

20. And there is an addendum, is there not?—Yes. “Let it not be lost sight of that Rome stirred the fire under Europe’s boiling cauldron, and therefore she must be pronounced ‘Guilty’ in primarily provoking the Great War.”

21. *Mr. Ostler.*] That is a reprint, Mr. Salmond?—I do not think so.

*Mr. Ostler.* I can produce the *Churchman’s Magazine*.

*Witness.* The addendum, then, is the following part: “This is the Church that our Mayor (Mr. Gunson) and City Councillors are pandering to. (NOTE.—Owing to the attitude of the Press the people are kept in darkness. Rome controls the papers. Your heritage of liberty and freedom is being attacked. You don’t know it. The booksellers of this city are afraid to stock the literature which would enlighten you. If you are not going to remain blindfolded write to box 912, G.P.O., Auckland, when you will receive a list of books and magazines which every Protestant should read.)”

22. *Mr. Gray.*] Those words you have read at the beginning and the end of the pamphlet are something in addition to the original publication which the *Churchman’s Magazine* itself had published?—Yes.

23. Now, Mr. Salmond, you have expressed your reasons for recommending—advising—censorship. Have you in consequence of anything that has happened since last December, or that you have heard in the course of this inquiry, seen any reason to alter or modify your views?—None whatever, except that I am inclined to regret I did not take stronger action at the time than merely impose censorship.

24. *Mr. Ostler.*] Is that a threat?—

25. *Mr. Gray.*] It may not be a matter of public interest, but may I ask, Mr. Salmond, are you a Roman Catholic?—No.

26. Or Colonel Gibbon?—I do not know what Colonel Gibbon is, but I have no reason to believe he is a Roman Catholic.

27. Then, shortly, Mr. Salmond, it is you, and you alone, who are responsible for the advice that the correspondence from this body should be censored, and it was pursuant to your advice that the censorship was established?—That is so.

28. *Mr. Ostler.*] Is that the only instruction the military authorities have—that memorandum of the 13th December?—Oh, yes.

29. The only connection you had with the matter was to send that memorandum of the 13th December, 1916?—I have often dealt with the Rev. Howard Elliott since then.

30. Well, have you advised any further restrictions than those?—No.

31. Are we to understand that you are really the Censor of New Zealand, Mr. Salmond?—No.

32. It sounds like it, does it not?—No; I said I was the legal adviser.

33. But you advise, of course, and when you advise the military authorities they follow your advice, do they not?—Usually.

34. In this connection you did not have any instructions from any Minister of the Crown at all?—No.

35. When you say you are inclined to regret you did not take stronger action, are we to take that as a threat you are going to take stronger action in future?—I am making no threat.

36. What do you mean by “stronger action”?—By “stronger action” I mean prosecution under the War Regulations.

37. Can you point to any war regulation under which any person responsible for this pamphlet could be prosecuted?—I think it is probably an offence against the War Regulations of the 4th December, 1916. These were not in force when the pamphlet was printed.

38. Were those regulations made with the view of prohibiting the circulation of the pamphlet?—Oh, no; the pamphlet was published just before the regulations, and came to my knowledge just afterwards.

39. You have told us that the attention of the authorities was called to that pamphlet by a person whose name you declined to mention?—Yes.

40. Can you tell us whether he is a member of Parliament?—I have no objection to saying Yes, he was a member of Parliament.

41. I think we know the gentleman then?—I think you probably do.

42. You say he wrote a letter to the Attorney-General: have you brought that letter up with you?—Yes, I believe so.

43. Is it a fact that there is not one word of Mr. Howard Elliott mentioned in that letter?—

*Mr. Gray.* I do not think Mr. Salmond should be asked about documents necessarily of a confidential character. They are really matters of State, and Mr. Salmond might have declined, I think, if he had cared, even to make any statement—

*His Worship.* Well, he has already answered, and I do not see that the counsel for the other side—

*Mr. Gray.* All that Mr. Salmond said was that the attention of the Solicitor-General had been drawn—

*His Worship* overruled the objection.

44. *Mr. Ostler.*] My last question was, Was it a letter about the Rev. Howard Elliott?—I have no objection to answer that.

45. I suggest to you, Mr. Salmond, there was not a word in that letter of Mr. Elliott?—There was not, as far as I know.

46. But I understood you to say that the attention of the authorities was drawn in that letter to the Committee of Vigilance and to the Rev. Howard Elliott?—Not in that letter.

47. Then when you issued that advice to the Chief of the General Staff you did not know Mr. Howard Elliott in the matter?—No.