

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,