

breach of contract, for whatever may have been his own ideas as to the contingencies that might arise at the end of his five years' tenure, the Council has certainly not exceeded the power which was reserved to itself in the conditions of his appointment. His last letter to the Council, in which he desired to know whether it was from "accident, ignorance, or design" that a certain course was followed, is explained as having had no discourteous intent, but it is difficult to put any other construction on the actual words. The suggestion of "ignorance," without the least qualifying statement, could scarcely fail to give offence; and it is astonishing that, with the desire to write with "brevity and perspicuity," a professor of languages should have chosen to incur so grave a risk of misinterpretation. From the public point of view the decision of the Council on the subject of the five-yearly professorial appointments is to be commended. The new rule, as several of the professors themselves recognise, gives a more certain tenure than would exist were there to be a new election at the end of every five years' term. Practically a life appointment is offered, subject to termination at six months' notice, to be given only on a specified day, should there be sufficient cause.

Advertiser July 11th 1888

DR. SMITH AND THE HON. D. MURRAY. ✓

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—In reading the reports of yesterday's meeting of the senate of the University, as given in both the daily papers, I perceive a variation which is of no little importance considering the comments which have been made on Dr. Smith's remarks. In the *Advertiser* that gentleman is reported to have called the Hon. David Murray "a respectable draper;" while in the *Register* the phrase is toned down to "a respectable merchant." Can you tell me which report is correct?—I am, &c.,

SPECTATOR.

[We have referred this question to our reporter and other gentlemen present at the meeting, and their replies leave no doubt that the *Advertiser* report is correct.—ED.]

✓ *Advertiser July 12th 1888.*

DR. SMITH AND THE HON. D. MURRAY. ✓

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—According to one of your leaders it seems Dr. Smith thinks disdainfully of illustrious ironmongers and respectable drapers. These tradesmen might give the learned gentleman the retort that many scholarlike men are practically speaking no better than school-boys all their life. Give me the man of common sense, no matter whether he is a schoolman, warehouseman, or ploughman.

What's fit your jargon o' your schools,
Your Latin names for horns and stools;
If honest nature made you fools,
What serve your grammars?
Ye'd better ta'en up spades and shools,
Or knappin'-hammers.

A set of dull, conceited hashes,
Confuse their brains in college classes;
They gang in stirks, and come out asses—
Plain truth to speak;
And then they think to climb Parnassus
By dint o' Greek!

Give me a spark o' nature's fire! &c.

Dr. Smith's unwarrantable disdain for men who do not profess to be scholars in his sense of the term does not by any means square with the sentiments of the great Ayrshire bard.—I am, &c.,

ANDREW ANDERSON.

July 10, 1888.

Advertiser July 12 1888

THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—The fact that in your article of the 10th instant you did me the honor to mention me by name is the reason for my troubling you with a few words. You say "there is a busy clique in the senate ever working" towards the election of none but graduates to the council. I am not aware that anything said in the debates which you have published indicates any such intention on the part of any clique; and, if the clique is "busy," as you say, one would think its views would have been made manifest. You then say, referring to this clique, that an idea of the exclusiveness and narrow-mindedness of the men whom the clique are likely to elect may be gathered from my remarks in the recent debate, and you afterwards add that "the public will regard with consternation the prospect of the University falling into the hands of a clique led on by such guides." The latter expression of course refers to me. Permit me at the outset to disclaim the honor of being a leader of my brother graduates. The gentlemen with whom I act entrusted me with the moving of certain resolutions, just as another resolution was entrusted to the Rev. Slaney Poole. We both discharged that duty, and are in no other sense leaders. Next, allow me to point out that the term "clique" is not properly applicable to that large majority of the graduates, which numbered 30 against 9 in the last division, and which all through the meeting far outnumbered their opponents. If my remarks were disdainful, unkind, and petty, as your article says, might not I and the majority of the senate make a similar complaint of the writer of that article? Now let me speak of the nature and object of those remarks which your article characterises as expressive of disdain, unkindness, and pettiness. I said that the committee appointed to choose the new professor was not a proper one, and I gave my reasons. Those reasons were that neither the two University men nor the two mercantile men on the committee had the qualifications for appointing to this particular professorship. I did not depreciate the mercantile men as such, or the general attainments of the two others. I spoke of the two mercantile men as "distinguished" and "eminent," but pointed out that neither they nor their colleagues were distinguished in languages, philology, or mental and moral philosophy. These observations were demanded by the facts of the situation, and appear to me as little open to the charge of "bad taste" as if I were to say that a gardener, however eminent, was not a fit man to choose a cook, or vice versa. The principle that a man who is to judge of another's qualifications should himself possess them is one so generally accepted by the bulk of mankind that, if its enunciation be evidence of bad taste, there will be very few who are in a position to taunt me with that fault. I do not think that the committee in England is a proper committee to whom the heads of a university should entrust the choice of the new professor, and I should have expected, if the council thought no one in Australia capable of deciding on the applications, that the reference would have been made to such men as the Master of Balliol, Professor Max Müller, Professor Freeman, or the Hon. George Brodrick — names which I have set down almost at random. In disparagement of non-academical men of business on the council neither I nor those with whom I act have ever said a word; but, since you have inferentially attributed such expressions to me, you invite me to remark that, if there is one thing more than another in which those gentlemen may be of service, it is the management of the finances of the corporation—a task in which the council has not yet distinguished itself. But, as far as I understand the views of those with whom I am acting, we are quite as dissatisfied with our academical as with our non-academical representatives, as I trust future elections will show. 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. This we shall oppose, quite irrespective of whether the outgoers are University men or not, on the ground that we regard the institution as having been mismanaged both financially and as an instrument of teaching. And I am sure we shall be able to select men quite as competent and of as good standing, both as men of business and as men of learning, and who are neither exclusive nor narrow-minded.—I am, &c.,

JAMES WALTER SMITH.

Adelaide, July 11, 1888.