

"HOW DID YOU DO IT?"
"HOW DO BSA DO IT?"

Anyone who has the good luck to get hold of a B.S.A. Bicycle nowadays is a man to be envied. "How did you do it—where did you get it?" ask his jealous friends. That wartime B.S.A. Bicycles should be so particularly sought after is a tribute to the way B.S.A. do it. If there's anything in omens, post-war B.S.A. Bicycles will beat even past B.S.A. records. The only rival to their perfect performance will be their splendid appearance.

Some more B.S.A. Bicycles are now coming into the country. Ask your dealer if he has one available for you—you may be lucky. Or—put your name down and be sure of it when it arrives.

B.S.A. Representatives:
Bicycles:
A. G. Healing & Co. Ltd.,
216 Madras St., Christchurch,
and 42 Cable St., Wellington.
Auckland District:
Skeates & White Ltd.,
48 Fort Street, Auckland.
Motor Cycles—N.Z.:
Skeates & White Ltd.

BSA
BICYCLES AND
MOTOR CYCLES
B.S.A. Cycles Ltd., England.

Here's a family that's CLEAR about Health!

They're bright and energetic because they all occasionally take a glass of sparkling Andrews. Andrews helps to refresh the mouth and tongue; soothes the stomach and relieves acidity, one of the chief causes of indigestion; acts directly on the liver and checks biliousness; gently clears the bowels, correcting constipation. Keep a tin of Andrews handy.

Make yourself **CLEAR** — say

ANDREWS
The Pleasant Effervescent Laxative

Scott & Turner Ltd., Andrews House, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England. 19A

PALATABLE AND EFFECTUAL

BAXTERS
PULMONIC ELIXIR
AND
LUNG PRESERVER
FOR COUGHS

"Cold Gone"
Thousands of New Zealanders for many generations have reported "Cold Gone" after taking "Baxters" plus commonsense precautions. Stick to "Baxters," the proved popular remedy for young and old.

BAXTERS LTD.,
602 Colombo Street,
Christchurch.

BAXTERS
LUNG PRESERVER

Consumption, Asthma, Hoarseness, and all the ailments of the throat.

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

(continued from page 5)

BRITISH AND AMERICAN FILMS

Sir,—R. Evans attacks G.M. for being in effect the only film critic to voice his "own" opinion. His reviews of but two recent British pictures, *Fanny by Gaslight* and *Mr. Emmanuel*, have been anything but complimentary, whereas *Mrs. Parkington* and *A Song to Remember*, horrible examples of American subservience to the Hays Office and the Star system resulting in emasculating of a credible story in the former and glorious music in the latter, were fairly and even flatteringly reviewed. R. Evans seems to be impressed by big blurb advertisements and by the sycophantic murmurings of "critics" whose employers depend for a good slice of their profits on the goodwill of the powerful distributors of American Films. What a pity his belief in the fitness of "colossal," "poignant," and "epic" as descriptions should be troubled by one poor critic who doesn't conform. The nerve of anyone questioning such big block-lettered words!

C. S. RAMAGE (Wellington).

HIT PARADE

Sir,—I should like to ask why 2ZB's Hit Parade was brought to such an abrupt conclusion some two months ago. Doubtless there were reasons for this measure, but I think the listening public could have been informed of them. As far as I can see, the Hit Parade was enjoyed by many more people than is the current feature, Top Tunes. Many of the records played as Top Tunes are certainly very good; but they do not represent the tastes of the New Zealand people. Why should we not have our own Hit Parade rather than accept the preferences of America and England? What do other readers think?

B. W. KING (Heretaunga).

ENGLISH PLACE NAMES

Sir,—Your correspondent "Homey" opens up a vexed question when he says Yarmouth should be pronounced Yarmuth. To call the place Yarmuth is to use a dialectal pronunciation. The fact that locals call Birmingham "Brumma-gem" does not make it right for all English-speaking people to call it so. One English dialect makes London "Lunnan"; another calls Marlborough "Mawlborough"; but no person with a good grounding in English language would, in ordinary conversation, descend to these pronunciations. What is more, very few would know them. As a New Zealander I found Wiltshire people pronouncing our English words in such a strange way that I had some difficulty in understanding them.

JOHN W. PRICE (Havelock).

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

Sir,—"Biologist" regrets that numerous people rush into print when their religious doctrines are criticised "without (1) realising what science is, (2) knowing what they are talking about." May it be pointed out that the scientists, and also others, who attack the Christian religion do not realise that they are out of their particular sphere when they endeavour to disprove doctrine by their

usual methods. Christianity, being based on affection and faith, is supernatural and therefore above cold scientific treatment. These scientific folk do not know or realise what religion is: they are in the same boat as the people who rush into print. "Biologist" is in error when he talks of "tragic shackling and limitation of the intellect by mysticism." The records of history prove that it is to the Church that science is indebted for encouragement of learning. It was also by the Church that education was commenced. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge prove this statement. If the scientists would consider religion as a co-partner, rather than an adversary, for science is the handmaiden of religion, there could be no conflict between religion and science.

MARCUS ST. B. JAMES (Hamilton).

Sir,—Your correspondent C. T. Williams seems to have been gulled by that able propagandist H. G. Wells into believing that the Wellsian "biology" is a panacea for our intellectual and moral ills. His suggestion that the problem of sex education would be solved by the teaching of this "biology" is fatuous in its naivete, but no more than one expects from an adherent of the discredited hypothesis of extreme evolutionism. "After all," the argument runs, "if the lower animals are preserved from sex problems by their ignorance of ethics, why should not it be the same with man? Let us then stick to physiology, and the morals will look after themselves." The moralists of all the ages would listen to such nonsense with a pitying smile.

The authorities I have already quoted are sufficient to show that the evolutionism to which Mr. Williams pins his faith is what I have called it, a discredited hypothesis. As the time-lag between European and New Zealand thought is about 20 years, this hypothesis will probably linger on here for some years, as a sort of tatara of scientific theories, before being consigned to the limbo of lost theories, to which Mr. Williams is confident that the teaching of "biology" will relegate "Sincere" and myself.

With regard to the origin of man, Vialleton writes in his book, *L'Origine des Etres Vivants* that between the Oligocene and the first strata containing human remains there is a great gap in which no bone has been found that can be related to man, and when the human type appears, it appears complete. And Vialleton is a "biologist of repute" for all but the ignoramus. Can Mr. Williams point to any fossil and say that, while not human, it is certainly an ancestor of man?

Mr. Williams would have been wiser not to mention experimental evidence and the work of breeders, for these provide a strong argument against his theory. The breeder can effect superficial changes in the race or species, but there are well-defined limits beyond which he cannot go. His breeds of pigeons, dogs, or cattle are pigeons, dogs and cattle from start to finish; and no one has succeeded in crossing mules.

G.H.D. (Greenmeadows).