

124. Did you read it aloud?—Yes.

125. "We have other letters also. For instance, there is one asking if all the evidence in connection with the drowning of a man ('nun,' it should be) at Taumarunui was divulged, or whether certain facts were suppressed in regard to her health that ought to have been stated in Court to have a full understanding of the matter." You read that?—I read that letter.

126. "We also have an inquiry as to whether there was not found in the grounds of an Auckland Roman Catholic institution the body of a child, and whether it had been buried at the expense of a local police officer." Did you say that?—I read that.

127. What good purpose, may I ask, do you suggest was being aimed at in making those statements to a large audience in the City of Auckland?—I made the charge there that the Post Office was being used corruptly to suppress correspondence in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church, and I read those as having come through the post and been suppressed.

128. I can understand your grievance against the suppression of the letters. Was it necessary for your purpose in regard to the Post Office to say aloud these things, which must be deemed offensive, to say the least? You answer my question?—Yes, absolutely.

129. You deemed it your duty to make these statements?—Yes, absolutely, or else the audience would not have had the opportunity of judging.

130. Would it not have been sufficient to say, "Certain letters of a very delicate nature have been suppressed in the Post Office"?—No, it would not.

131. Then you do not feel any shame in having made these remarks in public in a community which consists to a large extent of people of different religions, including Roman Catholics?—Not at all.

132. You glory in it?—Not at all. I regret the necessity that has been forced upon us by the action of censoring our box.

133. I want to see exactly the kind of man you are. How long have you been a minister of the gospel?—Twenty years.

134. And in charge of churches or congregations all that time until lately?—Yes.

135. Where?—In Australia and in New Zealand.

136. When did you begin the anti-Roman-Catholic propaganda?—When I was at school.

137. And you have kept it up ever since?—Yes.

138. Have you indulged in public utterances somewhat on these lines in Australia?—Yes.

139. With the same results?—No.

140. No disturbances?—No.

141. Now, evidently you are imbued with the idea that there is a good deal—I will not say in the Roman Catholic faith, but in Roman Catholics themselves that is objectionable?—Not at all.

142. Are you not?—Not at all. I say it is the system.

143. It is the system, you say?—The system. I have no prejudice against Roman Catholics as such.

144. No? I am glad to hear that. That hardly squares with your public utterances, however?—You may think so, but I do not.

145. We may differ there, perhaps. You consider it was a necessity, and you performed a public duty in making the statements I have quoted?—Yes.

146. Did you consider you were performing any useful and good purpose in inventing—forging—bogus letters addressed to yourself or your committee which your counsel produced yesterday?—They were not bogus in the sense that there was reason for believing—

147. Answer me [question repeated]?—They were not bogus letters in that the inquiries made in those letters were not mere figments. We have reasonable ground for believing that in every case in those inquiries there is a substratum of truth, which, if occasion arises, may be proved.

148. That is not the question. Did you not deliberately invent the letters?—No; one could not invent facts.

149. Did you write the letters?—No, I did not.

150. Who did it?—Friends, at my dictation.

151. Very well; that is practically you. Did they sign their own names?—No.

152. What did they sign?—Oh, various.

153. Various fictitious names?—Yes.

154. One is signed "Harry Travis": do you know of any person of that name?—Well, I do, in Australia.

155. You do not suggest that is from that person?—No.

156. You do not suggest it came from a person of this name?—No.

157. This is Elizabeth Blacklock: is that a true name?—No.

158. And in the case of Hoey, is there any such person?—No, not that I know of.

159. The fourth is Soden—an existing person?—No, not that I know of.

160. You invented those names?—I did.

161. These letters [addresses quoted] are practically letters prepared by you and practically addressed to yourself?—Yes. Not to me—they came to the box. I never used the box.

162. These letters were intended as traps for the Post Office or somebody?—Yes.

163. You said yesterday they dealt only with matters relating to Roman Catholicism?—Yes.

164. Do you not think that a decent man, if he wanted to make a trap for that purpose only, would have put into his letters something less disgusting and less offensive than this?—I say this: we could not have obtained the proof we desired to have without some statements such as those.

165. So you think that a harmless letter referring to some Roman Catholic matter of general interest would not have had the result you desired—namely, to find out whether the letters were being censored in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church or not?—No.

166. Now, these letters I have characterized as disgusting passed the Censor, you say?—Yes.