This offer I received the following reply.

By the said, it was evident that the board of directors had not given any reasons why they were refusing to appoint the chairman of the committee. The directors had not explained their reasons for the refusal, and it was clear that they were not prepared to reconsider the matter.

The offer has been rejected and the directors have not shown any evidence of a willingness to reconsider the decision.

The result of this decision may be that the board of directors will be forced to appoint a new chairman. This may be a good step for the university, as it may bring fresh ideas and new perspectives to the management of the institution.

The decision of the board of directors is not surprising, as they have consistently chosen to reject the offer of the chairman of the committee. The board has not provided any reasons for this decision, and it is unclear why they have taken this action.

I am hopeful that the university will be able to find a new chairman who will be able to lead the institution successfully. The university has a long and proud history, and it is important that it continues to thrive in the future.

The university has a strong tradition of excellence, and it is important that it continues to maintain this tradition. The university has a long and illustrious history, and it is important that it continues to thrive in the future.
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The board desired that the 2nd November should be set aside: -- that the President, Sir John Gray, the Vice-President, Mr. L. A. Buxton, and the Secretary, Mr. R. W. Sparrow, should be present, and that the following members be present: Mr. J. G. Cooper, Mr. J. G. F. R. Fox, Mr. J. H. M. Macdonald, Mr. J. W. R. Shaw, and Mr. W. W. W. Smith.

Mr. Brooker wrote to the Minister:

I am in receipt of a note from Mr. Brooker, E.M.O.,kh describing the situation of the Botanic Gardens, and I have the honor of forwarding the same. The Minister has requested that the Board should be informed of the steps taken by the Government in reference to the Government's intention to continue the Botanic Gardens under the jurisdiction of the Government. The Minister has also requested that the Board should be informed of the steps taken by the Government in reference to the Government's intention to continue the Botanic Gardens under the jurisdiction of the Government.

The Board was of opinion that the situation of the Botanic Gardens was unsatisfactory, and that the Government should be requested to take steps to improve the condition of the Gardens. The Board was of opinion that the situation of the Botanic Gardens was unsatisfactory, and that the Government should be requested to take steps to improve the condition of the Gardens.
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The Board was in the opinion that the situation of the Botanic Gardens was unsatisfactory, and that the Government should be requested to take steps to improve the condition of the Gardens. The Board was of opinion that the situation of the Botanic Gardens was unsatisfactory, and that the Government should be requested to take steps to improve the condition of the Gardens.

No Axe to Grind.

Mr. Brooker stated that the Board held the view that the Botanic Gardens were the responsibility of the Government. The Board held the view that the Botanic Gardens were the responsibility of the Government. The Board held the view that the Botanic Gardens were the responsibility of the Government. The Board held the view that the Botanic Gardens were the responsibility of the Government.
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DIRECTOR OF THE BOTANIC GARDEN.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S OPINION.

GOVERNMENT HAVE POWER TO APPOINT.

The deadlock between the Government and the Botanic Garden Board in connexion with the appointment of the successor to Mr. W. H. Hoitze led the Government to obtain legal advice on their right to make an appointment, if they desired, independently of the board.

The Crown Solicitor, Mr. J. M. Stuart, K.C., when giving the opinion, was asked to cover the whole ground. The Solicitor was asked whether, under the scope of the Civil Service Act, and therefore his appointment was in the hands of the Government. That was the reason why Mr. Hoitze had been appointed, and the Solicitor, in reply to Mr. Ryan, stated in the House of Assembly on Wednesday that the Crown law authorities were of opinion that the Government had power to appoint a director.

The appointment of Mr. W. H. Hoitze was first given by the late Mr. J. M. Stuart, K.C., when Crown Solicitor, and it was supported by the present Crown Solicitor (Dr. F. W. Richardson).

The Solicitor stated that the appointment was under the scope of the Civil Service Act, and therefore his appointment was in the hands of the Government. That was the reason why Mr. Hoitze had been appointed, and the Solicitor, in reply to Mr. Ryan, stated in the House of Assembly on Wednesday that the Crown law authorities were of opinion that the Government had power to appoint a director.
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