

26. Who were the reporters on the dates in question—the 5th and 7th September?—I believe—I have not looked it up—that it was Mr. Schwabe and Mr. Barr and Mr. Oakley Browne. The latter is in the Council, but he frequents the Press Gallery besides.

27. You were aware that the Committee was dealing with educational questions?—I was aware that it had been set up. I was not aware that any matter was before it.

28. Did you see the matter before it was printed in the *Times*?—No; I saw it in proof. I did not see the manuscript.

29. *Hon. Mr. Guinness.*] Do you say that you do not recollect the name of the reporter who supplied the information, or that you do recollect and decline to give his name?—I do recollect; but if I am pressed I shall decline to give his name.

30. Had he this information in manuscript, or in his note-book?—It was in manuscript; but whether he had it in notes in his note-book which he transcribed into manuscript, I do not know.

31. Had he any printed documents in his possession that he quoted to you?—Not that I am aware of. I have spoken to the reporter since, but I have not asked him for details. It is not usual to question a reporter as to his sources of information—in fact, sometimes it is a distinct stipulation that he should not disclose the source.

32. You know that it is wrong to publish information obtained from a Committee until the Committee reports to the House?—Yes.

33. Did you ask your reporter whether the Committee had reported?—No.

34. Did you assume that it had reported?—My assumption, if I made any at the time, was that the matter was not yet before the Committee.

35. *Hon. Sir W. J. Steward.*] I think you stated that you did not see the actual documents?—That is so; nor did I see the reporter's manuscript at all.

36. Were you aware that such documents were in existence—*i.e.*, those upon which you have commented—one relating to the syllabus, another to the training-schools for teachers, and another to secondary education?—No. I had no idea how the information had been obtained, whether from conversation or from documents.

37. It did not reach you, then, that certain documents had been issued to the Committee which were marked "Confidential"?—No, not at all.

38. Had you been aware of the fact that this information was contained in documents so marked, would you have considered yourself justified in disclosing the contents?—I should have thought it a matter for very serious consideration. I do not think I should have published it in that case.

39. Subsequent to this matter coming up in the House I think you had an article in your paper on the subject generally and the expediency of Parliament not observing secrecy with regard to matters of this sort?—Yes.

40. I think that in that article you referred to the Standing Order now in question, which prohibits publication of matters before Committees?—Yes.

41. And I think you expressed the opinion that it would be expedient in the public interest if that Standing Order were repealed?—Yes.

42. Because you hold that opinion, would you consider yourself justified in knowingly breaking a Standing Order of the House?—Decidedly not. I have great respect for authority in any way constituted; and while I consider it a duty to resist unjust laws and to oppose unjust rules, I should obey them until they were altered.

43. Then, you did not deliberately break the Standing Order with the intention of bringing about its repeal?—Certainly not. Such a thought never entered my head.

44. *Mr. Massey.*] I think I heard you say that you knew the documents in question were talked about, discussed, and handed about?—That was after the publication—after the question had been raised. I did not know that previously.

45. You did not know it before the publication of the articles which constitute the breach of privilege?—No.

46. Would you mind explaining what you meant by saying the documents were handed about?—I do not know that I can explain it.

47. Do you mean that they were handed about in the Press Gallery?—No. What was in my mind was that I was told after the publication that these matters had formed the subject of conference been various officers and educational authorities throughout the country; and that these gentlemen had discussed them with friends or with each other, and that the documents had been in that way handed about. That was all that was in my head.

48. Do you mean that you had been given to understand that the documents had been discussed by Boards of Education?—I do not think so.

49. Well, by whom?—By, as I said, educational authorities—meaning gentlemen versed in educational matters, whose opinions had been taken.

50. Do you say that you had been informed that the opinions of gentlemen outside of Parliament had been taken with regard to these documents?—Not with regard to the documents, but the subject-matter of them.

51. Well, the subject-matter of them?—Yes.

52. Would you mind mentioning the names of the people that you had in your mind at the time—the names of the people who had been consulted?—I certainly had no individuals in my mind at all.

53. Do you remember the case of the *Dunedin Evening Star*, two years ago?—Yes.

54. You knew that the proprietors of the *Evening Star* were fined for publishing documents which had come before the Committee to be reported upon?—Yes.

55. So that you knew what you were doing when you published a synopsis of these documents?—I did not know that these matters were before the Committee. I did not know that the papers had been sent to the Committee.