Austral, for instance, being transformed into a contralto. However, my frequent experiments on the machine taught me to judge by judicious management of the volume, that this was easily put right.

My first impressions were that I was getting more volume, but the tone was less. As I have stated, I was at first inclined to think that it was the added resonances and sonority produced by the Lifebelt—as to which there is no doubt whatever—that makes the machine sound louder. My machine was always considered both by myself and by those of my friends who have heard it, to be pretty good with orchestral and instrumental records, but there is no comparison between the results I used to get and those now obtained by the use of the Lifebelt. Just a few instances of records that have been improved out of all knowledge: The Entry of the Gods (H.M.V.); in the first part I get a much more resonant and roll of the drums, and in the second part the "Valhalla" motive comes through with a majesty of tone, and tonal truth and clarity that I never heard before.

The new Parfait records, especially the Grail Scene, are immensely improved by the Lifebelt: in the second side the choral work comes out almost as if one was sitting in the concert room or theatre, whilst the basses are heard as they should be. Of course, I know these are splendid examples of the new recording process, but I played them on my gramophone with and without the Lifebelt, and the improvement in the reproduction was marked.

Piano records too are greatly improved; the piano rings out splendidly, the added resonances being particularly valuable in this case.

Chamber music is also very much better. I played through the whole of the Beethoven Op. 59, and was particularly struck with the way in which the Lifebelt brought out all the parts in their proper proportion without affecting the balance—the viola parts in particular were beautifully clear and the 'cello also came out properly.

The Lifebelt has also made me change my mind about certain records. For example, some time ago I bought on speculation the Velvet Face records of German's Welsh Rhapsody, and was disappointed with them—in fact, had consigned them to the scrap heap. Played with the Lifebelt they sound entirely different and are now restored to their old place in the album. It will also show up bad records, and will reveal defects in those hitherto considered perfect. I think there can be no doubt of that, as used to be said of a certain well-known sound-box, "what there is in the record will be brought out," and that our reproducing apparatus has hitherto not done justice to the recording.

There is another point also and that is that the use of the Lifebelt will have in some cases an enormous effect for the better in the way of needle-track alignment. My own machine was pretty good in this respect before, but it is now, as far as I can judge, as nearly exact as it possibly can be.

Of course, it is impossible to say that the improvement that has been effected on my machine will be as great on others, and I am not technician enough to offer any opinion as to why it should be so good. As a matter of fact, in view of the dictum of a real expert in the Gramophone that fibre users would derive so much improvement from the use of this device as would the wax users, I did not hesitate to find anything like much improvement as has actually been effected, and can only say that if other users get much better results then they will indeed be worth hearing. — J. T. PFEFFER.

(3) My experience with the Lifebelt may be of interest to owners of goose-neck tone-arms. My tone-arm was specially made for me, according to Mr. Wilson's formula for the correction of tracking error, and I use Mr. Virtu's sound-boxes and fibre needles. I fitted the Lifebelt as directed, and the results were certainly better, but not much. Then I received the December number of The Gramophone and read Mr. Wilson's article in it. It made me keen to cut down my tone-arm, and as a result I found an improvement of 15%.

(4) A triumph. I have made exhaustive experiments with the Lifebelt, and the results are beyond all expectations; its amazing features are noticeable on all records.

My model is H.M.V. horizontal grand, with swell tone-arm and goose-neck, fitted with Lifebelt, Jewel sound-box and Seymour weight adjuster. I am a fibre man.

Readers interested in the Lifebelt must have some serious regard to alignment and weight. The Wilson Freestator is a necessity. I remedied the alignment defect by withdrawing the sound-box fitting from the Lifebelt, firmly attaching the fitting to the sound-box, then replacing the whole at a lateral angle which gave the best alignment.

The virtues of the Lifebelt are that its resonant qualities are not limited, it gives a wonderful sense of purity, resonance is amazing; all high notes of great volume hitherto should now perfect, and base work is a revelation. The Lifebelt's only drawback seems to be its price; but it pays for itself.

(5) Thank you for the Lifebelt received last week. On the day I received it I happened to be in conversation with a friend who has been in the gramophone trade for many years. I mentioned the Lifebelt and showed it to him. He smiled and passed some disparaging remarks, saying that that idea was tried by the big companies many years ago and discarded, that I should not find any improvement resulting from its use. This seemed rather encouraging. But I gave the Lifebelt a careful trial during the week-end on all kinds of records, new and old. As a result I have told my friend that he is wrong in his time.

As I have a good gramophone to start with, H.M.V. Table Grand model (largest size), Exhibition No. 2 sound-box, I hardly expected such a great improvement; but the improvement was really marked. Not only greater volume, but more resonance, notes in the lower register much improved (fibre needles used). By a little manipulation of the Lifebelt on the tone-arm, I have also secured proper alignment. I am, in fact, very pleased with the result.

I notice in the December Gramophone you advise the Lifebelt with Daws Charlie needle tension attachment. I had already discovered this, as I was previously using the attachment. I tried some records with the No. 2 sound-box by itself, and then with the Lifebelt and needle tension attachment and proper alignment, and the difference is really astonishing. There is absolutely no comparison; and I can enthusiastically recommend this combination with fibres needles.—D. F. HARRIOT.

(6) As a professional musician and acoustical expert to one of our largest musical instrument makers I have long been at a loss to understand why all models of tone-arm at present obtainable are made without any auxiliary (rubber) medium incorporated. I have for years considered it an essential to good reproduction, but have always been too busy to attack the problem myself, and have generally found it impossible to get anything like much improvement as has actually been effected, and can only say that if other users get much better results then they will indeed be worth hearing. — W. E. SREQ.

(7) My experience with the Lifebelt on my Sonora machine is that it increases resonance very much and makes the alignment with the Sonora, Luxus or Astra sound-boxes almost perfect.—R. H. HILLEROED.

(8) The machine is a large H.M.V. Table Grand with Exhibition box... The tone was always good—likewise definition; but the Lifebelt has improved both of these by at least 25 per cent, in 24 records out of 25. I now hear words (even in French) where I only heard sounds. I can hear the bass better; brass is rounder and more mellow, and bass is accentuated, as you warned it would be. Needle-track alignment is nearly perfect now.—W. E. SREQ.

(9) A friend of mine lent me his Lifebelt and I was amazed by the improvement of my machine. I am now convinced that a machine cannot be made without any auxiliary material, and I shall not hesitate to write and tell you that another of your grateful readers is a supporter and believer in the Lifebelt.—T. ANTONY PENSON.