G. Hampson (6) +22.

#### HANDICAP SINGLES (CLASS Y)

(Unrestricted) (16 Entries)

Mrs. H. M. Read (4) bt Mrs. E. Rotherham (-3) +13.

Miss E. C. Brumpton (5) bt H. M. Read (4) +21.

Miss E. J. Warwick (-2½) bt Mrs. F. E. Stobart (16) +12.

W. de B. Prichard (15) bt Dr. H. M. Browning (10) +20.

Mrs. A. D. Karmel (6½) bt Mrs. R. A. Simpson (3½) +12.

I. C. Baillieu (1) w.o. H. O. Hodgson (2) (scratched).

A. D. Karmel (16) bt Miss M. F. Mactier (-1) +14.

J. G. Warwick (-2) bt Miss E. M. Brumpton (5) +8.

SECOND ROUND

Miss E. C. Brumpton (5) bt Mrs. H. Read (4) +13. W. de B. Prichard (15) bt Mrs. E. J. Warwick  $(-2\frac{1}{2})$  +15. Mrs. A. D. Karmel  $(6\frac{1}{2})$  bt I. C. Baillieu (1) +7. J. G. Warwick (-2) bt A. D. Karmel (-1) +2.

W. de B. Prichard (15) bt Miss E. C. Brumpton (5) +26. Mrs. A. D. Karmel  $(6\frac{1}{2})$  w.o. J. G. Warwick (-2) (scratched).

W. de B. Prichard (15) bt Mrs. A. D. Karmel (61) +26.

DOUBLES HANDICAP

(Joint handicap must be 4 or over) (3rd hoop start)

(3rd hoop start)

FIRST ROUND

Mrs. E. Rotherham and D. J. Bird (9) bt Lt.-Col. F. Stobart and Mrs. F. Stobart (15) +1 on time.

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard and R. D. C. Prichard (9½) bt H. M. Read and Maj. E. Bromley-Fox (16) +17.

Lt.-Col. A. Saalfeld and Miss S. G. Hampson (5) bt Miss E. C. Brampton and W. W. Haynes (12½) +14.

R. A. Simpson and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (5) bt Miss E. J. Warwick and C. H. L. Prichard (6) +4.

W. B. Franklin and Mrs. A. N. Rolfe (6) w.o. Miss E. M. Brumpton and partner (scratched).

R. Rothwell and Miss E. M. Garratt (6) bt I. C. Baillieu and Mrs. D. M. C. Prichard (5) +6.

B. Lloyd-Pratt and Dr. H. M. Browning (8) bt T. O. Read and Mrs. H. Read (6½) +13.

J. G. Warwick and W. Prichard (12) bt A. D. Karmel and Mrs. A. D. Karmel (5½) +3.

SECOND ROUND

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard and R. D. C. Prichard (9½) bt Mrs. E. Rotherham and D. J. Bird (9) +14.

R. A. Simpson and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (5) bt Lt.-Col. A.

Saalfeld and Miss E. M. Garratt (6) bt W. B. Franklin and Mrs. A. N. Rolfe (6) +17.

G. Warwick and W. Prichard (12) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt and Dr. H. M. Browning (8) +11.

SEMI-FINAL

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard and R. D. C. Prichard (9½) bt

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard (12) bt B. Lloyd-Pratt and Dr. H. M. Browning (8) +11.

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard and R. D. C. Prichard (9½) bt R. A. Simpson and Mrs. R. A. Simpson (5) +22.
R. Rothwell and Miss E. M. Garratt (6) bt J. G. Warwick and W. Prichard (12) +3.

Lt.-Col. D. M. C. Prichard and R. D. C. Prichard (9½) bt R. Rothwell and Miss E. M. Garratt (6) +1.

#### PARKSTONE

6th-11th September

Hats (boaters, caps, toppers—even sou'westers) off to the organisers, management and players. For most of the time the weather was unbelievably bad, with driving rain time the weather was unbelievably bad, with driving rain and near-gale force winds alternating, and sometimes combining, with one another: on Thursday morning the flooded courts were more suited to water polo than croquet. However thanks to Della's calmly unobtrusive, but firm and efficient management, little time was lost and the programme proceeded as nearly according to plan as was humanly possible. It is necessary at this juncture to mention Mr. A'Barrow, the groundsman, who deserves much praise for the condition of the lawns and remarkable powers of recovery. And we must not forget the players who valiantly strove to make long rushes through standing water hazards: often resulting in aquatic explosions without, and rather more incendiary ones within.

standing water hazards: often resulting in aquatic explosions without, and rather more incendiary ones within.

As always there were many visitors, some new, but mostly old friends whom it was a pleasure to welcome, and whose sunny dispositions in some way made up for the weather. Of course, much of their good humour may well have found its origin in the excellent food prepared each day by Mrs. Allen and the ladies, of the club, who have established, and constantly maintain, a high reputation for their catering.

Outstanding among the players was 19-year-old Nigel Aspinall, who won the Opens and the Handicap Singles with consummate ease. He despatched his opponents with with consummate ease. He despatched his opponents with finely executed triple peels, rushes, cuts, split rolls and bold hooping that drew gasps of admiration, astonishment even, from the onlookers, and showed that he has the makings of a very good player indeed. Another whom we were delighted to see on the courts again was the hard-working Secretary, Mrs. McMordie, who is recovering from a serious illness earlier this year: we all sincerely hope that the improvement will continue and the recovery will be complete.

hope that the improvement will continue and the recovery will be complete.

Reverting to the weather once more and the varieties of dress necessitated by its vagaries, perhaps Rover would be pleased to hear that "whites" were very much in evidence whenever possible; even lurking beneath semi-transparent waterproofs. There is no doubt that he would have described many of us as "coastguards on a motor-cycling holiday", but I shudder to imagine in what terms he would have referred to the variety of protective footwear which the younger element fashioned from plastic bags and P.V.C. sheeting; however, I am sure that even he will admit that the functional is occasionally more important than the aesthetic aspect.

Once again, our thanks are repeated to all those responsible for making the week such a pleasant one: and I am sure that I speak for everyone when I say that we look forward to repeating the dose—preferably with less water-next year.

OPEN SINGLES (8 Entries) DRAW

FIRST ROUND Cmdr. G. V. G. Beamish bt Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt +3. Col. D. W. Beamish bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden +10. G. N. Aspinall bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith +19. Dr. R. B. N. Smartt bt Dr. H. J. Penny +16.

Col. D. W. Beamish bt Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish +7. G. N. Aspinall bt Dr. R. B. N. Smartt +26.

G. N. Aspinall bt Col. D. W. Beamish +19.

#### PROCESS

Col. D. W. Beamish bt Dr. R. B. N. Smartt +6. G. N. Aspinall bt Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish +12. Mrs. H. F. Chittenden bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith +13. Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt bt Dr. H. J. Penny +4.

G. N. Aspinall bt Col. D. W. Beamish +26. Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt bt Dr. H. J. Penny +4.

G. N. Aspinall bt Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt +26.

(10 Entries)

Miss K. Ault bt Mrs. R. A. Hill +18. Maj. F. Hill Bernhard bt Capt. W. A. T. Synge +7.

Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan bt Mrs. W. A. T. Synge +2. Miss K. Ault bt Mrs. E. M. Temple +17. Miss K. D. Hickson bt Maj. F. Hill Bernhard +3. R. F. Rigiani bt Mrs. N. McMordie +7.

Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan bt Miss K. Ault +7. R. F. Rigiani bt Miss K. D. Hickson +7.

Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan bt R. F. Rigiani +7.

HANDICAP SINGLES CLASS "C" (Qualification 6½ bisques and over) (8 Entries)

N. A. C. McMillan (7) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (6½) +10. F. Henshaw (11) bt Miss N. N. Fickling (14) +17. Mrs. C. Devitt (9) bt N. Vlasto (11) +6. Miss W. E. Creed Meredith (8) bt P. Cross (7) +17.

F. Henshaw (11) bt N. A. C. McMillan (7) +9. Mrs. C. Devitt (9) bt Miss W. E. Creed Meredith (8) +4.

F. Henshaw (11) bt Mrs. C. Devitt (9) +19.

HANDICAP SINGLES (Unrestricted) (26 Entries)

Miss W. E. Creed Meredith (8) bt Capt. W. A. T. Synge (4½) +3.
P. Cross (7) bt Miss K. Ault (3) +6.
Maj. F. Hill Bernhard (3) bt F. Henshaw (11) +6.
Mrs. E. M. Temple (4) bt Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan (3) +16.
R. F. Rigiani (5½) bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden (-½) +21.
G. N. Aspinali (2) bt N. A. C. McMillan (7) +20.
Mrs. C. Devitt (9) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor (6½) +8.
Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (4) bt Miss K. D. Hickson (3) +13.
Dr. H. J. Penny (1) bt Col. D. W. Beamish (-1½) +25.
Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt (1½) bt Mrs. N. McMordie (4) +11.

SECOND ROUND SECOND ROUND

Dr. R. B. N. Smartt (1) bt Miss N. N. Fickling (14) +8.

Miss W. E. Creed Meredith (8) bt Mrs. R. A. Hill (6½) +12.

Maj. F. Hill Bernhard (3) bt P. Cross (7) +4.

R. F. Rigiani (5½) bt Mrs. E. M. Temple (4) +2.

G. N. Aspinali (2) bt Mrs. C. Devitt (9) +24.

Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (4) bt Dr. H. J. Penny (1) +25.

Mrs. R. B. N. Smart (1½) bt Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish (-1½) +10.

Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith (2) bt N. Vlasto (11) +3.

Dr. R. B. N. Smartt (1) bt Miss W. E. Creed Meredith

(8) +12.

R. F. Rigiani (5½) bt Maj. F. Hill Bernhard (3) +7.
G. N. Aspinall (2) bt Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (4) +12.

Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt (1½) bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith

Dr. R. B. N. Smartt (1) bt R. F. Rigiani  $(5\frac{1}{2})$  +8. G. N. Aspinall (2) bt Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt  $(1\frac{1}{2})$  +15.

G. N. Aspinall (2) bt Dr. R. B. N. Smartt (1) +26.

#### MIXED DOUBLES HANDICAP (Qualifications combined handicaps not less than 2 bisques)

(12 Pairs) FIRST ROUND

V. A. de la Nougerede and Miss N. N. Fickling (13) bt Mrs. W. A. Naylor and N. Vlasto (17½) +6.

Capt. W. A. T. Synge and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt Dr. R. B. N. Smartt and Mrs. N. A. C. McMillan (4) +2.

Maj. F. Hill Bernhard and R. F. Rigiani (8½) bt Mrs. R. B. N. Smartt and P. Cross (8½) +3.

Miss K. Ault and G. N. Aspinall (5) bt Miss W. E. Creed Meredith and F. Henshaw (19) +3.

SECOND ROUND

Mrs. H. F. Chittenden and Mrs. E. M. Temple (3½) bt Comdr. G. V. G. Beamish and Mrs. R. Creed Meredith (12½) +2.

Capt. W. A. T. Synge and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge (8½) bt V. A. de la Nougerede and Miss N. N. Fickling (13) +13.

Maj. F. Hill Bernhard and R. F. Rigiani (8½) bt Miss K. Ault and G. N. Aspinall (5) +10.

Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith and Mrs. C. Devitt (11) bt Dr. H. J. Penny and Miss K. D. Hickson (4) +6.

Capt. W. A. T. Synge and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge  $(8\frac{1}{2})$  bt Mrs. H. F. Chittenden and Mrs. E. M. Temple  $(3\frac{1}{2})$  +14. Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith and Mrs. C. Devitt (11) bt Maj. F. Hill Bernhard and R. F. Rigiani  $(8\frac{1}{2})$  +4.

Capt. W. A. T. Synge and Mrs. W. A. T. Synge  $(8\frac{1}{2})$  bt Rev. Canon R. Creed Meredith and Miss C. Devitt (11) +7.

#### NOTTINGHAM v THE HELEY CLUB

(Played at Nottingham, 5th September)

Three members of the Heley Club arrived at Nottingham Three members of the Heley Club arrived at Nottingham on a deceptively pleasant Sunday morning to engage the local players. So as to make two doubles possible Peter Elmes was enrolled as a day-member of the club. We hope that he will one day be a full member. It is said to have been agreed before play that in the event of a tie the fourth singles would not count, but this has been disputed.

Arthur Reed swiftly got the Heley Club into the lead with a convincing win over Gerald Birch, and rather later Martin Murray pegged out against Paul Thompson. The two lower singles went to Nottingham which, in view of the alleged agreement, meant that Nottingham needed both doubles to win the match.

doubles to win the match.

In the top doubles David Miller and Reed each picked up breaks quickly but lost them by failing at hoops; in fact Reed found the fourth-corner hoop a considerable obstacle whichever side he approached it from. Birch proceeded to 1-back where he stuck. In the first half-hour five four-ball breaks were lost by bad hoop-shots, and the innings changed hands at every opportunity. Eventually Thompson kept the Heley Club out for a long time, going round off a rather uncontrolled break in which several likely crises were overcome and the apparently inevitable failures avoided. Reed then contributed a few more hoops to the visitors' tally, but the game was soon over.

The second doubles was also refreshingly expeditious, Murray and Elmes throughout having the edge over Bucknell and Taylor. Both doubles were finished between lunch and tea.

Despite the dreadful weather, the match was always enjoyable and interesting. The Nottingham Club are to be thanked for their kindness and hospitality.

#### SINGLES

G. Birch lost to A. A. Reed -25. P. Thompson lost to M. Murray -13. H. O. Hodgson beat D. W. Miller +18. G. K. Taylor beat P. Elmes +10.

#### DOUBLES

Birch and Thompson beat Reed and Miller +11. A. J. Bucknell and Taylor lost to Murray and Elmes +14.

Result: The Heley Club beat Nottingham by 3 games to 2, with 1 unfinished.