

71. Did you yourself give to any person any extract, or let any person have access to that copy of the syllabus which you had in your possession?—No; not at all.

72. You yourself gave to no person anything written therefrom?—That is so.

73. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Where do you do your writing-out?—In the Committee Clerks' room, at the top of the building, and sometimes I do it in the M to Z Petitions Committee room.

74. No one was in the room with you at the time, or came into the room?—Only the Clerks to the Committees. They have access to the room.

75. Have you had any conversation with any reporters with regard to these papers or anything in connection with them?—No.

76. *Mr. Massey.*] Did you leave the documents at any time on the table of the M to Z Petitions Committee room while they were in your possession?—No. Our practice always is to remove our documents when we leave the room. Supposing we are working in the morning, and go to lunch, our practice is to take our documents, and anything connected with any Committee proceedings, into the Committee Clerks' room, and to lock them up in a cupboard there.

77. You adhered to that practice in connection with these matters?—Certainly.

78. Where is the Committee Clerks' room?—Near the Minister for Customs' office—on the same floor as the M to Z Petitions Committee room, at the top of the building.

79. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] You see that article [paper containing extracts from syllabus produced and handed to witness]?—Yes.

80. As an experienced reporter, and having yourself had possession of the syllabus, would there be any doubt as to that being taken from the original document?—I should think there would not. I should say that it would not be possible for any man to write a summary like that without having access to the document itself, more particularly for this reason: that there are certain typographical peculiarities about these matters which are strictly followed in this article. For instance, take "S.II." and "S.I."; an ordinary reporter would probably write "Standard II." and "Standard I."

TUESDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1903.

EMIL SCHWABE, Reporter for the *New Zealand Times*, recalled, and re-examined on oath. (No. 15.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You have been recalled, Mr. Schwabe, to give further evidence. When you were last before the Committee you declined to answer certain questions. We have now ascertained that you were the reporter who had the information in question. We had this in evidence from one of the witnesses, "It was Mr. Schwabe who told me that we had some educational copy." Now, from whom did you get that?—In a newspaper office, where there is a very large staff, half a dozen members of the staff will sometimes know what is to appear in the paper.

2. From whom did you get that information?—I regret I must decline to answer that question.

3. You understand that by refusing to answer you are guilty of contempt, and the Committee intend to deal with the matter as one of contempt on your part, altogether apart from the paper. It is an individual act on your own part, irrespective of your paper, and will be dealt with as a personal act.

4. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Perhaps Mr. Schwabe is not aware that all reporters are only in the gallery by the permission of the House or by the permission of the Speaker—they are there practically by the will of Parliament.

5. *The Chairman.*] With full knowledge of these facts, do you decline to say from what source you received that information?—I regret that, under the circumstances, I must decline to answer the question.

6. You decline to give us this information?—With all due deference to the Committee, I decline.

7. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] Will you tell us the grounds on which you refuse to give it?—On the grounds of the trust generally reposed in newspaper men to regard as confidential the source of certain information which comes into newspaper offices.

8. You think it is a question of honour between you and the person who gave or enabled you to obtain the information in question that you should not disclose that person's name?—It is a question of honour with newspaper men. They regard the trust reposed in them as sacred.

9. Will you tell us whether it was a member of Parliament who gave you or enabled you to obtain the information?—I stated in my evidence in chief, I believe, that the information did not come from a member of Parliament, nor from an officer of the Education Department.

10. Did it come from an officer of the House?—So far as I am aware, it did not.

11. It came from no one employed in or about the House?—That is so.

12. Did it come from any Minister's office or officers?—It did not.

13. Did it come from any officer of the Education Department?—As far as I am aware, it did not.

14. *Hon. Sir W. J. Steward.*] Do you decline to state whether you obtained the information from any person?—Yes; I must decline to answer that.

15. Do you further decline to say whether you obtained it from any written document or memorandum left in any place to which you had access?—That question practically covers the same ground.

16. You are aware, as a newspaper reporter, of what took place at the time of the Banking Inquiry?—I was not in Wellington at that time, but I have knowledge of what happened.