

I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything further in the matter. The facts of the case are briefly and, I venture to think, clearly enough summed up in my letter of the 5th June, 1879. To that statement I adhere; and I leave it to others, having read it, to say whether I have been debarred from competing for honours by a quibble or not.

Professor Macgregor, Otago University.

I have, &c.,

A. R. BARCLAY.

2. *Mr. White to Professor Macgregor.*

SIR,—

Dunedin, 19th April, 1880.

I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of referring to the facts of the case to which allusion is made in your evidence before the Royal Commission. I will only remark, very briefly indeed, on events subsequent to my being allowed, under protest, to sit at the New Zealand University Examination. Some time after the examination my name appeared in the list of the successful candidates published in the newspapers. In due course the other Otago candidates were informed officially of their success by the Registrar of the New Zealand University. Receiving no notice, I wrote the Registrar, and received a reply to the following effect: first, that he had inadvertently omitted to send me notice when writing to the others; and, second, that the examiners had reported that I had passed. What I desired to ascertain from the Registrar was whether the New Zealand University had allowed the examination to count. I therefore again wrote, asking pointedly, "if this examination would stand as a section of the B.A. examination?" The Registrar made no specific reply, but directed my attention to the proceedings of a select committee that had been appointed to inquire into the case, and to the amended Regulations of the Senate which had followed this inquiry.

I judged that the Committee had reported against me, but, from the fact of the Regulations being amended, thought that there was some desire to meet the circumstances of my case. It did appear to me that there was a possibility of the examination being ratified by the passing of this Regulation. This, however, was by no means clear. I therefore again wrote the Registrar, asking definitely whether the Regulation had a retrospective effect validating the examination, or whether it referred only to future cases of a similar character. It will be seen that this was a most important query. It merited a decided reply. The reply I got referred me to the Regulations of the Senate—the Regulations upon which I had asked an opinion as to their interpretation. The report of the Committee seemed to conflict with the Regulations, I asked an opinion on this point, and received none. I may mention, although it does not bear directly upon the present phase of the matter, that when the Senate was sitting in Dunedin I wrote the Chancellor a polite note stating that, if it was not trespassing too much upon his time, I would like to see him in regard to my case. The Chancellor did not even acknowledge receipt of my note. From this brief recital it will be apparent that I have not known whether to prepare for undergoing examination again in the same subjects, or to proceed to another section of the degree upon the understanding that the one had been admitted. Whilst this protracted correspondence was going on I intimated my intention of taking up another section of the examination. I knew that under the amended Regulation I could proceed to either section. What I did not know was, whether the previous examination had been allowed. This prevented me from prosecuting my studies as I should have desired. I shall only be too glad to hear, even now, not that I have passed—that I have already been informed of—but that the examination has been allowed to count. If this be done, I will take the first opportunity of endeavouring to finish the course at the University.

I have written briefly and hurriedly; you will see, however, that it corresponds exactly with my verbal statement to you, and corroborates the evidence which you gave before the Royal Commission. I cannot conclude without thanking you, sir, for the assistance you have given me in bringing this case under the notice of the New Zealand University authorities.

I have, &c.,

Professor D. Macgregor, University of Otago.

D. WHITE.

No. 4.

The Acting-Secretary to the Royal Commission to the Chancellor.

Royal Commission on University and Higher Education,

SIR,—

Wellington, 27th April, 1880.

I have the honour, by direction of the Royal Commission, to forward to you copy of a letter, with enclosures, received from Professor Macgregor in regard to the matter brought forward in your letter of 6th instant, and am to request that you will favour the Commission with copies of the whole correspondence in the cases of Messrs. Barclay and White. It is evident that nothing would be gained by the publication of your letter and Professor Macgregor's reply, without the publication also of the correspondence in question.

I have, &c.,

The Chancellor, University of New Zealand,
Christchurch.

E. OSBORNE-GIBBES,
(for the Secretary).

No. 5.

The Chancellor to the Secretary to the Royal Commission.

SIR,—

University of New Zealand, Christchurch, 12th May, 1880.

I have the honour to enclose herewith, as requested by you, the correspondence relating to certain allegations contained in Professor Macgregor's evidence before the Royal Commission.

I should have left the correspondence to speak for itself were it not that Professor Macgregor, in his explanatory letter of the 23rd April, seeks to attribute to me statements which I never made, with the view, apparently, of showing that the evidence which he gave was only "formally," and not substantially, incorrect.

The question as regards Barclay is: Did Barclay give notice, in his letter of 4th April, 1880, that he intended to come up for honours during the then current year? Professor Macgregor says that Barclay did give such notice. I say that he did not. I maintain, further, that not only did he not give notice to that effect, but actually gave notice of his intention to do exactly the opposite. He gave it to be understood that he was *not* coming up for honours during the then current year. Professor Macgregor, in his explanatory letter, says, "I am bound, however, to admit that, owing to Barclay's