

56. You knew that the Committee had been set up for the purpose of considering these matters?—I knew that there was a general reference.

57. With regard to the reporter, I am afraid it will be the duty of the Committee to put you into the position of declining to give his name or otherwise. Do you decline to give the name of the reporter from whom you received the information contained in these paragraphs which appeared in the *New Zealand Times*?—I do decline.

58. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Would it have been the duty of the reporter to have informed you, or whoever his chief may be, that the documents from which he had taken the information were confidential?—It certainly would have been his duty. I may say that the only questions I put to him were, "Did you obtain these in any underhand way?" "No," he said, "I got them in a perfectly honourable manner." I asked, "Would it implicate any official or any member of the Committee?" and he said, "No, it would not."

59. *The Chairman.*] Was that prior to the publication of the articles?—No, that was after. I had no idea there was anything unusual or extraordinary, or anything involving a breach of privilege in the publication, until after it had appeared.

60. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] These documents that I have here are marked "Confidential." The reporter's duty would be to tell you that these were confidential documents?—Yes.

61. And as a journalist you would not have published documents so marked if you had seen the word "Confidential"?—Certainly not, if it were involving a breach of privilege.

62. *The Chairman.*] We understand that you actually decline to give the name of the reporter who obtained this information?—Yes.

63. *Hon. Mr. Guinness.*] You say that you got the information from which all the paragraphs were written from one reporter?—Yes, from one.

MONTAGUE EDWARD BANNISTER, publisher of the *New Zealand Times*, examined on oath. (No. 2.)

64. *The Chairman.*] You published the *New Zealand Times* of Saturday, the 5th September, and Monday, the 7th September?—Yes.

65. Were you aware that those issues contained articles in connection with education?—I was.

66. Had you any knowledge that those articles contained matter which made them practically a breach of privilege?—I had no knowledge to that effect.

67. Have you seen the proposed new Bill, or the regulations under that Bill?—I have not.

68. Do you know whence the information was obtained on which those articles were based?—I have no knowledge on those matters; they rest with the literary department. You have my letter.

69. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] You know the reporting staff?—Yes.

70. You are the publisher of the paper?—Yes; my name is on the imprint.

71. You have become aware, since the publication of the articles, that the *Times* has been cited for breach of privilege?—Yes.

72. What is the name of the reporter who brought the information to the office?—That I am not aware of.

PATRICK JOSEPH NOLAN, Chief Reporter for the *New Zealand Times*, examined on oath. (No. 3.)

73. *The Chairman.*] Have you seen the proposed new State-school syllabus?—I have seen what has been published about it, but nothing further.

74. Have you seen a copy of the original document?—I have not.

75. Have you seen the proposed new regulations in regard to training-colleges for teachers?—I have seen nothing further than what has appeared in the newspapers on the subject.

76. Have you seen the proposed new Education Bill?—No, sir.

77. Did you see any of this matter at all before it appeared in the *New Zealand Times*?—The articles published in the *New Zealand Times* on the Saturday I did not see until they appeared in the *Times*. If you mean whether I saw the printer's copy of the articles, I may say that I saw the copy of the third article before it appeared.

78. Did you give the information to Mr. Kelly, the editor of the *New Zealand Times*?—No. I had no communication with Mr. Kelly at all on the subject before the articles appeared.

79. You were not the reporter upon whose information he published those articles?—No.

80. And you yourself have not seen them?—I have not seen them—except, as I say, I saw the copy of one of the articles; but I did not see the original documents, if that is what you mean. I know nothing whatever about them.

81. As a parliamentary reporter, I suppose you are aware of the existence of the Standing Order which prohibits the publication of any matter which is before a Committee?—Yes; and I know that it works very awkwardly very often. I am aware that it exists.

82. I suppose you are also aware that a Select Committee had been appointed for the purpose of dealing with educational matters?—Yes.

83. With your knowledge of this, would you have handed over that information to the *Times* for publication, if you had obtained it?—Well, that is rather an awkward question to answer. I have every respect for the privileges of Parliament, but at the same time if certain information came into my possession in a perfectly honourable way I would consider that my duty to my newspaper would lead me to publish the information. The first duty of a reporter is, of course, to his newspaper, and, provided that he obtains information in a perfectly honourable way, I think he is bound to publish it. Of course, no reporter should endeavour to obtain information in a dishonourable way.

84. Would you consider that matter could be obtained in an honourable way when it had printed on it "Confidential"?—I would prefer not to speak about that. You see, I do not know