

No. in Order of Merit.	Name.	Locality of Examination.
7	Durrant, William Scott ..	London
8	Bennett, Charles Edmund...	London
9	Baker, William ... ..	London
10	Sayers, Christopher Robert	London
11	Bowser, Joseph Edward ...	London
12	Molony, Stephen Joseph ...	Dublin
13	Buxton, Henry ... ..	London
14	Langston, Frederick William	London
15	Rainbolt, William John ...	London
16	Smith, Arthur ... ..	London
17	Houghton, William ... ..	London
18	Greig, Frank Jones ... ..	London
19	Naish, Edward Joseph ...	London
20	Armstrong, Ernest William	London
21	Jonas, Edward Ernest Waldron	London
22	Harvey, William ... ..	London
23	Hicks, Henry Edwin ... ..	London
24	St neham, Edgar Cooper ...	London
25	Miller, Peter ... ..	Dublin
26	Steeet, Charles Henry ...	London
27	Gregg, Michael ... ..	Dublin
28	Kelly, Martin ... ..	Cork
29	Piper, George ... ..	London
30	Collins, John ... ..	Dublin
31	Nash, Robert Ernest ... ..	London
32	Howe, Jabez Edward ... ..	London
33	Northwood, Arthur ... ..	London
34	Dingle, Robert Walter ...	London
35	Damer, Frederick Walter...	Leeds
36	Edwards, Sidney ... ..	London
37	O'Sullivan, Michael ... ..	Cork
38	Emm, Walter ... ..	Bristol
39	Bugby, Alfred ... ..	London
40	Weslake, Robert Hole ...	London
41	Craig, Isaac ... ..	Dublin
42	Evles, Alfred ... ..	London
43	Sherry, George Edward ...	London
44	Wilson, Robert William ...	London
45	Poulton, Thomas Hill Mortimer	London
46	Boyle, William Austin ...	Cork
47	Major, Albany Fetherstone- haugh	London
48	Lake, Richard Stuart ...	London
49	Robinson, Thomas Ernest...	London
50	Hobbs, Arthur Owen ... ..	London
51	Corbitt, William ... ..	Dublin
52	Andersen, Joseph ... ..	Dublin
53	Hunt, Frederick William ...	London
54	Deer, Edward Joseph ... ..	London
55	Harris, William Thomas Hooper	Bristol
56	Evans, William James ...	London
57	Purchase, Alfred Hartnell...	London
58	Sherrington, John William Hickson	London
59	Pelley, George Kirkaldy ...	Dublin
60	Dagle, Charles Robert ... ..	London
61	Kelley, William ... ..	London
62	Davy, Frederick Francis ...	London
63	Wylie, Robert ... ..	Dublin
64	Williams, Charles Frederick	London
65	Innes, William ... ..	Edinburgh
66	Kennedy, Thomas Edward	London
67	West, Henry Thomas ... ..	London
68	Fitzgerald, Edmund, Jun....	London

WE, whose names are hereunder written, having been sworn this tenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, before the Queen's Remembrancer, at Goldsmith's Hall, in the city of London, have made the Assays and Trials of Her Majesty's Gold and Silver Coins in the Pyx of the Mint, and which, according to accounts produced by the officers of the Mint, were coined in the said Mint from the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, both days inclusive. We ascertained that the number of coins, both of gold and silver, in each packet produced to us, corresponded with the number which the officers of the Mint represented it to contain, and we took a coin or coins from each of such packets of Gold coins, making altogether twenty-six sovereigns or twenty shilling pieces, and fifty-six half-sovereigns or ten shilling pieces, and we weighed each of the said coins separately, so as to ascertain whether they were within the remedy prescribed in the First Schedule of the Coinage Act, 1870. We found that the amount of variation from the standard of weight specified in the said First Schedule of the said Act was minus a five thousandth part of an ounce (or .005) on the whole of such coins, and that, therefore, they were within the prescribed remedy as to weight. We then melted the said Gold coins so taken out and weighed, into an ingot, and assayed such ingot, comparing it with the Standard Gold Trial Plate produced by the Board of Trade, so as to ascertain whether the metal was within the remedy as to fineness prescribed in the said First Schedule to the said Act, and we found that there was no variation thereof from the Standard of Fineness specified in the said First Schedule to the said Act. We weighed the residue of the said Gold coins in bulk, and we ascertained that they were within the remedy as to weight. We then took from such residue five sovereigns and four half-sovereigns, and weighed and assayed them separately, and we found that such sovereigns weighed respectively,—the first 123.279, the second 123.272, the third 123.281, the fourth 123.304, the fifth 123.174, and that such half-sovereigns weighed respectively,—the first 61.587, the second 61.617, the third 61.637, and the fourth 61.567. We then assayed the said five sovereigns and four half-sovereigns separately, and we found the millesimal fineness of such sovereigns to be 916.8, 916.8, 916.8, 916.8, and 916.8 respectively, and the millesimal fineness of such half-sovereigns to be 916.5, 916.7, 916.8, and 916.6 respectively. We also took a coin from each of such packets of Silver coins, making altogether ten half-crowns, nine florins, six shillings, eight sixpences, and nine threepences, and weighed each of the said Silver coins separately, so as to ascertain whether they were within the remedy of the said First Schedule of the said Coinage Act, 1870. We found that the amount of variation from the Standard of Weight specified in the said First Schedule of the said Act was minus a seven thousandth part of an ounce (or .007) on the whole of such coins, and that, therefore, they were within the prescribed remedy as to weight. We then melted the said Silver coins, so taken out and weighed, into an ingot, and assayed such ingot, comparing it with the Standard Silver Trial Plate produced by the Board of Trade, so as to ascertain whether the metal was within the remedy as to fineness prescribed in the said First Schedule to the said Act, and we found that the amount of variation from the Standard of Fineness specified in the said First Schedule to the said