full regulations for the whole five years' course, as sent up by the Council, were assented to. These are the arrangements to which reference was made in our paragraph a few days ago, and so far as the words employed seemed to imply approval of the existing facilities for fourth and fifth year students acquiring sound instruction they were unquestionably misleading. In point of fact it should have been stated that the paragraph was inspired by officials of the University. That institution is now placed in relation to this unfortunate matter in somewhat the same position as that occasionally occupied by a Civil servant who is ordered to perform some ridiculous duty by his politically superior officer, and who, on being asked whether he believes in it, merely shrugs his shoulders and repeats his instructions.

The loss of every one of the fourth and fifth year students is a serious affair; but if the Government were to carry out their threat of withdrawing even the diminished grant given in lieu of the South Australian scholarships the result would probably be to wreck not merely the classes of those years, but the others also. The advanced students, if they had remained in Adelaide to continue their studies, would have had to pay for the fourth year £31 10s. and for the fifth £23 2s. in fees. They and their parents have exercised the right of private judgment in asking themselves whether there is any likelihood of the contract being fairly and faithfully carried out, and no one who knows anything about the matter can conscientiously find fault with them for answering in the negative and accepting the alternative of temporary exile.
The report of the Council of the University of Adelaide for 1896, like its predecessors, is brief and dry. No attempt is ever made to present more than the barest record of the year’s proceedings, for which purpose what appears like a stereotyped form is used. Names and figures change from year to year, but otherwise the reports are as like each other as peas in a pod. There are no comparisons, so that without laborious research it is impossible to ascertain the measure or direction of advancement. The report for 1896 chronicles changes in the Council and re-elections to the Senate. It also mentions that during the year alterations were made in various regulations, but the effect of these is not described. The same uninteresting method is followed in dealing with all other matters. We have a list of the gentlemen admitted to degrees at the last Commencement; particulars as to the number of undergraduates and of non-graduating students, and the names of winners of prizes and scholarships; the subjects in which evening lectures were held; statistics of the public examinations; a brief reference to the University Extension lectures, and so on. Almost the only sentence in the report that ventures on a comment or opinion is that recording with deep grief the death of the late Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Hartley. That gentleman, it is stated, was a member of the first Council appointed in 1874, and from that time until his death devoted himself with untiring energy and zeal to the best interests of the University. This is a well-merited recognition of the value of Mr. Hartley’s services to the cause of higher education, in which, as well as in the perfection of the system of public elementary instruction, he was deeply interested. No better memorial of a liberal-minded, many-sided man could be desired than one which will establish further links between the lowest and the highest seats of learning.
One cannot help wishing that, even at the risk of departing from solemn academic precedents, the Council would strain a point and give the public a report in place of what can only be regarded as a catalogue. There are so many things about which further information would be welcome. Is the University, for example, making itself increasingly useful as an instrument of culture? Does it find our utilitarian community as indifferently Philistine as ever, or