Over the hill on the fourteenth fairway, Broadmoor

and I decided to discontinue its use for the time being.

Shows Drainage Need

My regular top-dressing during last season was accordingly changed to a mixture of sand, humus, and soil, with 5 pounds urea per green. I consider that I saw sufficient improvement in my greens to confirm my opinion that mis-use of sulphate of ammonia can be responsible for hardening the surface of greens. With the advent of the general terrible weather that hit us all last summer, my troubles were, of course, multiplied tenfold, and I did not strive further at that time to establish rules that I could follow in normal years.

Did I have brown-patch? Plenty. Against it, I applied Semesan, and I can say that as soon as the weather gave them half a decent break, my greens came back speedily and well. I consider, however, that the 1928 troubles would have hit my course less severely had surface drainage conditions been better.

At the conclusion of the 1928 season, I found myself firmly convinced of two things. The first was that nitrogen-feeding is good for turf up to a certain point only; that beyond that certain point it is bad; and that if nitrogen is fed to turf in the months of hot suns, it can be positively dangerous. The second was that adequate drainage is an absolute essential to good turf. My chairman and I being in entire agreement on the latter point, we got to work last fall to carry out an ambitious plan to raise a number of our greens. We completed the job on number eighteen green before the frost set in, and this spring we hope to get numbers five and two done before play begins.

Recently I heard a much-respected soil scientist predict marked changes in the generally accepted methods of course maintenance, and many of us are eagerly awaiting a revised system of nitrogen feeding. Possibly, too, some measure of maintenance misery will in future be checked at its source—as it surely would be if, during course construction, wholesome turf-producing materials were imported, in adequate quantities, to regions where unsuitable soils prevail. The cost would doubtless often seem excessive, but would it not amply pay in the end?

Protecting Trees from Wind Damage

ATTRACTIVENESS of golf club grounds depends in no small measure on the number and size of the trees that decorate it, and no club can afford to neglect these most important adjuncts to the landscape. Every storm that destroys a tree, every tree that dies from disease that might have been checked, spells a reduction in the club's assets, even though it is not written off the books.

If your club has no "Forestry Committee," consider well the advisability of appointing one. Let it operate independently or under the Grounds committee. Let this new committee conduct a survey of all the woodlands on the property, in company if possible with a tree expert; mark for removal all trees found dead or hopelessly diseased; plan to doctor all trees needing surgery or trimming; order the strengthening of all trees found structurally weak.

To be effective, this work must be done correctly and carefully and it is best to turn it over to men trained in the profession of tree surgery. It is comparatively inexpensive and certainly the cost is more than justified as a means of insuring important club assets against the ravages of storms the year around.

Many trees are structurally weak. Usually the greatest danger is with trees which have sharp forks. The upper branches get heavier and heavier as the tree grows older. Finally the weight is too much and during a storm, or even on a still day, the branches will snap or the fork split down, leaving the tree disfigured and permanently ruined as a thing of beauty.