

1903.

NEW ZEALAND.

CHARGES AGAINST THE REGISTRAR OF ELECTORS, AUCKLAND

(REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO).

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.

REPORT.

To His Excellency, the Earl of Ranfurly, G.C.M.G., &c., Governor of New Zealand.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

In pursuance of the powers and instructions contained in the accompanying instruments under Your Excellency's hand, we duly inquired into the matters and things mentioned therein, and have now the honour to report as follows:—

We opened the Commission at Auckland on the 16th March, 1903, and sat seventeen days, hearing the examination of witnesses and the addresses of counsel and of Mr. John King, the person charged.

Up till the issue of the Commission, no definite charges had been formulated, and the grounds of complaint against the Registrar of Electors were contained in the letters of various people, and the statements of depositions to Your Excellency's advisers. Public notification was given of the sitting of the Commission, and at the opening thereof all parties were invited to appear and lodge any complaints they might have against the Registrar within the scope of our Commission.

The parties appearing were a number of persons alleging wrong-doing on the part of the Registrar, and these were all represented by Mr. J. R. Reed, barrister, and Mr. A. Peak, solicitor. The Registrar was not represented by counsel, and it was apparent from the outset that he was placed at a considerable disadvantage in not having professional legal assistance, and we ourselves were embarrassed by the Registrar's want of skill in conducting an intricate contest, and the corresponding advantage possessed in that respect by the other side. Our endeavour was to ascertain all necessary facts, in order to determine the points in dispute, but probably we were not altogether successful in doing this. The exhaustive address of counsel in reply for the complainants, occupying four hours in delivery, was of assistance to us, but it would have been more satisfactory had there been any one able to speak for Mr. King.

On the opening of the inquiry the counsel for the complainants delivered definite and formal charges as under:—

That the Registrar corruptly attempted to influence the result of the Grey Lynn election:—

- (1.) By omitting to transfer names of electors from the city rolls to the Grey Lynn roll on the subdivision of districts;
- (2.) By transferring a number of electors to Grey Lynn, and still leaving the same persons on the City roll;
- (3.) By omitting to enrol a large number of persons on the Grey Lynn roll who put in their applications for enrolment, and against whom there was no valid objection;
- (4.) By inserting on Grey Lynn roll names of persons who applied for enrolment after the issue of writ, and whose application forms came through Masefield's Committee;
- (5.) By wrongfully expunging from the Grey Lynn roll, after issue of roll, names of persons who were qualified to vote for Grey Lynn;
- (6.) By 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;
- (7.) By absolutely refusing to transfer from other rolls to Grey Lynn roll when special application made to do so.
- (8.) That persons applying for enrolment on Grey Lynn roll were inserted in City roll.

City Roll.

- (1.) That claims, totalling eighty in number, of persons qualified to be on the City roll were put in by the Temperance Electoral Office, and none of such persons' names were inserted upon the said City roll.
- (2.) That a number of persons entitled to vote had their names expunged from the roll without notice at the last moment.
- (3.) That persons whose names were on the 1900 roll were left off the new roll although they voted at the by-election. No notice sent to persons so struck off.

Detailed lists were furnished by the complainants of the names of the persons referred to in these charges, and these lists are inserted herein.

It will be noticed that these charges specifically allege corrupt motive on the part of the Registrar in doing or omitting to do the acts mentioned therein. The two first matters mentioned in our commission might occur without improper motive, and, if such was the case, might be met by the Registrar admitting the fact, and saying that the refusals were the result of a mistaken but *bonâ fide* belief that he was right in his action.

The allegation of corrupt motive makes the matter much more serious, and it was recognised by all parties concerned that the accusation must be supported by proof of corrupt motive although such proof might be furnished either by direct or circumstantial evidence. It might be that such a mass of omissions or acts could be shown as to negative the suggestion of accident, and create an almost certainty that they must be the result of design, and of improper design.

The facts proved to us are as follows:—

In 1898 Mr. John King was appointed Registrar of Electors for the then existing Electoral Districts of Auckland City, Parnell, Manukau, and Eden, at a salary of £100 a year. He also held the office of Deputy Registrar of Old-age Pensions, and the office accommodation was selected and provided by the Departmental Head of the latter branch of administration. As in the course of the inquiry it was said that Mr. King was to blame for the choice of office accommodation, it may be stated at once that he was not responsible for the situation of the office. The position chosen was not, in our opinion, inconvenient or improper either as an office for old-age pensions or for the Registrar of Electors, except that at the period of an election the space for the public was very limited, and only a few could be attended to at the same time. In pursuance of the report of the Representation Commissioners these four electoral districts were redivided. The accompanying map shows how fresh districts were created with widely different boundaries. The new districts for which Mr. King on the 11th September, 1902, was appointed Registrar were named Auckland City, Parnell, Eden, and Grey Lynn; though the first three names are similar to those of districts existing before the redivision, they are, equally with Grey Lynn, new districts. No district of Grey Lynn had previously existed in name, and it was made up of parts of other districts. The boundaries of the new districts were gazetted on the 13th August, but the *Gazette* and plans illustrating the boundaries do not appear to have been received by Mr. King for at least a week later. It was not until the middle of September that Mr. King received from his departmental superior instructions and authority to prepare rolls for the new districts, and he was required to have the rolls ready for printing by the 6th October, 1902. It will be seen that this was a task of considerable magnitude, and the time in which the work was to be done was very short. The rolls for the districts affected contained some thirty-seven thousand names, and there were many thousand new claims for enrolment or transfer to be considered and dealt with. Although in June and July, 1902, a house-to-house visitation had been made by the Registrar's assistants, and as far as possible the existing rolls had been altered, added to, or amended, as occasion required, nothing could be done in advance which could be fairly said to be preparation for the new rolls.

The method adopted in September for preparing the new rolls is fully described in Mr. King's letter, prepared at our request (see Appendix); but it may be summarised as follows: The existing rolls, made up to date for each district, were gone through one by one, and against each name on each roll was placed a sign denoting the new district to which the name belonged. Each name was then written upon a slip of paper and deposited in a pigeon-hole alphabetically. There was a set of pigeon-holes for each district. To these slips were added the names of persons putting in new claims to enrolment, and of persons asking to be transferred from other districts and whose claims had been passed by the Registrar. These slips and claims were then sorted into true alphabetical order, and the names and descriptions were then copied on sheets of paper, which were termed the "MS. roll for printer." The sheets were sent to the printer as soon as written, the first being delivered about the 6th October; and proofs, revises, and advance pulls were sent by the printer to the Registrar as soon as they could be produced. Copies of these advance sheets were placed on the counter in the Registrar's office as soon as received, and were available for inspection by the public. This method of compiling a new roll has been found by experience to be convenient, and is adopted by other Registrars.

The work of examining so many names on four separate rolls and deciding in which of four new districts, the boundaries of which had only just been defined, the names should be inserted was naturally very difficult. Mr. King has extensive local knowledge, and besides the assistance of his office staff he invoked the aid of two gentlemen of great knowledge of the inhabitants and localities. Mr. Fitzpatrick had been many years census enumerator and collector of statistics, and had exceptional facilities for knowing the people and where they lived. Mr. J. R. Walters, J.P., had an almost equal knowledge. These two gentlemen went through the rolls, and to the best of their ability located all the people they knew. It was not suggested that they were other than perfectly *bonâ fide*, and that what they told the Registrar he acted on. But even men who had been all their lives in the district, and who had had special opportunities of knowing the residents, could not be expected to know every individual on an electoral roll based on manhood or womanhood suffrage. The compilation of a burgess roll, or any roll based on a property qualification, would be

simple compared to the task of compiling a general electoral roll based on the wider qualification. The time given was very short, and the attempted combination of economy, expedition, elasticity in interpretation, and accuracy seems to have contributed to the errors and omissions charged to Mr. King. The recurrence of the same name for streets situate in different districts, and the fact that some streets are partly in one district and partly in another, tended to create doubt and delay in allocating the names, and also doubtless led to errors and confusion. Had there been more time and more skilled assistance available all these difficulties could have been overcome; but in considering the number of errors discovered it is necessary to recognise the conditions under which the work was performed.

The complainants in this inquiry had, on or about the 8th October, established an office for the purpose of putting on the roll persons favourable to their party, and they were very active in doing this. Between the 15th October and the 12th November they lodged some two thousand claims for enrolment, and the lateness of these applications, the number of them, and the carelessness displayed in the preparation of some, no doubt added to the labour of the Registrar. The Registrar could not personally make inquiries into these claims; he was compelled to depend on the information afforded him by others, and he was necessarily engaged in answering inquiries at the office and deciding on cases submitted to him by his subordinates, and unfortunately in attending the Magistrate's Court in proceedings taken against him. Although there is evidence that great demand was made on Mr. King's time by the complainants' party, and by others, and that some of these did not treat him in a conciliatory way, there is no evidence, and hardly an allegation, that he was guilty of discourtesy or want of attention to any one. Some of his letters and some of his actions may be criticized adversely, but his personal attitude seems to have been conciliatory and unobjectionable. Various proceedings were taken in the Magistrate's Court by and against Mr. King (see Appendix), the first of which appears to have been some informations by Mr. Spedding alleging that he kept no roll. These proceedings, occurring as they did at a time when the Registrar's attention was required in supervising the preparation of the rolls, tended to hinder the work. The main complaint is with regard to the Grey Lynn roll, and it appears that until a late stage no great opposition was expected to Mr. Fowlds, M.H.R., the candidate supported by the complainants, and who indeed is himself one of the principal complainants. When it was found that Mr. Masefield would oppose Mr. Fowlds a rush was made, probably by both sides, to place names on the Grey Lynn roll. In the City of Auckland electorate there were eleven candidates, and no doubt the committees of each of these required a good deal of attention. In Parnell and Eden there were also sharply-contested elections, with the usual energy displayed on these occasions by the supporters of each candidate. It will be seen on reference to the schedules that a very large number of claims to enrolment were put in through the complainants in cases where the applicants were already on the roll of another district. This naturally added much to the difficulty of the Registrar, and it is very doubtful if such applications are permissible. The claimant declares that he is "not within his knowledge registered in any other district in the colony, nor in the district for which he now claims to be registered." Although in many instances the claimant had voted at a previous election, and had no reason to suppose that his name was erased, the complainants justified the lodgment of the claim by the argument that the claimant did not actually *know* that he was on any other roll.

The first general roll for Auckland City was published and sold freely on the 27th October, and persons whose names were on that roll were found to be making claims for enrolment on the Grey Lynn and other districts at a later date than the 27th October. Advance sheets as the work progressed were available, and could have been referred to at a much earlier date. One special difficulty in dealing with such claims was the danger of erasing names of persons from, say, the Auckland roll who were not the individuals making claims for enrolment on another roll, although the names were the same, and the descriptions very similar. For instance, the Registrar erased in error the name of Christina McLeod from the Auckland roll, and put her on the Eden roll, but it turned out that there was one Christina McLeod who was rightly on the Auckland roll, and another Christina McLeod who had put in a new claim for enrolment on Eden roll. The Registrar adopted a form of words in rejecting many claims for enrolment by persons whose names appeared to be on some other roll, which may have led to misapprehension. He generally wrote, "Wrong form; reject"—meaning that, if this was the person already on another roll, the form of transfer should have been used; and the complainants say, with some show of reason, that if this was the case the Registrar should have made the transfer under the powers given him by section 40. We shall treat of the legal aspect hereafter, but may here say that in our opinion the Registrar meant by his memorandum that he was not satisfied the person was the same, and that in the absence of proof, and considering the impossibility of proceeding by notice, owing to the shortness of the time before the issue of the writs, he would not take the responsibility of acting under section 40, and that he would require strict compliance with the statute. It will be seen that in such cases the Registrar must either take the responsibility of risking such a mistake as he actually made in Christina McLeod's case, or of putting the same person on two rolls. The complainants say that the Registrar could have dealt with these cases by giving notice to the claimants under section 36, but we are of opinion that this is not so, for the reason that until the matter was decided by a Court the name objected to must remain on the roll in which it appears. All the complaints made are in regard to claims lodged at a very late date.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LAW.

"The Electoral Act, 1902," is a consolidation measure, and does not materially alter the law as it stood prior to the Act coming into force on the 2nd October, 1902. The spirit of the Act is, that the Registrar should endeavour to place on the proper roll the name of every person entitled to be placed thereon; but that as safeguards are necessary to prevent personation, double voting, and

other election frauds, which some persons, otherwise honest, seem to regard as venial offences, the Registrar has the power of calling upon claimants for proof of the validity of these claims. Unfortunately the Act does not distinguish between claims sent in within a reasonable time prior to the issue of the writ and those sent in so late as to prevent the procedure for testing the validity of disputed claims being adopted. The intention of the statute is to allow the Registrar an opportunity of investigating every claim, but at the same time to allow claims to be sent up to the last moment, and these intentions clash in actual practice.

Sections 35, 36, and 40 are among the principal sections touching the points under consideration, and on the interpretation put upon these sections depends a good deal of the argument addressed to us.

Section 40 says: "It shall be the duty of the Registrar to make the rolls as complete as possible, and to place thereon the name of every person of whose qualification he is satisfied." It is urged by the complainants that this compels the Registrar to ignore any informalities in claims, and, if satisfied that the qualification is good, to put the claimant on the roll. Section 35 says: "The Registrar shall reject as informal every claim which is not complete in all particulars." No person may be registered on more than one electoral roll (section 27). It appears to us that section 40 does authorise the Registrar to treat an informal or incomplete claim as a nullity, and, if satisfied of the person's right to be registered, to insert his name on the roll. Where there is a doubt, such as would be raised for instance in the case of a claim coming in for registration in Grey Lynn by a person whose name and identity seem to be similar to that of a person already on the City of Auckland roll, but there is no certainty as to this, the Registrar cannot act under section 40 because he cannot be satisfied of the facts, and he cannot act under section 36 unless the claim has been lodged a sufficient period before the closing of the rolls to allow for the procedure mentioned in that section.

Section 36 requires the Registrar to inquire as to the truth of the claim within five days from receipt, and if not satisfied to give to the claimant notice of the particulars required. The claimant then has twenty-one days to either withdraw or make good his claim, and if he do not do either the Registrar must obtain a summons from a Magistrate, and, after the necessary delay in serving the same and obtaining a hearing, the matter is dealt with. If therefore the last day on which any names can be put on the roll is the 17th November, it is obviously impossible to deal under this section with claims lodged within thirty days prior to that date. The period of thirty days is made up by reckoning five days for inquiry, twenty-one days for the period to elapse before obtaining a summons, and at least four days for service and hearing. Whether the Registrar should not have given a formal notice in each case in which he was not satisfied is rather a difficult question. If he had done so, it appears that he would have had to go on with the matter, and obtain summonses in each case, and the matters would have been in suspense at the time the election took place, and he took a *via media* by making such inquiries as he was able to make in the time at his disposal. Whether the Registrar was right or wrong in this view we are not called on to say. It is a view which might well be honestly held, and there is no ground for a suggestion of *mala fides* in his doing so.

It is difficult to formulate any scheme of practically working the Act, which is not open to objection either on technical or practical grounds. In the case of application for enrolment, treated as transfers, the difficulty arises that if there is any doubt about the identity of the claimant with a person of similar name and description on another roll, the Registrar cannot proceed under section 41 to remove the person's name from one roll with a view of placing it on another unless there is sufficient time for the procedure under sections 41 and 42 to be adopted. In these cases, as in the cases considered under section 36, the Registrar before removing a name from a roll must give the person objected to a fifteen-days' notice, and if not then satisfied by proof, one way or the other, must apply for a summons, which must be heard by a Magistrate in due course; but no such proceeding can be taken unless the matter can be heard before the issue of the writ, and no name can be removed until the matter has been so determined. If then, in the before-mentioned case of Christina McLeod, the Registrar had elected to proceed by notice he would have been defeated on two grounds—first, that no sufficient time was given to enable the matter to be heard before the issue of the writ and the closing of the roll; and, second, that the objected name must remain until the objection was determined. The provisions with regard to the sitting of a Revision Court are peculiar; such a Court is not mentioned before the 43rd section, which suddenly declares that no sitting of a Magistrate's Court shall be held for the revision of any roll for any district, or for hearing objections to any name thereon, after the issue of the writ for an election until the completion of such election, but that the Magistrate may hold a special sitting, not later than four days after the issue of an election-writ, for the sole purpose of investigating the validity of any new claims for registration received within fifteen days prior to the issue of the election-writ. Notwithstanding this strict limitation section 50 empowers the Magistrate, on the *ex parte* application of the Registrar, or of any other person, to order the Registrar to correct any mistake proved to have been made in the roll, and to insert in the electoral roll the name of any person who proves his claim to be enrolled thereon, and also empowers the Magistrate to expunge from the roll (a) fictitious names, (b) names objected to and proved to be on another roll, (c) names of persons objected to who have lost their qualification, (d) the name of any person who is included in any such roll which is insufficiently described for the purpose of being identified. The confusion which appears to exist in these sections is referable to the want of recognition of the question of time. Section 50 appears to require to be placed before section 43 and to have a time-limitation added; and section 58 confirms this view, for it says, "except as provided in sections 43 and 51, and notwithstanding anything in the Act, it shall not be lawful for any Registrar, either by virtue of any authority conferred upon him by this Act or by direction of a Magistrate, to insert or to remove from the roll of any electoral district the name of any person after the date of issue of the writ for

the election of a member for the said district until the completion of the said election." In our opinion a Revision Court should be held at a reasonable time before every election, and after that has been held a subsequent sitting might be provided for with a specifically limited jurisdiction, as in section 41. In section 51 the Registrar is prohibited from removing the name of a person who is registered in another district unless such removal is prior to the election-writ or subsequent to the election; but immediately following this specific prohibition there is a provision that, notwithstanding anything in the Act, the Registrar, on being satisfied that the name of any person has been omitted or expunged from any roll by mistake or clerical error or through false information, may restore the name of such person to the roll at any time, and after the issue of the writ, but not later than ten clear days before the election. Then follows section 52, which says the Registrar shall at any time expunge from the roll the name of any person proved to have left the district for six months.

We do not attempt to indicate the course a Registrar can best adopt amid the difficulties created by this statute. The Registrar is not recognised as a Civil servant who is entitled to the advice and direction of a superior, and is informed that he must construe the law for himself and act on his own responsibility. Probably this is the sound constitutional position for the authorities to take up, and any other position would probably lead to danger and distrust; but when an accusation of corruption is made against the Registrar, and part of the proof relied on in support of the charge is that the Registrar omitted to do some act contemplated, or alleged to be contemplated, by the statute, it must be remembered that skilled lawyers find the Act difficult to interpret, and so far no satisfactory solution of many of the problems arising in the interpretation has been found.

The Registrar appears to have held that he could receive no claims after the moment at which he received notification of the issue of the writ; he received a telegram on the 12th November informing him that the writs were issued on the 11th. Section 58 says, "after the day of the issue of the writ"; but the interpretation clause says "issue of the writ" means the "day on which the Registrar receives a notification by letter or telegram that the Clerk of the Writs or person acting for him has signed a writ for an election for the district." The question arises whether the use of the expression "day of the issue of the writ" removes it from the interpretation of the bare words "issue of the writ." Probably it does not, but, coupled with the fact that the telegram did not come to hand until the day after its despatch, it creates one more difficulty for the Registrar, and, if our view is correct, the Registrar would not have erred if he had continued to receive claims until the close of his office on the 12th. He seems to have again adopted the *via media*, but not to have obtained safety in doing so. With the exception of one case, treated of hereafter, it is certain the Registrar treated all parties alike, and refused to receive claims after the telegram announcing the issue of the writ reached him.

The question of allowing the rolls to be inspected raises the doubt whether there was any legal roll for any districts until after the dissolution of Parliament on the 5th November, 1902. If there had been no change in the districts the rolls for each district, altered and amended from time to time in pursuance of section 40, would have been the rolls in force, but the redivision of the districts produces a peculiar situation. Subsection (8) of section 75 enacts that every new electoral district shall be deemed to have been constituted six months prior to the report of the Representation Commission taking effect, but subsection (9) says that all electoral districts existing, and all electoral rolls in force at the time of the redivision, shall continue in existence and force until the dissolution or expiration of the Parliament in being at the time when such division is made. Taking the 5th November, 1902, as the date of dissolution of Parliament, the old electoral rolls remained in force, and the new rolls, although published, were not in force until that date. Further, the new districts were to be supposed to have been constituted six months before they really were constituted, and the position was therefore this: the new district of Grey Lynn was, by a fiction of law, supposed to have been constituted six months before it was in fact constituted or defined; but as there never had, up to the time of its constitution, been any such district, or any roll for such district, there could not *de facto* be any roll for Grey Lynn until the same was compiled, and *de jure* there could be no such roll until the 5th November. The same state of things existed as to the other districts, which, though continued in name, differed in boundaries. The district of Auckland City was not the same after as before the redivision, and, however well the roll for the former district might have been kept up to date, it was not only unreliable, but actually misleading, if trusted to as a roll of the new Auckland City district, which by the said fiction had been six months in existence. By section 69 any person is entitled to inspect the roll without payment, but which roll is not stated. If such person be shown the roll of Auckland City as it existed prior to the redivision, he might well complain that such roll is not the roll of the district which *de jure* had been constituted six months prior to the redivision, and if he require the roll for the new district he must be told that such roll is not in force until Parliament is dissolved, and in fact is only in course of preparation.

When the Registrar was proceeded against at the instance of Mr. Spedding for not keeping a roll, his counsel appears to have avoided the dilemma just pointed out, by pleading that the place for keeping the roll (section 68) had not been fixed by the Colonial Secretary, and this plea was apparently allowed to prevail, and the information was dismissed.

NOTICE TO ELECTORS OF ENROLMENT.

Section 38 says that the Registrar shall, "as soon as convenient notify all persons whose claims are sent in after the printing of the general roll that they have been duly enrolled." It is presumed that this means that notice is to be sent to persons whose names have been placed upon supplementary rolls, and not to all persons who have sent in claims. It is admitted by Mr. King that such notices were not sent to such persons, and the term "notify" is not interpreted in the Act. Mr. King says that owing to pressure of business he could not send notices to such persons,

and that it was not "convenient" to do so before the election. Whether the printing of the supplementary rolls and placing them for inspection is sufficient does not very clearly appear, but it seems that an individual notice to each person enrolled after the printing of the general roll is contemplated.

EXHIBITING NAMES OF PERSONS STRUCK OFF THE ROLL.

Section 59 enacts that the names of electors struck off rolls shall be publicly exhibited on a board outside the Registrar's office, and maintained there for a period of at least one month from the time of their being struck off. We do not think this provision applies to the case of persons erased from one roll and placed on another when a redivision takes place. The Registrar advertised the numbers attached to names he expunged from various rolls after printing thereof, and this was more than the statute required; but if such names were required by law to be exhibited on a board outside his office, he technically failed to observe the requirements of the law in this respect. The point is of no importance when considering the charge of corruption.

THE CHARGES GENERALLY.

We are of opinion that there is no evidence to support the charge of corrupt motive, which is the gravamen of the whole accusation, and we might end our report here were it not that the complainants say that the multitude of errors made show that they must have occurred wilfully, and that if there was no excuse for making so many errors, and that if they are of such a nature as would not be made by an honest and reasonably competent person, a presumption of corrupt motive arises, which the Registrar is required to rebut, or be condemned. We must therefore proceed to examine in some detail these charges. There is no evidence that Mr. King discriminated between the parties claiming enrolment; if he rejected many claims put in by the complainants' party, it is amply proved that he rejected as many put in by others. In the absence of proof of discrimination according to political party, the first and eighth charges appear to rebut each other.

CHARGE No. 1 (GREY LYNN): Omitting to transfer Names of Electors from the City Roll to the Grey Lynn Roll on the Subdivision of Districts.

The complainants produce a list containing originally some 309 names, which they say were not transferred as they should have been from the City roll to Grey Lynn upon the redivision of the districts. But they say that upon application 120 of these names were transferred to Grey Lynn before the election, leaving 189 names wrongly on the City roll. Some reductions were made in this number by the complainants having apparently taken the same names twice, and by other errors. The lists are not easy to examine, as they appear to be in no sort of order, either alphabetically or numerically.

Mr. Spedding says that he has found from examination of the rolls 195 names were of persons living in streets wholly in Grey Lynn, and 114 were living in streets partly in Grey Lynn and partly in the City. But it must be noticed that there are several quite different streets bearing the same name in both electorates, and some streets the locality of which, from an electoral-district point of view, can only be determined by a careful reference to the maps showing the districts and the gazetted description of their boundaries. It was apparent that the complainants had themselves been misled, and had made several mistakes in locating the persons whose names they supplied. On the whole it appears that about 140 people were wrongly left on the City roll instead of being transferred to Grey Lynn, and that a number were wrongly transferred to Grey Lynn who should have been left on the City roll. If any evidence had been offered that these transfers or omissions to transfer were caused in any way by party considerations, or affected the result of an election, it would have been a matter of very serious moment. There is not even a suggestion that the people wrongly left on the City roll were all, or mainly, supporters of any particular party, nor that those wrongly transferred to Grey Lynn were all, or mainly, supporters or opponents of Mr. Fowlds, or any other candidate. The fact that errors were made on both sides negatives the suggestion of fraud; and that the fact that there were more mistaken retentions on the City roll than mistaken transfers to Grey Lynn is quite consistent with the numerical proportions of the two rolls. We have described the methods pursued in the preparation of the new rolls, and need not again refer to the difficulties in the way of those who undertook the task of dividing the names on the old rolls among the new electorate. We were favourably impressed with the way in which Mr. Keven, the Registrar's chief clerk, gave his evidence. The fraud charged could not have been perpetrated without his knowledge and complicity, nor without the knowledge of many of the extra clerks employed in the office. Taken on the whole, although the number of errors under this particular heading seems to be large, yet when judged in comparison with the enormous mass of names to be dealt with—about forty thousand in all—and the peculiar difficulties of the work, the margin of error does not seem to be unreasonably excessive.

CHARGE No. 2 (GREY LYNN): Transferring a Number of Electors to Grey Lynn, and leaving the Same upon the City of Auckland Roll.

It appears that upon this list there are eighty-five names appearing on both the Grey Lynn and City of Auckland rolls. Only the first twelve cases were particularly inquired into, and they appeared to leave no doubt that an error had been made by the Registrar in each of these cases. The evidence as to the remainder of the cases was that, on a careful comparison of both rolls, all the names in the list appeared on each roll. The Registrar says that the causes of this blunder were want of skill on the part of his assistants, difficulty in allocating at once the person to the proper district, which would cause the matter to be left in suspense; and oversight in not erasing the name from one roll when passing the slip which had been written out for enrolment in the other district. There is no suggestion that there was any picking according to political party of these

names. No proof was given that the same persons voted in both districts. Although a blunder, and only excusable on account of the difficulties mentioned in our general observations, there appears to be no ground for charging the Registrar with corruptly attempting to influence the result of the election by the act charged.

CHARGE No. 3 (GREY LYNN): Omitting to enrol a Large Number of Persons on the Grey Lynn Roll who put in their Application for Enrolment and against whom there was no Valid Objection.

This charge appears to be one upon which most stress is laid by the complainants, and every name on the list supplied was examined in detail. We therefore set out this list at length, and the result is shown as under:—

Names and Addresses, and Dates of Claims; together with Registrar's Explanation and Commissioners' Comments.

- Archer, Jane, Richmond Street; 10th November, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 261. There is Richmond Road in C.A. as well as in G.L. Claim marked "Wrong form; reject."
- Archer, Lydia Ann, Richmond Street, Glenmore; 10th November, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 262. Claim marked "Wrong form; reject."
- Bowden, Joseph, New North Road; 27th November, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 1302. Claim marked "This application is irregular, and must be rejected."
- Barnaby, Henry, Mount Roskill Road; 28th October, 1902.—Police reported, "Claim not signed in presence of witness, but name put on special supplementary for G.L., and Barnaby voted thereon."
- Booth, Hannah, Murdock Road; 30th October, 1902.—Rejected as a duplicate, claimant being already on G.L. general roll, No. 251.
- Brigham, David Dale, Codrington Street, Arch Hill; 24th October, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 1477. Rejected as irregular.
- Carlson, Julia Mary, Millais Street; 24th October, 1902.—Rejected as a duplicate. Claimant being already on G.L. roll, No. 497.
- Conn, Jan Ann, Richmond Road; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 2804. Claim marked "Wrong application form; must reject."
- Corden, Annie, King Street; 24th October, 1902.—Rejected as a duplicate, claimant being already on G.L. roll, No. 697.
- Cross, Mary Jane, Flower Street, off Eden Terrace; 3rd November, 1902. Rejected as a duplicate, claimant being already on G.L. general roll, No. 798.
- Dick, William, Alexander Street, Glenmore; 27th October, 1902. On C.A. general roll, No. 3683. Rejected.
- Dorrington, Annie, Eden Vale Road; 4th November, 1902.—On Eden general roll, No. 915. Wrong form; reject.
- Duff, Sarah, Oxford Street; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 3986. Wrong form; reject.
- Edgar, Laurina, Oxford Street; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 4126. Wrong form; reject.
- Edwards, Bridget, King Street; 24th October, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 4166. Wrong form; reject.
- French, Mary, Williamson's Avenue, Grey Lynn; 3rd November, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 4871. Wrong form; reject.
- Freeman, Amy-Letitia, Charles Street, Rocky Nook; 23rd October, 1902.—Form incomplete. Claimant's former electorate not stated in claim for transfer. See section 35, "Electoral Act, 1902."
- Frater, Susannah, Stanley Street, Richmond; 25th October, 1892.—On C.A. general roll, No. 4855. Held in suspense, and apparently not put on.
- Firth, Emma, Murdock Road; 11th November, 1902.—On C.A. general roll, No. 4631. Wrong form; reject.
- George, Albert Henry, Princess Street; 29th October, 1902.—Rejected as a duplicate. Already on G.L., No. 1293. Not fully dated.
- Green, Sarah Jane, Disraeli Street; 4th November, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 1906. Wrong form; reject.
- Gray, John, Arch Hill; 10th November, 1902.—On C.A., No. 5522. Rejected.
- Gray, Joseph, Arch Hill Brickworks; 10th November, 1902.—On C.A., No. 5556. Rejected.
- Gray, Isabella, Arch Hill Brickworks; 10th November, 1902.—On C.A., No. 5548. Rejected.
- Harnett, Herbert Henry, Great North Road; 27th October, 1902.—On C.A., No. 6063. Wrong form; reject.
- Hellings, Thomas, Eden Street; 28th October, 1902.—On Eden, No. 1488. Wrong form; reject.
- Hodgson, Catherine, King Street; 30th October, 1902.—On C.A., No. 6661. Applicant made personal application for transfer, and was told it would be done. By some error this was omitted.
- Hood, George, Norman Street; 31st October, 1902.—Rejected as a duplicate. Already on G.L., No. 1676.
- Hill, Frances Margaret, Argyle Street; 3rd November, 1902.—On C.A., No. 6593. Wrong form; reject.
- Holmden, Peter Sladden, Eden Vale Road, Mount Eden; 7th November, 1902.—Claim for transfer duly accepted; put on roll.

- Holmden, Alice, Eden Vale Road, Mount Eden; 7th November, 1902.—Claim for transfer duly accepted; put on roll.
- Jones, Alice Mary Elizabeth, Argyle Street; 6th November, 1902.—Name "Alice Jones" on C.A. roll, No. 7397. Identity doubtful; too late to inquire. No transfer made.
- Jackson, Henrietta, Mackelvie Street, off Great North Road; 10th November, 1902.—On Parnell, No. 2373. Wrong form; reject.
- Johnston, Charles William, Codrington Street.—Duly enrolled G.L., No. 4260.
- Judge, Emily Graham, Princess (or Princep) Street; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 7501. Wrong form; reject.
- Lawrence, Frederick James, Great North Road; 23rd October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 2769. Form not fully dated. Wrong form; reject.
- Mountfort, Florence, Victoria Avenue.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 2375.
- Norton, Annie, Crummer Road; 4th November, 1902.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 5217.
- Murray, Margaret Ann, Argyle Street; 6th November, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 9790. Wrong form; reject.
- Moriarty, John, Monk Road; 10th November, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 3285. Wrong form; reject. Apparently a mistake. John Moriarty, the claimant, denies identity with No. 3285, Parnell roll.
- McQuarrie, Dugald, King Street; 25th October, 1902.—On Eden roll, No. 2471. Wrong form; reject.
- McGibbon, Helen, Regent Street; 24th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 10178.
- Margaret Stewart, Arch Hill.—Wrong form; reject.
- McNair, Isaac Howarth, Wolseley Road; 30th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 10544. Wrong form; reject.
- McDonald, Patrick, Summer Street, Eden Terrace; 30th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 10120. Wrong form; reject. Calling misleading.
- McLeod, Fanny, Richmond Road (left-hand); 8th November, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 10460. Wrong form; reject.
- Noone, Charlotte Swaisland, Argyle Street; 29th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 10842. Wrong form; reject.
- Normansby, Mary, Murdock Road; 28th October, 1902.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 5215.
- Prichard, William David, Eden Vale Road; 30th October, 1902.—On Eden roll, No. 2798. Wrong form; reject.
- Porter, Annie Eliza, Russell Street; 30th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 11672. Wrong form; reject.
- Reyland, William Henry, Oxford Street, Arch Hill; 23rd October, 1902.—Addressed to Registrar of Electoral District, Arch Hill. Informal; rejected.
- Ross, John, Oxford Street, Arch Hill; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 12488. Wrong form; reject; not fully dated.
- Richards, Edward George, Home Street, Arch Hill; 24th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 12168. Wrong form; reject.
- Roseman, Emma Hester, Victoria Avenue; 29th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 12469. Wrong form; reject.
- Reardon, William Thomas, Richmond Road; 6th November, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 12030. Wrong form; reject.
- Strongman, Ellen, Commercial Road; 23rd October, 1902.—Duly enrolled, G.L. No. 3376. Duplicate claim; reject.
- Sinclair, Charles Henry, Russell Street; 24th October, 1892.—Duly enrolled, G.L. No. 3169. Duplicate claim; reject.
- Smith, Evelyn, Richmond Road; 23rd October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 13367. Wrong form; reject.
- Smith, Bertie, King Street; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 13312. Wrong form; reject.
- Smith, Philip Percy, King Street, Arch Hill; 25th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 13464. Wrong form; reject.
- Stanton, Sarah Jane, Mount Eden Road; 24th October, 1902.—On Eden roll, No. 3277.
- Stanton, John William, Mount Eden Road; 25th October, 1902.—On Eden roll, No. 3272.
- Sanders Albert Ernest, Crummer Road; 24th October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 4344. Wrong form; reject.
- Stewart, Mary, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 31st October, 1902.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 5394.
- Stone, Ellen, Esplanade Road.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 3395.
- Silvino, Edith, Home Street.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 5358.
- Stone, Johanna Caroline, Cross Street.—Duly enrolled, G.L., No. 5397.
- Spragg, Gilbert Wilfred, Commercial Road; 24th October, 1902.—Claimant wrongly declared age and was prosecuted. (See next case.)
- Spragg, Gilbert Wilfred, Commercial Road; 11th November, 1902.—Not satisfied as to age. (See note on this case.)
- Tremain, Herbert Edward, Crummer Road; 23rd October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 14482. Wrong form; reject.
- Taylor, Jennie, Murdock Road; 28th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 14129. Wrong form; reject.
- Williams, Ernest Albert, Coleridge Street; 23rd October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 15563. Wrong form; reject.
- Walker, Charles William, Queen Street, Richmond; 23rd October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 14833. Wrong form; reject.

Walker, Charles William, Queen Street, Richmond; 7th November, 1902.—Duplicate of above.
 “Not satisfied; reject.”
 Ryland, George, Oxford Street.—No trace of this claim. Not put in by Mr. Spedding.
 Grant, Mary.—On C.A. roll, No. 5517. Claim not produced. Not put in by Mr. Spedding.
 Davis, Mary Ann J.—No trace of this claim. Not put in by Mr. Spedding. On C.A. roll, No. 3478.
 Cox, John, sen.—No trace of this claim. Not put in by Mr. Spedding.
 Harper, William Thomas.—No trace of this claim. Not put in by Mr. Spedding.
 Elvidge, Mary Ann, Great North Road; 23rd October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 4306. Wrong form; reject.
 Walker, Emily Clara Eleanor.—No trace of this claim. Not put in by Mr. Spedding.
 Honeycombe, Charles.—No trace of this claim. Not put in by Mr. Spedding.
 McGibbon, Helen Margaret Stewart, Regent Street.—See *supra*. Same claim treated.
 Lindsay, Margaret, Westmoreland Street; 17th October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 8389. Wrong form; reject.

Notes on the Above Cases.

1. Fourteen persons, namely—Booth, Carlson, Cordon, Cross, Johnston, Mountfort, Norton, Normanby, Strongman, Sinclair, Stewart, Stone, Silvino, and Stone, were duly enrolled on Grey Lynn roll, but are included in list of those omitted.

2. Twenty-three names on lists furnished by complainants are more or less wrongly spelled, namely—Conn, Cordon, Dick, Duff, Edgar, Freeman, Harnett, Hellings, Holmedon (2), Lawrence, Norton, Moriarty, McGibbon, McDonald, Noone, Ross, Reardon, Strongman, Sinclair, Stanton, Stewart, and Tremain.

3. With the exception of those of whose claims no trace can be found, and of G. W. Spragg, all the persons were enrolled on an electoral roll.

4. *Re G. W. Spragg*: This is a case in which the claimant was not twenty-one until the 11th November, 1902, but on the 24th October, 1902, he declared that his age was not under twenty-one years. Mr. King prosecuted him for this offence, but the case was dismissed on the plea that the defendant thought that if he was twenty-one at the time he voted he might make the declaration. On the 11th November, as asserted by the complainant, but on the 10th November, as asserted by Mr. King, Spragg lodged another claim to vote. The day of the month in the form of claim is blurred or blotted, and it is impossible to say positively which date was originally written or which party is correct in their assertion. Mr. King forwarded the papers to the Crown Solicitor with a view to further proceedings, but the Crown Solicitor advised against such a course. It was then too late to put Spragg on the roll.

CHARGE NO. 4 (GREY LYNN): Inserting on Grey Lynn Roll Names of Persons who applied for Enrolment after the Issue of Writ, and whose Application Forms came through Masefield's Committee.

For proof of this charge the complainants rely upon the evidence adduced upon one claim only—viz., the application of Mrs. Frances Tessa Chatfield, which, according to the complainants, was brought by one of their party to Mr. Spedding's office on the 12th November, after Mr. Spedding had been informed by Mr. King that the electoral writ had been issued, and that no more claims could be received. The complainant's party then decided to use this as a test as to whether their opponents could get such a claim on the roll, and one of them took it in an envelope to the office of Mr. Masefield, who was Mr. Fowlds' opponent for Grey Lynn. Except as to time of delivery the claim was regular in all respects, and none of the difficulties appearing in so many of the cases before mentioned were present. Mr. Spedding puts the time he was informed of the issue of the writ at between 9 and 10 a.m. Mr. King puts it at 10.45 a.m., and in this he is corroborated by one of his clerks, Mr. McGill, who appeared to be a very intelligent and reliable witness. There is a mass of contradiction, however, on both sides, concerning the circumstances of this matter. Neither Mr. King nor any of his witnesses remember the receipt of this particular claim, and it is impossible to say definitely the exact time when Mr. King personally received the telegram notifying the issue of the electoral writs. The whole circumstances are unsatisfactory and somewhat suspicious.

The claim itself bears in Mr. King's handwriting the erased words “Rece'd after,” but neither side has traced the claim from Masefield's office to the Registrar. We ourselves summoned a witness who, it was supposed, would throw some light upon the matter, but failed to elicit any information. The name of the clerk in Masefield's office to whom the claim was alleged to be given was not stated, if indeed it was known. When a device like this is employed it is necessary that those employing it should make the matter perfectly plain. There are so many ways which ingenuity might suggest of obtaining the introduction of a single claim into the Registrar's office, unknown to the Registrar, that, even without employing the rule of giving the benefit of the doubt to the accused, we are compelled to hold that this case has not been proved satisfactorily, and that the charge itself is unsupported.

CHARGE NO. 5 (GREY LYNN): Wrongfully expunging from the Grey Lynn Roll after Issue of Roll Names of Persons who were qualified to vote for Grey Lynn.

A list of seven names was furnished in support of this charge, but the names of Challis, Higgott, and Connor were discovered to have been entered in error, as these names were not expunged as first alleged by complainants.

The explanations as to the other four are as follows:—

Elizabeth Taylor.—A claim for transfer was produced in which “Elizabeth Taylor, John Street, home duties,” applies for transfer from Grey Lynn to Eden. The Registrar marked the claim, “Erase from Grey Lynn Roll,” and No. 3414, “Elizabeth Taylor, Great North Road,

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.

Caley's Cases.—There was ample room for doubt when the rolls were made up, and until the sitting of the Revision Court, as to whether these names belonged to Eden or Grey Lynn. The omission of Josephine Caley's name was brought about by the Caley's accidentally omitting her name from the order of the Court, and it would naturally mislead the Registrar in making up the special supplementary roll. He says that, taking the order of the Court as the basis for the supplementary roll, he would naturally overlook any names not included thereon.

Spragg's Case.—This was the case mentioned in Charge No. 3 (Grey Lynn), and need not be further referred to in this place.

Crudge's Case.—This was an application to transfer from Grey Lynn to Eden, and the Registrar marked it "Not approved," making a further minute to the effect that there was no time for erasing from Grey Lynn and transferring to Eden. In our opinion this is not a sufficient reason, and no other is offered.

Fox's Case.—This case is dealt with in schedule under heading "Charge No. 1" (City roll). It will be noticed that the only cases in this list which fall under the heading adopted by the complainants are Cromarty's, Caley's, and Spragg's, and in each of these cases there is no ground for alleging corrupt motive, even if the Registrar had been proved to have erred in his decision.

CHARGE No. 8: That Persons applying for Enrolment on Grey Lynn were inserted on City Roll. This charge was abandoned as being substantially included in Charge No. 1.

CHARGE No. 1 (CITY ROLL): That Claims totalling Eighty in Number of Persons qualified to be on the City Roll were put in by Temperance Electoral Office, and none of such Persons' Names were inserted upon the said City Roll.

Names and Addresses, and Dates of Claims; together with Registrar's Explanation and Commissioners' Comments.

- Boreham, Frank, Collingwood Street; 5th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 252. Wrong form; reject.
- Boreham, Jane, Collingwood Street; 5th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 254. Wrong form; reject.
- Burgess, Mary Ann, Newton Road; 5th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 405. Wrong form; reject.
- Brown, Letitia.—Presumed to be No. 1620, C.A. roll. No claim produced.
- Cordes, Elizabeth, St. Mary's Road, Ponsonby; 5th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 700. Wrong form; reject.
- Corrie, Ellen.—Claim not produced. No information.
- Flynn, Elizabeth, 95, Nelson Street; 6th November, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 4712. Rejected.
- Gavan, Janet Russell, Victoria Street; 4th November, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 5076. Rejected.
- Gorrie, Sarah.—Claim not produced. No information.
- Holland, John, Wellington Street.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 6715. Rejected.
- Hardy, Robert, Picton Street; 30th October, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 1480. Rejected.
- Hardy, Robert, Picton Street; 11th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 1480. Rejected.
- Lawson, Amelia, Nelson Street.—This case is specially and separately dealt with by us *infra*.
- Meek, Charles Henry, Somerset Place, off Howe Street; 6th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 2245. Wrong form; reject.
- Meek, Elizabeth Jane, Somerset Place, off Howe Street; 6th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 2246. Wrong form; reject.
- Mumford, Easton Hunter, Cobden Street; 7th November, 1902. Duplicate of C.A., No. 17122. Rejected.
- Matthews, Horace.—Probably a mistake for "Florence Matthews," No. 19358, C.A. roll. No claim produced. No evidence.
- McMillan, Jessie, Wellington Place; 6th November, 1902.—Confused with Jessie McMillan, No. 3595, Parnell. Mistaken identity.
- Rae, Elizabeth, Costley Street.—On C.A. roll as No. 11914. Claim not produced.
- Robinson, William Leo, Abbott's Road.—On C.A. roll as No. 19889. Claim not produced.
- Rainger, Charles, Sentinel Road, Ponsonby; 10th November, 1902.—Claim marked "Treat as transfer. Erase from Parnell roll, 4076." Erased from Parnell. Not on City roll.
- Reader, Caroline.—Claim not produced. No evidence.
- Reed, Rebecca, Edinburgh Street, Newton; , 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 12055. Rejected; form and date incomplete.
- Skelton, G. H.—Said to be identical with Edward Harold Skelton, No. 19998, C.A. Claim not produced.
- Shiels, Maggie, Boston Road.—Said to be No. 13043, C.A. Claim not produced.
- Whiteheath, Hattie, Cook Street; 6th November, 1902.—On G.L. roll as No. 3471.
- Williams, L. R. Scott, Great North Road.—On C.A. roll as No. 19960. Claim not produced.
- Brown, Peter Samuel, Norfolk Street, Ponsonby; 28th October, 1902.—Police report he is in Te Aroha. "Not satisfied as to residence; reject."
- Boyce, John James, Salisbury Street, Ponsonby; 28th October, 1902.—On G.L. roll as No. 271. Wrong form; reject.
- Crumpton, Thomas, Prospect Terrace; 28th October, 1902.—Police report he cannot be found. "Reject." N.B.—They seem to have confused Prospect Street with Prospect Terrace, which are in different electorates.

- Clarke, Harriett, Douglas Street; 5th November, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 882. Wrong form; reject.
- Davison, Henry Pearson, Church Street, Ponsonby; 17th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A. No. 3538. Rejected.
- Davison, Henry Pearson, Church Street, Ponsonby; 25th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 3538. Rejected.
- Fox, Thomas Benjamin, Upper Queen Street; 29th October, 1902.—Applicant struck out line in claim as to residence. Probably this was accidental: *prima facie* it looked as if it were deliberate, and he had not the qualification.
- Goodenough, Annie, Spring Street; 28th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 5368. Rejected.
- Gannon, Kate, King Terrace; 24th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 5001. Rejected.
- Geddes, Robert, Arawa Street; 28th October, 1902.—Claim marked "Erased from Parnell roll, No. 1714." Name erased, and not inserted in City roll.
- Gooch, Thomas, sen., Rutland Street; 28th October, 1902.—On G.L. roll as No. 1344. Apparent confusion with applicant's son.
- Glendinning, Robert, Liverpool Street; 31st October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 16688. Rejected.
- Gwilliam, Louisa, Durham Street; 1st November, 1902.—Apparent confusion with Louisa Gwilliam, G.L. roll, No. 4202. Applicant appeared; gave her name as Louisa Eliza Gwilliam. Both claims produced, signed "Louisa Gwilliam."
- Haydon, Sarah, Milford Street; 24th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 6258. Rejected.
- Hoey, Nellie Gibson, Hobson Street.—On C.A., No. 16809. No claim produced.
- Harper, William Thomas, Coburg Street; 29th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 6073. Rejected.
- Hughes, Mary Elizabeth, Prospect Street; 28th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 6949. Rejected.
- Hutton, Harriet Mary, Randolph Street, Newton; 30th October, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 1730. Wrong form; reject.
- Jones, Mary Jane.—No claim produced. Said to be No. 7446, C.A.
- Jackson, William Thomas, 50, Pitt Street; 2nd October, 1902.—Claim not witnessed by an elector. Claim for witness passed 30th October, 1902.
- Kelly, Jane, Karangahape Road; 28th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 7667. Rejected.
- Leyland, Samuel Herbert, Bella Vista Road, Ponsonby; 28th October, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 8352. Rejected.
- Longhurst, William James, Swanson Street; 29th October, 1902.—Police report unable to find claimant. Very small street. Reject.
- Langley, Stephen Edward, Hobson Street; 28th October, 1902.—Claim signed "Edward Stephen Langley." Two Edward Langleys on C.A. roll, Nos. 8037 and 8038.
- Locke, Thomas Hopkins, Khyber Pass Road; 29th October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 2882.
- Lowry, Corliss Augustine, Dedwood Terrace.—On C.A. as No. 19303. Claim not produced.
- Lewis, Emma, 50, Pitt Street; 29th October, 1902.—On Eden roll, No. 2004. Wrong form; reject.
- Massey, Emma.—No claim produced. No evidence.
- Moorcroft, George, Hobson Street; 28th October, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 2320. Wrong form; reject.
- Millar, Matilda Welsman, Grafton Road; 29th October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 3156. Wrong form; reject.
- Mundy, Elizabeth, Ireland Street; 29th October, 1902.—Mistaken identity with Elizabeth Mundy, No. 3367, Parnell roll.
- Mayne, Frederick, Napier Street; 1st November, 1902.—Duplicate of C.A., No. 9058. Rejected.
- Message, Elizabeth, O'Neill Street; 3rd November, 1902.—On G.L. roll, No. 2261. Wrong form; reject.
- Murray, Fanny, District Hospital; 3rd November, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 3392. Wrong form; reject.
- McQuillan, Charles, Jermyn Street.—On C.A. roll, No. 10573. No claim produced.
- Nicholls, Annie Maud, 90, Victoria Street; 25th October, 1902.—Duplicate of No. 10755, C.A. Rejected.
- Quedley, Ernest Joseph, Wyndham Street; 28th October, 1902.—Police report cannot be found in Wyndham Street. Rejected.
- Pisani, Jacob, Chapel Street; 24th October 1902.—Police report cannot be found in Wyndham Street. Rejected.
- Peacock, M. B., Shelly Beach Road.—Complainant admits is an error. Withdrawn.
- Preston, William, Sussex Street.—Complainant admits is an error. Withdrawn.
- Pook, Alfred Henry, Beach Road; 26th October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 4006. Wrong form; reject.
- Preston, Sophy, Sussex Street.—On G.L., No. 2831. Claim not produced.
- Reeve, Fanny, Niue Street.—On C.A. roll, No. 12062. No claim produced.
- Rowberry, Daisy, Durham Street; 25th October, 1902.—Registrar says he was not satisfied as to this claim, but there appears no valid reason for rejection.
- Rhodes, James, Crummer Road.—On C.A. roll, No. 12159. No claim produced.
- Reynolds, Percy, Graham Street; 30th October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 4145. Wrong form; reject.
- Tattersall, Ada, Dunedin Street; 12th June, 1902.—Confusion of identity with another Ada Tattersall, C.A., No. 14084. Two claims produced which were believed to be duplicated.

- Tattersall, Ada, Dunedin Street; 29th October, 1902.
 Waterhouse, James William, Summer Street, Ponsonby Road; 23rd October, 1902.—Duplicate of No. 5048, C.A. Rejected.
 Wilson, James, Queen Street; 28th October, 1902.—Police report cannot be found in Wyndham Street. Rejected.
 Waterhouse, Arthur, Summer Street.—Complainant admits is an error. Withdrawn.
 Woodhall, Joseph, Karangahape Road; 5th November, 1902.—Confused identity between "Woodhall" and "Woodall." No. 15861, C.A., is Woodall.
 Burns, Thomas.—No claim produced. Not put in through Mr. Spedding's office.
 Kelly, Mary Ann.—No claim produced. Not put in through Mr. Spedding's office.
 Langley, Jessie.—No claim produced. Not put in through Mr. Spedding's office.
 Message Elizabeth.—Already set out under this list.
 Boone, Ernest Albert, Severn Street; 27th October, 1902.—On Parnell roll, No. 397.
 Harrison, Sarah, Durham Street.—No date to claim, "Reject; same as C.A., 6132."
 Lydiard, Walter, Russell Street; 22nd October, 1902.—On C.A. roll, No. 8608. Claim produced for enrolment in Grey Lynn. "Rejected; not satisfied; form irregular."
 Burns, Margaret, Surrey Street.—Complainant admits as an error. Withdrawn.

The only case in this long list which in any way supports a charge against Mr. King is that of Daisy Rowberry in which no satisfactory reason is given for the Registrar not being satisfied with the validity of this claim. The Registrar pleads that amid the multitude of cases he had to deal with, and the heavy work entailed upon him during this inquiry, he cannot recollect the circumstances of each particular case, and, though there is no record showing his reasons for rejection, he has no doubt they were apparent to him at the time.

Amelia Lawson's Case.—This case was the subject of proceedings in the Magistrate's Court, on an information charging Mr. King with omitting to enrol the claimant. Mr. King then pleaded that he rejected the claim because he found upon the roll, No. 8139 "Amelia Lawson, Clarence Street, tailoress," and because he inferred identity of person from similarity of name and occupation. But this inquiry has clearly shown that there was an error in the copying by the clerk in the Registrar's office. Two claims were produced signed respectively "Alice Maud Lawson, Nelson Street, tailoress," and "Amelia Lawson, Nelson Street, tailoress." They were copied and printed as "Alice Maud Lawrence, Nelson Street, tailoress, 8133," and "Amelia Lawrence, Nelson Street, tailoress, 8134." The conjunction of the two names "Alice Maud," and "Amelia" seems to place this beyond reasonable doubt. No one voted in the names of Alice Maud Lawrence or Amelia Lawrence. The mistakes made by the complainants in the lists of names supplied by them caused a good deal of difficulty in tracing the claims and obtaining particulars.

In the cases marked "No claims produced," it was not proved that they had been lodged.

CHARGE No. 2 (CITY ROLL): That a Number of Persons entitled to vote had their Names expunged from the Roll without Notice at the Last Moment.

Numbers and Names; together with the Explanation.

4340. Entrican, Jane Jack.—See remarks *infra*.
 12635. Ryan, John Lee.—Apparently transferred in error to Bay of Plenty on application of Joseph Lee Ryan. No Joseph Lee Ryan appeared on C.A. roll for 1900, but John Lee Ryan was taken from that roll in error.
 14369. Tilsley, Ann.—Transferred to Parnell roll on application.
 575. Barker, Jane.—Should be James Barker. Transferred in error, which was discovered prior to election. Official roll marked "Stet" against name, but, owing to some difficulty with Returning Officer, man was not allowed to vote. Registrar appears to have endeavoured to rectify mistake.
 7761. Kerr, Mary.—This was allowed to stand over for further evidence, but none was produced. Possibly overlooked.
 1076. Black, William Currie.—Transferred to Egmont on application.
 5440. Grace, Martin.—Apparently mistaken identity. No evidence offered.
 7676. Kelly, Mary Jane.—Mistaken identity. Claim for enrolment in Eden put in; accepted as transfer, and wrong person erased. This illustrates the danger of accepting claims for enrolment as transfers.
 7929. Knowles, Charles.—Transferred to Kaipara on application.
 7931. Knowles, Melina Hanson.—Transferred to Kaipara on application.
 8119. Lawford, Richard Henry.—Duplicate of No. 16946, C.A.
 8328. Lewis, Jane.—Duplicate of No. 19262, C.A.
 9252. Mills, Mary Ann.—Transferred to Patea on application.
 10457. McLeod, Christina.—Transferred to Eden as No. 4906. Claim for enrolment signed "Christina McLeod," put in, but apparently by a different person.
 11110. O'Rourke, Mary.—Transferred to Courtenay on application.
 11905. Quinton, Maud.—Proved to have been wrongly on roll. Put on G.L., and voted there.
 12383. Robinson, Robert Campbell.—Marked "Stet" on City roll, but not allowed to vote.
 13328. Smith, Charles V. Samuel.—Marked "Stet" on City roll, but not allowed to vote.

NOTE.—*Jane Jack Entrican's Case.*—This name was transferred to Waikato on application, the 30th September, 1902, signed "Jane Jack Entrican." There were two Jane Jack Entricans on C.A. roll, 1900; one of them (No. 3444) being styled "junior." The application for transfer was not signed "junior," and consequently No. 3443 was transferred. Hearing subsequently that the younger Entrican had left the Auckland District the Registrar erased her name too. The mistake arose from the manner in which the application was made out,

CHARGE No. 3 (CITY ROLL): That Persons whose Names were on the 1900 Roll were left off the New Roll, although they voted at the By-election. No Notice sent to Persons so struck off.

The only case brought under this heading is that of James Leslie Chalmers, and it is rather extraordinary that no other cases were brought. We are aware that not infrequently, owing to the pressure at the polling-booths, omissions by poll-clerks to duly mark the names of persons voting at elections mislead the Returning Officer and Registrar of Electors. The latter is not responsible for the result of such omissions, but the Registrar should send a notice to the person struck off. Mr. Chalmers says he received no such notice, and the Registrar does not keep a record of notices sent. The non-receipt of notice by Chalmers does not prove it was not sent. No doubt more particularity in recording claims, expungements, and notices would be desirable in the Registrar's Office.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON ABOVE CASES.

As part of his general answer to the charge of corruptly selecting claims for refusal according to political bias, the Registrar put in evidence a great mass of rejected claims, amounting in number to many hundreds. Neither side seemed disposed to examine minutely into these claims, and no examination by ourselves would enable us to determine whether any selection had been made. As an answer to the charge of corruptly rejecting the claims put in by the complainants, it seems to us to furnish the very cogent argument that, although he did reject many of those claims, he also rejected many more put in by other people, and on precisely the same grounds. The complainants did not deal with this matter, and the Registrar is entitled to the legitimate deduction therefrom.

OTHER MATTERS.

As to the charge made for advance copies of the roll: It incidentally appeared during the progress of the inquiry that the parties most interested in the election—including the complainants—arranged with Mr. King for advance sheets of the electoral rolls as they came day by day from the printers, and that they paid comparatively large sums for the privilege, the money being paid for the use of the printers; but there is practically an admission by Mr. King that he would receive some portion of it in the shape of discount or commission. The complainants' counsel urged very strongly upon us that this was a proof of the corrupt nature of Mr. King. But this argument would indicate that if this was a corrupt, dishonest, or indeed improper act on the part of Mr. King, the parties obtaining the rolls were active participators in the corrupt, dishonest, or improper act. In our opinion the arrangement made was neither corrupt nor dishonest. If it was improper it was only because of the *quasi*-status of Mr. King as a public servant. There is no prohibitive law or rule against the advance sheets being supplied the moment they are struck from the press. To obtain them is a great convenience to the parties interested, and the price paid is, we should suppose, a matter of mutual agreement. The Department having control of electoral matters may give its attention to this question, and issue instructions thereon, but we do not think it has any legitimate bearing on the questions we have to decide.

The complainants' counsel mentioned a number of alleged technical breaches of the Electoral Act by the Registrar. We believe that we have dealt with each of these in the course of this report. He concluded his address by urging upon us that his clients had no animus against the Registrar, but deemed him to be incompetent to hold the position of Registrar of Electors. We feel that it would be improper for us to enter into this phase of the question. The complainants' case was conducted throughout on the assumption that the acts and omissions complained of arose not from incompetence, but from corrupt motives on the part of the Registrar.

COSTS.

We have paid the expenses of such witnesses as we required to attend, and there do not appear to be any witnesses called by Mr. King who are entitled to payment. We make no order as to complainants' costs.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion we beg to report that none of the charges made against the Registrar have been substantiated, and therefore we have no recommendation to make to Your Excellency.

Given under our hands and seals, at Wellington, this 22nd day of April, 1903.

[Seal.]
[Seal.]

W. R. HASELDEN, Chairman.
HUGH POLLEN.

APPENDIX A.

LIST OF CASES HEARD AT MAGISTRATE'S COURT, AUCKLAND, IN CONNECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION OF 1902.

3314. William Spedding *v.* John King: Refusing inspection of C.A. roll.—Information laid, 24th October, 1902; hearing, 29th and 30th October, 1902; decision, dismissed.
3315. William Spedding *v.* John King: Failing to keep C.A. roll open and available for inspection.—Information laid, 24th October, 1902; hearing, 29th and 30th October, 1902; decision, dismissed.
3458. John King *v.* Gilbert W. Spragg: Making a false statement in claim for enrolment C.A.—Information laid, 7th November, 1902; hearing, 12th November, 1902; decision, 14th November, 1902, dismissed.
3529. John King *v.* Henry Dryland: Signing another person's name as claimant in a claim for enrolment.—Information laid, 14th November, 1902; hearing, 19th November, 1902; decision, convicted.
3530. John King *v.* Henry Dryland: Witnessing a signature without seeing it written or having declaration made.—Information laid, 14th November, 1902; withdrawn by leave on 19th November, 1902.
3532. John King *v.* John Dinnison: Witnessing a signature without seeing it written or having declaration made.—Information laid, 14th November, 1902; hearing, 19th November, 1902; decision, convicted.
3550. John King *v.* Frederick C. Wing: Making a false statement in claim for enrolment C.A.—Information laid, 18th November, 1902; hearing, 15th December, 1902; decision, 24th January, 1903, dismissed.
3551. John King *v.* Sarah Campbell: Signing another person's name as claimant in a claim for enrolment.—Information laid, 18th November, 1902; hearing, 21st November, 1902; decision, convicted.
3552. John King *v.* Robert Muir: Witnessing a signature without seeing it written or having a declaration made.—Information laid, 18th November, 1902; hearing, 21st November, 1902; decision, convicted.
3553. John King *v.* John McDonald: Witnessing a signature without seeing it written or having declaration made.—Information laid, 18th November, 1902; hearing, 21st November, 1902; decision, dismissed.
- 3554 and 3555. Frederick C. Wing *v.* John King: Failing to enrol. Same: Failing to comply with section 36.—Informations laid, 20th November, 1902; hearing, 15th December, 1902; on 24th January, 1903, dismissed for nonprosecution.
3780. Josephine Caley *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on G.L. roll on 11th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing, 17th December, 1902; on 23rd December, 1902, dismissed.
3781. Amelia Lanson *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 10th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing, 17th December, 1902; on 23rd December, 1902, dismissed; 7th January, 1903, appeal.
3782. Edward Ross Campbell *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 10th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing, 17th December, 1902; on 23rd December, 1902: dismissed; 7th January, 1903: appeal.
3783. Thomas Gooch *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 6th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing adjourned *sine die* on 6th January, 1903.
3784. William Thomas Jackson *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 17th October, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing adjourned *sine die* on 6th January, 1903.
3785. Peter Andersen *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 10th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing adjourned *sine die* on 6th January, 1903.
3786. Gilbert W. Spragg *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 11th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing adjourned *sine die* on 6th January, 1903.
3787. James Leslie Chalmers *v.* John King: Failing to enrol on C.A. roll on 5th November, 1902.—Information laid, 5th December, 1902; hearing adjourned *sine die* on 6th January, 1903.
3788. William Spedding *v.* John King: Enrolling T. F. Chatfield after issue of writs, viz., on 11th November, 1902.—Information laid, 10th December, 1902; hearing, 17th December, 1902; dismissed, 23rd December, 1902.
3789. William Spedding *v.* John King: Refusing inspection of roll (section 60) on 12th November, 1902.—Information laid, 10th December, 1902; hearing adjourned *sine die* on 6th January, 1903.

APPENDIX B.

PREPARATION OF ROLLS.

SYSTEM ADOPTED.—THE COMPILATION AND OTHER DETAILS.

SIR,—

Auckland, 27th March, 1903.

In accordance with your instructions I beg to submit the following report in connection with the preparation of the electoral rolls for the districts of City of Auckland, Parnell, Eden, and Grey Lynn, the last one being included for Manukau, which is now managed by my colleague at Papakura.

1. I kept an official roll of my electorates, which, until the Boundary Commissioners' last report, comprised City of Auckland, Parnell, Eden, and Manukau. Alterations required, such as transfers to other districts, deaths, change of address, &c., were marked on these several rolls. Bound copies were always on the counter and available for reference and information. This system was continued between the printing of one set and the coming into operation of another.

The attachments will, I trust, be of further assistance in making matters clear.

2. When the time arrived for the compilation of a new roll, a copy of the rolls was cut up and each page pasted on a sheet, and any alterations, &c., were transferred to these pages.

3. A house-to-house visit was made in the middle of last year by persons appointed by the Registrar under instructions for the purpose of enrolling any person who was not on the roll and wished to be, making alterations in addresses, reporting absentees or deaths, and transferring the entries to the sheets. The transfers, if relating to any of my electorates, were expunged from the rolls thus: A person leaving Parnell and coming to live in the City would be erased from the former roll and the transfer to the City would, with all similar transfers and new claims, be put in pigeon-holes alphabetically arranged for the respective electorates. The papers would remain there for reference until the time arrived for commencing a new roll. If a transfer came from any outside place a copy would be sent to the Registrar of the district from which the voter came and the original put in its proper place.

4. Monthly the Registrar of Deaths sent a list of those over twenty-one years who died. These names were examined, and, if necessary, they were erased.

5. When I had doubts as to the *bona fides* of applications, the forms were sent to the Inspector of Police, and his reports guided me.

6. In addition to the house-to-house visitation by subordinates, the police were supplied with rolls for them to make inquiries in their several sub-districts as to removals, deaths, &c. When these were returned, any corrections not already made were transferred to the sheets.

7. To make the rolls correct and reliable I got well-known gentlemen to go through them with myself or one of the clerks. For instance, Mr. James Walters, J.P., who has lived all his life in the Mount Roskill district, and near the border-line of Parnell and Manukau, and since the alteration of boundaries dividing the Grey Lynn from the Eden Electorate, came at my special request and went carefully through the then Eden, Parnell, City of Auckland, and Manukau rolls. The alterations and corrections he made were duly transferred to the sheets. Mr. E. Fitzpatrick, residing at Pakuranga, did similar work in the Parnell, Eden, and Manukau rolls. These remarks apply to all the divisions of the electorates. After exhausting outside help and completing corrections and embodying everything on the sheets, the most reliable assistant then went carefully through every sheet and made any corrections or alterations which from his local knowledge he knew should be made, marking opposite the name on the roll the initial or the name of the electorate in which he believed it should appear. The greatest difficulty here arose on account of the numbers of streets bearing the same name—for instance, there are four Eden streets, three of which are in different districts from those to which they belonged before the alteration of boundaries, three Victoria Avenues, all of which are in different electorates. I give these two instances out of a great many in the same position.

8. The sheets were then handed to me, and I went through every one of them, and when I was satisfied that all that could be done was attended to I ticked and initialled them, and handed them over to the clerical workers to make slips of all the names unerased and portion them off to their respective electorates. Slips were then made out of all new claims and transfers that were passed for the manuscript roll, and incorporated with the slips from the sheets. Before the issue of the writs all claims in hand were included, and after seeing that they were properly arranged the manuscript was commenced. On the successful tenderer signing the bond he was supplied with copy, and kept going until the completion of his contract. As progress proofs and revises reached my hands they were placed on the counter for inspection, &c., and this applies also to the manuscript of all the rolls, as the printing work was completed and the papers returned.

EXHIBITS.—A, house-to-house visitation; B, sample of four sheets; C, *Gazette*, 13th August, 1902; D, form of tender; E, bond.

In conclusion allow me to respectfully urge that both Mr. Walters and Mr. Fitzpatrick be summoned to give evidence. It is also my intention to get other gentlemen to attend and give evidence on my behalf.

The Chairman, Royal Commission, Auckland.

Yours, &c.,

JOHN KING, Registrar.

APPENDIX C.

LISTS PUT IN BY COMPLAINANTS.

OMITTING TO TRANSFER NAMES OF ELECTORS FROM CITY ROLL TO GREY LYNN ROLL ON THE SUBDIVISION OF DISTRICTS.

Kilgour, William, James Street; 7798. Coppel, Annie, James Street; 2947. Dickens, John, Great North Road; 3696. Bruce, Marion, Great North Road; 1694. Graham, Mary Selina, Mackelvie Street; 5485. Appleton, Jane, Great North Road; 249. Harnett, Herbert Henry, Great North Road; 6063. Suns, Hannah Matilda, Great North Road. Ellis, Stephen Colonel, Great North Road; 4292. Harnett, Ada, Great North Road; 6062. Brierly, Edith, Great North Road, 1458. Barrett, George, Great North Road; 618. Bowden, Albert John, Great North Road; 1290. Clarke, John, Great North Road; 2521. Gentles, Eliza, Great North Road; 5114. Porter, John Francis, Great North Road; 11680. Nannes, Priscilla, Surrey Street; 10815. Noone, Charlotte, Argyle Street; 10842. Hill, Frances Margaret, Argyle Street; 6593. Roxburgh, Amelia, Grosvenor Street; 12558. Murphy, Agnes, Burns Street; 9724. Murray, Margaret Ann, Argyle Street; 9790. McLeigh, John, Old Mill Road; 10443. Crocher, Jessie, Stuart Street; 3233. Schofield, Margaret, Millais Street; 12811. Schofield, Minnie, Millais Street; 12813. Schofield, Mary Eva, Millais Street; 12812. Moreland, James Samuel, Sackville Street; 9457. Crippen, Lena, Codrington Street; 3226. Cross, Emily, Sackville Street; 3258. Fearon, Lilla Edith, Sackville Street; 4510. Fearon, Roger Burns, Sackville Street; 4511. Lovett, Irwin, Sackville Street; 8545. Andrews, Arthur Frederick, Sackville Street; 207. Holmes, Rhoda Emily, Westmoreland Street; 6765. Holmes, Gustaf, Westmoreland Street; 6756. Rainton, Jane, Westmoreland Street; 11933. Wright, Ethel, Wolseley Avenue; 20404. McDonald, Caroline Julia, Sussex Street; 17175. McDonald, Allan, Sussex Street, 10102. Bleakley, Alice, Sussex Street; 1131. Soffe, Joseph Frederick, Home Street; 17531. Watt, Matilda Mary, Home Street; 15125. Selkirk, Charles, Home Street; 12906. Smith, Philip Percy, King Street; 13464. Thompson, Sarah, King Street; 14262. Thompson, Septimus Edward, King Street; 14263. Welch, Jane Ann, King Street; 15216. Welch, John, King Street; 15217. McKenzie, Alexandrina, King Street; 10329. Edwards, Bridget, King Street; 4166. Lindsay, Isabella, King Street; 8394. Lindsay, James, King Street; 8395. Stewart, Maria, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 13822. Sutherland, Hannah, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 13979. Peace, Ann, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 11360. Edwards, Samuel, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 4205. Ellis, Henry William, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 4277. Ellis, Mary, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 4282. Bergin, Elizabeth, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 942. Turning, Matilda, Victoria Avenue; 14629. Walker, Lily, Wellington Park Avenue; 14863. Poole, Arthur E., Oxford Street; 11655. Holt, Annie, Burns Street; 6769. Holt, Gerald Joseph, Burns Street; 6774. Duff, Sarah, Oxford Street; 3980. Ross, John, Oxford Street; 12488. Cooper, Wilfred, Oxford Street; 2933. Page, Jane, Mackelvie Street; 11133. Page, William, Mackelvie Street; 11143. Buchanan, Grace, Mackelvie Street; 1726. Barraclough, Jessie, Monmouth Street; 611. Yorke, Celia, Monmouth Street; 16046. Morrow, Agnes, Monmouth Street; 9577. Trevarthan, Henry William, Monmouth Street; 14509. Trevarthan, Mary Ann, Monmouth Street; 14512. Anderson, Catherine Margaret, Regent Street; 158. McGibbon, Helen Margaret Stewart, Regent Street; 10178. Brigham, David Dale, Codrington Street; 1477. Williams, Susan, Codrington Street; 15616. Smith, James, Regent Street; 13408. Holmes, Catherine, Codrington Street; 6751. Crippen, William, Codrington Street; 3227. Brigham, Martha, Codrington Street; 1481. Holmes, Peter, Codrington Street; 6764. Rowe, Frances, Codrington Street; 12540. Rowe, Mary, Codrington Street; 12545. Williams, John, Codrington Street; 15591. Herbert, Mary, Cracroft Street; 6474. Eslick, Florence Sarah, Keppell Street; 4350. Eslick, George, Keppell Street; 4351. Curtain, Nathaniel, Home Street; 3356. Moylan, Gertrude Honnor, Tennyson Street; 9638. Johnson, Florence, Tennyson Street; 7321. Ryan, Julia, Crummer Road; 12636. Ryan, Maria, Crummer Road; 12640. Gillespie, Alexander, Millais Street; 5188. Lindsay, James Connelly, Westmoreland Street; 8396. Lindsay, Margaret, Westmoreland Street; 8398. Barnes, Cissie, Harcourt Street; 597. Bellhouse, Herbert William, Rose Road; 877. Bellingham, Helen, Rose Road; 880. Burchell, Edward Joseph, Rose Road; 1801. Hatfield, Mary Ann, Rose Road; 6209. Brown, Elizabeth, Richmond Avenue; 1581. Walker, May, Richmond Avenue; 14872. Davidson, Florence, Richmond Road; 3535. Durbin, Anna, Richmond Road; 4033. Sinclair, John, Richmond Road; 13193. Bromberger, Florence Ann, Richmond Road; 1522. Manktelow, Arabella, Richmond Road; 8749. Virtue, Norah, Richmond Road; 14768. Golds, John Alexander, Richmond Road; 5310. Greenough, Alice Lillian, Richmond Road; 5635. McKeon, Elizabeth Jane, Richmond Road; 10351. McKeon, John, Richmond Road; 10355. Beardon, William Thomas, Richmond Road; 12030. Beardon, Ellen, Richmond Road; 12019. Dunningham, Florence, Northcote Street; 4038. Gravatte, Annie, Elgin Street; 5683. Gravatte, William James, Elgin Street; 5684. Sinel, Elizabeth Jane, Peel Street; 13198. Sinel, H. C., Peel Street. Holland, Jenny, Peel Street; 6714. Motion, Margaret, Peel Street; 9619. Matheson, G. B., Williamson Avenue, 8972; McHair, Isaac Howard, Wolseley Road; 10544; Wilson, Mary Catharton, Wolseley Road; 15751. Wilson, Mary Jane, Wolseley Road; 15752. McGehan, Patrick P., Ponsonby Road; 10174. McGehan, Sarah, Ponsonby Road; 10175; Cleal, Eli, Ponsonby Road; 2576. Cleal, Margaret, Ponsonby Road; 2580.

TRANSFERRED TO GREY LYNN WHEN SHOULD HAVE BEEN ON CITY.

Leahy, Mary Alice, Richmond Road; 5076. Leahy, Francis Sarah, Richmond Road; 4288. Leahy, George, Richmond Road; 4289. Leahy, Rose Cecilia, Crummer Road; 2023. Leahy, Kate Beatrice, Richmond Road; 4290. Leahy, Bertha Maud, Richmond Road; 4287. Green, Margaret, Great North Road; 1382. Thomas, Annie, Great North Road; 4574. Powell, Arthur, Pollen Street; 5251. Powell, Ann, Pollen Street; 2817. Powell, Clara, Pollen Street, 2818. Murphy, Jane, Pollen Street; 2392. Murphy, Francis Elizabeth, Pollen Street; 2389. Ferguson, James, Crummer Road; 1152. Ferguson, John, Crummer Road; 1153. Ferguson, Rebecca, 3—H. 14.

Crummer Road; 1154 Woods, Alice Marie; 3890. Wood, Alice Maud, Crummer Road; 3889. Brown, Robert R., Rose Road; 367. Brown, Mary, Rose Road; 361. Snowdon, Arnold, Mackelvie Street; 5375.

AFTERWARDS TRANSFERRED FROM CITY ROLL AND ADVERTISED AS TRANSFERRED IN LIST PUBLISHED 21ST NOVEMBER.

Aitchison, Sophia, Parnell; 70. Anderson, Samuel John, Regent Street; 197. Armstrong John, Sussex Street; 298. Ashworth, John, Cross Street; 350. Baxter, Frederick, Richmond Road; 748. Bellhouse, Edward, Rose Road; 875. Bellhouse, Eleanor Jane, Rose Road; 876. Bellhouse, Jessica, Rose Road; 878. Benjamin, Louisa Jane, Richmond Road; 893. Benjamin, Mary Ann, Richmond Road; 897. Bergquist, Herman Leonard, Sussex Street; 947. Bridson, Ruth, Great North Road; 1454. Bridson, Thomas, Great North Road; 1455. Brodie, Annie, Great North Road; 1512. Bronberger, Otto Carl, Richmond Road; 1523. Brown, Albert George, Richmond Road; 1551. Brown, Annie Maria, sen., Richmond Road; 1563. Brown, Annie Maria, jun., Richmond Road; 1562. Brown, Henry, Richmond Road; 1600. Brown, Henry William, Richmond Road; 1601. Brown, Jane Laing, Richmond Road; 1602. Brown, Nathaniel, Richmond Road; 1633. Bullen, John, Great North Road; 1789. Bushell, Sydney Sargeant, Elgin Street; 1913. Clarke, Clara Louisa, Richmond Road; 2504. Clarke, Frederick Arthur, Richmond Road; 2513. Clough, Annie, Stanley Street; 2607. Colson, Henry Ambrose, Richmond Road; 2778. Colson, Sarah, Richmond Road; 2779; Copas, George Edward, Crummer Road, 2935. Curtain, Arthur, Home Street; 3353. Davenport, May Cecilia, Richmond Road; 3430. Davenport, William, Richmond Road; 3432. Dimery, Elizabeth, Richmond Road; 3735. Dimery, William, Richmond Road; 3736. Donald, James, Richmond Road; 3793. Edwards, Maria, Stanley Street; 4194. Edwards, Martha Jane, Richmond Road; 4195. Ellis, Elizabeth Edgar, Great North Road; 4268. Erwin, Sarah, sen., Brisbane Street; 4349. Evans, David John, Rose Road; 4366. Evans, Elizabeth Ann, Rose Road; 4370. Evans, Maurice, Rose Road; 4387. Felton, Thomas, Grosvenor Avenue; 4522. Finley, Isabella, Mackelvie Street; 4616. Finleyson, Thomas, Remuera; 4623. Franchi, Alice, Richmond Road; 4820. Geddis, John, Cox's Creek; 5096. Geddis, Mary Ann, Cox's Creek; 5098. Gillespie, Elizabeth, Millais Street; 5189. Grigg, Annie, Great North Road; 5731. Gwilliam, George William Alfred, Murdoch Road; 5803. Harker, Ambrose, Sussex Street; 6028. Harker, Clara Alice, Sussex Street; 6029. Hayson, Frances Annie, Great North Road; 6284. Hendry, Sadi Russell, Richmond Road; 6431. Hendry, William, Richmond Road; 6432. Hill, Alfred James, Argyle Street; 6573. Hill, James, jun., Argyle Street; 6601. Honnor, Belinda, Great North Road; 6786. Honnor, Charles, Great North Road; 6787. Hopkins, Emma, Oxford Street; 6813. Hulse, Eugene, Great North Road; 6963. Hutson, Emma, James Street; 7070. Hutson, Edwin Joseph, James Street; 7071. Ironside, Alexander W., Boston Road; 7109. Ironside, Mary Somerville, Boston Road; 7110. Kelly, Alice Maude, Great North Road; 7644. King, Joseph Austin, Surrey Street; 7829. Latta, Louisa, Richmond Road; 8084. Latta, Robert Sanderson, Richmond Road; 8085. Latta, Sydney Ponsonby, Richmond Road; 8086. Lawrence, Harry Slater, Argyle Street; 8124. Lawrence, Nina Ada, Argyle Street; 8129. Lawrence, Thomas Swaisland, Argyle Street; 8130. Lawrence, Zelda, Argyle Street; 8132. Manson, John, jun., Williamson Avenue; 8786. Maxwell, Fawcett, Great North Road; 9032. Megson, Elizabeth Ellen, Millais Street; 9096. Moir, David John, Cockburn Street; 9325. Moir, Isabella, Cockburn Street; 9327. Murray, William Joseph, Argyle Street; 9804. Maclean, Emma, Sussex Street; 9908. McGibbon, Hugh Marshall, Regent Street; 10179. McGibbin, Lillias, Regent Street; 10180. McGibbin, Lillias Jane, Regent Street; 10181. McKenzie, Norman, King Street; 10347. McKnight, Robert, Sackville Street; 10404. McLeigh, Eliza, Old Mill Road; 10441. McLeigh, George, Old Mill Road; 10442. McMurray, Harry, Nugent Street; 10534. McMurray Matilda Susan, Nugent Street; 10536. McNair, Emily, Wolsley Road; 10543. Noone, William Henry, Argyle Street; 10844. O'Rorke, Patrick, Codrington Street, 11112. Parkinson, Blanche, Salisbury Street, 11219. Pearce, Albert Victor, Richmond Road; 11389. Pearce, Caroline Louisa, Richmond Road, 11391. Poole, Sarah Julia, Oxford Street; 11660. Richards, George, Richmond Road; 12171. Richards, Sarah, Richmond Road; 12178. Roseman, Elizabeth Frances, Monmouth Street; 12468. Roseman, James, sen., Monmouth Street; 12470. Roseman, Joseph Henry, Monmouth Street; 12471. Ryan, James, Princes Street; 12632. Schofield, Mary Eva, Millais Street; 12812. Silva, Louisa, Home Street; 13076. Silva, Manuel Joseph, Home Street; 13077. Silvano, Bernard, Home Street; 13078. Silvano, Edith, Home Street; 13079. Sinel, John Baber, Richmond Road; 13199. Smalley, Emily, Stanley Street; 13285. Smalley, George, Stanley Street; 13296. Sproul, Mary Ann, Codrington Street; 13644. Sproul, William, Codrington Street; 13645. Stanton, Bertha, Arch Hill; 13681. Stanton, George, Arch Hill; 13682. Stanton, Henry Edward, Williamson Avenue; 13684. Stone Caroline Johanna, Cross Street; 13878. Stringfellow, Christina, Monmouth Street; 13919. Thompson, Wilhelmina, Cockburn Street; 14269. Thompson, William, Stewart Street; 14270. Thomson, Adela, Farrar Street; 14274. Thomson, Arthur, Farrar Street; 14279. Walker, John Joseph, Richmond Road; 14860. Watson, Ethel, Murdock Road; 15085. Williams, Ernest Albert, Coleridge Street; 15563.

NOT TRANSFERRED.

Edinburgh, Charles Allen, Burn Street; 4122. Edinburgh, Jessie Frances, Burn Street; 4123.

WRONGLY EXPUNGED GREY LYNN ROLL AFTER ISSUE OF WRIT.

3414: Taylor, Elizabeth. 528: Challis, John. 1614: Higgott, Richard. 665: Connor, Margaret. 688: Cooper, Wilfred. 424: Burrows, Jacob, Williamson Avenue. 558: George Walter Chipman.

OMITTING TO TRANSFER NAMES OF ELECTORS FROM CITY ROLL TO GREY LYNN ROLL ON THE SUBDIVISION OF DISTRICTS (ADDITIONAL).

Brown, Annie Maria, jun., Richmond Road; 1562. Smith, Nellie, Elgin Street; 13454. Short, Charlotte Augusta, Wolsley Avenue; 13058. Parkinson, Eric Edward, Salisbury Street; 11221. Bright, William Robert, Mackelvie Street; 1486. Kinsey, Elizabeth, Oxford Street; 7852. Sutherland, Mary Hannah, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 13982. Bleakley, James, Sussex Street,

Eden Terrace; 1134. Edgar Laurina, Oxford Street; 4126. Havill, William, Sackville Street; 6219. Haville, William Francis, Sackville Street; 6220. O'Rorke, John, Codrington Street; 19684. Kidd, Bertha May Walton, Codrington Street; 7782. Greenough, Sydney Lancelot, Richmond Road; 5641. Healey, Mary Roallons, Ethel Street; 6313. Speirs, Norah, Westmoreland Street; 13617. Speirs, Robert, Westmoreland Street, 13618. Edwards, Ellen, Westmoreland Street; 4179. Cromarty, David, Monmouth Street; 3242. Edmonds, Ada Ellen, Disraeli Street, 4145. Hutchings, Ada Florence, Richmond Road, 7041. Ellis, Sarah F., Great North Road; 4290. Hodson, Catherine, King Street; 6661; Richards, Edward George, Home Street; 12168. Elvidge, Mary Ann, Great North Road; 4306. Walker, Emily Clara Eleanor, Home Street; 14847. McLeod, Fanny, Richmond Road; 10460. Smith, Evelyn, Richmond Road; 13367. Conn, Jane Ann, Sackville Street; 2804. Roseman, Emma Hester, Wilton Street, Grey Lynn; 12469. Frater, Susannah, Stanley Street, Arch Hill; 4855. Judge, Emily Graham, Home Street, Grey Lynn (now of Princess Street, Grey Lynn); 7501. Gray, Joseph, Regent Street; 5556. Gray, Mary, Regent Street; 5560. Gray, Isabella, Regent Street; 5548. Gray, John, Regent Street, 5552.

TRANSFERRING A NUMBER OF ELECTORS TO GREY LYNN AND STILL LEAVING THE SAME PERSONS ON THE CITY ROLL.

[The first number following each name is the number on the City roll, the second the number on the Grey Lynn roll.]

Rogers, Margaret, Exmouth Street; 12404, 2986. Young, Alice E., Summer Street; 20418, 3930. Whitecome, Jabez, Summer Street; 15322, 3723. Talbot, David Richard, Sussex Street; 14051; 3401. Talbot, Ada, Sussex Street; 14050; 3400. Taylor, Ann, Sussex Street; 14101, 5407. Jackson, John, Sussex Street; 7165, 1754. Collett, Florence, Sussex Street; 2719, 641. Heath, Walter R., Sussex Street; 6342, 4229. Dixon, Lillie, Sussex Street; 3759, 951. Dickens, Alice, James Street; 3695, 4819. Murphy, Mary, James Street; 9756, 5162. Leneham, Mary, James Street; 8262, 2047. Johnson, John, Oxford Street; 7331, 1795. Kinsy, William, Oxford Street; 7853, 1954. Lawrence, Walter William, Oxford Street; 8131, 2019. Lambert, Caroline, King Street; 8000, 1981. Corden, Alice, King Street; 2956, 696. Corden, Arthur, King Street; 2957, 698. Coulan, Samuel James, King Street; 3047, 717. De Berg, Charles Rudolph, Salisbury Street; 3590, 4124. Cockroft, Jane Annie, Cracroft Street; 2645, 623. Cockroft, Mark, Cracroft Street; 2647, 624. Holloway, Charles, Harcourt Street; 6733, 1661. Kay, Robert, Great North Road; 7540, 1858. Spargo, Martha, Great North Road; 13587, 3287. Reeves, Rachael, Great North Road; 12071, 4487. Lightfoot, Ewin, sen., Great North Road; 8639, 2063. Lightfoot, William, Great North Road; 8370, 2064. Lightfoot, Harriet Caroline, Great North Road; 8371, 2065. Lange, Annie Elizabeth, Great North Road; 8025, 1988. Lange, Philip Winnifred, Great North Road; 8026, 1989. Christmas, Annie, Great North Road; 18209, 4754. Kirkby, Clementine, Great North Road; 7864, 1955. Larkin, Nellie, Great North Road; 8059, 2003. Lynch, Charles Harold, Great North Road; 8626, 2143. Muir, Robert, Great North Road; 9658, 2379. Benth, Frances, Great North Road; 982, 4684. Conn, Robert, Sackville Street; 2805, 4081. Fearon, Lillie Edth, Sackville Street; 4510, 1142. Fairbrother, Henry, Sackville Street; 4437, 1114. Webley, Annie, Rose Road; 15191. Doherty, Elizabeth, Rose Road; 3778, 959. Carr, James William, Rose Road; 2193, 506. Smith, Nellie, Elgin Street; 13454, 3251. Newbegin, George William, Elgin Street; 10726, 2565. Follows, Robert, Elgin Street; 4451, 1126. Callaghan, Kate, Elgin Street; 2015, 458. Stanton, Alfred, Williamson Avenue; 13679, 3297. Stanton, Mary Ann, Williamson Avenue; 13685, 3304. Ewen, Fred Clark, Williamson Avenue; 4413, 1099. Stringfellow, Sydney William, Monmouth Street; 13921, 3372. Short, Fred Mortimer, Wolseley Avenue; 13059, 3146. Ryan, Jeremiah, Crummer Road; 12634, 3060. Ryan, Julia, Crummer Road; 12676 or 7, 3063. Coutts, George Craig, Crummer Road; 3073, 723. Cleghorn, James, Crummer Road; 2590, 601. Cleghorn, Jessie, Crummer Road; 2591, 602. Cleghorn, Robert, Crummer Road; 2593, 604. Cunningham, Annie, Crummer Road; 3325, 819. Cunningham, Robert, Crummer Road; 3327, 824. Davis, Eliza, Crummer Road; 3459, 856. Kearney, Maria, Crummer Road; 7569, 5028. Hayden, Victoria Albert, Crummer Road; 6253, 1550. Parkinson, Blanche Stuart, Crummer Road; 17307. Parkinson, Eric Edward, Crummer Road; 11221. Pitkethley, George, Mackelvie Street; 11593, 2766. Pitkethley, Janet, Mackelvie Street; 11594, 2768. Larrett, Ada Ellen, Mackelvie Street; 8067, 2005. Larrett, Emma Jane, Mackelvie Street; 8068, 2006. Bright, William Robert, Mackelvie Street; 1486. McNaughton, Minnie, Codrington Street; 10558, 2526. Verrall, Annie, Regent Street; 14743, 3677. Kelly, Margaret, Pollen Street; 7673, 1900. Jones, William, Pollen Street; 7468, 1833. Jones, Sarah Cassey, Pollen Street; 7461, 1831. Dymock, Edward John, Pollen Street; 4059, 1038. Dymock, Harry, Pollen Street; 4060, 1039. Curtain, Henry, Home Street; 3354, 828. Curtain, Margaret, Home Street; 3355, 831.

TRANSFERRING A NUMBER OF ELECTORS TO GREY LYNN AND STILL LEAVING THE SAME PERSONS ON THE CITY ROLL.

[The first number following each name is the number on the City roll, the second the number on the Grey Lynn roll.]

Cook, Robert Hunter, Salisbury Street; 18300, 672. Kelley, Andrew James, Devon Street; 7646, 1883. Dunningham, Esther Millicent May, Surrey Street; 4037, 1028. Dunningham, John Thomas Eden, Surrey Street; 4039, 1032. Curtain, William Drummond, Home Street; 3357, 832. Over, Garnet William Herbert, Richmond Road; 10974, 4436.

OMITTING TO ENROL ON THE GREY LYNN ROLL, THERE BEING NO VALID OBJECTION.

Archer, Jane, Richmond Road; Archer, Lydia Ann, Richmond Road; Bowden, Joseph, New North Road; Barnaby, Henry, Mount Roskill Road; Booth, Hannah, Murdoch Road; Brigham, David Dale, Codrington Street; Carlson, Julia Mary, Millais Street; Conn, Jane Ann, Richmond Road; Conden, Annie, King Street; Cross, Mary Jane, Flower Street; Dich, William, Alexandra Street; Darrington, Annie, Eden Vale Road; Duffin, Sarah, Oxford Street; Edgar, Lorina, Oxford Street; Edwards, Bridget, King Street; French, Mary Williamson Avenue; Freeman, Amy Lett, Charles Street; Frater, Susannah, Stanley Street; Frith, Emma, Murdoch Road;

George, Albert William, Princess Street; Green, Sarah Jane, Disraeli Street; Gray, John, Arch Hill; Gray, Joseph, Arch Hill; Gray, Isabella, Arch Hill; Harnett, Herbert William, Great North Road; Hillings, Thomas, Eden Street; Hodgson, Catherine, King Street; Hood, George, Norman Street; Hill, Francis Margaret, Argyle Street; Holinder, Peter Slade, Eden Vale and Wynyard Street; Holinder, Alice, Eden Vale and Wynyard Street; Jones, Alice Mary Elizabeth, Argyle Street; Jackson, Henrietta, Mackelvie Street; Johnston, Charles William, Codrington Street; Judge, Emily Graham, Princess Street; Lawrence, James, Great North Road; Mountfort, Florence, Victoria Avenue; Morton, Annie, Crummer Road; Murray, Margaret Ann, Argyle Street; Marrat, John, Monk Road; McQuarrie, Donjald, King Street; McGibbon, Helen Margaret Stewart, Regent Street; McMair, Isaac Howarth, Wolseley Street; McDougall, Patrick, Summer Street; McLeod, Fanny, Richmond Road; Noone, Charlotte Sorazlin, Argyle Street; Normanby, Marie, Argyle Street; Pritchard, William David, Eden Vale Road; Porter, Annie Eliza, Russell Street; Reyland, William Henry, Oxford Street; Ross, John, Oxford Street; Richards, Edward George, Home Street; Roseman, Emma Hester, Victoria Avenue; Rearden, William Thomas, Richard Road; Stronginar, Ellen, Crummer Street; Sinclair, Charles Henry, Russell Street; Smith, Evelyn, Richmond Road; Smith, Bertie, King Street; Smith, Philip Percy, King Street; Stanton, Sarah Jane, Mount Edin Road; Stanton, John William, Mount Eden Road; Sanders, Albert Ernest, Crummer Road; Stuart, Mary Stuart, Bond Street; Stone, Ellen, Esplanade Road; Silvino, Edith, Home Street; Stone, Johanna Caroline, Cross Street; Spragg, Gilbert Wilfred, Crummer Street; Tremain, Henry H. E., Crummer Street; Taylor, Janie, Murdoch Road; Williams, E. A., Coldridge Street; Walker, Charles W., Queen Victoria Street; Ryland, George, Oxford Street; Grant, Mary, Oxford Street; Davis, Mary Ann, jun., Great North Road; Cox, John, sen., Great North Road; Harper, William Thomas, Coburg Street; Elvidge, Mary Ann, Great North Road; Walker, Emily Clara Elinar, Home Street; Honeycombe, Charles, Rose Road; McGibbin, Helen Margaret Stewart, Regent Street; Lindsay, Margaret, Westmoreland Street.

NAMES OF PERSONS QUALIFIED TO BE ON THE CITY ROLL WHOSE CLAIMS WERE PUT IN BY THE TEMPERANCE ELECTORAL OFFICE AND NONE OF WHOSE NAMES WERE INSERTED ON THE SAID CITY ROLL.

Boreham, Frank, Collingwood Street; Boreham, Jane, Collingwood Street; Burgess, Mary Ann, Newtown Road; Brown, L., Grey Street; Cordes, Elizabeth, St. Mary's Road; Corrie, Ellen, Costley Street; Flynn, Elizabeth, Nelson Street; Gavan, Janet Russell, Victoria Street; Gorrie, Sarah, Hobson Street; Holland, John, Wellington Street; Hardy, Robert, Picton Street; Lawson, Amelia, Nelson Street; Meek, Charles Henry, Somerset Place; Meek, Elizabeth Jane, Somerset Place; Mumford, Esther H., Cobden Street; Matthews, Horace, Union Street; McMillan, Jessie, Wellington Place; Roe, Elizabeth, Costley Street; Robinson, William Leo, Abbott's Road; Rainger, Charles, Sentinel Road; Reader, Caroline, Hobson Street; Reed, Rebecca, Edinburgh Street; Skelton, G. H., Karangahape Road; Shiels, Maggie, Boston Road; Whitehead, Hattie, Cook Street; Williams, L. R. Scott, Great North Road; Brown, Peter Samuel, Norfolk Street; Boyce, John James, Salisbury Street; Crampton, Thomas, Prospect Terrace; Clarke, Harriett, Douglas Street; Davison, William Pearson, Church Street; Fox, Thomas Benjamin, Upper Queen Street; Goodenough, Annie, Spring Street; Gannon, Kate, King Terrace; Geddes, Robert, Arawa Street; Gooch, Thomas, sen., Rutland Street; Glendinning, Robert, Liverpool Street; Guillian, Louisa, Durham Street; Hayden, Sarah, Milford Street; Hoey, Nelly Gibson, Hobson Street; Harper, William Thomas, Coburg Street; Hughes, Mary Elizabeth, Prospect Street; Hutton, Mary Harriet, Randolph Street; Jones, Mary Jane, Wynyard Street; Jackson, William Thomas, 50, Pitt Street; Kelly, Janet, Karangahape Road; Leyland, Samuel Herbert, Bella Vista Road; Longhurst, William James, Swanson Street; Langley, Stephen Edward, Hobson Street; Locke, Thomas Hopkins, Khyber Pass; Lowry, Augustus Corless, Dedwood Terrace; Lewis, Emma, Pitt Street; Massey, Emma, Curran Street; Moorcroft, George, Hobson Street; Millar, Matilda Wellsman, Grafton Road; Mundy, Eliza, Ireland Street; Mayne, Frederick, Napier Street; Message, Elizabeth, O'Neill Street; Murray, Fanny, Hospital; McMillan Charles, Jermyn Street; Nicholls, Annie Marie, 90, Victoria Street; Dardley, Ernest Joseph, Wyndham Street; Pisani, Jacob, Chapel Street; Peacock, M. B. Shelly Beach Road; Preston, William, Sussex Street; Pock, Alfred Henry, Beach Road; Preston, Sophy, Sussex Street; Reeve, Fanny, Vine Street; Rowberry, Daisy, Durham Street; Rhodes, James, Crummer Road; Reynolds, Percy, Graham Street; Tattersall, Ada, Dunedin Street; Waterhouse, James William, Summer Street; Wilson James, Queen Street; Waterhouse, Arthur, Summer Street; Woodhill, Joseph, Karangahape Road; Burns, Thomas, Great North Road; Kelly, Mary Ann, Upper Pitt Street; Langley, Jessie, Vermont Street; Message, Elizabeth, O'Neill Street; Boone, Ernest Albert, Severne Street; Harrison, Sarah, Durham Street East; Lydiard, Walter, Russell Street; Burns, Margaret, Surrey Street.

WRONGLY EXPUNGED FROM CITY ROLL AFTER ISSUE OF WRIT.

4340: Entrican, Jane Jack. 12635: Ryan, John Lee. 14369: Tilsley, Ann. 575: Barker, Jane. 7761: Kerr, Mary. 7076: Black, William Currie. 5440: Grace, Martin. 7676: Kelly, Mary Jane. 7929: Knowles, Charles. 7931: Knowles, Melina Hanson. 8119: Lawford, Richard Henry. 8328: Lewis, Jane. 9252: Mills, Mary Ann. 10457: McLeod, Christina. 11110: O'Rourke, Mary. 11905: Oninton, Maude. 12383: Robinson, Robert Campbell. 13328: Smith, Charles Samuel.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,250 copies), £10 15s.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1904.