

16. Very well; I do not care whether it was on your own account or not. You certainly delivered a lecture in Hamilton, and you have delivered lectures in other places?—Yes, at Eltham and Stratford, and Dunedin, and Wellington.

17. Anywhere else?—Yes, here in Auckland, of course. I have delivered Sunday evening lectures on the subject.

18. But the lectures I spoke of were delivered in public halls?—Yes, and were the same I delivered in my church.

19. Not on Sunday evenings?—Not on Sunday evenings.

20. Now, I think that the lecture you delivered in Hamilton at the end of February led to some disturbance?—Yes, it led to a disturbance because the Roman Catholic Church organized the disturbance.

*Mr. Gray* objected that he was not asking for reasons, and *His Worship* upheld the objection.

21. *Mr. Gray.*] In point of fact the lecture in Hamilton ended in what may vulgarly be called a row?—Yes; it commenced in a row.

22. Here is a short account of it published in the *Auckland Star*, 28th February, which you probably read?—Yes, supplied by a Roman Catholic.

*Mr. Gray* objected on the ground that such matters should be left to Mr. Elliott's counsel to bring out if desired, and *His Worship* upheld the objection.

23. *Mr. Gray.*] Is that a correct account in the *Star* of the 28th February?—No, it is not; it is twisted in the extreme.

24. Now let me read this to you, and will you say in what respect it is incorrect?—Will you allow me to refer to a correct report?

25. That, of course, refers to the *Free Press*?—This is from the *Waikato Times*.

26. Is this correct? "Angry scenes were witnessed in the Theatre Royal last night at a lecture on 'What caused the War?' by the Rev. Howard Elliott under the auspices of the Orange Lodge. The speaker was subjected to interruption throughout, and was frequently 'counted out.' His remarks were at times bitterly resented by a section of the audience. At an early stage of the meeting a protest was lodged by a member of the audience against Mr. Bollard, M.P., taking the chair, as the proceedings were construed as an insult to a large number of his constituents. Mr. Bollard explained that the meeting was a public one, and if any did not like it they could leave. A strong body of police was present, and at the request of the lecturer several members of the audience were removed." Anything incorrect in that?—Nothing incorrect, except what is left out.

27. So far that is correct, subject to omissions of something which might have been put in. "Mr. Elliott sought to show that Roman Catholic influence was against the Allies, as a chastisement to France, for the restoration of the Pope's temporal power, and for the overthrow of Protestant England. His declaration that the responsibility for the war rested on the Pope, who sought world dominion, met with a storm of indignant dissent."

*Witness:* The storm of indignant dissent came from forty men who were sent there for the purpose. The rest of the audience were absolutely in accord.

28. *Mr. Gray.*] "The speaker retorted that these interruptions would serve to stir up Protestant sentiment in Hamilton, to which there were cries of 'Is that what you have come here for?' The speaker's remarks as to the action of the Pope in regard to Cardinal Mercier, Nurse Cavell, and the sinking of the 'Lusitania' evoked a storm of protest, which was renewed when he described a Minister of the Crown in a sister colony as a 'rotten traitor.'" Did you use that expression?—Yes, I did.

29. "Mr. Elliott was frequently told that he would be better in the trenches than endeavouring to stir up religious strife, and the police were called on to arrest him under the War Regulations. A motion urging on the Minister of Defence the grave necessity for impartial administration of the Defence Act in regard to clergymen was put to the meeting, but, owing to the large volume of 'Ayes' and 'Noes,' the chairman made no declaration."

*Witness:* That is distinctly untrue. It is only one of the—

30. *Mr. Gray.*] Very well, that is the first statement incorrect; the rest you say is correct. "A man in the audience asked Mr. Elliott if he was aware that out of a hundred members of the Hamilton Catholic Club no less than eighty-three were serving with the colours. The lecturer replied that if this was a fact it was a unique record for the Empire." Correct?—No; I said it was a unique record for a Roman Catholic institution.

31. Very well, I accept your correction. "At the conclusion of the meeting an angry crowd waited for the lecturer outside the theatre, and followed him along the main street, but a strong police escort shielded him from bodily harm, and he drove off in a motor." Is that true?—No; I was not escorted by the police to a motor-car.

32. And there was no angry interruption or scene outside?—There was an angry scene.

33. Very well; except that you say you were not escorted to your motor-car, and that you substitute "Roman Catholic Club" for "Empire," this report is substantially correct?—No; it is a report that is wholly incorrect in that it is written to convey a wrong impression.

34. Well, you say that something has been left out?—No; I say that everything is twisted.

35. Do you dissent from the actual statements?—No.

36. Did that display and lecture of yours at Hamilton cause the *Auckland Star* to deal with you somewhat trenchantly a day or two later?—Yes, on that report.

37. You read the Press, of course, and you read all it has to say about yourself and your doings?—Yes.

38. No doubt, then, you read the leading article in the *Auckland Star* of Thursday, 1st March?—Yes.