

The following Tournament results were omitted from Issue No. 113:

HURLINGHAM

OPEN HANDICAP SINGLES (48 entries)

August 4th-7th

Manager: I. C. Baillieu, Esq.

Silver Jubilee Cup

1st Round

G. W. Williams (-1) bt. W./Cdr. D. L. Allen (6½) +13.
G. F. Hallett (1½) bt. Mrs. Longman (-2) +26.
Mrs. Lightfoot (½) bt. Miss Morgan (0) +8.
H. S. Clemons (-2) bt. M. G. Pearson (7) +14.
Mrs. G. T. Trull (6) bt. Miss Joly (1½) +8.
Gen. Wilson-Haffenden (2) bt. Miss Duthie (1½) +4½.
A. Solomon (7) bt. D. V. H. Rees (½) +23.
R. A. Godby (-1½) bt. Mrs. Carlisle (7) +13.
Mrs. Meachem (3) bt. Mrs. N. E. Figgis (5½) +12.
H. C. Green (1½) bt. Mrs. N. R. Dodd (-1½) +9.
B. Bliss (7) bt. I. S. Anderson (8) +1.
Prof. Skempton (3) bt. M. B. Reckitt (2½) +19.
P. L. Gifford-Nash (1) bt. Mrs. Read (1½) +13.
Mrs. Sundius-Smith (-1) bt. E. B. T. Tanner (7) +4½.
J. R. G. Solomon (7) bt. Lady FitzGerald (2) +1.
Mrs. Skempton (3) bt. Mrs. J. W. Solomon (16) +16.

2nd Round

Col. Saalfeld (-1) bt. Mrs. Bressey (5½) +1½.
Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) bt. Miss Lintern (1) +8.
S. G. Kent (5) bt. I. W. Cheavin (4) +15.
M. McWeaney (3) bt. Miss Hay (7) +11.
G. F. Hallett (1½) bt. G. W. Williams (-1) +23.
H. S. Clemons (-2) bt. Mrs. Lightfoot (½) +8.
Gen. Wilson-Haffenden (1) bt. Mrs. Trull (6) +1½.
R. A. Godby (-1½) w.o. A. Solomon (7) (opp. scr.).
H. C. Green (1½) bt. Mrs. Meachem (3) +4.
Prof. Skempton (3) bt. B. Bliss (7) +7.
P. L. Gifford-Nash (1) bt. Mrs. Sundius-Smith (-1) +13.
J. R. G. Solomon (7) bt. Mrs. Skempton (3) +7.
The Rev'd J. E. Andrews (3) bt. Mrs. G. F. H. Elvey (-½) +1½.

3rd Round

Col. Saalfeld (-1) bt. Mrs. G. W. Solomon (1) +19.
S. G. Kent (5) bt. M. McWeaney (3) +14.
G. F. Hallett (1½) bt. H. S. Clemons (-2) +8.
R. A. Godby (-1½) w.o. Gen. Wilson-Haffenden (1) (opp. scr.).
H. C. Green (1½) bt. Prof. Skempton (3) +8.
J. R. G. Solomon (7) bt. P. L. Gifford-Nash (1) +14.
J. B. Meachem (0) bt. Rev. J. E. Andrews (3) +4.
S. S. Townsend (-1) bt. T. O. Read (-1½) +19.

Quarter-Final

S. G. Kent (5) bt. Col. Saalfeld (-1) +8.
G. F. Hallett (1½) bt. R. A. Godby (-1½) +4.
J. R. G. Solomon (7) bt. H. C. Green (1½) +21.
S. S. Townsend (-1) bt. J. B. Meachem (0) +6.

Semi-Final

G. F. Hallett (1½) bt. S. G. Kent (5) +19.
J. R. G. Solomon (7) bt. S. S. Townsend (-1) +12.

Final

J. R. G. Solomon (7) bt. G. F. Hallett (1½) +13.

10th-15th August

The Ladies Field Candlesticks

LADIES' HANDICAP DOUBLES (13 pairs)

(Under the Direction of the C.A.)

1st Round

Mrs. Longman & Miss Morgan (-2) bt. Mrs. Rotherham & Miss Hay (3) +7.
Lady FitzGerald & Mrs. Meachem (5) bt. Mrs. Solomon & Mrs. J. W. Solomon (15) +5.
Mrs. Jarden & Mrs. Wood (3) bt. Miss Duthie & Mrs. Skempton (4½) +15.
Mrs. Lightfoot & Mrs. Prichard (-1) w.o. Mrs. Bressey & Mrs. Gifford-Nash (15½) (opp. scr.).
Mrs. Read & Mrs. Sundius-Smith (½) bt. Mrs. Chittenden & Mrs. Dodd (-2) +11.

2nd Round

Mrs. Longman & Miss Morgan (-2) bt. Mrs. McMillan & Mrs. Nalder (6) +2.
Mrs. Jarden & Mrs. Wood (3) bt. Lady FitzGerald & Mrs. Meachem (5) +6.
Mrs. Read & Mrs. Sundius-Smith (½) bt. Mrs. Lightfoot & Mrs. Prichard (-1) +14.
Miss Warwick & Mrs. Carlisle (4) bt. Miss Lintern & Mrs. Neal (7) +13.

Semi-Final

Mrs. Longman & Miss Morgan (-2) bt. Mrs. Jarden & Mrs. Wood (3) +8.
Miss Warwick & Mrs. Carlisle (4) bt. Mrs. Read & Mrs. Sundius-Smith (½) +13.

Final

Miss Warwick & Mrs. Carlisle (4) bt. Mrs. Longman & Miss Morgan (-2) +8.

The Wine Coolers

GENTLEMEN'S HANDICAP DOUBLES (16 pairs)

(Under the Direction of the C.A.)

1st Round

Col. Beamish & E. H. S. Shelton (-1) bt. Cdr. Borrett & R. O. Havery (-1½) +6.
S. S. Townsend & J. B. Meachem (-1½) bt. J. A. Wheeler & D. V. H. Rees (1½) +12.
H. S. Clemons & I. W. Cheavin (2) bt. D. J. V. Hamilton-Miller & J. Parr (3½) +4.
M. Stride & F. Reynold (0) bt. J. G. Warwick & I. C. Baillieu (-1) +17.
B. G. Perry & I. S. Anderson (4) bt. B. Lloyd-Pratt & M. B. Reckitt (-1) +17.
R. A. Godby & A. W. Solomon (4½) bt. Prof. Skempton & Prof. Neal (-1½) +4.
Col. Saalfeld & Capt. Nalder (1) bt. W. de B. Prichard & P. L. Gifford-Nash (½) +2.
T. O. Read & M. McWeaney (1½) bt. Dr. Bray & J. R. G. Solomon (1) +17.

2nd Round

S. S. Townsend & J. B. Meachem (-1½) bt. Col. Beamish & E. H. S. Shelton (-1) +12.
M. Stride & F. Reynold (0) bt. H. S. Clemons & I. W. Cheavin (2) +14.
R. A. Godby & A. W. Solomon (4½) bt. B. G. Perry & I. S. Anderson (4) +8.
T. O. Read & M. McWeaney (1½) bt. Col. Saalfeld & Capt. Nalder (1) +18.

Semi-Final

S. S. Townsend & J. B. Meachem (-1½) bt. M. Stride & F. Reynold (0) +7.
R. A. Godby & A. W. Solomon (4½) bt. T. O. Read & M. McWeaney (1½) +8.

Final

R. A. Godby & A. W. Solomon (4½) bt. S. S. Townsend & J. B. Meachem (-1½) +4.

CARRICKMINES

The Co. Dublin Championships

14th-19th September (30 entries)

Manager: Lady FitzGerald

Championship of County Dublin

Winner: R. J. Leonard

Runners-up: Mrs. H. M. Read; F. Regan

Boxwell Cup

Winner: R. J. Leonard (-½)

Runner-up: Miss G. Hopkins (3½)

Coronation Cups

Winners: R. J. Leonard and M. B. McWeaney (2)

Runners-up: F. and Mrs. Regan (6½)

This Carrickmines Tournament was, alas, not as successful as other years. The weather was cold all week, and the try-out of having this Tournament in September was seen to be unwise. Most players wore heavy overcoats, mufflers, and boots. Also, due to catering difficulties, no lunches could be served. Due to the late date, no visitors came, and so it became a Club Tournament.

However, to brighten things up, we had the warming elements of hot Irish whiskey and strong tea, and the wonderful managing of Geraldine FitzGerald. On the courts, one man ruled the show; Reggie Leonard won all the events and was in sparkling form. He is one of the best shots in the game and has one of the most fluent styles—a delightful player to watch. He was the highlight of the week.

THE CROQUET GAZETTE

ISSUE No. 114

JANUARY 1971

The Official Organ of the Croquet Association

The publication of this special Winter number of the *Gazette* calls for explanation. In the first place, a number of proposed amendments to the Laws and Regulations for Tournaments should have been published in issue No. 113, in order, pursuant to Rule XIV, to be effective in time for the 1971 season. They now appear herein.

A further important reason is the need to clarify the situation that led to articles in the National press in December, following the Editorial in the last issue. I wish to dissociate the Council from the views expressed in that Editorial which were those solely of the Editor. They run counter to the policy of the Council who, with the object of encouraging and developing croquet, have authorised the Coaching Scheme towards which a Government grant has been made. It is to be deprecated that the views expressed by the Editor should appear following the words "The Official Organ of the Association". It had been the intention to describe the proposed plans for operating the Coaching Scheme in the Spring issue, but, if only to correct distortions of fact contained in the Editorial, I think it desirable to give some details now.

The Editor was in error in stating that the Coaching Scheme is now being negotiated; it was in fact first discussed by the Council as long ago as October 1969. By February 1970 it was agreed that an application for grant aid should be made to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (now the Department of the Environment). After detailed discussions with the Central Council of Physical Recreation and the Sports Council, the application was submitted in June 1970. An offer of virtually the full grant sought was received in August, and was accepted by the Council at its meeting on 24th October 1970.

The objective of the Scheme can be stated very simply; it is actively to encourage more people to take up croquet. It will operate in two ways. First, it is hoped to establish new clubs, usually situated in public parks. The cost of starting a new club on a virgin site would be prohibitive, but if a park has a suitable area of grass, such as a disused bowling green, facilities for croquet can be provided at a very reasonable cost. The new and thriving club at Stourbridge was formed in this way, and the Harrow Oak club now has two courts on what were formerly grass tennis courts, with ample room for further expansion.

A sustained effort will be made to discover further opportunities of this nature, with suitable sites and a willingness on the part of the parks authority to permit the formation of a club if there is enough local interest. Once a site has been found, it is intended that a weekend exhibition will be given, with extensive local publicity. Those spectators who wish to try their hand at the game will be offered coaching, perhaps on each evening of the following week. At the end of the coaching period, a club will be established if there are enough potential members to make it viable. An Associate living nearby will be asked to foster the club during its first season.

The other aim of the Scheme is to provide assistance to existing clubs where the membership is declining. It would be foolish to concentrate on creating new facilities for croquet if existing ones were falling into disuse. Indeed, preliminary surveys suggest that the main effort must initially be concentrated in this area. The assistance offered will be similar to that involved in the formation of a new club, with an exhibition followed by coaching for potential new members. As far as possible, the services of club members will be enlisted for these activities, but help and advice in the organisation and publicity will be given.

There will be a very considerable amount of administration involved in these Schemes, and we have been fortunate in finding two Associates willing to undertake the work. Mrs. Meachem and Mrs. Neal are both enthusiastic about their task, but they will need full and active co-operation from many other Associates if their efforts are to prove successful. I am confident that this will be forthcoming; we all wish our game not just to survive but to flourish.

The Scheme will be supervised by the Publicity and Develop-

ment Committee under the capable chairmanship of Dr. Bray. This Committee has the important job of establishing a panel of coaches who will provide the coaching services required. Many Associates will have coached beginners individually, but they may not have had experience of coaching groups, so that it will be necessary to work out a systematic procedure for dealing with fairly large classes.

This is a pilot scheme, the grant covering three years of operation, and the two administrators will need to feel their way carefully at first, gaining experience of the best ways of ensuring good publicity and an effective follow up at the end of each coaching period.

Mrs. Meachem and Mrs. Neal will not be representatives of the C.C.P.R., as stated in the Editorial. Their work will be for, and will be controlled by, the Council. The services of the C.C.P.R. will, however, be enlisted in securing publicity for the coaching courses. This is a field in which the C.C.P.R. has a considerable amount of expertise, and experience in the West Midlands Region has shown how effective their efforts can be.

The Editorial also referred in derisive terms to the use of a film-strip. This reference is to a series of seven instructional film-strips, accompanied by a sound commentary, which is being financed by the Rothman's National Sports Foundation of Australia. Following the success of the 1969 Test Team, the Australian Croquet Council asked four of its members, Nigel Aspinall, Roger Bray, Bernard Neal and John Solomon, to devise these film-strips for use in Australia. Their task has now been completed, although the film-strips have not yet been finally produced. Roger Bray will visit Australia towards the end of 1971 to advise on the use of these film-strips in coaching schemes.

Our own coaching scheme would have been launched even if these film-strips had never been conceived. When they are available we shall need to consider very carefully the best way of making use of them, but they are for use by coaches and it was never intended that Mrs. Meachem and Mrs. Neal should, "encumbered with an expensive film-strip projector, scour the countryside, spreading the gospel of Croquet wherever they go".

The opinion expressed in the Editorial that croquet can never become a popular sport may well be true. Its lack of appeal as a spectator sport to all but the initiated suggests that this will always be so. But it should be more popular than it is; many potential players do not even consider it as a possible sport because of complete ignorance of what Association Croquet really is. An important side effect of establishing clubs in public parks is that many people will, for the first time, see the game played with proper equipment on a full-sized lawn, and will realise that it is far removed from the garden party pastime which they believed it to be. As to the type of people who will be drawn into the game, I can only assert that by its very nature it will only appeal to sportsmen and sportswomen who enjoy and appreciate a game which is a fine test of skill, intelligence and character; in short, just the type of people who it is a pleasure to meet in tournaments and club matches.

I should like to conclude by reminding Associates of two of the objects of the Association, as stated in Rule I:

(a) To encourage, promote and develop the Game played in accordance with the Laws of Association Croquet and Golf Croquet and control the Game in the United Kingdom.

(c) To control the registration of Croquet Clubs in the United Kingdom and render assistance to any club.

The Coaching Scheme has been devised in pursuance of these objects.

Associates may have read a remark ascribed to me in the National Press recently in which I appeared to infer that the degree of skill and intelligence required in croquet was beyond the abilities of the lower income groups. Needless to say, this is not my opinion and was the result of compression of two separate comments, as I was able to explain in the Radio 4 News Desk programme on 24th December and in a letter to *The Times* on 31st December.

S. S. TOWNSEND, *Chairman.*

The Editorship

Many Associates will have read recent articles in the *Sunday Times* (20th December) and *The Times* (24th December). These implied that Mr. Lloyd Pratt was dismissed from his post as Editor because the Winter number of the *Gazette* contained an editorial which was strongly critical of Council policy in accepting the grant for the development of croquet.

The primary reason for Mr. Lloyd Pratt's dismissal was quite different, and was due to his refusal to keep the cost of the *Gazette* within the budget laid down by the Finance and General Purposes Committee and ratified by the Council. The regrettable distortions contained in these two articles make it necessary to record the facts.

The budget agreed by the Council for the *Gazette* in 1970 was £800, exclusive of wrapping and postage charges, which would provide five issues each costing £160 and comprising 16 pages, including the use of four cover pages. This budget was itself well in excess of that for previous years, due to rising costs of production. The first (Spring) number consisted of 20 pages and cost £250, alarmingly in excess of the target of £160. As soon as this became known the Editorial Board stressed the need for economy. This and several other warnings went unheeded, and the Summer and Autumn numbers both exceeded the prescribed length. The first three issues together cost £760, virtually absorbing the whole of the agreed budget for the year.

At its October meeting, the Council decided that only one more issue should appear in 1970, and at its November meeting that its cost should not exceed £250. In fact, the Editor then failed to carry out the agreed plans decided by the Editorial Board in consultation with him on the size and contents of the issue and the cost of the Winter number proved to be £303.

NOTICE OF ALTERATION IN THE LAWS AND REGULATIONS (Pursuant to Rule XIV)

At their meeting on 21st November 1970 the Council passed a resolution proposing the following amendments to the Laws and Regulations:

1. **Cancel temporary variation in Law 51**, which was promulgated in the *Croquet Gazette*, number 111 (Summer 1970). (This temporary variation read as follows: "Law 51 (in Tournaments players must not warn an opponent that he is about to play with the wrong ball) shall be temporarily varied by adding after 'players must not so warn' in line 6, the following sentence: 'This over-rides Law 45 (b) (duty to announce an irregularity) and Law 28 (Ball misplaced).'")
Substitute:
(a) Insert "(a)" before GENERAL RULE in heading of Law 28.
(b) Add new sub-paragraph 28 (b) as follows:
"(b) EXCEPTION TO FORESTALLING. A player shall not forestall play when the striker is about to play with the wrong ball, even though a ball is misplaced."
(c) Law 28 (a) line 4. After "stroke" cancel the full stop and add: "(subject to (b) below)."
(d) Law 45 (b) line 5. After "observes" insert: "except as provided in Law 28 (b)".
2. **Regulation 19.** Cancel Regulation 19 (f) and substitute: "(f) to decide:
(i) as to the shortening or time-limiting of games if in his opinion these are in the interests of the tournament, but may, at his discretion, decide that the final of an event which has been played in shortened or time-limited games may be played in the form of a full game.
(ii) to play an event advertised as single life in the form of two life, best of three, or American.
(iii) to alter the limits of handicaps in singles or doubles according to entries received and to move a player from one class to another for which he is qualified."
3. **Regulation 20.**
Page 45, line 22, after the words "in a similar manner" and before "The XYZ and XY Systems" insert the following:
"The two life variation.
The following variation may be introduced during play by the Manager, if in his opinion it is in the interests of the tournament, provided that it is:
(i) authorised in the advertised conditions of the tournament, or
(ii) applied to an event originally advertised as single life which is being played as two life under Regulation 19 (f) (ii).
It may not be used in a first-class level event. For the purposes of this variation, a first-class level event is one which is played under conditions of advanced play, and which is open to all, without any restriction other than one excluding men or women, non-Associates, or competitors with official handicaps exceeding a stated number of bisques."

The cost of the *Gazette* in 1970 has therefore been £1,063, excluding this special number, as compared with the target of £800, despite the fact that several tournament results have been curtailed or omitted, contrary to Council policy. The Autumn and Winter numbers did, however, suffer from unforeseen rises in printing costs, accounting for a total of about £70 for which the Editor was not responsible.

It has been necessary to state these figures because Associates might otherwise be misled by the reference to "derisively small" savings in the note "The Rape of Roquetetta" on page 54 of the Winter number. An over-expenditure of £263 looms large in the total budget of the Association, and it is clear that the *Gazette* could not continue to be produced on the same basis as in 1970. While a less ambitious format will have to be introduced this year the aim will be to obtain as high a standard as possible in relation to the means available.

The situation has been relieved somewhat by two special donations, totalling £75, from our President and Mr. Victor Evans but future policy for the *Gazette* cannot rest on the assumption that over-expenditure will be retrieved in part by such generous actions.

Mr. Lloyd Pratt has put a great deal of effort into producing a *Gazette* of the quality which he feels is appropriate, and Associates will wish to join the Editorial Board in thanking him for his work this year. However, because he was not prepared to accept that the costs of the *Gazette* must be kept within the budget, the Board had no alternative but to relieve him of his post.

B. G. NEAL,
Chairman, Editorial Board.

Two life variation

- (a) This variation is identical with the two life system until the two lives have been played down to the semi-finals. If there are still eight competitors engaged, the event is concluded in accordance with the two life system.
 - (b) If there are less than EIGHT competitors engaged, the two lives are married, and the competitors are entered on a new competition card for eight, in the following manner:
 - (c) If there are SEVEN competitors, the player engaged in both lives is placed at the top of the competition card with a bye, and the six remaining competitors are drawn by lot to fill places 3 to 8 inclusive.
 - (d) If there are SIX competitors, one of the two engaged in both lives is placed at the top of the competition card with a bye and the other is placed at the bottom of the competition card with a bye. The remaining four players are subsequently drawn by lot for positions 3, 4, 5 and 6.
 - (e) If there are FIVE competitors, the three players involved in both lives are drawn for positions 1, 3 and 5, each with a bye; the remaining players are placed in positions 7 and 8.
 - (f) If there are FOUR competitors, they are drawn by lot and are all placed in the same round."
4. **Regulation 24.**
Delete sub-para. 24 (d) and substitute:
"(d) to make reductions in handicaps after play which shall take immediate effect.
(e) to receive from competitors applications for an increase in handicap and to forward such applications to the Handicap Co-ordination Committee with recommendations thereon."
 5. **Regulation 26.**
Delete.

These alterations have to be ratified by the Council, after this publication, before coming into force.

EXTRACT FROM PROCEEDINGS OF COUNCIL MEETINGS

24th October 1970

1. The use of the name "Croquet Gazette" for the magazine was approved. In view of the cost of the magazine to date this year there would be four issues only, the size and contents of the last issue to be determined by the Editorial Board in the light of the financial position.
2. The Handicap Co-ordination and Handicap Appeal Committees were instructed to review Handicap revision practice in all its aspects.
3. Approval was given to a coaching scheme, towards the cost of which a Government grant was being made available.

21st November 1970

1. The Calendar fixtures for 1971 were approved. The main change is the deferment of the Men's and Women's Championships to two weeks later than in 1970 with a few consequential changes in the dates of Club tournaments. The Champion of Champions event is not to be held: Mrs. Stoker would be informed and consulted regarding the future of the trophy which she had donated.
2. It was agreed to plan for a new edition of the Laws to be ready in March 1972.
3. The F. and G.P. Committee's recommendation that the cost of the final issue of the *Gazette* should be limited to £250 was accepted.
4. Among changes in handicap revision procedure for 1971 was a decision that reductions made by Tournament Handicappers would be treated as confirmed with immediate effect (see proposed alterations to Regulations set out in this number).
5. The Council agreed to certain amendments in the Laws and Regulations as set out in this number.
6. It was announced that the following awards had been made for 1970: Apps Bowl, Col. E. L. Vulliamy; Steel Bowl, Miss E. H. Arkell; Most deserving club, Ipswich.
7. The Annual General Meeting is to be held on 24th May 1971 at 2.30 p.m.

HANDICAP ALTERATIONS AGREED BY THE HANDICAP CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

- Colchester**, 27th July-1st August
W. J. Millie 14; Mrs. W. J. Millie 14; Capt. A. W. Greenham 11 (D.9) to 8; J. N. Robinson -1 to -1½.
[Non-Associate: R. S. Alford 9.]
- Hurlingham**, 4th-7th August
G. F. Hallett 1½ to 1; J. R. G. Solomon 7 to 5; R. O. Havery 1½ to 1; Miss S. F. Hay 7 to 6; A. W. Solomon 7 to 6; S. G. Kent 5 to 4.
- Hurlingham**, 10th-15th August
D. V. H. Rees ½ to 0; I. S. Anderson 7 to 6; Mrs. J. W. Solomon 16 to 14; Mrs. A. W. Skempton 3 to 2½; A. W. Solomon 6 to 5; Mrs. H. M. Read 1½ to 1.
- Cheltenham**, Week-end, 14th-16th August
H. G. Boulton 9 to 8; Miss E. H. Arkell 9 (D.7) to 7 (D.6); Brig. L. E. Bourke 7 to 6; N. Williams 6 to 4; R. N. Bateson 7 to 6.
[Non-Associates: Dr. L. S. Harris 9 (D.8) to 8; J. A. Lawson 16 to 12.]
- Nottingham**, 17th-22nd August
J. A. Wheeler 1 to ½; Mrs. A. J. Bucknell 12 to 12 (D.11); P. B. Puxon 10 to 9 (D.8); Dr. D. I. Nichols 0 to -½.
[Non-Associates: R. A. G. Hermon 6* to 5; Miss L. Henshaw 16 (D.14) to 15 (D.13).]
- Brighton**, 24th-29th August
E. J. Tucker 4 to 3; Mrs. N. W. T. Cox 5 to 4½; Sir Leonard Daldry 2 to 1½; M. Stride -2 to -3; Mrs. J. B. Meachem 3 to 2½; K. A. Ross 2½ to 1; R. O. Havery 1 to ½; Mrs. E. Thompson 7½ to 7; F. F. Staddon 4½* to 6; W. J. Baverstock 4 to 3½; Dr. W. R. Bucknall 1 to 0.
- Colchester**, Week-end, 28th-31st August
Mrs. G. S. Digby 9 to 8; P. D. Hallett -1½ to -2.
- Hunstanton**, 31st August-5th September
H. B. H. Carlisle -½ to -1; Capt. A. W. Greenham 8 to 7; J. B. Meachem 0 to -½; Mrs. F. J. T. Mew 16 to 13 (D.10); W. de B. Prichard -½ to -1; J. N. Robinson -1½ to -2.
- Cheltenham**, Week-end, 1st-5th September
W. J. Sturdy 5 to 4; Brig. L. E. Bourke 6 to 5½; Miss E. H. Arkell 7 (D.6) to 6.
- Roehampton**, 14th-19th September
R. N. Bateson 6 to 5; Miss S. F. Hay 6 to 5½; Mrs. A. W. Skempton 2½ to 2.
- Parkstone**, 14th-19th September
J. H. J. Soutter 7* to 5; Sir Leonard Daldry 1½ to 1; L. S. Butler 6 to 5; Mrs. G. H. Wood 6 to 5½; Mrs. I. N. Duveen (Club recommendation) 15 to 13.
- Cheltenham**, Week-end, 18th-20th September
Miss E. H. Arkell 6 to 4½; L. G. Ayliffe 6 to 5; P. J. Cross 5½ to 5; G. H. Betts 8 to 7½; Brig. L. E. Bourke 5½ to 4½.
- Devonshire Park**, 28th September-10th October
Miss K. M. O. Sessions -2 to -2½; Col. G. T. Wheeler ½ to -½; E. J. Tucker 3 to 1½; Mrs. J. Walker 3 to 2½; Col. E. L. L. Vulliamy 3 to 2½; Dr. M. D. Nosworthy 14; L. Middleton 7* to 7; Mrs. G. H. Wood 5½ to 5; D. A. Harris 0 to -½.
- Cheltenham**, Week-end, 16th-18th October
R. N. Bateson 5 to 4; P. W. Hands -2 to -2½; R. A. W. Chaff 7 to 5½; Mrs. G. H. Wood 5 to 4½.
- All-England Handicaps (Finals)**, 26th September
R. N. Maclean 7 to 5.

CLUB RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Colchester**
R. S. Alford 9 to 7; J. Cockayne 7 to 6; Capt. A. W. Greenham 7 to 6½; Mrs. F. E. M. Puxon 6 to 5½.
- Parsons Green**
Mrs. L. C. Farlie 5½ to 5; John Parr 7 to 5; Mrs. G. Trull 6 to 5.
- Budleigh Salterton**
Mrs. M. H. Vincent 2 to 1½.
- Nottingham**
Miss E. M. Brumpton 4½ to 4.
- Southwick**
H. C. Higinbotham 9 to 8; Mrs. R. E. Tucker 5 to 4½; Mrs. M. S. Tyrell 7 to 6½.
[Non-Associates: Miss Piper 8 to 7; Miss Pratt 6 to 5½; Mrs. Webb 7 to 6½; Mrs. Woodward 8 to 7; Mrs. Hawkswood 14 to 13.]
- Handicaps raised at own request**
Mrs. D. M. C. Pritchard -1½ to -1; Mrs. E. Rotherham -3 to -2; W. B. C. Paynter -½ to 2; J. G. Warwick -2 to -1; Miss E. J. Warwick -3 to -2; Miss D. A. Lintern 1 to 2½.

LIMIT OF CLAIMS, CONDONING AND WAIVING by the Chairman of the Laws Committee

In several places in the Laws the phrase appears that the error or fault may be "condoned". (Law 27, Playing when not entitled, Law 30(c), Wrong Ball, and Law 32(b) Fault.)

Chambers Dictionary defines the word condone as "To forgive, to pass over without blame, overlook, to excuse, atone for". Most of these meanings, except "overlook", imply some sort of voluntary forgiveness, but as used in the Laws the word "condone" has a restricted interpretation. It means that the error or fault is condoned not because the adversary is being magnanimous or even exercising some option under the Laws, but simply because he has not noticed it or drawn attention to it within the time limit laid down in the Limit of Claims.

Law 32(b) (i) explains when a fault may be "waived" at the option of the adversary. This only occurs when the striker commits a fault in a croquet stroke under Law 32 and also in the same stroke sends his own ball or croqueted ball off the court. In this event the opponent has the option of having the balls replaced or of "waiving" the fault and leaving the balls as they lie at the end of the stroke (bringing balls on to the yard line where necessary).

A common fallacy is that the option of waiving only applies to the fault of not shaking the croqueted ball. Admittedly this is probably the most common cause of this occurring, but in fact it applies to all faults under Law 32, when in the same stroke the striker's or the croqueted ball are sent off the court.

Note that playing with the wrong ball is NOT a fault, and the option of waiving does not operate in this case.

The Limits of Claims are extremely difficult to memorise, and they take some finding in the Laws book. The following is a potted guide to the Limits of Claims:

GUIDE TO LIMIT OF CLAIMS

- | | Law |
|--|------------|
| 1. Playing When Not Entitled To Do So | |
| (a) Before adversary's next turn | 27 |
| (b) End of game for restoration of bisques | 39 A |
| 2. Playing When Ball Misplaced | |
| Adversary must forestall | 28 |
| 3. Taking Croquet Off Wrong Ball | |
| Before stroke after continuation stroke (Adversary has option of replay) | 29(a) |
| 4. Taking Croquet When Not Entitled | |
| Before stroke after continuation stroke | 29(b) |
| 5. Failing To Take Croquet When Entitled | |
| Before next stroke but one | 29(c) |
| 6. Ball Wrongly Pegged Out | |
| or | |
| Ball Pegged Out And Not Removed | |
| No limit. Balls replaced as when error occurred, and player entitled to play plays | 29(d) |
| 7. Playing With Wrong Ball | |
| (a) Before first stroke of next turn | 30(c) |
| (b) End of game for restoration of bisques | 39 A |
| 8. Fault During Striking | |
| Before next stroke but one | 32 |
| 9. Mistake in Score or Wrongly Placed Clips | |
| No limit for adjustment of score or clips. | |
| Before second stroke of offending party's next turn for replay | 35 |

Referees and aspiring referees may find it useful to copy the above guide into their Law books. A convenient blank page occurs at the end of the book.

D. M. C. PRICHARD.