

41. That is what I say. Mr. Schwabe made you acquainted with the fact that he had obtained some educational copy?—Pardon my correcting you again. I did not say that Mr. Schwabe said he had obtained some educational copy, but that the paper—the *New Zealand Times*—had some educational copy.

42. You decline to say who supplied the information which the *New Zealand Times* had?—Yes.

43. As a matter of fact, you know who supplied the information, although you will not tell us who it was?—I must decline to answer that, too.

44. Do you happen to know how that person became possessed of the information?—No.

45. But you decline to say whether you know who it was that gave the information to the editor?—I do not know who gave it to the editor.

46. *Mr. Massey.*] Was there any member of the *Times* staff besides Mr. Schwabe and yourself present in the Press Gallery on the 4th?—There was nobody in the Lower House gallery. There was Mr. Oakley Browne in the Upper House.

47. You say that you did not supply the information on which those articles were based to the editor?—I did not supply it to the editor.

48. I suppose you see the position in which Mr. Schwabe is placed?—I see perfectly the position in which Mr. Schwabe is placed.

JAMES OAKLEY BROWNE, Parliamentary Reporter for the *New Zealand Times*, examined on oath. (No. 12.)

49. *The Chairman.*] You are one of the parliamentary reporters for the *New Zealand Times*?—Yes.

50. Were you in the Press Gallery on or about the 4th September?—I could not say.

51. Have you seen the articles which appeared in the *New Zealand Times* of the 5th and 7th September with regard to education and matters before the Education Committee?—I have seen them, but I have not read them very carefully.

52. Have you ever seen a copy of the printed proposed new State-school syllabus?—No.

53. Have you ever seen a copy of the proposed new regulations for training-colleges?—No.

54. Or of the proposed new Education Bill [produced, and handed to witness]?—No.

55. Did you write the articles for the *New Zealand Times*, or give the information upon which those articles were based?—No, I did not.

56. Do you know who did give it?—No; I cannot say who did.

GEORGE POWICK BROWN, Reporter, *New Zealand Times*, made affirmation and was examined. (No. 13.)

57. *The Chairman.*] You are one of the parliamentary reporters for the *New Zealand Times*?—I was.

58. Were you on or about the 5th September?—No; I have been off for a fortnight now—I think it is a fortnight.

59. Did you give any information at all to the *New Zealand Times* in regard to certain articles, which appeared on the 5th and 7th September, with reference to education?—No.

60. Do you know who did so?—No.

61. You yourself did not?—I did not.

62. Have you ever seen a copy of a document similar to that [Bill produced and handed to witness]?—No.

63. Have you ever seen either of these other two documents in print or in typewriting before, or similar copies of them [documents produced and handed to witness]?—I saw them in the *Times*, but I did not see them anywhere else in print.

64. You never saw a copy similar to those before you?—No.

EDWIN JAMES LE GROVE, Parliamentary Committee Reporter, examined on oath. (No. 14.)

65. *The Chairman.*] You were the reporter to the Education Committee?—Yes; I reported it from the first sitting.

66. You had in your possession, had you not, a copy of the regulations, which was given to you by the Clerk?—I asked the Clerk for a copy of the syllabus, and I also obtained from him a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Inspectors' Conference, and likewise an octavo edition of the Education Act of 1877, with the regulations. It was necessary for me to get those copies in order to verify the questions and comments of members in connection with matters which were touched upon.

67. On what day did you get them?—On the first day on which the Committee sat.

68. That was Thursday, the 3rd. When did you return them?—I had them in my possession for several days. There was only one paper marked "Confidential." That was the syllabus. It was not my fault, I might say, that I did not get a copy of the Secondary Education Bill, because that was mentioned, and I thought it might be useful to me, so that I could get the *ipsissima verba* from the Bill if quotations were made from it at all by members when asking questions.

69. Whilst that copy of the syllabus was in your possession did you permit any person to see it?—No; it was not possible, except that anybody passing while I was working might have glanced at it, but he would not have had an opportunity of even reading it.

70. No one ever had it in his possession for any time in which extracts could be made from it?—I do not think that would be possible. Our practice, as Committee reporters, is to put all our copy, and any documents which may come into our possession, into a locked cupboard, and to secrete the key. I might say that we are extremely careful, because several questions of privilege have cropped up, and, of course, we recognise that it is very important that documents like that should not get into the hands of people who might make the contents public.