

Some Committee Questions That Come to Mind

by **ELI BUDD**

Green Committee Chairman, Oak Ridge Country Club, Minnesota

ONE OF THE QUESTIONS I am frequently asked is, "Should green superintendents participate in green committee meetings?"

I would have to give a positive YES answer to this question. The green committee meeting is the best forum for the superintendent to explain his objectives for both his current and future programs, to explain his needs for new equipment, chemicals, fertilizers, trees, and seed. It's his opportunity to learn the members' thoughts and what he can do about them. It is also the superintendent's conduit to the membership. It is perhaps the most important means for members to understand the problems the superintendent faces.

Another frequently heard question is, "Should the superintendent attend board meetings?"

I can't see the necessity for the superintendent to attend board meetings. In my 25 years on club boards, I have found

Eli Budd



that 95 percent of the meeting is not related to the superintendent's domain. It would be an imposition to a man whose hours start from daybreak and end at sunset daily during the season, to sit for three or four hours and listen to other club matters that do not pertain to him. There is at least one exception. That is the case of a significant change in the golf course itself. Surely the superintendent should attend such meetings.

"Should the superintendent attend budget meetings?"

If you are referring to budget committee meetings that encompass all of the club's committees, I would say no. At Oak Ridge, Keith Scott, our superintendent, prepares his annual budget and presents it to the entire green committee for approval. It is then submitted by the green committee chairman to the board for final approval. We have never had a problem getting his budget approved through these channels.

The Rules of Golf and the Golf Course Superintendent

by **WILLIAM J. WILLIAMS, JR.**
Vice President, USGA

IAM DELIGHTED to have this opportunity to speak to you about course condition and setup from the point of view of a Rules official and former Chairman of the USGA's Rules of Golf Committee.

When I set out to officiate at the U.S. Open, the Amateur or the Masters, my friends frequently say they hope to see me on television. Not me! That means that there is a Rules problem, and Rules problems can be very difficult to resolve.

It's not just that I'm chicken, which I am, but no one likes to see the outcome of a major golf competition turn on a Rules incident or an official's decision, even if most believe the decision was

correct. A golf competition should be determined by the skill of the players and not the resolution of a Rules problem, an inadvertent Rules violation, or a bad course condition.

Accordingly, it is in our common interest to avoid Rules problems that detract from a competition.

First, a word about the history of the Rules. The earliest written Rules we are aware of were laid down in 1744, at Leith, in or near what is now Edinburgh, Scotland, to govern a competition for the Silver Club of the city of Edinburgh. There were 13 rules; they took up less than two handwritten pages, and they still exist in a bank vault in Edinburgh.

For those who yearn for the simpler days of the original 13 rules, I might mention that Rule 13 deals with French ditches and dykes, scholars' holes, and soldiers' lines — the first local rule. And you will especially enjoy Rule 1: "You must tee your ball within a club's length of the hole." Did the original 13 rules last long? The second page is largely taken up with changes in Rules 5 and 13, which were apparently found to be unsatisfactory.

Early in the 19th century several clubs had their own rules. Later in the century there was an approach toward uniformity based on the Rules of the Royal and Ancient Golf Club of St. Andrews