

Advertiser July 13 1888.

DR. SMITH AND THE HON. D.  
MURRAY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I have no knowledge whatever of Dr. Smith, and have no wish to make his acquaintance. His remarks in the senate regarding the gentlemen appointed to choose a professor of English literature may be very funny, but they are equally silly. Is a doctor of laws, may I ask, better qualified than any other man by his training or otherwise to choose a professor of English literature; and what is the special qualification required to make such a choice? Is it customary to put a professor on his trial before such a committee, or are his credentials simply examined with care and judgment. If the latter, I submit that the gentlemen chosen are quite as competent to select as even the learned Dr. Smith. No honest occupation is contemptible, and it is one of Dr. Smith's littlenesses that he thought he would make a hit by referring to two of the committee as tradesmen. Does Dr. Smith think they are a lower grade than lawyers, and that they are ignorant and unlettered simply because they happen to be business men with, I dare say, a shade more common sense than himself?—I am, &c,

W. M. MURRAY,

Gawler-place, July 12, 1888.

THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—In a letter in to-day's issue Dr. Smith writes that "the outgoing members" of the council "seem strangely anxious to retain their places." Will you allow an "outgoing member" to contradict this. During the last 12 months I have made no secret that on the expiration of my term of office I shall not offer myself for election. My reasons for retirement are personal, and are in no way connected with the alleged clique in the council or with the openly acknowledged clique—I beg pardon, I should have said "the brother graduates"—who appointed Brother Smith and Brother Poole as their spokesmen.—I am, &c.,

H. T. WHITTELL.

July 12, 1888.

Advertiser July 14 1888.

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—In Dr. Smith's letter, which appears in your issue of Thursday, the following passage occurs:—"The outgoing members seem strangely anxious to retain their places, and though the elections are not till November, a canvas has already begun for putting the same men in again." As one of the outgoing members I shall feel much obliged if you will allow me space to say that, so far as I am concerned, the above-quoted paragraph has not the slightest foundation in fact.—I am, &c.,

JOHN A. HARTLEY.

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND  
MR. ANDERSON.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—As a member of the senate of our Adelaide University, a position I am proud to be in and appreciate, I may perhaps be permitted to say that Mr. Andrew Anderson's letter in to-day's issue of your paper is beside the mark, and without going further on that I would refer to Dr. Smith's letter, which ably answers Mr. Anderson. On the lines quoted from Burns—the sentiment no doubt is very beautiful—for the ignorant, he wants learning and culture to be like the root described in Comus, which in another country

Bore a bright golden flower; but not in this soil  
Unknown, and like esteem'd, and the dull swain  
Treads on it daily with his clouted shoon.

I resent Mr. Anderson's doctrine, and think it is the duty of all to do everything to ennoble and elevate mankind by education, but don't let us stop short at a horrid mediocrity.—I am, &c.,

EGBERT SABINE.

July 12, 1888.

Advertiser July 16<sup>th</sup> 1888.

THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—To-day I have read a letter published in yesterday's *Advertiser*, in which Dr. Smith, referring to the University Council, wrote:—"The outgoing members seem strangely anxious to retain their places, and though the elections are not till November a canvass has already begun for putting the same men in again." As I am one of the outgoing members allow me to say that my anxiety to retain my seat has not induced me to canvass for a single vote, or to abandon my hostility to the theory that the council is to act as the agent and obey the behests of the senate. To the opinions and wishes of the senate I will give the earnest consideration due to electors by their representative, but delegate I decline to be.—I am, &c.,

WILLIAM BARLOW.

July 13, 1888.

"UNWARRANTABLE DISDAIN."

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—Although Mr. Egbert Sabine is a "member of the senate of our Adelaide University" I am certain that I could smash up and pulverise any quantity of men such as he one after the other in quick succession. But I will spar gently with him. He says my letter was beside the mark. He might as well have said that your leader was beside the mark. The subject of my letter was Dr. Smith's unwarrantable disdain for business men. Mr. Sabine's critical remarks on Burns are not just. Burns, although a ploughman, could hold his own in argument with the best scholars of his age. He loved learning, but loved common sense more, and he recognised the fact that these two are not always allied. Hence his satire on university blockheads. Mr. Sabine says that he resents my doctrine. I do not know to what doctrine of mine he refers. I respect learning as much as he does. I do not like the expression "horrid mediocrity." It is bad taste. We are always learning, and possibly our descendants in a century from this will regard us as comparatively ignorant.—I am, &c.,

ANDREW ANDERSON.

Advertiser July 17<sup>th</sup> 1888.

MR. SABINE REPLIES AND THE CORRESPONDENCE CLOSES.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I did not know Mr. Andrew Anderson suffered from *cacoethes scribendi*, or perhaps would have not further irritated the disease; but I really cannot allow his remarks to pass unanswered. I take it that before anyone is in a position to express an opinion such an one should have a knowledge of the particular facts. Apparently Mr. Anderson has not. With due deference dear old Burns may be all very well in his way, but surely Mr. Anderson knows he was a man whose mind was not always evenly balanced, and as Mr. Anderson would not have us all kept ignorant all the days of our life, I say to him goodbye.—I am, &c.,

EGBERT SABINE.