

to bang the ball at the wicket when there is not half a chance of a run out, and should the savage hurl come, away it will generally go for an over-throw for two or three, to the still further demoralization of the adversaries, particularly if the excitable man of the team has had anything to do with it. Such performances will put the best of bowlers off their bowling, and many times be the means of winning what looks, until their commencement, a completely hopeless match.

(To be continued.)

COMMUNICATION.

THE TORONTO CRICKET CLUB.

To the Editor of the Canadian Cricket Field.

DEAR SIR,—I am delighted to see a cricketer interested in the Toronto Club at last calling attention to its marked weaknesses. Is it not strange that in Toronto, where there is as good or better cricket material than in any city or town in Canada, cricket has been and is at so low an ebb? Our club exhibits what is often really only a caricature of metropolitan cricket. With an excellent ground and every opportunity for practice, and, I may add, good play shown in practice, it is a matter of surprise to a superficial on-looker that our record is from year to year a disgrace. For this there are no doubt many reasons; one cause of it is well pointed out by "Veteran," in your last issue. "Veteran" ascribes it to scarcity of matches; and in conclusion calls for abuse from the "youngsters," as one of the latter, I refer to him, not by any means for purpose of abuse, but to assist him in accounting for our fallen condition. I would like "Veteran" to understand that he is hitting at, not the "youngsters" but the "oldsters" of the Toronto Club. I believe it is the apathy and indifference of the latter class, coupled with their cricket conceit and conscious air and feeling of superiority, that mainly hinders our club from making the progress it should and might make. Here is the rotten spot in the State of Denmark. Every cricketer knows that those who practise most regularly and most distinguish themselves in practice, ought to constitute the teams. Yet in our matches, and particularly in all important matches, the places are monopolized almost entirely by old players who are rarely or never seen before the wickets in practice. A club whose representative teams are chosen from those who, from season to season, play only in matches, cannot expect to rank very high. Numerous examples could be adduced of clubs in this Province suffering from this drawback, which have degenerated from respectability to insignificance or dissolution. The method pursued by the best clubs in Canada in keeping up good teams is simply this: as soon as an old player gives up practice, drop him, and supply his place with young blood and enthusiasm; depend on present play, not on past reputations; this is just the plan *not* adopted by the Toronto Club. Here the colts are ignored, unless, as now, they are an absolute necessity, and superannuated patriarchs are chosen, not for what they can do now, but on the reputation of what they have done, or it is believed they have done, in the past. The folly of this system is shown in every match played this season. In the opening match of the season, under thirty easily defeated those over; in the match against Toronto University, the 'Varsity team (almost all junior members of Toronto) did as they wished with their older opponents; in the match between the Toronto Club and the Toronto Cricket Club, which resolved itself into a match between the oldsters and the youngsters, the former puffed and struggled for a bad defeat. The match against a weak team from Trinity College would have been ridiculous but for the bowling services of one of the youngest members of the club. And the other day an ignominious defeat was only prevented by the chance good play of a man who had not handled bat or ball for years. It is time the *personnel* of teams had a shaking up. If the experiment

suggested were tried, it ought to be found to work satisfactorily. All reference to the T. C. C. considered in good part.

Toronto, 6th July, 1882.

I am, yours truly,

YOUNGSTER.

ENGLAND

On the same days that the Australians met the Gentlemen, Kent and Sussex played. The former won in one innings and 175 runs. For Kent, Lord Harris made 176 out of 521 runs. Sussex got 128 the first and 218 the second innings.

The forty-eighth Inter-University match ended on the 28th ult., at Lord's, in a victory for Cambridge by seven wickets. At the commencement of the season it was thought that the Light Blues would have no chance; but Oxford did not maintain their form of the early part of the year. Score: Oxford, 165 and 257; Cambridge, 275 and 148.

AUSTRALIANS v. GENTLEMEN OF ENGLAND.

The unusual interest shown in this match, played at Kennington Oval on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th ult., was shown by an attendance far in excess of anything ever recorded on the Surrey ground, with the one exception of the match between England and Australia in 1880. The heavy rain just after luncheon on Thursday reduced the numbers considerably on the first day, but still 10,028 paid for admission, and on Friday and Saturday the numbers were 18,540 and 11,030 respectively, so that in all 39,598 persons paid the entrance fee of a shilling. The sudden indisposition of Mr. A. H. Evans left the eleven without a fast bowler, but the comparative weakness of the eleven in bowling was thought to be fully compensated for by their general excellence in batting and fielding. Murdoch, in winning the toss, gained a decided advantage in the wicket, and the out-cricketer of the Gentlemen was so weak that the Australians were able to make a very creditable total of 334. Mr. Steel was kept on far too long, considering how plain his delivery was. Mr. Ramsay might fairly have been tried a great deal more, and it was a matter for general surprise that Mr. W. G. Grace should hardly have been allowed a ball until a long innings was nearly over. The fielding, too, fell decidedly below expectations. Mr. Lucas made two fine catches, one, that which disposed of Bonnor, as good as has ever been seen, but generally the display was not up to the mark, and Mr. Leslie's misjudgment of the chance Bonnor gave when he had got only seven cost the Gentlemen quite a hundred runs. As to the batting of the English eleven, the mildest that can be said is that it was altogether unworthy of the individual reputations of many of the players engaged, and that collectively it was much below the ordinary standard of English amateur cricket. Score:

AUSTRALIANS.

Bannerman, c Hornby, b	J. M. Blackham, c Lucas, b
Steel..... 50	Grace..... 6
H. H. Massie, c Read, b	S. P. Jones, l b w, b Grace.. 4
Ramsay..... 32	G. E. Palmer, b Grace..... 8
W. L. Murdoch, c Grace, b	T. W. Garrett, c Hornby, b
C. T. Studd..... 57	Steel..... 26
P. S. McDonnell, c G. B.	F. R. Spofforth, not out.... 10
Studd, b Ramsay..... 19	
G. Giffen, l b w, b Grace.... 43	Extras..... 5
G. J. Bonnor, c Lucas, b	
Ramsay..... 74	Total..... 334

GENTLEMEN OF ENGLAND.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
W. G. Grace, b Giffen..... 61	b Palmer..... 32
A. P. Lucas, b Spofforth..... 16	c Spofforth, b Giffen..... 2
W. H. Patterson, c Palmer, b Giffen..... 21	b Palmer..... 15
W. W. Read, b Giffen..... 17	c Jones, b Giffen..... 19
C. T. Studd, b Giffen..... 9	c and b Giffen..... 11
A. N. Hornby, c Bannerman, b Giffen..... 20	c and b Palmer..... 17
A. G. Steel, l b w, b Spofforth 12	not out..... 32
G. B. Studd, l b w, b Giffen. 9	c Blackham, b Garrett..... 6
C. F. H. Leslie, not out.... 13	b Spofforth..... 10
E. F. S. Tylecote, b Giffen.. 0	c and b Palmer..... 1
	c Jones, b Garrett..... 0
Extras..... 13	Extras..... 6
Total..... 182	Total..... 161