The proceedings of the Senate of the University at the meeting held yesterday terminated in a fiasco. The senatorial body was almost unanimously carried by a motion by Dr. Smith for the appointment of a committee to draft a Bill to repeal the University Act and annul the provisions thereof. Only two speeches were contributed—those of the mover and that of the seconder, Mr. Sutherland. The meeting did not elicit anything more than a cursory discussion of the subject that as soon as those gentlemen had delivered their orations it was resolved that the motion be referred to the Senate and the debate was put accordingly. On a division being taken, it was found that nine were in favor of referring the motion and one against it. The reason assigned for disapproving with a debate was that "time was precious." As the meeting immediately adjourned it could not be expected to take action in the direction indicated, it is to be presumed that senators desired to avoid a waste of time in considering a proposal predestined to defeat. Under the circumstances Dr. Smith and his friends must feel exceedingly chastened. The suggestion that the Senate are possessed of sufficient force to have the motion rejected, rather on account of the nature of its advocacy and the possible outcome of an appeal to the public in relation to the dispute with the Council, than from a conviction that fresh University legislation is unnecessary, or that it is not needed for no one has a voice or have any voice concerning it. It is generally recognised that the Act requires to be amended, but the task of amendment is undertaken it would be both proper and desirable that the Senate should give expression to its view. Several proposals have been suggested, but the generous offer of Dr. Smith and his little body of supporters to act as the mouthpiece of the Senate. Both Dr. Smith and Mr. Sutherland have repeated the notion that at this moment a deadlock exists between the Senate and the Council. The Senate, it is said, has overstepped its powers as an executive, though it has followed a wrong course; and the Senate, on the side, has not exceeded its rights of prosecution in the revising body. It is merely a matter of strained relations. The controversy has, however, brought out the deplorable element of introducing amending legislation, and the explanation of yesterday's proceedings is, of course, the fact that Dr. Smith and Mr. Sutherland, for their own purposes, to be the first in the field. The way in which they would anoint the Senate with the power in the way in which the public will have it amended. They propose, that at present, the Senate should be called to vote on the Senate to add to the Senate, in addition to graduation, as few as possible, as it pleases, or none at all; and that the power should be given to the Senate of initiating legislation. Dr. Smith, on the other hand, will insist that something besides the purely academic element shall be represented in the governing body of the University. They and that, to that end, either the Senate shall be required to elect a certain proportion of candidates representing the public interest demands that the popular basis of the University shall be secured by additional provisos. We are glad that the majority of the Senate were refused to play into the hands of the party of which Dr. Smith is the guiding spirit. The offer of the services of a committee, the constitution of which was most mystifying and slight, before the gentlemen interested, has been promptly declined without even the conventional vote of thanks.
UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS.

FEEDKMARKS.
The results of the preliminary examination held in connection with the Adelaide University were announced on the 21st, to less than 50 candidates presented themselves, and 135 passed. The following list gives the names of the successful candidates:


Ladies’ College School—Surbelle, E. A. M. Ashwood, M. P. Baston, F. M. Bryant, and A. Lamb.


Lunmianin Convict—Lily Birmingham.

Mary E. Gordon, Catherine L. Kelly, and Rose A. Howard.


Flaxley Park—Myra J. Finches and Sarah M. Hamann.

Naracoorte College—School—E. W. Davy and E. E. Goodall.

Adelaide Grammar School—Margaret A. Males

Mrs. Alderson’s School—Elizabeth L. Alderson.

Rev. W. Hopkins’ School—E. J. W. Ashton, Miss Sonner’s—Florance Igglesha.

Miss Matters—School—Elenie McPherson, Mrs. Hutt’s School—Albertus W. Kugelmann.

Miss Adamsson’s School—Beatrice A. Binks, Miss Watson’s—School—Evelyn Watson, Miss Kay’s School—Winifred E. Harvey, Mrs. Long’s school—W. W. Lamont, Private Instruction—Richardson, and Annie M. P. Whitelaw, E. A. Christie, J. E. Ford, E. F. Sullivan, Beatrice E. Lloyd, and W. E. Wainwright.

FROM ACCOUNT OF CITY COUNCIL’S MEETING.

HEALTH COMMITTEE’S REPORT.

Details of Mr. J. B. Talbot’s case are now before the Year’s of the Local Court.—Further complaint having been made this week of the fumes from the dyes, the committee have drawn into the water-tower, that have been made by the Government, and have placed their attention to the question.

(1858-1859) Adelaide University.—Mr. W. Hopkins wrote complaint of the inspecting of the vessels and the rooms used for ventilation in the buildings used by the University. As the college of health forwarded a report to and it is requested that there are no

Adverse, Adverse University. —Mr. W. Hopkins wrote complaint of the inspection of the vessels and the rooms used for ventilation in the buildings used by the University. As the college of health forwarded a report to and it is requested that there were no