MODERN GUNS.

New methods have been developed for the manufacture of big guns and canons and these are now in use by the British Army. The new method is known as the "Pompeian Process," and has been patented by Dr. George B. Challis, of Philadelphia, who acted as consultant to the Government on this subject. The new process consists in the use of a special explosive mixture, known as "Pompeian Powder," which is said to be more effective than any other known explosive. The mixture is made up of graphite, charcoal, and a small amount of nitroglycerin. The result is a very powerful explosive that can be used in place of gunpowder.

A British discovery, according to a recent report, is the invention of a new type of shell, known as the "Dart Shell," which is said to be capable of piercing any existing armor. The shell is made of a combination of steel and graphite, and is said to be unaffected by water or fire. The new shell is expected to revolutionize the art of warfare.

The lecture showed a plan of Adelaide, and explained that the deficiency of gunpowder was a serious matter, as it is the only known explosive that can be used in warfare. The new shell is expected to be used in the next war, and it is believed that it will be a great advantage to the British Navy.
ALIEN STUDENTS AT THE ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY.

Recently recommendations were made to the various State and the Commonwealth Government to have the University of Queensland that the electoral and naturalisation laws should be reviewed. The University referred the matter to the professional board for a report. That report was given for a time but the matter was not to the extent that the matter was that University was concerned with the question of official and corporate capacity. Any representation which was given for a time was not to be rather than express of public opinion which was the best left to the official view of the University as it was.

The board had, however, submitted their report to the Government, and suggested that a copy of it should be referred to the University. Professor Harrison Moore was reported in the University "Age" to have been asked by the Government whether there would be any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could be further discussed, Mr. Hodge said, "I do not think that the statement that the Adelaide University would not have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University."

Professor Harrison Moore was reported in the "Age" to have been asked by the Government whether there would be any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairman of the committee of the University to the position of the University. It was asked whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position. Whether any candidate who had already been appointed should be accepted for the position was not the subject of any suggestion made. In reply to a question as to whether the University could have any objection to the appointment of the chairma
To the Editor,

Sir,—In "The Advertiser" of the 12th inst., under the heading "Universities and Aliens," an account is given of a meeting of the council of the University of Melbourne, at which a report from the professorial board in regard to this question was discussed. Professor Harrison Moore is reported to have said that "the board considered that it had no power to remove the names of enemy graduates from its roll, as was suggested by the Adelaide University." In March last, this question was brought under the notice of the council of the Adelaide University in connexion with certain foreign visitors with the British Association, and as a result we wrote to the University of Melbourne and Sydney. "The Council of the University has recently had under consideration the question whether the names of enemy subjects should be allowed to remain on the rolls of the University. A member of the council has been directed to ask whether the same question has been considered by the University or whether you can kindly supply any information which will assist the council in this matter.

You will see from this letter that the University of Adelaide did not "suggest" removing the names of enemy graduates from its roll. The statement in "The Advertiser," as it appears, is incorrect. Professor Harrison Moore has been incorrectly reported.—I am, &c.

CHAS. R. HODGE, Registrar.
University of Adelaide, June 14, 1916.

Reply:

19. 6. 16

ALIEN STUDENTS

A telegram in The Register recently intimated that recommendations had been made to the State and Commonwealth Government by the Senate of the University of Queensland that the electoral and naturalisation laws should be reviewed. In a report to the council of the Melbourne University the Professorial Board asserted that the question was one in which the University was interested, and that the matter had been referred to the Melbourne University Senate by the Queensland government. The Council of the University (Mr. C. R. Hodge) reported that proposals similar to those made to the Senate of the Melbourne University by the Queensland committee had been made to the North Terrace Committee, and that the reply sent was on the lines of the Melbourne University council's answer—that the proposal was reasonable and one not for the council. When a member of the council who already had been admitted should be struck off the roll was another matter, but no conclusion was reached. It was remarked by Mr. Hodge, that the Adelaide University had suggested the removal of the names of enemy graduates.