

## John Bumby JENKINS (1842-1892)

*1874-1875 and 1875-1876 and 1877-1878 and 1879-1880 Thames Electoral Rolls*  
John Jenkins, household qualification, house and section of land, Block 27, Thames

*Thames Directory 1875 – within “The Auckland Directory 1875” Provincial Part IIA published by Arthur Cleave*  
John Jenkins, labourer, Eyre St - also William Jenkins, Shortland and Eliza Jenkins, Karaka Creek

*Thames Star 8 Mar 1875 Lincoln Castle Goldmining Company (Registered)*  
A meeting of shareholders will take place at the Company's Office, Grahamstown, at 3 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, the 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 1875. The following shareholders to pay the 13<sup>th</sup> Call of 1s per Share before Thursday next, otherwise the Company is likely to be wound up by the Official Liquidator:- ... John Jenkins, Grahamstown...

*Thames Star 11 Oct 1875 Eldorado Gold Mining Company (Limited) – Extraordinary meeting*  
Whereas a requisition has been addressed to the Directors of the above-named Company, requesting them to call an Extraordinary Meeting. Notice is hereby given that at Extraordinary Meeting of the Shareholders in the Eldorado Gold Mining Company (Limited) will be held in the Mechanic's Institute, Queen-street, Grahamstown, in the Province of Auckland, on Wednesday, the thirteenth day of October 1875 at the hour of two o'clock afternoon. The following is a copy of the Requisition and business to be transacted at said meeting:- To the Directors of the Eldorado Gold Mining Company (Limited). Gentleman, We the undersigned Shareholders in this Company request you to call an Extraordinary Meeting of Shareholders of the Company, for the purpose of passing resolutions upon the following business, that is to say – 1<sup>st</sup> to request the present Directors to resign, and elect others in their place, 2<sup>nd</sup> to consider the propriety of erecting crushing machinery upon the Company's ground, or securing a site for the machinery adjacent thereto, and to authorise the Directors to raise the necessary capital... **John Jenkins...**

*Thames Star 27 Nov 1875 Dog Fighting*  
John Jenkins was charged with a breach of Bye-law No.3, Borough of Thames, by unlawfully urging one dog to attack another. Defendant pleaded guilty. From the statement of defendant it appeared that he had set his dog to drive out another dog out of his yard. Mr Bullen said as he was informed there were three dogs worrying one, and they were being urged by defendant. Fined 2s 6d and costs.

*1876 Thames Electoral Roll*  
John Jenkins, Household, Block 27, house and section of land

*Thames Star 10 Mar 1877*

We have been requested to state that a search party will leave Shortland tomorrow to discover if possible the fate of Mr George Halliwell, formerly linesman at the Telegraph station here; and any persons willing to join in the search are requested to muster at the Grey street bridge at nine o'clock in the morning. It may not be generally known that the missing man has been absent nearly a fortnight. He had left the telegraph service and had been indulging too freely in intoxicating liquors. Last Sunday week he was seen passing the Rob Roy Hotel. Next day he was seen at Keri Keri **by the linesman who succeeded him, Mr Jenkins**, and it was then thought that he (Halliwell) was making for Kelly's place, or Say's at Puriri, and no anxiety was felt for him. The above mentioned persons having been communicated with, and they not having seen Halliwell, it was at once feared that he had come to harm, and the search party is organised to discover this and set the question of the missing man's fate at rest. Halliwell was a member of the Grahamstown Fire Brigade, and was generally liked by his acquaintances for his inoffensive manners and genial disposition.

*Thames Star 5 Apr 1877 Kauaeranga Highway District*

Notice is hereby given that a Petition in the words and figures following will be presented to Council of the County of Thames at the end of thirty-two days from the date hereof. Dated April 4<sup>th</sup>, 1877. W.S. McCormick, A ratepayer of the said District. Kauaeranga Road District. To the Chairman and Councilors of the Thames County Council. Gentlemen, The petition of the undersigned ratepayers of the Kauaeranga Road District showeth (1) That your petitioners are the holders of property of the annual value written opposite their names. (2) That the number of ratepayers in the said district is 404, and the rateable value of the property is £6,501. (3) That your petitioners are not less in number than one-third of the ratepayers, and possess not less than one-half the rateable property in the said road district. Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable Council will take the necessary steps to abolish the said road district, and merge the same into the Thames County. And your petitioners will ever pray... [signed] **John Jenkins**, rateable value £7 and witnessed by W. S. McCormick.

*Thames Star 2 Mar 1878 Thames County Valuation*

The Assessment Court, for the purpose of hearing all objections to the valuation list of the County of Thames, was held today at St. George's school, Rolleston street, before Captain Fraser, Judge.... John Childerhouse applied that J. Jenkins' name be substituted for his. Granted.

*Thames Star 28 Mar 1879 – Assessment Court – County of Thames*

The annual Assessment Court for the purpose of hearing and determining objections to the valuation list of Thames County, was held at the St. George's Schoolroom, Rolleston street, to-day, before Col. Fraser, Judge. Mr J. A. Miller represented the County...Parawai Riding... John Jenkins, two acres and house, Parawai road, assessed at £12. Not the occupier. No appearance. Confirmed.

*1881 Thames Electoral Roll*

John Jenkins, Parawai, Telegraph Linesman

*1882-1884 Thames Electoral Roll*

John Jenkins, Queen Street, boatman

*Parawai School Register, Thames area*

No. 73 Clara Jenkins

No.284 Blanche Jenkins, admitted 6 Aug 1883

No.447 Blanche Jenkins, admitted 7 Feb 1887

*Burgess Roll of the Borough of Thames for the year ending May 1887 – For the taking of a poll in connection with a loan of £1500 on 7 Oct 1886*

No.283 John Jenkins, miner, allotment and house, Tararu Road

*Kauaeranga Boys School Register, Thames area*

No. 1733 Rose Jenkins, born June 1879, admitted 15 Aug 1887, last day 14 Sep 1887, Destination: Home duties; Parent: \_Jenkins, Richmond St

No. 1736 Blanche Jenkins, born 31 Aug 1877, admitted 15 Aug 1887, last school: Parawai, last day 8 Apr 1891. Parent: \_Jenkins, Richmond St

No. 1787 Ethel Jenkins, born 5 Sep 1879, admitted 21 Nov 1887, Parent: S. Jenkins, Mackay St

No. 117 Alfred Jenkins, born 19 Mar 1887, admitted 25 Jul 1892, Parent: S. Jenkins, Alfred St; Last day 1 May 1900, Destination: Work

No. 212 Ethel Jenkins, born 5 Sep 1879, admitted 27 Feb 1893, Parent: Mrs Jenkins; Last day 21 Jul 1893, Destination: Work (Prev No.1787)

*1887 Thames Electoral Roll*

John Jenkins, Queen Street, boatman

*The Thames Star 18 Jan 1887 The Case of the Old Man Brett*

At the meeting of the District Charitable Aid Board last night, the Relieving Officer (Mr H. T. Rowe) reported as follows *re* the case of the unfortunate man George Brett, who was found lying in his hut at Parawai on the 4<sup>th</sup> inst. in a pitiful condition:- “An indigent person named Geo. Brett, living in Fenton street, Parawai, was reported to me by the police on the 5<sup>th</sup> inst., as dying. I also received a note from the chairman, and accordingly waited on Dr Williams. He said the constable had made a wrong statement as to the hospital being full; he did say that he was incurable, and could not take him in. The doctor further told me that he was not fit to be shifted. I then proceeded to Brett’s house, and found him lying on a matras on the floor, but with very poor covering. This I remedied by sending him a pair of blankets. I then got him to tell me all he could, which I noted down in the presence of two of his neighbours. I obtained the services of a man named Kemp as nurse, and gave him full instructions how to act. I will now relate what I know of the case from the first:- On October 5<sup>th</sup> I was informed by several people that he was very hard up, and found on enquiry that such was the case. I then gave Dr Payne instructions to see him, and he informed me that he was suffering from cancer in the throat. On 11<sup>th</sup> October he received rations, and on November 3<sup>rd</sup> he was struck off Dr Payne’s list, as I considered the man quite able to attend the Hospital as an out-patient. He always fetched his own ration ticket, and therefore he could also walk to the Hospital when he came for his ration ticket. In the beginning of last month he said the doctor had told him he was going to die, and it seemed to make him down-hearted; he said he should go away to Auckland, and I found out a few days afterwards that he had gone. I knew nothing of his return until I received the letters from the Chairman and the police. With reference to the report that appeared in the Evening Star, of the 5<sup>th</sup> inst., stating that the man was lying on the floor with no bedding under him, and maggots were crawling from him, it is not true. The man had a very good matras to lie on, but a bad covering. As far as the maggots are concerned, the neighbours are quite indignant, as several of them looked after him as well

as they could, and I may state that a man named **John Jenkins** fixed him up and made him comfortable, the same day that the police reported the case to Dr Williams. Altogether I think the affair has been greatly exaggerated, as can be proved in his neighbourhood. I may further state that the man has been well looked after both by the doctor and myself since the 5<sup>th</sup> inst., the cost of the patient being £2 15s per week.”....

*Thames Star 13 Jun 1887 Revision Court*

A sitting of the Revision Court was held at 11 a.m. today before H. A. Stratford, Esq., R.M., in accordance with section 68 of the Counties Act, 1886, for the purpose of revising the Electoral Rolls for the different ridings in the Thames County, and hearing objections that may be made to the names of any persons appearing on the said rolls. Kauaeranga Riding. Mr Miller appeared for the County Council and Mr J. G. Hall, who compiled the list, while Mr E. W. Hollis, County Clerk was also in attendance. Mr A. Bruce objected to the following names being allowed to remain on the Electoral Roll for the Kauaeranga Riding:-... **John Jenkins**.... Mr Lush appeared for the persons whose names were objected to. Mr Bruce's objections were as follows: (1) I object to the names, as they are not in actual occupation of any property within the Kauaeranga riding, and are not liable for any rates, consequently they would not be entitled to be placed on the valuation roll, if the county or riding were a road or a town district; (2) That they appear on the Electors Roll as part of a conspiracy to stuff the roll, and that any receipts for rent they hold are not *bona fide*; (3) That the names W. and J. Murdoch appear on the valuation roll for the allotments in question, and they have never applied to the Council to be relieved from the liability of paying the rates during the supposed tenancy of these people, therefore W. and J. Murdoch are the persons liable to be rated; (4) The names of W. and J. Murdoch appear on the defaulter's list for these allotments, and by clause 71 of the Counties Act, if they pay rates before the Clerk signs the roll, it is imperative on him to place their names on the electors roll and if this was done, two different persons would have qualifications to vote in virtue of the same property; (5) That the person appointed by the Council, in terms of Sec. 64 of the Counties Act, 1886, did not make proper and due enquiries as to the *bona fide* of the claims of such persons to appear on the electoral roll of Kauaeranga riding; (6) That the aforesaid fit person did not make out a correct list of persons in the Kauaeranga riding, who would be entitled to be placed on the valuation roll, if the riding was included in a road or town district. Albert Bruce, sworn, stated – J. W. Adlam is not in occupation of any allotment in the Kauaeranga Riding. His name appears on the Electors' Roll as the occupier of allotment 501 on Block 27, merely for the purpose of having a vote. Mr Lush objected to such a statement. Mr Bruce said the name was in the roll for the sole purpose of stuffing it with bogus voters. His Worship pointed out that opinions were of no use to him; he must administer the Act as he found it. Mr Bruce (continued): J. W. Adlam is also not liable for any rates, while the names of W. and J. Murdoch appear on the defaulters list for the same property, and also in the rate book. To Mr Lush: I will swear Adlam is not in occupation of the allotment; it is vacant and without even a fence. It is in Hill street, Block 27. There is neither fence, garden, nor anything else. I will swear Adlam has no lease for the place, though I believe he holds a receipt for it for twelve months. W. and J. Murdoch would be liable for the rates this year. E. W. Hollis stated in reply to Mr Bruce – I am Clerk and Treasurer to the County Council. The names of W. and J. Murdoch appear on the Valuation Roll of the County for Lot 501, Hill street, Block 17; and also on the defaulters list for the same allotment. Murdoch Bros'. names appear on the rate book for the current year, and they have made no objections thereto. – To Mr Miller: The Valuation is compiled every three years, and was last made up about 12 months ago. Joseph G. Hall, sworn, stated – I am the person appointed under section 64 of the Counties Act, 1886, and prepared partly the list required of me under the section of all persons entitled to be placed on the Kauaeranga roll. That is the list produced, and on it appears the name of J. W. Adlam for allotment 501, Hill street, Block 27. I did not find Adlam in actual employment. I took steps through the agent (Mr Fleming) to ascertain that he was a yearly tenant. Mr Fleming is agent for Mr Murdoch, owner of Block 27. I cannot say that I visited Lot 501. I do not know whether it is fenced in, or whether there is a dwelling upon it. To the Court: Mr Fleming informed me that Adlam and the others were *bona fide* yearly tenants. I took this statement as correct, and put the names on. Andrew Fleming, sworn, stated – I am agent for J. and W. Murdoch, owners of Block 27. Mr Adlam is the occupier of allotment 501; he has a

yearly tenancy. His tenancy began on the 1<sup>st</sup> January 1887, at three shillings a year for the allotment. There was no agreement as to who should pay the rates. It is not likely that Mr Murdoch should pay them. In this instance there is no lease, but some on the Block have. The verbal agreement with Adlam was that he should take it from year to year at three shillings per annum. To Mr Miller: Adlam has paid the rent for the year 1887. I produce the block in the receipt book. Have been agent for Block 27 for 12 or 13 years. My duties have been to let the allotments to the best advantage and collect the rents. To Mr Bruce: I think Adlam lives in Grey street, Parawai. I do not know whether Adlam was an occupier of a similar allotment about three years ago, on the eve of a County election. The money was not paid in a lump sum for the whole of the allotments; Adlam gave me three shillings. J. G. Hall (re-called) stated – J. and W. Murdoch's names are not on the voters' list I prepared. I had not time to carry out the Act in its entirety, and had to go to a certain extent by the old list. I missed out the names of J. and W. Murdoch because the time was so short, and I did something else. I only tried to find out the new names. I authorised Mr Hollis to adopt the old list as well as the new one which I prepared. In reply to His Worship, Mr Hollis said he had received no such authority. J. G. Hall (continued): I was allowed five weeks to compile the list. I did not put J. and W. Murdoch's names on the new list, because I thought it was on the old one. Mr Hollis said he might inform His Worship that he had to compile the roll himself. His Worship said he had only to review the work supplied by Mr Hall on the one hand, and Mr Burgess on the other. J. G. Hall (continued): I handed my incomplete list to the County Clerk, and authorised him to adopt last year's Electoral Roll as part of my new list. This was tacitly understood. I did not use these words – it was an understood thing Mr Hollis should do so. Mr Lush submitted that there was ample evidence to entitle Mr Adlam's name to be allowed to remain on the roll. Mr Hall had done his work properly. His Worship said he did not agree with Mr Lush that Mr Hall had done his duty. This was not the case, even from Mr Hall's own evidence, as he stated he had not sufficient time to complete it. Mr Lush submitted that Adlam had a tenancy for 12 months, which warranted Mr Hall placing his name upon the roll, and it could not now be struck off. Mr Miller said when the Council appointed Mr Hall they thought he would have sufficient time to complete the list. It would be seen from his statement that it was tacitly understood between himself and Mr Hollis that as he had the information in the office he should complete the list. According to section 10 of the Act Mr Murdoch was liable for the rates if he failed in giving notice to the Council that he had let the allotment to Adlam for a year. Mr Murdoch's name appeared on the rate-book solely because of this neglect on his part to give the Clerk notice to this effect. Mr Hall had compiled a list of those entitled to be placed thereon. He submitted that Mr Hall had done his duty in making inquiries, and placing Adlam's name upon the list, as he was a *bona fide* lessee for a year, and was thus entitled to be placed upon the Valuation Roll. Mr Hall had trusted to Mr Hollis to make up a proper list from his (Mr Hall's) own incomplete list, the Valuation Roll prepared by the Property Tax Commissioner, the rate-book then in force, and also the Electors' Roll in force at the time. His Worship pointed out that Mr Hall had handed Mr Hollis an incomplete list upon which appeared the name of J. W. Adlam for lot 501 while in the rate book was the name of J. and W. Murdoch for the same allotment. Mr Hall had given Mr Hollis *carte blanche* to do as he pleased, but he could not place both names on the roll for the same allotment. The question was which of the two should be placed on the roll. In reply to His Worship, Mr Bruce said the decision in one case would affect the whole, as they were in a similar position. The Court then adjourned until 2 o'clock. On resuming – Mr Lush pointed out that Mr Adlam's name appeared on the Valuation Roll. His Worship said that after having considered the several contentions raised by Mr Bruce, it was only fair to mention that it was apparent that his motive in bringing the matter before the Court was because he thought it had power to deal with it. The reasons were apparent when such words were used as "stuffing the roll." He (the R.M.) was of opinion, however, that Mr Bruce had done so from a proper motive, but, as he could well understand, the Court was bound to confine itself to the law as it finds it. He would point out that according to the Municipal Corporations Act a person who had property valued up to £50 had only one vote, while at the same sitting of Parliament an Act was passed reducing miners' rights fees to 5s, the possession of which also allowed a person to exercise one vote. It would thus be seen that there was not much difference between a miner's right qualification for 5s, and one of these allotments for 3s. He had given every consideration to the points raised, and would like to point out that no matter how small a man's interests might be in any Riding, yet it was

not to be supposed by the Court that men would allow themselves to be led by the nose like a flock of sheep. The evil thus anticipated that these men who had purchased these allotments will vote for one man would not hold good, as men were now-a-days so well educated that each had a mind of his own and was capable of exercising his vote in what he considered the best manner, if a man did contribute money out of his won pocket for the purpose of these allotments. Regarding the legal aspect of the question, he would point out that the person appointed by the Council under Section 64 of the Counties Act did not perform his duties properly. He had given the reason that he had not been allowed sufficient time by the Council to prepare the list, but it was the duty of the Council to give him ample time, which the Court presumed had been done, while Mr Hall should have seen that he was able to do the work in the allotted time before he undertook it. It was a pity Mr Hollis had proferred Mr Hall assistance, and that there should have been any tacit understanding between them, although Mr Hollis appeared to have acted in a good natured manner and with the best intentions. He, however, should have insisted upon Mr Hall performing his duties properly, and handing in a correct voters' list, as owing to this not having been done there were now certain inconsistencies, for all of which Mr Hall was responsible. There could be no doubt that the Court must rule that when a person becomes a tenant he is in possession for the time being, and could turn off any trespasser. It was not necessary that he should be in occupation, so long as he was proprietor for even six months. Mr Adlam could at the present time turn Mr Murdoch off allotment 501, Block 27, as his title was a good one for 12 months. It was not for the Court to interfere in politics, but to administer the law as it found it. Mr Adlam was a tenant for 12 months, no matter whether the allotment cost him one shilling or £50, and his name would be returned on the roll. The names of the other persons mentioned were also retained, all being in a similar position to Mr Adlam. Mr Bruce, on behalf of the *bona fide* ratepayers of Kauaeranga riding, then objected to the names of Henry T. Rowe, Patrick Trainor, and James Lanning appearing on the Electors' Roll. After hearing evidence, the objections were allowed, and the three names struck off. There was also an objection to Mr G. W. Bull's name by Mr W. S. McCormick, but not having been received until the 1<sup>st</sup> June, it could not be entertained.

*Thames Star 7 Feb 1889*

At the Police Court to-day, before H. W. Northcroft, Esq., R. M., **John Jenkins** was charged, on the information of his wife, Sarah Jenkins, with having failed to provide his children, viz.: Clara, Rosina, Blanche, Ethel, Marlborough, and Alfred Philmore, with adequate means of support. Defendant pleaded not guilty. Sarah Jenkins, complainant, stated that she had six children, whose ages ranged from 16 to 2 years. Her husband earned a few shillings now and then, but never looked for work. He did not drink, but had ill-treated her several times. They lived as best they could, and sometimes had nothing in the house. She still lived with her husband. Defendant stated that his wife had left her home, and he had since taken care of the children. He had given his wife every shilling he had earned. The complainant explained that they had had a quarrel, when she had threatened to throw a saucer at her husband, and he had struck her on the breast. His Worship said he considered that no matter how great the provocation, no man was a man who would raise his hand to a woman. If a big man met a little man and they had some words, the former usually walked away, as if he struck his fellow he would be called a coward, or else someone else would perhaps come along and take the smaller one's part. But many men seemed to think that when they were married they could punish a woman as they pleased, which was cowardly. If a husband struck his wife in the presence of his children, how could they be expected to honor their mother? Any father would be ashamed were his son brought before the Court for striking a girl in the street, and therefore he ought to set his children a good example. His Worship counselled the parties to make it up, and let bygones be bygones, and adjourned the case for a week with that end in view.

*Pre 1900 Burial records for Thames Tararu and Shortland Cemeteries*  
1889 Stillborn child of Mrs Sarah Jenkins – Shortland Cemetery

*1890 Thames Electoral Roll*

John Jenkins, Alfred Street, Thames, boatman

*Thames Star 25 May 1892 Death*

On Sunday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1892, at New Plymouth, John Jenkins, the beloved husband of Sarah Jenkins, of Thames, aged 50 years.

*Hawera & Normanby Star 27 May 1892 Death*

At New Plymouth, on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1892, John Bumby Jenkins, eldest son of the late W. Jenkins, Native Interpreter, of Wanganui and Nelson, and brother to W. N. and Thos. Jenkins, of Eltham, aged 49 years.

*Pre 1900 Burial records for Thames Tararu and Shortland Cemeteries*

1893 Stillborn child of Mrs Jenkins – Shortland Cemetery

*1893 Thames Electoral Roll*

Sarah Jenkins, Baillie Street, Thames, household duties

*1896 Thames Electoral Roll*

Sarah Jenkins, Baillie Street, Thames, household duties

*Thames Star 3 Mar 1896 Alleged False Declaration re Birth – Accused committed for trial*

At the Police Court yesterday, before Jas. McGowan and Theo. Wood, Esqs., J.P.'s, Marion Milne was charged that on February 7<sup>th</sup>, at Thames, she did wilfully commit a breach of "The Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1875," by making a false declaration touching the birth of a child, to wit: that the mother's name was Sara Potter, aged 17 years, and that the child was born at Puriri; whereas the mother's name is Sara Jenkins, formerly Potter, aged about 39 years, and the said child was born at Baillie street, Thames. The proceedings were taken under section 44 of the Registration of Births' and Deaths' Act. Sergt. Gillies appeared for the Police and called Sara Jenkins, who deposed that she was the wife of the deceased John Jenkins. Witness was at present residing in Baillie street, Thames, and she had been occupying her present residence about two years. Her husband would have been dead four years in May next. On January 30<sup>th</sup>, 1896, witness was confined of a female child, at six o'clock in the morning. On that morning prior to her confinement witness sent her little girl for the accused to attend to her. Accused arrived about an hour after witness' confinement. She then attended to witness and washed the baby. After doing this she took the baby away; she took it away on the same day as the confinement. Accused was to keep the baby for a couple of weeks till witness got better. Two or three days after the confinement accused again returned to witness' house. She suggested to witness that the child should be registered. Witness said it would be better to wait for 4 or 5 weeks. Accused suggested having the child registered in her own name and witness told her not to do that. It was not decided that the child should be registered. That was all that passed at that interview, and witness did not instruct accused to register that child. Three or four days subsequently accused again called at witness' house and said she had registered the child. Accused did not tell witness anything further. Witness

was aged between 39 and 40. Her maiden name was Sara Potter. Witness had been married about 23 years and had been residing on the Thames about 25 years. Had known accused intimately for 20 years. Accused was a next door neighbour to witness and her husband for some years, and she knew witness' husband was dead. It was on account of their intimacy that witness sent for her at the time of her trouble. Baillie street, where witness was living, was in the Borough of Thames. Accused knew where witness lived, and on several occasions prior to the confinement visited witness. The accused returned the baby to witness on February 18<sup>th</sup>. The baby in witness' arms was the bay in question. It was a female child and witness was its mother. The accused knew at the time that witness was the mother of the child. Cross-examined by accused – Accused was twice at witness' house after she told accused that she was going to have a baby. It was about an hour after the child was born that accused arrived, not at 11 a.m. Accused said witness could not register the child in the name of Jenkins as the man was dead, so witness agreed to it being registered by accused in the name of Potter. Re-examined by Sergt. Gillies- Accused suggested that she could not register the child in the name of her husband and that she should use her maiden name. Witness simply said, "Yes" and gave no other instructions. By the Court – In answer to the Court witness said, "I agreed to the child being registered in my maiden name. I cannot remember which of us suggested it." Edward Honiss, sworn, stated that he was a Registrar of Births and Deaths at the Thames. Knew accused. She called in witness' office, in Mary street on February 5<sup>th</sup> 1896 and registered the birth of a female child. Witness put the usual questions to accused, who had an infant child in her arms. Witness asked her when it was born, and she said "January 30<sup>th</sup>, 1896." Witness then asked where it was born. First she said she did not know, and witness asked why she did not know. Accused answered: It's a child that my son brought home to me and told me it was his child and that I was to take care of it. Witness said he must know where it was born, and she said she believed it was somewhere about Puriri. Witness asked if he should enter Puriri as the place, and accused said: "yes, Puriri will be right. I will sign for Puriri." Accused gave the sex of the child as female, and said the mother's name was Sara Potter – the Christian name to be spelt without the final h. She gave the age of the mother of the child as 17, and Auckland as her place of birth. All this was given voluntarily. After filling in these particulars witness read them over carefully to accused and she signed the register as "Marian Milne." Witness produced a copy of the register of the birth of the child. Witness gave to accused the vaccination notice now produced, as was customary. To this notice three blank forms were attached. Accused had no questions to ask. Constable Stapleton deposed that when he read the summons to accused, the latter said that she made a mistake when she said Puriri, as she meant Parawai. She added that she thought that the child could not take the name of Jenkins, and would have to take the mother's name. Accused said Mr Honiss did not ask her for the mother's name but for the mother's maiden name. Witness replied, "No doubt he thought when you said the age was 17, that she was single." Accused said: "I don't know what made me say 'seventeen,' I did not know her age." She produced a paper known as the vaccination notice. Accused said she had offered the paper to the mother when she took the baby back. Three blank forms were attached to the notice (produced) and witness took possession of it. Accused had no questions to ask. Sara Jenkins, recalled, said she remembered Mrs Milne living next door to witness' on the Beach 18 or 19 years ago. They might have been neighbours there for about one or two years. Accused knew witness' husband very well, and knew witness was the wife of **John Jenkins**. She knew that witness' husband died four years ago. On being cautioned by the Bench in the usual manner, accused stated that all she had to say was that she had done it in ignorance of the law, and was very sorry for what she had done. The Bench, addressing the accused, said they were very sorry to see her in her present position, but they had no option but to commit her for trial at the Supreme Court. She would be bound over in her own recognizance of £10, which would be sufficient to meet the ends of justice.



*Auckland Star 10 Mar 1896 Supreme Court*

..The common jury were then sworn in. One jurymen was excused on account of being a member of a Fire Brigade. Breach of Registration of Births and Deaths Act. Marian Milne, a middle-aged woman, was charged that on 7<sup>th</sup> day February, 1896, at the Thames, she did wilfully make, for the purpose of being inserted in the register book of births, a false statement touching particulars required to be known and registered under the provisions of the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1875. Prisoner, who was undefended, pleaded guilty. When challenged prisoner said, "that she was ignorant of the law, she committed the offence." Constable Stapleton, stationed at the Thames, was called, and in answer to His Honor said he had known the prisoner for fifteen years. She bore a good name and was a respectable woman. He did not know if she attended confinements. His Honor said prisoner was liable to a severe sentence, but taking into consideration the good character borne by her, he would order her to enter into her own recognisance of £25 to come up for sentence when called upon.

*1899 and 1900 Thames Electoral Rolls*

Sarah Jenkins, Baillie Street, Thames, household duties

*Thames Directory 1899-1903 – within "The Auckland Directory 1899-1903"*

Mrs Sarah Jenkins, Baillie Street (Right side from Karaka Creek)

*Thames Star 15 Jul 1901 Death*

On the 14<sup>th</sup> July, at his late residence, Grey Street, Captain Henry Dalton, dearly beloved husband of Elizabeth Jane Dalton, aged 58 years. The many friends of Captain Henry Dalton will regret to hear of his death, which took place yesterday at his residence, Shortland. The deceased gentleman was closely associated with the early history of the Thames district, and his courtesy and pleasant disposition secured for him many friends. He had been ill for some time, and yesterday he succumbed to a complication of diseases. He was in his 59<sup>th</sup> year at the time of his death.

*Evening Post 22 Jul 1901*

Captain Henry Dalton, for a great many years engaged in the Thames River trade as captain of various steamers, died a few days ago from a complication of diseases. Deceased was closely associated with the early history of the Thames district.

*Thames Star 17 Jul 1905 Death*

On July 16<sup>th</sup> at the Thames Hospital, Elizabeth Jane, relict of the late Henry Dalton, aged 58 years.

*1908 Auckland Central Electoral Roll*

Sarah Jenkins, Union Street, widow

*1911 Eden Electoral Roll, Auckland*

Blanche Amelia Jenkins, Prospect Terrace, Mount Roskill, spinster

Sarah Jenkins, Prospect Terrace, Mount Roskill, widow

[struck off as at 30 Oct 1911]

*New Zealand Expeditionary Force Embarkation Roll Volume 2 (1914-1919)*

Alfred Fillmore Jenkins, Regimental No. 25011, Gunner, Surveyors Chainman; Nominal Roll 37 Page 27

Next of kin: Mrs S. Jenkins, mother, Naumai Park Avenue, Auckland

*1925 Wisers Post Office Directory*

Alfred F. Jenkins, chainman, Raymond rd, Point Chevalier, Auckland

*1930 Wisers Post Office Directory*

Alfred F. Jenkins, linesman, Te Ra rd, Auckland

### **Background and continuing research**

*School List of Nelson College 1856-1956 4th Edition (1956)*

Confirm that there is an entry for John Bumby Jenkins c1857-1858

*Gold Miners of New Zealand 1861-1872 ([www.kaelewis.com](http://www.kaelewis.com)) – **Could these be John Bumby Jenkins?***

John Jenkins, Miner's Right No. 10875 dated 1 Sep 1868 at Karaka, Thames – Archives NZ Auckland Reference BACL 14358 2a (\*)

John Jenkins, Miner's Right No. 10 dated 10 Sep 1870 at Puriri, Thames – Archives NZ Auckland Reference BACL 14358 3b (\*\*)

John Jenkins, Miner's Right No. 319 dated 30 May 1872 at Karaka North, Thames – Archives NZ Auckland Reference BACL 14358 3b (\*\*)

(\*) Miner's Rights Register Book kept by the Gold Warden at Thames – August 1867 to May 1868

(\*\*) Miner's Rights Register Book kept by the Gold Warden at Thames – January 1870 to July 1872