Michael McDonnell’s “Friday Golf Club” column in the *Daily Mail* was discussing the perfect golf course last month.

It came out at 6,732 yards with Par and S.S.S., 72. There were four dog-legs, two par-5s in each half with one at the 1st and one at the 18th, and four par-3s — one odd and one even number to each nine holes. Bunkers were all down the sides of the fairways “to catch hooks or slices — NOTHING ELSE.” And there was rough.

It takes a professional journalist to tackle this question in 15 inches of column and still have room for reports of holes in one, hints of play and a news item about Scottish selectors. But we may as well have a stab at it in half a page.

First of all, there should be eight dog-legs, because a straight par-5 is a bore.

The first hole should be a par-4 if traffic is to flow smoothly at the start. At a par-5 there will surely be somebody who thinks he can reach the green with his second shot. Meanwhile, those on the tee continue their practice swings. The ideal length supposes that one match can walk to the green after taking its second shots and putt out while those behind are walking to their drive.

Last hole a par-5? Agreed.

Two odd and two even holes is fine for foursome play, but not a factor important enough to influence the design of the course in the first place. Four short holes in all? Probably, but an odd thing is happening. With 7,000 yards the aim to test the expert, four short holes restrict the length of the par-4s and the number of par-5s. Five short holes make the long holes longer for any given total. The future may even see six short holes, excellently defended, with some of the others almost out of sight.
Bunkers lining the sides of fairways are putting the clock back, but not far enough. Rough, on the other hand, there must be. The problem is — what sort? And if it has to be grass — how long?

What do you think?

Irrigation Systems — Economics

The Automatic System

By CHARLES McCREA, Golf Course Superintendent

Perhaps at some future date as historians write of the Twentieth Century, they will call it the century of automation. This is especially true of golf courses when you consider irrigation systems.

In the North-east, automatic systems are out of the novelty class. With the continuance of our four-year drought labor problems, increased play, and rising standards of excellence, more clubs are wondering whether to convert to, or install an automatic or at least a more modern irrigation system.

The unanswered question is will the automatic systems stand up to the test of time? Ten years from now we will have the answer.

Well designed manual systems with sufficient water capacity can still operate efficiently. Two courses indicated that of the amount spent for labor, less than 5 per cent was used for irrigation. With an automatic system this percentage can be cut further with labor savings of from $2,500 to $5,000.

Although a manual system with hose and travelers allows greater flexibility it should only be considered as a last resort. The operational costs become excessive. Also, there is the added expense of hose purchase and repair which would be higher than for any other type system.

Another factor influencing system selection and operational cost is yearly rainfall. The North-east averages 40 inches of rain per year, with the distribution almost even throughout the year. As a result, we don't irrigate as many times per year as other parts of the country, and therefore we have to operate our automatic systems for a greater number of years trouble-free to recoup the increased outlay for an automatic system. I'm in favor of automatic systems for golf courses in the North-east, but I think there are important reasons other than just economics. Member convenience in that they may never have to play when the system is operating and the fact that the superintendent has complete control over the water program alone are as good reasons as any possible labor savings in deciding to go automatic.
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