

19. And your petitioners say that several of the Deputy Returning Officers, by error and mischance, miscounted the number of votes given for each of said candidates at said election, and that the statements made out by said Deputy-Returning Officers, upon which the Returning Officer based his said return, were erroneous, in that they showed the total number of votes polled for each of said candidates to be respectively as follows:—

Frederick Mackenzie.....	2,030
Thomas White, jr.....	2,023

Whereas the real majority of good legal votes polled at the said election was in favor of the said Thomas White, jr., over the said Frederick Mackenzie.

20. And your petitioners further say that, even if the majority of votes declared by the Returning Officer in favor of the said Frederick Mackenzie really exists, which your petitioners deny, the same is only an apparent and colourable majority, inasmuch as the votes of divers persons were accepted and received on the said poll in favor of the said Frederick Mackenzie, who were not legally entitled and had no right to vote at the said election, and that one vote for every vote so unlawfully accepted and received ought now to be struck off from the number of votes appearing to have been given to the said Frederick Mackenzie at said election.

21. And your petitioners further say that several of the Deputy Returning Officers in counting the number of votes given for each candidate at said election, accepted and counted a number of ballot papers, representing votes, upon the poll of the said Frederick Mackenzie, whereas, the said ballot papers were illegal and defective, and ought to have been rejected, in that they were not in accordance with the requirements of the said "Dominion Elections Act, 1874," and more especially had upon them writings and marks by which the voters could be identified.