

lives of vast numbers of men are ordered on the radically erroneous assumption that the only thing worth living for is to make enough of money to exist without working. That is the real "taint of subserviency to life" of which Ruskin speaks. In this country the object which needs encouragement is not the mad rush for riches—because the pursuit of wealth has more than enough of votaries already—but it is what has been well named "plain living and high thinking." A land in which a working man can do his day's duty and have leisure left in which to enjoy ample opportunities for taking an interest in literature, art, and science—this is a far better ideal than that of a place where people submit to a sordid life merely with the motive of accumulating riches.

There is no need, unfortunately, to encourage high living—it grows by what it feeds on—but high thinking is in danger of faring badly in the conflict of social aims, and therefore there is peculiar wisdom and discernment in the application by Sir Thomas Elder of £25,000 to purposes of art, of the same amount for assisting students in acquiring knowledge at the University of Adelaide, £20,000 for helping to disseminate among the people a love and appreciation of music, and of £20,000 for strengthening the Medical School. In this latter bequest, coupled with that for the erection of workmen's houses, we may see an interesting parallel with the plan adopted by the late Mr. Nobel, already alluded to. Medical science and sanitary dwellings promote health, which is essential for all enjoyment, whether of a mental or of a physical character. The details of the methods by which the plain intentions of the testator in regard to all the objects mentioned above are to be complied with will no doubt be worked out at considerable length both by the Council of the University and by the Board of Governors of the National Gallery. With regard to the sum which is to be expended by the latter body it should be noted that the £25,000 must be disbursed solely in the purchase of pictures; and as the accommodation provided for the national art treasures is already miserably inadequate, the question of housing the whole collection—which will be about doubled in value by the new purchases—will demand very careful consideration. In this connection it is worthy of note that Sir Thomas Elder has left all his public bequests absolutely free of duty. In other words,

he gives £155,000 in aid of educational, philanthropic, and religious objects, and in addition a sum of £15,400 to the Government as payment for the privilege of being allowed to place this larger amount to the credit of the nation and of the trustees of various public and semi-public institutions. It is only right that the legacy duty on the remaining portions of the estate should be passed to the account of the general revenue as provided for by law, but there are very strong reasons why the £15,400 which is chargeable upon his public benefactions should be used for purposes associated with them. And, as suggested by a correspondent whose letter is published elsewhere, to what better purpose could the sum be applied than to the completion of the portion of the Institute Buildings provided for in the original design for the accommodation of the national collection of pictures? It is discreditable to South Australia that the loan paintings obtained from the neighbouring colonies should be relegated to the miserable little room in the Institute on North-terrace where they are now being exhibited, and yet the lenders are not to be blamed for insisting that they should be bestowed in a place deemed to be less liable to risk from fire than the building in which our own art treasures are housed. In course of a short time the pictures owned by the colony will be worth at least £50,000, and for commercial reasons, if for no other, they should be protected against the imminent danger of destruction. No better method of honouring the memory of Sir Thomas Elder could be devised than to have a compartment in a new National Gallery named after him and reserved for the works purchased with the money he has provided.

Poor students should receive more assistance from the University than can possibly be afforded to them in the existing condition of its funds; and it is to be hoped that the recent legacies to that institution will be in part devoted to that purpose. The first gift of £20,000 which Sir Thomas made to the University during his lifetime was specifically intended to the endowment of professorships, and similarly the amounts now devoted to the encouragement of musical and medical studies has been ear-marked for the chairs of music and medicine. But the larger sum of £25,000 has been left to the University apparently without any directions or conditions. As a matter of bookkeeping, as