

ment in appearance is obtained. This is true because most of the things which I have in mind are wholly artificial and unnatural, and when you take them away you are taking a long step in the right direction.

Our experience has also proved to my satisfaction that you can alter holes or construct new ones without disregarding the interests and the pleasure of the average golfer and still retain a real test for the star. In our changes, I am very sure that we took a considerable number of strokes from the score of the high-handicap man, but nothing from the low-handicap man, and our feeling is that we added a couple of strokes to this latter class.

In this article I have made no attempt to prepare a scholarly paper but have simply given some of the experience gained from the work at our course, and have set forth some suggestions in connection with this work, with the hope that it might contain something of interest and possibly of help to other golf courses whose position might be at least somewhat similar to that of the Country Club of Atlantic City.

Some U. S. Golf Association Decisions on the Rules of Golf

A ball played from 30 yards off the green strikes the stick and remains lodged halfway in the hole between the stick and the cup. The player or his caddy did not remove the stick, but it was removed by his opponent's caddy, who drew the ball out on the green when he removed the stick. Can the player count it holed?

DECISION.—This raises a question of fact which your letter does not make clear. If the ball or the greater portion of it was actually in the hole, of course A can count it as holed. If, on the other hand, it was resting against the pin on one side and the lip of the hole on the other, he can not count it as holed. However, A was entitled to remove the flagstick, and if he was able to remove the pin in such a way that the ball would fall into the hole he was entitled to count it as holed at his last stroke (see Rule 32). B's caddy deprived A of this right, and in so doing he moved A's ball, infringed Rule 18, and thereby lost the hole for his player B. In any event, therefore, A wins the hole.

Ball is conceded to be lost in ground under repair off fairway. May another ball be dropped without penalty?

DECISION.—No. Rule 22 applies. It is impossible to apply the directions laid down in Rule 11 as there is no means of determining the place where the ball lay.

A and B are playing a golf match, followed by C and D. On the tenth hole, A hits his tee shot down the middle and B slices into the rough; while they are looking for the ball, C and D start through, and C drives, landing near A's drive. At this point B finds his ball, A and B resume play, A unconsciously plays C's ball to the green, and as B is on in six and A in two, B concedes the hole (A plays only one shot with C's ball). A and B proceed to the next tee and C plays his second shot to the green, but when addressing his first putt discovers it is not his ball and calls to A. A then discovers he played

C's ball on his second shot to No. 10. B promptly claims the hole. What is the United States Golf Association's decision?

DECISION.—The question as understood is—A and B are playing a match. A hits his tee shot down the middle and B slices to the rough. B's ball is finally found and he reaches the green in six. A reaches the green in two, but does so not with own ball but by playing a ball outside of the match. B concedes the hole and they proceed to the next tee, but before striking off are notified by the pair behind that A has not played his own ball but one of theirs, whereupon B claims the hole. B's claim is sound. By playing a ball not in the match and failing to inform B of the fact before B played his next stroke, A lost the hole. See Rule 20 (2).

1926 Experiments on Brown-Patch Control

By John Monteith, Jr.

During the past season experiments have been continued on the Arlington Turf Garden to determine the efficiency of various chemicals in controlling brown-patch. Since the small type of disease was most prevalent throughout the season on the area allotted to this work, the observations reported here apply chiefly to small brown-patch.

Numerous chemicals were tested, including copper sulfate, copper stearate, Bordeaux mixture, formaldehyde, sulfur, phenol, superkalimat, sodium fluosilicate, potassium permanganate, and various compounds containing mercury. While certain of the other compounds gave some indication of checking the fungus, by far the most outstanding control was obtained with the mercuric compounds.

The tests with the organic mercury preparations used in previous work (Semesan, Uspulun, Corona 620, Corona 640, and Germisan) were repeated during the past summer. The results were essentially the same as those obtained during the preceding season, as reported in the October, 1925, number of *THE BULLETIN*. Each was effective in checking the disease, but the period of protection again varied considerably, apparently depending on climatic conditions. The two common commercial chemicals in this group (Uspulun and Semesan) gave practically identical results when applied in like manner and amount.

Much work was devoted to testing bichlorid of mercury, since during the previous season this chemical appeared to be as effective as the organic mercuric compounds, and considerably cheaper. In this season's more thorough comparison of bichlorid with the two chlorophenol mercury preparations (Semesan and Uspulun), it was found that $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{5}$ pound of bichlorid gave practically the same control as did one pound of either of the above commercial organic preparations. These tests were repeated frequently throughout the season and gave ample evidence that the preceding season's conclusions concerning this chemical were fully justified.

A series of plots was devoted to a comparison of several inorganic mercuric salts in an attempt to determine whether any of this group, other than bichlorid, would prove effective against the disease. In these tests were used mercurous nitrate, mercurous chlorid (calomel),