

assisted Jones throughout the examination, and certified that he had passed it properly. It does not appear that there was any collusion between Allman and Jones previous to this time. Von Schoen appears to have induced Jones to apply for a certificate of service in the first instance, on obtaining which he (Jones) was to pay him £20, and to have made up an ingenious list of services in support of this application. On its being rejected, and after the suggestion "that he should go up for examination" had been made by Allman to the Minister, Jones applied to him for instruction sufficient to pass an examination for a competency certificate; and he then supplied Jones with the papers given to Allman. Jones having obtained his certificate, Von Schoen gave the information to Mr. Hutcheson against his own client: not, as he explained, with a view "to this *emeute*," but in order to have the examinations properly conducted—possibly with himself as Examiner.

It is unnecessary to advert to the various allegations framed by ourselves, as they are already sufficiently dealt with in the foregoing part of our report.

Our opinion on Mr. Pirani's charges against the Hon. William Hall-Jones may be gathered from the preceding portions of our report; but we may here make a more categorical statement on the subject. Upon the first charge we find that Mr. Hall-Jones never did "order that James Jones should be examined." But we are of opinion that Mr. Hall-Jones was so far favourably disposed to the proposal made by Captain Allman, that Jones should be admitted to examination, that he might easily have so expressed himself to Captain Allman as to leave the latter to suppose that there would be little difficulty in the matter if he (Allman) could find anything in the regulations to meet Jones's case; but we see no reason to doubt that Mr. Hall-Jones did expect further information from Captain Allman before anything was done, although he may have been rather too easily disposed to act upon the latter's recommendation without carefully examining its legality for himself. This view may explain the apparently exaggerated account of the remarks of the Minister given by Captain Allman to Mr. Allport—remarks which he interpreted as amounting to actual instructions.

The second of these charges we consider unfounded.

The third charge is supported only by some statements made in evidence by Captain Allman, which, however, do not go to the extent of the charge as stated, —statements, moreover, upon which Mr. Hall-Jones had not been cross-examined. Upon examination of these statements of Captain Allman, we are of opinion that some of the remarks attributed by him to Mr. Hall-Jones are capable of an innocent interpretation, and we have already given reasons for accepting Captain Allman's narratives of conversations with much caution. If a further reason for distrusting this witness's memory is required, we may refer to his remarkable version of the Premier's telegram to Mr. Hall-Jones, which, if the original had not been preserved, might have had a material influence in misleading our judgment. We have no hesitation, therefore, in saying that this charge is unproven.

The last of these charges relates to Mr. Hall-Jones's telegram to the Premier on the 26th February, 1899, and would never have been made had the distinction between the certificate of service and that of competency been kept in view. The telegram must in fairness be understood as referring only to the latter, the question of the service certificate having at that time no bearing on the question, and therefore presumably not under the contemplation of the Minister when he framed the telegram in question. We regard this charge, therefore, as unfounded.

Finally, taking into consideration the immense comments on the Jones case and the minuteness of the facts, we desire to express our respectful astonishment at the "intolerable deal of sack" that has been poured over this "pennyworth of bread."

Our report is accompanied by the following documents: (1) Commission, (2) Minutes of Proceedings, (3) Minutes of Evidence, (4) Copies of Exhibits, &c.

We have the honour to be,

Your Excellency's most obedient servants,

C. D. R. WARD, }
J. GILES, } Commissioners.