

4. As to the circumstances which led to the prosecution of the said William Lambert for perjury, and whether there was any undue delay on the part of the said John James Meikle in taking proceedings for perjury against the said William Lambert.

5. As to the circumstances under which the said John James Meikle accepted the sum of £500 in full settlement of his claims ; and whether, apart from legal considerations, the settlement then made should be treated as final.

6. As to the financial position of the said John James Meikle immediately preceding his arrest for the said offence of sheep-stealing, and during his imprisonment, and at the date of his release from prison and since ; and whether, having regard to all the circumstances, the said John James Meikle is fairly entitled to further pecuniary compensation in respect of his conviction and imprisonment, or in respect of the loss and suffering alleged to have been entailed upon his family thereby ; and, if so, to what amount.

7. As to the amount of legal and other costs incurred and paid by the said John James Meikle—(a) in respect of his defence at his trial upon the charge of sheep-stealing ; (b) in respect of the prosecution of the said William Lambert for perjury ; and (c) as to the circumstances under which the said John James Meikle accepted the sum of £294 16s. 1d. in full settlement of his claim for legal and other costs as aforesaid ; and whether, apart from legal considerations, the settlement then made should be treated as final.

8. Whether, having regard to English precedent and the circumstances of the case, the claim of the said John James Meikle that his name be removed from the prison records can be given effect to ; and, if not, what alternative is practicable in the way of placing on record his innocence, if in your opinion his innocence has been established or may be presumed as aforesaid.

9. Whether, in your opinion, legislation is necessary to give effect to your recommendations, or to any of them.

And whereas we, the said Worley Bassett Edwards and Theophilus Cooper, acting under the powers conferred upon us by the said Commission, have inquired into the several matters and things therein mentioned, sitting for that purpose in open Court, and have heard counsel for the said John James Meikle (hereinafter called "the claimant") and for the Crown respectively, and have also heard the evidence upon oath in examination, cross-examination, and re-examination of all the persons tendered as witnesses for the claimant and for the Crown respectively.

And whereas we, the said Worley Bassett Edwards and Theophilus Cooper, as and being such Commissioners as aforesaid, have duly weighed and considered the evidence adduced by and on behalf of the claimant and the Crown respectively, and the addresses of their counsel respectively :

Now, therefore, we, the said Worley Bassett Edwards and Theophilus Cooper, as and being the said Commissioners, have the honour to report to Your Excellency touching the several questions referred to us for inquiry by the said Commission as follows, that is to say :—

*As to the First of the said Questions.*

The conviction of the said William Lambert for perjury did not establish the innocence of the said claimant.

*As to the Second of the said Questions.*

The conviction of the said William Lambert did not *per se* raise a reasonable presumption that the claimant was innocent or that he was wrongly convicted.

*As to the Third of the said Questions.*

No evidence has been adduced before us to show that the claimant has since his conviction made any admissions or statements inconsistent with his innocence.

*As to the Fourth of the said Questions.*

No evidence has been adduced before us as to the circumstances which led to the prosecution of the said William Lambert for perjury other than the circumstance that the said William Lambert was the chief witness against the claimant