

SESS. II.—1879.
NEW ZEALAND.

CITY OF AUCKLAND WEST ELECTION PETITION INQUIRY COMMITTEE

(REPORT OF, TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE, AND APPENDIX.)

Report brought up 24th October; Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence brought up 20th November, 1879; and ordered to be printed.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

Extracts from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, THE 17TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1879.

Ordered, "That it be referred to a Select Committee to inquire whether the forms of this House and the requirements of the Election Petitions Acts have been complied with by the petitioner in the petition of Joseph Newman against the return of Dr. Wallis and Mr. Hurst as members of the House; that the Committee report to the House within seven days; the Committee to be appointed by the Committee of Selection; four to form a quorum."—(*Mr. Hislop.*)

TUESDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF OCTOBER, 1879.

Mr. Seymour, from the Committee of Selection, brought up a report, and the same was read as followeth:—

"In pursuance of the resolution of the House of Representatives, dated the 17th day of October instant, the Committee of Selection have the honor to report that they have appointed the Committee to inquire whether the forms of the House and the requirements of the Election Petitions Acts have been complied with by the petitioner in the petition of Joseph Newman against the return of Dr. Wallis and Mr. Hurst as members of this House; such Committee to consist of Mr. Bain, Captain Colbeck, Hon. Mr. Gisborne, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Whyte, and Mr. Swanson.

"A. P. SEYMOUR, Chairman."

REPORT.

THE Committee, to whom was referred the question whether the forms of this House and the requirements of the Election Petitions Acts have been complied with by the petitioner in the petition of Joseph Newman against the return of Dr. Wallis and Mr. Hurst as members of the House, have the honor to report as follows:—

The Committee are unanimously of opinion that the forms of the House and the requirements of the Election Petitions Acts have not been complied with by the petitioner in this case.

The word "bribery," as one of the alleged charges, has been interlined in the petition, and the interlineation is a breach of Standing Order No. 263, because it is not, as required by the order, signed or initialed at *each* end of such interlineation, and because such interlineation is not, as also required by the order, "indorsed and duly signed and attested on the back of every such petition by the petitioner or petitioners."

The petition is against two members jointly named therein. The Committee are unanimously of opinion that the Election Petitions Acts do not sanction nor make any provision for the presentation of a single petition against the return of more than one member.

W. GISBORNE,
Chairman.

24th October, 1879.