THE GLACIAL CONTROVERSY.

To the Editor.

Sir—Dr. Bascow's so-called reply in The Register is not the sort of thing I should have expected from the editor of a paper which claims to be able for the absence of any real facts or arguments, able to carry on a controversy. Dr. Bascow has been obliged to descend to the use of the language and arguments of the origin of certain beds occurring in the Cambrian series of South Australia. In doing so he has only attempted to show that there are certain beds in the geological column which he considers to be of glacial origin. He has pointed out that these beds are not present in other parts of the world, and that they are not found in the same order or in the same position as in other parts of the world. He has also tried to prove that the beds are not of glacial origin by the fact that they are not found in the same order or in the same position as in other parts of the world.

In my opinion, Dr. Bascow has made a mistake in assuming that the beds are of glacial origin. He has not taken into consideration the fact that the beds are found in the same order and in the same position as in other parts of the world. He has also failed to take into consideration the fact that the beds are not of glacial origin, but are of volcanic origin. The beds are of volcanic origin, and are not of glacial origin. The beds are not of glacial origin, but are of volcanic origin. The beds are not of glacial origin, but are of volcanic origin. The beds are not of glacial origin, but are of volcanic origin. The beds are not of glacial origin, but are of volcanic origin.

I therefore suggest that Dr. Bascow should revise his arguments and his conclusions, and that he should take into consideration the fact that the beds are not of glacial origin, but are of volcanic origin. I hope that Dr. Bascow will be willing to do this, and that he will not continue to mislead the public with his arguments and conclusions.