

required by section nine, or on other days in lien thereof (See testimony of L. T. Polk, p. 43; of T. D. Jones, p. 72; A. Hayman, p. 178.)

In others they did not close the lists on the day require by law, but kept them open and altered them up to the Monday night preceding the election, in opposition to section eleven. (See testimony of I. J. Moore, p. 164, and W. S. Moore, p. 168.)

In others they did not swear witnesses to prove disloyalty, but made the entries without evidence, although clearly required to examine evidence by the plain provisions of the 6th section of the law. (See the *testimony passim* and the books of Registration.)

One of them made an improper offer to register a voter if he would vote the Republican ticket, and others they repeatedly refused to register upon the ground that they belonged to the opposite party. (L. I. Harris, p. 188.)

(See evidence of Clement M. Wright, p. 111; R. Langsdale, p. 120; J. Evans, p. 113; H. J. Johnson, p. 161; B. A. Wright, p. 116; L. I. Harris, p. 188.)

In other cases they refused to allow persons to take the preliminary oath positively required by section 5, (See evidence of Robert Disker on page 8; of Benjamin W. Truit, p. 88.)

In some districts, the proper notices were not given as required by section 9.

See evidence of C. W. Fontaine, as to fifth district, p. 32.

They did not make the proper entries or in the proper way in the books of registration, as positively required by section 5, of the Registration Act. The registration books, show that entries are frequently made in the seventh column, not recognized by the law.

That voters are frequently disfranchised without the assignment of any reason, and that almost every form of error and omission is displayed throughout the lists.

Unless all the rules as to the execution of special powers, are to be set at naught in the performance of this most important function, "the fair copy," of the corrected register, which was to be delivered to the judges of election, should have shown on its face that it was the work of duly appointed, and qualified officers who had given the notices, met at the time, administered the oaths and made the inquiries prescribed by the act under which they acted. If the Registers had been commissioners to lay off a road or condemn an alley in a village, their return would have been a nullity, unless it had shown on its face the regularity of their action. Can less particularity be required in so all important a matter, as the decision upon the sacred right of suffrage? And would not judges of election be justified in refusing under