

home duties," was erased. No other "Elizabeth Taylor" appears on Grey Lynn roll. A Mrs. Elizabeth Taylor appeared before us and said the claim for transfer was not signed by her. This is clearly a case where the circumstances justified the Registrar in acting as he did.

*Wilfred Cooper.*—This name was apparently expunged in error. The Registrar's office was apparently misled by a Wilfred Cooper, who appeared on City roll as No. 2933. There is an Oxford Street in City of Auckland, as also in Grey Lynn. This is clearly an accidental error.

*Jacob Burrows.*—Two claims were produced, one for enrolment, City of Auckland, signed "John Burrows," one for transfer from Grey Lynn to City of Auckland, from "Jacob Burrows, Williamson's Avenue, gardener," and the Registrar expunged the name "Jacob Burrows" from Grey Lynn accordingly. There seems to have been a confusion in this matter, and an error to have occurred.

*George Walter Chipman.*—A claim for transfer from Grey Lynn to City of Auckland was produced, and appears to be quite correct.

**CHARGE NO. 6 (GREY LYNN):** Refusing to allow Inspection of Rolls or Inspection of Claims for the Purpose of ascertaining whether Names of Qualified Electors who had applied for Enrolment were upon such Rolls, and not notifying Electors that they had been enrolled after issue of Main Roll.

We have referred to the legal aspect of this matter in the general observations on the statute, and the facts on which these charges are made appear very simple. Some one from Mr. Spedding's office brought to the Registrar a somewhat long list of names of persons for whom claims had been lodged, and wished to verify by reference to the rolls—or what were termed rolls—whether these names were inserted in such rolls. Mr. King looked upon this as equivalent to obtaining an abstract from the rolls, for which payment should be made, and demanded and obtained the sum of 3s. therefor, which he duly accounted for to the Treasury. He says he made a special appointment during the luncheon-hour for the purpose of making the necessary examination, and that the list was duly checked, marked, and returned to the person paying the demanded fee.

Whether the demand was actually justified in law is somewhat doubtful. A different practice in respect to supplying such information, with or without fee, appears to have prevailed in various parts of the colony, and in the somewhat analogous matter of obtaining office copies from Supreme Court offices the practice has not been always uniform. For the purposes of this inquiry it is immaterial whether the demand was strictly justified or not; the question could have been settled by reference to the Colonial Secretary's office, and is a departmental matter. It is too trivial to be considered in such an inquiry as this when the question is one, and really only one, of corrupt motive on the part of the Registrar.

The addendum to this charge of not notifying electors that they had been enrolled after printing of the general roll has been considered in its legal aspect in our observations on the statute. As affording any proof of the charges made against the Registrar it is valueless, and is no more than a technical objection to procedure, analogous to those objections in legal practice which were formerly so prevalent, but are now discountenanced by Judges. Illustrations of this kind of objection are sometimes afforded when registered companies sue for calls, and it is shown that some step provided by the statute has not been taken, or, in an appeal, that the proper notice has not been given thereof. The party at fault sometimes fails in his case, but he is not charged with fraud because of his slip.

We have shown that neither *de facto* nor *de jure* were there any rolls, and we are of opinion that the Registrar allowed parties every reasonable opportunity of inspecting the lists and documents from which the rolls were ultimately prepared. The same observation applies as to the inspection of claims. There is nothing to show that Mr. King put any unnecessary difficulties in the way of any person applying to inspect the claims.

**CHARGE NO. 7 (GREY LYNN):** Absolutely refusing to transfer from other Rolls to Grey Lynn Roll when Special Application made to do so.

Under this heading the complainants say that in the cases mentioned below the Registrar deliberately decided not to make transfers, although the applicants personally attended and urged their claims.

*Jenkin's Case.*—There appears to be nothing in this. Jenkin had no claim or cause of complaint, and his evidence is merely as to a casual remark said to have been made by Mr. King.

*Jones's Case.*—There seems to have been a confusion in this matter, arising from difference of description. Mr. Jones in his claim is described as "traveller"; on Eden roll as "draper," and there was a Thomas Jones on Parnell roll described as "warehouseman." Mr. Jones called at the Registrar's office, and communications were sent to him, but the Registrar says that owing to pressure the transfer was not effected.

*Miles's Case.*—Mr. Dickson says that the Registrar refused to transfer from City of Auckland to Grey Lynn, but that a man could be transferred from Franklin to Grey Lynn; but this seems very unlikely to have occurred. The claim for transfer is not properly dated; but this does not appear to have been the Registrar's reason for refusal. Until Mr. Reed's closing speech no stress seemed to be laid on this case, and it was not fully inquired into.

*Cromarty's Case.*—The Registrar says he cannot explain why this man was not transferred, but that the omission was accidental.

*Johnston's (G.M.) Case.*—This was a case that ought to have been transferred to Eden, but was put on Grey Lynn. Mr. Johnston attended at the Registrar's office, and there seems to have been a good deal of friction between himself and the Registrar. The Registrar said that he was not satisfied that Victoria Avenue, Mount Eden, was not confused with Victoria Avenue, Eden Terrace, the first being in Eden and the latter in Grey Lynn. What the Registrar did in this matter he did openly, and to the knowledge of Mr. Johnston, whom he invited to test the matter in a Court of law.