

DECISIONS BY THE RULES OF GOLF COMMITTEE

OLD FOLD MANOR GOLF CLUB.—A heap of sand was deposited on the rough grass at the edge of the fairway, one side of the sand touching the fairway. The sand was for the up-keep of the green. A player's ball lodged on the edge of the sand nearest to the fairway. Was the player entitled to drop the ball on the fairway, but not nearer to the hole, or should he have dropped behind the sand in the rough grass?

Answer.—The ball lay on "ground covered up for the purpose of the up-keep of the course" (see Rule 11), and could be lifted without penalty and dropped as near as possible to the place where it lay, but not nearer to the hole. The player therefore had to drop his ball on the fairway.

TROON MERCHANTS' GOLF CLUB.—A and B were competitors in a stroke competition, and marked each other's cards. At the last hole A stated that he had taken 7 strokes, which statement was not questioned by B, who marked a 7 for the hole, signed the card, and placed it in the box. After A had left the clubhouse, B came to the conclusion that A had taken 8 strokes to the last hole, and reported to the captain of the club, in the absence of the secretary, that he, B, had marked a 7 for an 8 on A's card. The committee disqualified A on the spot, without hearing what he had to say on the matter. A says that he has two witnesses to prove his score correct. Can a marker alter his fellow-competitor's card after he has signed and returned it?

Answer.—No, but a marker should certainly report to the Committee any error he is aware of having made in marking a card. The Committee should then take all avail-

able evidence and decide in accordance with the facts.

SEAFORD GOLF CLUB.—No one is eligible for membership until 18 years of age. In August, A, being then under 18, entered for a handicap competition open to him as a member's son, and received a handicap of 10 strokes. A was elected a member of the club on 13th December. On 25th December, A's father went to the clubhouse to see the secretary about A's handicap. The secretary was absent through illness, so A's father asked the steward whether A could play with a handicap of 10, and the steward replied he believed he could. No application for a handicap for A was received by the secretary or committee in writing or otherwise. A entered for club competition on 26th December, paid his entry money, and returned the best score at a handicap of 10. The committee disqualified A. Was their decision correct?

Answer.—Yes. A had not been handicapped as a member of the club.

ORMSKIRK GOLF CLUB.—What is the difference between the case submitted by this club in January, 1912 and the case submitted by Glasgow Postal Golf Club No. 35, 1909-1910, where the decisions were directly opposite?

Answer.—The intention of the first sentence of stroke rule 4 (2) is to prevent competitors from acquiring knowledge of the putting-greens either by pitching on to them or by putting upon them. In the case submitted by the Glasgow Postal Golf Club it would be impossible to apply that part of the rule if a competitor were permitted to pitch without penalty on to a putting-green under the circumstances described;

deduct handicap allowances. Should these circumstances rendered the accident more than likely to occur, and by the accident the competitor was enabled to gain the information which the rule prohibits. The second sentence of the rule is intended to prevent competitors testing the carry from any given spot to a hole, and was not intended to penalize a competitor who merely drives a ball across the course, even if by chance an erratic stroke should cause the ball to roll on to a putting-green, because the competitor in this case gains no information whatever as to the play of a hole in the stipulated round.

PAU GOLF CLUB.—The secretary checks competitor's cards on behalf of the committee. In a mixed four-some stroke competition played under handicap, there were two prizes. The secretary checked the best cards, 72 and 76½, and tore up the remainder of the cards. Shortly after the prizes had been delivered to the competitors with scores of 72 and 76½, it was reported that a card of 76 had been handed in. The secretary remembers a card marked 86 net. This card was subject to a deduction of 10 strokes handicap. As stroke rule 5 (2) states that "no alteration can be made on any card after it has been returned," can this card be now considered? Neither the lady or gentleman who returned the card checked it before it was placed in the card box.

Answer.—Under stroke rule 5 (2) the signature of the marker is a certificate that he has marked the correct score for each hole. Neither he, nor the competitor for whom he has marked the card need add up the scores taken at each hole, or add or the competitor return a card wrongly added or deducted, it is the duty of

the committee to correct and the card is valid. Reference to stroke rule 5 (2) makes it clear that it is only the scores marked for each hole which cannot be corrected after a card has been returned. Considering the number of cases in which competitors have been disqualified some time after being declared prize winners, the cards returned in a stroke competition should always be kept for a reasonable time by the committee. Assuming that the card of 86 was wrongly marked "net," it should have been corrected and the 10 strokes deducted. If the committee is satisfied that this card correctly represented a net score of 76 the competitors who returned it were entitled to the second prize. When the "scores are called after each hole" as recommended in stroke rule 5 (1), there is nothing to check on the completion of the round except the addition, in which an error does not effect the validity of the card.

PETERHEAD GOLF CLUB.—If a ball lies on a mole hill, may part of the mole hill be removed so long as the ball does not move?

Answer.—Yes, a mole hill is a "loose impediment," (see Definition 12) and can be removed or lifted in accordance with rule 12 or rule 28 (1), without penalty, so long as the ball is not moved. A mole hill is, however, "damage caused to the course by animals" for which it is advisable, where these obstructions are common, to frame a local rule.

NEW GRANGE GOLF CLUB.—In a stroke competition, A drove off with a white ball, but owing to a shower of snow he had difficulty in finding his ball. He therefore lifted and replaced it with a red one. The matter was reported to the committee by A's fel-

low competitor. The committee decided that under rule 9 (1) and rule 24 A had incurred a penalty of one stroke. Was this decision correct?

Answer.—The decision of the committee of the New Grange Golf Club is not easy to follow. Assuming that a breach of rule 24 had taken place, the penalty under rules 34 and stroke

rule 14 is two strokes, not one stroke. A's ball was not "unfit for play" as described in rule 24, and A could only change his ball by lifting it under a penalty of two strokes and teeing a ball behind the spot from which the original ball had been lifted under the provisions of stroke rule 11 (1). If he did not conform to the provisions of this rule he is disqualified.

