example, in the construction industry or for water filtration purposes, are available in the United Kingdom at reasonable prices. Furthermore, the technical specifications for these sands to which suppliers habitually work often permit a wide range of particle size, so that insistence on close limits may cause difficulties.

Thus a lowering of standards from the ideal becomes inevitable to cost-conscious golf club committees who may be ill-equipped technically to distinguish good sand from bad.

In the experience of two years ago, it was found that the cheapest sands were contaminated with silt, clay and organic matter. Better sands, at up to twice the price, tended to be too coarse, with too great a proportion over 0.60mm. in size or too fine with too great a proportion less than 0.30mm.

The best sand, which may have approximated to the American specification, was available only from a distant source and was priced at about three times the sand actually purchased, and about six times the cost of the cheapest local product.

It is not suggested that bunker sand should necessarily be standardised throughout the country. To go so far might detract from the individual characteristics of courses in widely differing environments. Nevertheless, guidance from some recognised authority would be welcomed and would help to improve golf course standards.

Who in this country will confirm the American recommendations and express a view on the tolerance that may be permitted in the interests of cost without impairing the playing qualities of the sand?

Your action in reprinting the American article is to be applauded and may stimulate further comment from the experience of others and from sand suppliers, followed by the authoritative guidance suggested.