control over those who are not within the PGA fold.

Like many another fellow in pro golf, I have been at the game since I was a small caddie. I regard this game and my profession as a work of serious responsibility to the public. If I have the job of teaching golf to someone who hopes to enjoy life more because of the game, I bring into that job everything that I have learned from the fine men who have been my pro teachers, and everything that I have learned by myself and want to contribute to pro golf and its public.

As you probably do, I take a great deal of time and draw upon my knowledge of the game and the individual’s requirements, to see that when I sell clubs, they are the best at the price, for the buyer’s game.

Now do the over-night pros, or the sideline golf retailers, go at their golf operations in the same spirit or with the same qualifications?

Of course not. They can’t.

Does the public appreciate the difference between them and those of us who have the right—for the golfing public’s protection—to be licensed as pros?

Again, of course not!

We say to ourselves that the golf business should be ours because our predecessors and teachers built the game and entrusted to us its sound future development and protection.

What do we do to assert that the golf business is ours?

We can’t simply make a claim of ownership and hope that the public will agree.

The public will think we want to hog it all, not for the public’s protection, but because we are selfish and resent competition. We have to make our position clear and simple.

There probably aren’t enough qualified pros to fill golf’s need in this country. Still you hear all kinds of complaints about pro unemployment.

Doesn’t that suggest to us that something’s wrong, somewhere? Don’t the ill-fitting clubs that are in your members’ bags—clubs bought “cheap” from some sideline retailer—suggest that something’s wrong with the important job of supplying players with correct equipment?

That’s a matter concerning the manufacturers as well as the pros, because if the principle of badly-fitted clubs is endorsed, then a fellow might as well play with one old wood, 3 or 4 old irons and a putter, and never be in the market for modern, helpful playing equipment.

All of us who believe that a real pro’s job requires training, specialized skill and a responsibility toward each other as well as toward the game and its amateurs, must do some thinking about the licensing control of golf instruction and golf playing goods retailing.

Play 18 Different Courses—Portland, Ore., saw one of its most interesting golf matches when Ted Longworth, Waverly pro, and Lew Railsback, amateur, defeated by a 5 up margin, Joe Mozel, Lloyd’s pro, and Chuck English, amateur.

The match was played one hole apiece at 18 different courses within a 12½ mile radius from downtown Portland. Including transportation between courses, the match was played in 5 hours, 50 minutes. Longworth got 74, two over par. Mozel tied that figure. Railsback got 83 and English 87. The match started at West Hills’ par-5 first hole and finished on the 225-yard eighteenth at Broadmoor. Most time scheduled for travel between courses was the 20 minutes between the Portland CC and Tualatin CC. Six jumps were made with only 5-minute travels between courses.

First prize for an ingenious house organ goes without any argument to the Forest Hill Field Club, Bloomfield, N. J. It has a circulation of one copy, and is read by every member and guest of the club. It’s called the Handicap Herald, and is a long sheet that’s displayed on the club’s bulletin board.

It contains golf items and illustrations clipped from newspapers and magazines, and considerable exclusive typewritten material, giving news and comments on matters of club interest.

Any club that considers the expense of circulating its own club magazine too strong to assume, can adopt the Forest Hill idea and by some smart fellow using his head, typewriter, scissors and paste, turn out a job that everyone around the club will read.