

E.—LETTER FROM THE REGISTRAR OF CANTERBURY COLLEGE RELATIVE TO THE SCHOOL OF MINES.  
SIR,— Canterbury College, Christchurch, 24th January, 1880.

I have the honour, by direction of the Chairman, to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 22nd January, and, in reply, to inform you that the amount received on account of the School of Mines is £600.

Scientific apparatus to the value of £50 has been procured, and is now in the Chemical Laboratory; £85 was forwarded to the Registrar of the Royal School of Mines, London, for the purchase of mining models; £70 was forwarded to Professor von Hochstetter for the purchase of metallurgical specimens, which have been received, and are now lodged in the Museum; £15 was transmitted to Mr. George Thureau, of Sandhurst, for the purchase of models for timbering mines. These models have not yet been received. Until the models and apparatus necessary for the pupils arrive the school cannot be commenced.

The Secretary, Royal Commission,  
University and Higher Education.

I have, &c.,  
F. G. STEDMAN,  
Registrar.

F.—DESPATCH FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES RELATIVE TO THE PETITION  
OF THE OTAGO UNIVERSITY FOR A SEPARATE CHARTER.

SIR,— Downing Street, 22nd July, 1879.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch No. 16, of the 13th of May last, transmitting a memorandum from Sir George Grey, submitting, with a recommendation from your Government, a petition addressed to the Queen by the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Council of the University of Otago, praying for a grant of Letters Patent providing for the recognition of the degrees of the University, in the same manner as if they had been granted by any University of the United Kingdom.

2. I have also received your despatch of the 20th of May (No. 21), enclosing a petition to the Queen from the Governors of the Canterbury College, praying Her Majesty not to grant a charter to any educational body in New Zealand other than the New Zealand University; together with a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Senate of the University of New Zealand, expressing the opinion that it is undesirable that the power to confer University degrees should be possessed by more than one institution in the colony; and a printed address by the Attorney-General, containing information on the subject of the relations between the New Zealand and Otago Universities.

3. I request that you will inform the Chancellor of Otago University, and the Governors of Canterbury College, that their petitions have been laid before the Queen, but that, having regard to the objections pointed out in Lord Kimberley's despatch of the 31st of January, 1873 (No. 8), to the grant of a charter to more than one University in New Zealand, and not being able to find anything in the present circumstances which would justify me in departing from the decision then arrived at, or in recommending the establishment of more than one chartered University in any Australasian Colony, I have not thought it my duty to advise Her Majesty to authorize any steps towards granting Letters Patent to the University of Otago.

Governor Sir Hercules Robinson, G.C.M.G., &c.

I have, &c.,  
M. E. HICKS BEACH.

G.—CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO THE COMPLAINTS OF MESSRS. A. R. BARCLAY AND D. WHITE  
CONCERNING CERTAIN ACTION OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND.

No. 1.

*The Chancellor to the Secretary to the Royal Commission.*

SIR,— University of New Zealand, Christchurch, 6th April, 1880.

In reading over Professor Macgregor's evidence, given before the "Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the operations of the University and its relations to the secondary schools of the colony," I observe some serious inaccuracies as to matters of fact, which I desire to correct. I have only recently seen the statements made, or I should have corrected them sooner.

I have mentioned the matter to the Hon. C. C. Bowen, one of your Commissioners, and he has advised me to address you on the subject, as this appears the readiest way of removing from the mind of the Commission, as well as from the minds of those who may read the evidence, the wrong impression which Professor Macgregor's evidence conveys with regard to the action of the Chancellor, as representing the University. Permit me to suggest that this correction of the evidence should be so embodied among the documents of the Commission as to obtain as wide publicity as the original statement.

I may, in the first place, remark that, on the points to which I am about to allude, Professor Macgregor does not profess to speak from his personal knowledge of the transactions which he describes, but merely states what some one else has told him. It is on this foundation that he appears to base certain charges against the authorities of the University. Of these charges, the first to which I wish to draw attention is contained in his answer to question 7262. Professor Macgregor there states—in reference to a young man of the name of Barclay, who, after having taken his B.A. degree, wished to go up for honours—as follows: "This young man was going up for honours, but he tells me that he cannot proceed to honours, because the Chancellor informs him that, as he did not give notice in time, he cannot go up. *The student sent in a letter to the Chancellor, stating his intention to go up for honours in mental science, and also to take the LL.B. degree.* The Chancellor sent him a letter, on receipt of that, saying he could not go up for honours *because he had not given notice* at the time of his taking the B.A. degree." I have underlined, for more convenient reference, those parts of this statement which are contrary to fact, and to which I am going to allude. Professor Macgregor, in answer to a later question, No. 7266, produces, in corroboration of the above statement, what he calls "the correspondence" on the subject; and I am bound to say that, as the letters are arranged in the evidence, they appear to a certain extent to bear out his assertion, or at least to make its truth appear probable.

I may here observe that the term used by him—"the correspondence"—would convey to an ordinary reader, as I have no doubt it did to the Royal Commission, the idea that the whole corre-