

*Re Poll No. 76—No Oath of Secrecy Taken:*

Neither the D.R.O. nor the Poll Clerk, who functioned at this Poll, was available to give evidence but one of the Agents acting at the Poll was Mrs. Nell Slack and she states very positively that she and all the other Agents, who were present at the opening of the Poll, were required to take and did take the oath of office. The poll book shows that the D.R.O. and the Poll Clerk were each duly sworn. Mrs. Slack states that one of Mr. Probe's Agents, who came in later in the day as a substitute, may not have been sworn; she is not sure about her. This particular Agent, who acted as a substitute, did not attend at the hearing to give evidence that she was not sworn.

*Re Poll No. 85—No Counterfoils on Ballots Presented by Voters to the D.R.O.*

The D.R.O. at this Poll was Mrs. Stalla Tache. She was called as a witness and gave her evidence impressibly. I judge she would be a very intelligent and conscientious official. She states that her practice at the Poll was to hand the folded ballot to the voter with the counterfoil attached and to tear it off when the voter returned with the ballot from the booth. She was not prepared to swear that she did not, in some instances during a rush period, tear off some of the counterfoils before handing the ballot to the voter but says if she did do so no one objected to it. She simply could not be sure about it herself, under the circumstances, and her Poll Clerk, Mrs. Mary Folk, who also gave evidence, could not enlighten us on the matter as she was busy attending to her own duties. No witness was called to support this charge.

*Appendix B:*

The complaint made by Mr. Probe under Appendix B is, on its face, a disturbing one and one which caused Mr. Probe, in his letter of complaint, to suggest that there must have been "culprits" involved in an attempt to destroy the secrecy of the ballot and interfere with the free will choice of the electorate. It was, therefore, necessary that the investigation should be intensely thorough so that, if possible, a solution would be found that was acceptable and convincing to all concerned. I am glad to report that such a result was obtained and that the unquestioned explanation is one which shows a complete innocence of wrong doing or evil design or any design on the part of any official or anyone else.

As already stated, it was decided to thoroughly investigate two sample Polls, namely Nos. 57 and 87, in the first instance in the expectation that a solution for these two Polls would mean a solution to the whole problem. The result of this procedure proved its justification.

During the interval between September 23rd, when the preliminary hearing was held, and October 12th, when the Inquiry proper began, the Expert made a careful examination of the ballots connected with these two Polls and was in a position to give the results when the Inquiry proper opened on October 12th.

*Re Poll No. 57:*

Dealing with Poll No. 57 first, the D.R.O. and Poll Clerk, functioning at this Poll, were examined under oath and from their evidence and that of the Expert and from an examination of the Poll documents, including the ballots, we got the following result:

As the elector entered the station his name was located on the election list and the Poll Clerk then made the entry in the poll book in accordance with the regulations, giving the voter a number depending in harmony with the order in which he presented himself to the Poll and placing such number to the left of the name in the poll book, and also placing the number, which such voter had on the election list, to the right of the name in the poll book.