

39. Perhaps you will recollect that the editor began his remarks thus—the article is headed “Religious Strife”: “To stir up religious strife is a serious offence against society at any time. Where all men are free to worship according to their beliefs they should be equally free from attacks prompted by a bigotry and intolerance utterly alien to that spirit of religious liberty which gave inspiration to Protestantism, and which forms the essence, the very soul, of the British Constitution.” Do you agree?—You are not going to ask me to agree with those.

40. “It is particularly serious at a time like this, when the nation and the Empire is fighting for its life. Not only the safety of the community, but the respect that is due to both dead and living soldiers and their relatives, demands that men shall sink their religious differences as deep as possible. If only because all denominations are represented in the Army, and the law of conscription is being enforced against all classes in the community, the convictions and feelings of all should be carefully respected. Since the duty of avoiding offence of this kind lies upon the layman, it lies much more heavily upon the clergyman, whose duty in this, as in all things, is to set an example. We regret exceedingly that the Rev. Howard Elliott”——

*Mr. Ostler:* What are you reading the article for? You are not asking a question.

*His Worship:* Mr. Gray is asking whether he agreed to the sentiments.

*Mr. Gray:* Yes, I was; and if this is not the way the Press and community are dealing with him and his utterances.

41. *Mr. Gray:* Do you recollect that after commenting upon your theory of the cause of the war, supported by your pamphlet “Rome’s Hideous Guilt,” the paper went on to say this?—Excuse me—not my pamphlet.

42. The pamphlet for which you were responsible?—Not for which I was responsible.

43. You told my friend?—Not me personally—my committee. Let me get that clear, please.

44. Let me quote your words: “I am one of those responsible for the pamphlet ‘Rome’s Hideous Guilt in the European Carnage’”?—It is not a matter of shedding responsibility, but there are certain other gentlemen who deserve credit in connection with this matter.

45. Very well; you accept part of the responsibility. Do you recollect that article winding up with these words: “We hope this public attempt to stir up strife between Roman Catholics and Protestants will cease at once. If this is not done voluntarily, it would be a proper thing for the Government to take action under the War Regulations if it has power to do so. The circulation through the post of the leaflet to which we have referred should be stopped. The leaflet is distributed by some one whose only address is a box at the Auckland Post-office. At a time like this it is no part of the work of the Post Office to carry violent literature subversive of public amity, and even order.” Now, you know that is one of the results of your lecture at Hamilton?—Why do you go on to quote from that article?

46. Excuse me, I am not here to be cross-examined. You admit that is one of the results of your utterances in Hamilton: that is the way the Press dealt with them?—There are quite a number of others——

47. Now, you lectured before or after that at Taranaki?—After that.

48. Was this your first public utterance outside your church?—Yes, except that I lectured last October at Dunedin in the theatre there.

49. Did you lecture first in Eltham or Stratford?—At Eltham.

50. You know, of course, that your public utterances were criticized by the Press in Taranaki?—Yes, in the same way.

51. Do you recollect this article from the *Taranaki Herald*?—I did not see that article.

52. May I suggest that this is one of the results of your public utterances: “There is much indignation in certain parts of the Taranaki District at the present moment in consequence of lectures that have been delivered by the Rev. Howard Elliott on the alleged relationship of the Roman Catholic Church to the existing terrible world war. The lectures were preceded by the free distribution of a scurrilous pamphlet.” What was that—“Rome’s Hideous Guilt in the European Carnage”?—I have not any idea. I did not distribute a scurrilous pamphlet.

53. What pamphlet did you distribute?—I distributed the pamphlet “Rome’s Hideous Guilt in the European Carnage.”

54. “—— purporting to be issued by a Vigilance Committee, but whether there is any connection between the lecturer and the pamphlet propaganda does not appear to be clear. We have seen one of these pamphlets, and certainly it invites the attention of the authorities, its purpose and effect necessarily being mischievous at a moment like the present. One of its statements, for example, is that ‘Germany is being made the scapegoat for an equally guilty party—Rome.’” Then, after some further remarks, they quote from the *Eltham Argus*, which says, “From our own little community of Eltham the sons of Anglicans and the sons of Roman Catholics have gone forth like brothers, fought side by side and made the supreme sacrifice for us. Because he belonged to this or that religion do we think any the less of a lad who has fought and died for us? Have we not equal sympathy for those parents in our midst (whatever their creed) who have lost their sons? Is there a creature in human shape amongst us who would withhold sympathy for the suffering because of creed? We think not. And yet at this particular time, when the world is in the throes of bitter agony, when all creeds alike are suffering and sending up to heaven their prayers for peace and tranquillity, a gentleman with the prefix of ‘Reverend’ thinks it a fitting opportunity to come upon the platform and deliver an address in which he attributes all the horrors of the war to one particular Church”?—That is a wrong statement.

55. It may be a wrong deduction?—It is a wrong statement, not a wrong deduction.

56. Possibly. At any rate, it is one instance of how the Press of the community has thought fit to deal with your utterances. “To our minds it was sorrowful to hear a teacher of religion take up the attitude taken up by the lecturer last night. In this little village community we