REPORT NO. 10

of

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

on

THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.
To His Excellency Lieutenant General Sir Charles Henry
Gairdner, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order
of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the
Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Most Honourable
Order of the Bath, Commander of the Most Excellent Order
of the British Empire, Governor in and over the State of
Western Australia and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth
of Australia.

May It Please Your Excellency —

INQUIRY INTO THE RAILWAY INVESTIGATION SECTION.

This inquiry is the culmination of many years of unrest
in the Railway Investigation Section and the evidence discloses
a state of affairs which should no longer be tolerated.

Eight hundred and fifty-two (852) pages of sworn evi-
dence were given, and I have never known so many trivialities
to be submitted as matters of big moment or experienced such
contradictory and unsatisfactory evidence from allegedly re-
ponsible officers.
Throughout the years, seeds of discord have been so successfully sown, that officer has been turned against officer and a general feeling of suspicion and mistrust has been engendered, with a result that it is impossible to work of the section to be carried out with any harmony and goodwill.

Some officers have allowed their whole course of conduct to be influenced by what they have been told by others, without making any attempt whatsoever to verify the truth of their information. Allegations have been bandied from one to the other, not only against officers in the section but against other senior W.A.S.R. officials, whose absolute integrity, in my opinion, is beyond question.

**SHORT HISTORY.**

The Railway Investigation Section comprises:

- Senior Railway Investigator.
- Railway Investigator.
- Seven Assistant Railway Investigators.
- Twenty Patrol Officers, stationed at Perth, Fremantle, and Midland Junction.
- One Clerk.

For some years the section came under the jurisdiction of the Chief Traffic Manager, but after the Workshops incident, involving Messrs. Marshall and Lee, I recommended that it be transferred to the Secretary's Branch so that it could be directly responsible to the Commissioner himself. The recommendation was accepted and the section is now part of the Secretary's Branch.

The Senior Railway Investigator is Leonard William Tomson. He was appointed to his present position on the 8th August, 1951, and he has seen the section grow from eight
officers to its present strength of thirty.

The Railway Investigator is Arthur John Pedgeon who was appointed to his present position on the 5th September, 1951.

The section is of paramount importance and it is essential that it be staffed by officers of ability and integrity. It is responsible for general police railway routine, particularly the safeguarding and protection of W.A.G.R. equipment and property amounting to millions of pounds, the prevention and discovery of theft, investigation and inquiry work in connection with claims against the W.A.G.R. and in many of their duties, the officers of the section must maintain close liaison with the Criminal Investigation Branch of the Western Australian Police Force.

FACTIONS WITHIN THE SECTION.

For some considerable time, there have been two main factions within the section.

The first is constituted by several officers who are discontented with the administration of the section and who allege that the seniors, Tomson and Pedgeon, have been negligent in the performance of their duties, have abused their office and that, in addition, Tomson has actually stifled the work of junior officers in their work of investigating crime within the W.A.G.R.

A leading figure in this faction is Mr. E.J. Summet-, an Assistant Railway Investigator, who was appointed to his position on the 21st February, 1950, and the evidence very clearly establishes that he has stirred up a great deal of trouble within the section and by various means has endeavoured, not without success, to turn one officer against the other.

3.
Mr. R.H. Foreman, a Patrol Officer of considerable ability and who was appointed to his position on the 21st February, 1951, is also a member of this faction. He has allowed his mind to become so clouded with the idle gossip and scandal fed to him by Summerton and others, that his judgment and vision have become impaired.

Tomson and Pedgeon have been aware of the undercurrent against them, and they may be said to form the second faction. Tomson has played a passive role and has been forbearing, even to the point of weakness. It has been alleged that he was weak, administratively and allowed himself to come too much under the domination of Pedgeon. Pedgeon has on occasions been indiscreet and, like Summerton, has repeated gossip told to him by one officer about another and this has not conduced to general harmony in the section.

Most officers in the section are completely loyal to Tomson, and the evidence amply discloses this. Some officers have endeavoured to remain clear of both factions, but it has been most difficult to maintain an entirely neutral course.

INQUIRY BY MR. T. TANISHAW. AT THE TIME, ACTING ASSISTANT CHIEF TRAFFIC ENGINEER, [RESEARCH AND INVESTIGATION].

Troubles which had been smouldering for some time, flared up in January, 1958.

On the 24th January, 1958, Messrs. Foreman and Summerton, were in possession of certain information which would enable arrests to be made in the Ways and Works Section of the Civil Engineering Branch.

Mr. Tomson was on leave at the time and Mr. Pedgeon was Acting Senior Railway Investigator. Without informing the head of the section, as should have been done, Foreman immediately called on the services of the C.I.R., arrests were made, and the offenders were subsequently convicted.
Following upon all this, the Acting Commissioner of Railways appointed Messrs. F.H. Downing, W.G. Britten and H. Botirell, as a Committee of Inquiry, to investigate reports made by the Railway Investigation Section into thefts from the Ways and Works.

Finally, as a result of Pedgeon's report to the Deputy Chief Traffic Manager, with statements from Summerton and Foreman attached thereto and in view of evidence before the Committee of Inquiry as to the alleged general dissatisfaction and inefficiency in the Railway Investigation Section, Mr. Barnshaw was directed to conduct an inquiry into the various allegations.

Both Summerton and Foreman say that they thought Mr. Barnshaw's inquiry was directed only to allegations affecting the relations between the section and the Ways and Works, but very many matters, in no way connected with this issue, were raised by these two officers.

Except where necessary, I am not going to deal in detail with the evidence given before Mr. Barnshaw because all the incidents referred to, plus many others, have been brought up before me.

Mr. Barnshaw did not call all the available witnesses from the section, but evidence was given by the following personnel: Summerton, Foreman, Tomson, Pedgeon, Pearce, Dixon and Van Helden. Pearce and Dixon are Assistant Investigators, and Van Helden, a Patrol Officer.

The main issue was alleged to be the Ways and Works but, as I have said, considerable evidence was given about many other matters. I cannot accept for one moment that Summerton and Foreman did not raise everything they could think of at the time and whether it referred to Ways and Works or not.
Mr. Harnshaw submitted his report on the 27th February, 1956, and in it he pointed out that the majority of the incidents brought to notice, dated back several years and he expressed surprise that the various complaints against Tomson and Pedgeon had not been ventilated before the Chief Traffic Manager, long before.

He indicated that Summerton had been before the Chief Traffic Manager on occasions in the past and he presumably had ample opportunity to ventilate any of his grievances.

Summerton and Foreman are men whom can take care of themselves and the fact that they had not aired their grievances long before, also impressed me.

I questioned them both very carefully on this aspect and their explanation, with which I shall deal later, is most unacceptable.

Similarly, Mr. Harnshaw expressed surprise that if Summerton were the troublemaker, as alleged, some corrective action should have been taken by either or both Tomson and Pedgeon, in their capacity as Senior and Acting Senior Railway Investigator, respectively.

Summarised, Mr. Harnshaw's report is to the effect that, in one instance, Messrs. Tomson and Pedgeon may have been indiscriminate and that Foreman's assertion that a much stricter officer than Tomson as head of the section, could be true. On the evidence, however, he was unable to find sufficient grounds why Mr. Tomson should not be allowed to continue as head of the section.

His findings with regard to Summerton and Foreman are not very specific but, undoubtedly, he found their general allegations against Pedgeon and Tomson to be unproved. Apart from this, he had very little to say about Pedgeon himself.
Following Mr. Harnshaw's report, Mr. Gates, then Acting Chief Traffic Manager, recorded in the form of "Notes", his opinion on the facts and the action he had taken in the matter.

He agreed with Mr. Harnshaw that there was considerable dissatisfaction in the section and that, "There is little doubt Summerton is harbouring a grievance and is causing trouble. Whether his grievance is real or is engendered by an inferiority complex is difficult to say." Accordingly, in an endeavour to re-establish harmony in the section, Summerton was transferred to duties in the Commercial Agent's Office and Dixon replaced Summerton. As will be seen later, however, the transfer did not have the desired effect.

Mr. Gates also came to the conclusion that the inquiries disclosed a certain lack of administrative ability in the part of Messrs. Tomason and Pedgeon which, however, he did not consider sufficiently serious to warrant the drastic action of replacing them.

Accordingly, he had both officers before him and pointed out the various weaknesses in the administration, instructed them how to improve matters and told them that a firmer approach in handling the staff was required.

The final paragraph of his "Notes" is as follows:

"Should no improvement not eventually, serious consideration must be given to the replacement of one or both. No matter what the effect on their position in the service. It must be recorded, however, that I believe both officers are enthusiastic in their jobs and any shortcomings are the result of lack of training in administration."

Summerton, of course, did not appreciate his transfer, considered it was more or less by way of punishment, and on the 15th March, 1956, wrote to myself complaining that he had been
Victimised and at the same time setting out eleven grounds of complaint.

SUMMERTON'S ALLEGATIONS.

Summerton's specific allegations were as follows:-

(1) Unlawful removal of wheat from a railway truck at Perth Goods Yard by Sheeter Castle, which the Sheeter stated was for Senior Railway Investigator Tomson and Railway Investigator Pedgson, and as a consequence, Sheeter Castle was not charged.

(2) Assistant Investigator Dixon received a quantity of linoleum from Ways and Works, took it to his home in a railway vehicle. No charge was laid and no reprimand filed.

(3) A patrol officer taking articles from Midland Junction Loco Sheds for an employee. "I reported matter to S.R.I. Tomson who would not allow me to conduct an inquiry on same."

(4) A complaint passed on from Foreman to Summerton by telephone regarding a W.A.G.R. motor truck from the Ways and Works, delivering cyclone wire to South Perth. Summerton's complaint is that Tomson would not allow him to make an official report on the use of the vehicle, whereas, another person had been previously convicted and fined £5 for the same thing.

(5) This is a complaint that Summerton received information from a C.I.B. officer about iron, allegedly stolen from W.A.G.R. houses in Lord-street, Perth. He says that at the time, he told the officer he would not be allowed to conduct an inquiry affecting Ways and Works and that this subsequently turned out to be correct.

(6) Complaints were made to Tomson about excessive use of petrol in section vehicles but Tomson ignored them.
(7) An Assistant Railway Investigator falsified his
time sheet for penalty rates, with the full knowledge of
Pedgeon, his senior officer.

(8) Investigator Pedgeon and Assistant Investigator
Pearce used W.A.R.R. vehicles on Sundays to take home materi-
als purchased from the Ways and Works.

(9) That Pedgeon, whilst acting as Senior Railway
Investigator, reported to the Chief Traffic Manager, that
Summerton had instructed Patrol Officer Foreman to go direct
to the C.I.B., over the head of the Section, in connection
with an inquiry into the Ways and Works.

(10) Word for word, this is Summerton's complaint:—
"Extensively rumoured that I was the informer, the result of
anonymous information resulting in the search of the premises
of Investigator Pedgeon by the C.I.B. and compulsory return
of one railway table."

(11) Summerton and other officers have repeatedly
given information to S.W.I. Tomson regarding alleged thefts
from the Ways and Works and that Summerton could not recall
an instance of action being taken in any instance.

Summerton alleged that he had witnesses to support
all his complaints but this is far from the case. He certain-
ly had some supporting witnesses but very little concrete
evidence was offered.

In February, 1959, I interviewed Summerton for the
first time and he had further complaints to make, so I re-
quested him to specify them in writing and he did this.

The further complaints were as follows:—
(1) Members of the section had to drive Pedgeon to
and from work in the Investigation Section vehicles.
(2) That he complained to Tomson about Ways and
Works employees removing a ladder and clippers from a W.A.R.
house in East Perth and that Tomson would take no action in respect thereof.

(3) The theft of eggs from the Perth Goods Sheds was being investigated in conjunction with the C.I.B. The allegation is that Inspector Baird requested that no information be divulged and that Pedgeon passed on information about the thefts to the Chief Traffic Manager and the Perth Goods Agent with a result that the suspects were warned.

(4) This is a complaint that Assistant Investigator Dixon had W.A.G.R. rugs in his possession and was compelled to return them.

(5) Pedgeon requested Summerton to give false evidence in connection with a prosecution for parking on railway property.

(6) Allegations that an employee from the Civil Engineering Branch had in his possession, 40 good sleepers, that Tomson knew all about the matter and took no action.

(7) Pedgeon allegedly requested Summerton to give evidence in an appeal that he had submitted information anonymously and not under his own name, which was false.

These were by no means all the allegations made by Summerton and fresh complaints were made right up to the conclusion of the evidence. One day, during the hearing, Summerton actually alleged that Tomson moved his chair very close to his and was reading his notes for cross-examination of the various witnesses.

**FOREMAN'S ALLEGATIONS.**

Whilst other matters were raised, Foreman's chief allegation against Tomson, amounts to an indictment that he was abusing his office by failing to prevent theft in the Ways and Works. If I believe both Summerton and Foreman, I
would have to conclude that Tomson was given valuable information as to alleged irregularities in the Ways and Works and deliberately shut his eyes to suspected theft.

Particulars of Foreman's allegations are as follows:-

(1) A complaint that one, Pavlinovich, an employee of the Chief Civil Engineer, had unlawfully taken six sheets of galvanised iron, the property of Foreman, and that Tomson failed to take action against Pavlinovich as he should have done.

(2) Foreman gave information to Tomson, verbally, of cement, paint and timber being unlawfully removed from Ways and Works and that an employee named Pentland was the principal offender in regard to timber. His complaint is that he did not hear anything from Tomson as to any inquiries made.

(3) That as Tomson had friends at Ways and Works, it was useless to report matters concerning that section, because no action would be taken.

(4) That Foreman approached Tomson about lack of security at Ways and Works but Tomson took no action.

(5) Tomson was negligent by not calling a particular witness in a case against a plumber, named Teaster, an employee of the Chief Civil Engineer, who was charged with being unlawfully in possession of earthenware pipes removed from Ways and Works.

(6) Foreman reported to Tomson that cyclone wire had been unloaded from a W.A.S. vehicle in Gwenyfred-road, South Perth, and no action was taken.

(7) Foreman reported to Tomson that he had caught a checker named Baker stealing vegetables from Perth Goods and no action was taken.
(8) Cement was delivered to Tomson's private residence by a Government vehicle.

(9) Foreman found a small piece of paper at a saw-bench in the Ways and Works which purported to be an order for a ton of firewood and a piece of oregon for "L. Tomson."

(10) Tomson told Patrol Officer Keady that he would see Foreman on the street carrying his swag.

(11) Allegations of graft against a very senior W.A.G.R. officer.

(12) An officer of the Ways & Works named Martin was apprehended, removing timber from the Ways & Works by two Patrol Officers, Jess and Toll. These two officers were instructed by Pedgeon to say nothing about the matter and no action was taken against Martin.

(13) A truck driver named Bupe removed timber from the Goods Shed area and Foreman reported this. No action, however, was taken, although another driver who had done exactly the same thing was fined £5. 0. 0.

(14) Pedgeon had taken good timber from the Ways & Works on two or three occasions.

(15) Information in the possession of Foreman that Pedgeon had taken asbestos from the Ways & Works.

(16) Pedgeon told Foreman that Tomson would not take action against the Ways & Works and it was, therefore, use
cess reporting irregularities in that section.

Many side issues have arisen from time to time, especially during the actual hearing, but in the main, the chief allegations against Tomson, Pedgeon and the administration generally, have been set out above.

Certain evidence and comments have been offered by witnesses as to other matters and these will be dealt with later.
Tomson and Pedgeon answered the various allegations and at the same time raised many issues affecting both Summerton and Foreman and these will also be dealt with, as this report progresses.

Very contradictory evidence has been given and so many varnished and unvarnished lies told, that in many instances, it has been quite difficult to sort out the truth.

It will be noted that Summerton and Foreman, in certain cases, have raised the same issues and accordingly these will only be dealt with under one heading or the other.

**Unlawful removal of wheat from a Railway truck.**

This incident happened as long ago as 29th May, 1952, and many of the witnesses, including Messrs. Tomson, Pedgeon and Brodie, in my opinion, have genuinely forgotten most of the details. One or two of the witnesses have a better recollection but Summerton himself has given evidence as if the whole affair only occurred yesterday.

The evidence discloses, beyond any doubt, that two sheeters, Castle and Woodland, removed clean wheat from a truck in Perth Goods Yard. When apprehended, they both told lies about the matter but as they were actually caught in the act, they finally had to admit taking the wheat from the truck.

Woodland was not called before me but Castle can only be described as a most unsatisfactory and untruthful witness.

During their interrogation, on the day in question, both Castle and Woodland said that they had been instructed to take good wheat from the truck for Messrs. Tomson and Pedgeon. A number of witnesses, including Van Helden, Assistant Investigator Lauder and Summerton all say they heard this said and I have no doubt that it was said.
It was sought to be shown that words, such as "We were told to take wheat like Fedgeon and Tomson get" were used but with no success.

Immediately the names of Tomson and Fedgeon were mentioned, Summerton, the senior officer present, rang Tomson, repeated what had been told to him and suggested that he come to the patrol office where the two alleged offenders were being held.

Tomson arrived at the patrol office and I am satisfied that he questioned Castle in a room alone, whilst all the other officers remained outside. Shortly afterwards, Castle came out and said to Woodland, "Come on, we go home," and again without doubt, they were permitted to leave and no charge was ever laid against them.

Mr. Tomson, however, after instructing Van Helden to make a report, stated that he would see the Goods Agent in the morning.

The train of events, as outlined, created some suspicion in the minds of those present and Van Helden, Lauder and Summerton have testified accordingly.

Van Helden, having apprehended the two men and seeing that no action had been taken, feared he might leave himself open to an action for unlawful arrest and therefore, on 14th June, 1952, wrote direct to the Chief Traffic Manager, setting out all the facts.

It has been customary to sweep up wheat spilled from the trucks in order to feed fowls in transit or waiting in the shade overnight and also to sell some of the spillage to employees for a shilling a bag. Generally, the bag contained not only wheat, but a fair proportion of sweepings and dirt.
The evidence is that, sometimes, none of this wheat is available and that on occasions, in order to keep the fowls alive, good wheat has been taken from the trucks to feed them. This is irregular but it has happened. Why all the dirty wheat is not kept entirely for this purpose, instead of some of it being sold, is not stated.

Tomson says he made inquiries and ascertained from the Goods Agent that instructions, in fact, had been given to the sheeters generally, that if the swept up wheat was not available, the fowls would have to be fed with the clean wheat from the trucks.

In view of these circumstances, he considered that it would be very difficult to sustain a successful prosecution and I must say that I agree with him.

Seeing that Pudgeon and Tomson had both been named by Castle, it would have been most unwise for Tomson himself to have assumed the responsibility not to prosecute the two sheeters. On the facts, however, I must come to the conclusion that he did report the whole matter to Mr. Brodie, the then Chief Traffic Manager.

After Van Helden's letter to the Chief Traffic Manager of 14/6/52, Tomson wrote to the latter on 20/6/52, complaining inter alia that:-

"(a) Prior to discussing this report with myself, Patrol Officer Van Helden openly discussed same with the Assistant R.O.U. Secretary, Mr. Davies.
(b) Addressed correspondence to your office direct without submitting same through normal channels.
(c) The report states no action taken against employees concerned, Patrol Officer Van Helden was notified per letter under the date of the 5th inst. of action taken."

Unfortunately, this letter of 5th June, 1952, cannot
be traced and there is some suggestion that it may have been destroyed by Mr. Pedgeon, when destroying records and files on the transfer of the office to premises elsewhere.

On 27/6/52, Mr. Brodie wrote to Van Helden, reprimanding him for the breach of railway regulations and the following interesting paragraph is worthy of note:

"The matter referred to in your report was promptly reported to me at the time, and the subsequent action taken after consultation with the Senior Railway Investigator was approved and it is not proposed to alter that decision."

All the facts must have been fully reported to Mr. Brodie and he must have known that both Pedgeon and Tomson had been named by Castle in connection with the incident. In any case, Van Helden's report of 14/6/52 specifically stated this to be so and it gave all the circumstances.

Castle told so many lies, not only on the day in question but in evidence before me, that it would be impossible to give credence to anything he said. It must be remembered, that at no time, did he say that Pedgeon and Tomson had told him to take the wheat, but that he had been given instructions to take it for Pedgeon and Tomson. It would be very dangerous to accept the statement and I don't think for one moment it was true.

On one or two occasions, over a number of years, Pedgeon and Tomson had purchased a bag of wheat under the usual conditions and both say that they received their fair share of sweepings and dirt.

Mr. Harshaw came to the conclusion that whilst not irregular, it may have been a little indiscreet for the two officers to purchase the wheat as they did, but at the same time.
he pointed out that some of the Goods Agents, themselves, have participated in the scheme.

I agree with Mr. Earnshaw and it must be remembered that Railway Investigators have a paramount duty to prevent the theft of goods from railway trucks. They should not, therefore, put themselves in a position, from which it could even be remotely inferred, that they might be receiving favours from the very people it is their duty to check.

The wheat incident and Castle's statement show how careful it is necessary to be and both Tomson and Pedgeon were placed in a very invidious position. Castle knew they bought the wheat and used this fact in an endeavour to exculpate himself.

Furthermore, whilst I am satisfied that Tomson made a full verbal report to Mr. Brodie, in all the circumstances, it would have been far wiser to have made a written record of all the facts and the action taken.

It seemed a peculiar thing to Summerton, Lauder and Van Helden that Tomson questioned Castle in the absence of another officer and this is certainly a very unusual procedure. Furthermore, as he never informed them as to why no action was taken, they assumed the worst against him. My sympathy, in this instance, is with the three subordinate officers concerned. In all the circumstances, Tomson may, as I have said, been indiscreet but I am not prepared to find anything worse against him in the matter.

Whilst Tomson, as head of the section, owes no duty to his subordinates to inform them of the outcome of a particular inquiry, it would be very little trouble to do this. If a proper file had been made up it is a simple matter to mark it out to interested officers so as to show the final action taken.
In many instances, however, he has reported the result of inquiries made by his section to a particular branch and he himself has never been informed of action taken.

**Assistant Investigator Dixon receiving a quantity of linoleum and no charge laid.**

Summerton alleges that about five years ago, when the Investigation Office was on the east side of Beaufort-st., Assistant Investigator Dixon virtually stole a quantity of linoleum belonging to the Ways & Works Section, he was instructed to return it, which he did, and no action was taken against him.

Summerton said that he received a complaint from a carpenter employed in the Ways & Works that Dixon had obtained a quantity of linoleum from him, off a new roll. He thereupon reported it to Pedgson who allegedly said, "Let him go to Ways & Works and get a receipt." Summerton demurred to this and insisted that Dixon be made to return the linoleum and it was accordingly returned.

Dixon gave me a statement not only concerning this incident but the section generally. Unfortunately, he has not been able to give sworn evidence, as a day or two before he was due to do so, he had a heart attack and has been too ill to be called.

He prefaced his statement on the matter by saying, "Summerton is a liar and he knows it." He says new linoleum was being laid in a portion of the premises used by another section and he asked Mr. Carr of the Ways & Works what he was going to do with the old stuff that was being pulled up. Carr said, "We are going to burn some of the rough pieces. It has no salvage value." He then allegedly gave Dixon a piece of 3' x 4' and Dixon took it home for his son's utility.
Hearing a rumour that he had taken the linoleum, Dixon says he immediately went home and brought it back and it was burned with the rest of the scrap.

Pedgen gave sworn evidence on the matter and he more or less corroborates Dixon's statement. He says he is positive that the linoleum was secondhand and that at the time, a great deal of scrap was being destroyed in the incinerator.

The carpenter was never named nor called and it is strange to me, that in the first instance, he would permit Dixon to take the linoleum from a new roll. Dixon is altogether too shrewd a man to have obtained the linoleum in the circumstances alleged by Summerton.

I feel that it was secondhand linoleum and was obtained in the circumstances stated by Dixon. This being so, Pedgen cannot be held blameworthy in the matter and as Tomson knew nothing of the incident he must also be exonerated.

Throughout the whole of the proceedings, Summerton has shown considerable animus towards Dixon and if I were to believe all he says about him he is unfit to be employed in a position of trust.

With permission of the Commissioner of Railways, Dixon is employed as a bookmaker's clerk in his spare time. Summerton says that on one occasion, Dixon told him that if he liked to go over to the betting shop, the bookmaker would not be there and after the race had been run a ticket would be made out for the winner. Summerton, according to himself, refused.

Summerton also said that Lauder told him that Dixon had put up the same proposition to him. I immediately contacted Lauder by 'phone and he said this was correct. The statement allegedly used to Lauder was, "If you hang around a minute I will get a good one for you." Under oath, however, Lauder said he
did not quite know what was meant but eventually admitted that
Dixon was going to cheat his boss in some form or other.

I would want for more specific evidence before I was
prepared to find Dixon guilty of these allegations. He is not
a well educated man but, as I said, is shrewd and would not leave
himself open in the way alleged. He has done his work well, has
a good reputation with the C.I.D., and has co-operated with them
in all their inquiries.

A patrol officer taking articles from Midland Junction
for an employee. The matter was reported to Tomson
who refused to take action.

Summerton says that W.J. Bennett, a fitter in the
Midland Running Shed, gave him information that an employee in
the running shed had some motor car wheels repaired and he did
not know how to get them out of the shed, and that Patrol
Officer Thompson told the employee, "Don't worry, I will get
them out for you." Thompson is then alleged to have got them
out during an afternoon shift.

Summerton says he passed the information on to Tomson
and the latter is alleged to have said, "There is enough trouble
in the Workshops without this" and that accordingly, he did
nothing in the matter.

The incident is said to have occurred in January, 1957,
round about the time that Nessara, Marsland and Lee were involved
in the "Brady and Ward Affair", with which I have already dealt
in another report, and there certainly was some trouble in the
Workshops.

Summerton called Bennett as a witness and at no time
did the latter even remotely suggest that words, such as "Don't
worry, I will get them out for you", were used. Bennett said
that Thompson did inquire about a pair of wheels and although
they were behind his cupboard, he denied all knowledge of them.

Summerton put this question to Bennett: "You dis-
associated yourself with the whole incident and walked away, didn't
you?" The answer was: "Yes, I was working. But I knew they
were there."

As Bennett was Summerton's only informant and as he
swore in evidence, that he did not know to whom the wheels
belonged, how he could have passed on information that Thompson
said to an employee, "Don't worry, I will get them out for you",
is hard to imagine. I have not the slightest doubt that the
words were the figment of Summerton's own imagination and that
they were introduced just to give his story a bit of colour.

Tomson says he never remembers Summerton giving him
any information about Thompson and that the first he knew of the
incident was when it was raised before this Commission. When he
did hear about it he made inquiries and as a consequence called
Patrol Officer Thompson as a witness.

Thompson appeared to me to be an honest witness and
his story in the matter is quite straightforward.

He says that on 3/12/55, he was unloading a trailer of
sand at his place, 10 John-st., Midland Junction, and that a
driver named Brown, also employed by the W.A.G.R., asked him to
pick up a pair of wheels from West Midland Loco. Brown had a
broken leg at the time and could not call for them himself.

Brown lived practically behind Thompson in what the
Housing Commission called Muriel-st. and this is the name of the
street, in which Brown's address at the Loco Sheds, was recorded.

Brown's father-in-law arranged for the wheels to be
delivered to Muriel-st. but in reality the correct name of the
street is "Cole-st." The carrier could not find Muriel-st. and delivered the wheels to the Loco Sheds where he knew Brown worked. Unfortunately, Brown's father-in-law is dead and hence could not be called.

Thompson went openly to the sheds, made inquiries and said he wanted to pick up a pair of wheels for Keith Brown. He finally located the wheels and took them to Brown's place quite openly.

I am not prepared to find that Summerton did not pass on the information to Tomson. Tomson himself says he does not remember the incident at all and had the information been given to him, he would certainly have instituted inquiries; whether he was preoccupied at the time or not I do not know. Evidence is to the effect, that information is sometimes given to Tomson and he merely walks away. I think it is a case of genuine preoccupation. I have noticed it in the man myself and I feel there is nothing wilful in it. In my opinion, the whole incident has been grossly played up. There is no real substance in it; it was not raised before Mr. Harahaw and it has only been raised now to build up a case against Tomson.

**Complaint that a driver from the Ways & Works used a V.A.G.R. vehicle to carry cyclone wire to an address in Unyfred Road, South Perth, on 24.10.52.**

Both Summerton and Foreman join in this incident.

Foreman had seen a V.A.G.R. vehicle unloading cyclone wire in Unyfred rd., South Perth, and immediately informed Summerton of the fact by 'phone.

On receipt of the information, Summerton interviewed the driver of the vehicle who informed him that he had carried the wire from an address in James-st., Perth. He then interviewed
a man at the address given and he was satisfied that the wire had not been stolen. The truck driver admitted to Summerton that he had received a few shillings for cutting the wire and there is not the slightest doubt that the vehicle had been used irregularly.

Summerton had previously reported another driver for a similar act, as a result of which a fine of £5. had been inflicted and he and Foreman cannot see why Tomson did not take action in the present case.

Tomson says Summerton told him that the driver was working on the other side of the Causeway and this was subsequently confirmed by Mr. Morgan Hall, the officer in charge of the store at Wya & Works. In addition, the driver, a New Australian, was leaving Western Australia altogether in a fortnight's time and returning to Egypt.

In all the circumstances, Tomson did not consider the driver had made any great deviation from his normal course and as the man was going away, he decided not to take any action.

The incident has been used by Summerton and Foreman in support of their case that the Wya & Works were "acquiescent" and Tomson was "in with them".

A clear case of irregular use of the vehicle was established and in view of the fact that previous offenders had been dealt with and as a future deterrent, some sort of action should probably have been taken. I feel, however,
in not doing so, Tomson had no ulterior motive and, at the worst, he showed poor judgment.

Information from a C.I.B. officer regarding iron allegedly stolen from W.A.W. houses in Lord-st., Perth.

On 21st April, 1956, Detective Peter Johnson of the C.I.B. told Summerton that he had received information that 40 sheets of iron had been stolen from railway houses in Lord-st., Perth, and that they would probably be offered for sale by a second-hand dealer.

Summerton says he told Johnson, "I am not allowed to interfere with W.A. Works." He and Johnson, however, went out to the yard where the iron was supposed to be sold.

They then returned and saw Tomson. Summerton says Tomson then went over to W.A. Works to interview Foreman Carr and that he refused to take him with him. After about an hour, Tomson returned and is alleged to have said, "There will be no inquiry. W.A. Works couldn't check on 40 sheets of iron." According to Summerton, Johnson then said to him, "You were right; they are untouchable."

Tomson says that Carr, Sub-Foreman Plumber Mackie and himself went into the matter and checked for the alleged missing iron but could not find it. They discovered that one-third of the iron from the Lord-st. houses went to WAYS.
& Works in Perth and two-thirds to Ways & Works, West Midland.

Johnson has subsequently given evidence and he corroborates Tomson. He says Summerton merely told him, "I don't think we will get very far with this" and he denies that Summerton made any suggestion against his superior officer.

Furthermore, Johnson denies ever having said to Summerton, "You were right; they are untouchable."

He was satisfied with what Tomson told him. He realised the difficulty there would be in identifying the sheets of iron and in any case, when he went to the place where the iron was supposed to be sold, he could find no traces of it.

Detective Johnson could see nothing suspicious and said it was a case where the facts did not come up to the information received.

In his conversation with Johnson, Summerton, in my opinion, has introduced deliberate untruths.

I have no hesitation whatsoever in finding the allegation unproven and completely exonerate Tomson in the matter. The facts show the length Summerton is prepared to go, in order to fit something on Tomson.

**Allegation that Tomson ignored all complaints made to him about the excessive use of petrol in the section vehicles.**

Summerton says that he complained to Tomson on many occasions about the excessive use of petrol in the section vehicles but that his complaints were always ignored.

He does not go so far as to suggest that Pedgeon might be the offender and that Tomson could not take any action because Pedgeon had something on him. This is a scandalous
suggestion and there is not the slightest foundation for it.
Summerton's own words were, "I think there is a tie-up between
Pedgoen and Tossen but can't prove it."

After suggestions such as this have been made, it can
be readily appreciated why all agree, including the chief
protagonists themselves, that either Tossen and Pedgoen or the
one hand or Summerton or the other will have to get out of the
section. For reasons which I will develop as I go along, I am
of the opinion that it should be Summerton.

Summerton's suggestion is all the worse because, finally,
he had to admit that he had no evidence which could point in any
way to Pedgoen being responsible for the misuse of the petrol.
Finally, he also had to admit that the most he could allege was
that Tossen had taken no action to prevent the misuse or theft
of the petrol.

Summerton and Foreman also say that the misuse of the
petrol was a topic of general conversation amongst officers in
the section but I am satisfied, on the preponderance of the
evidence, that it was Summerton who always raised the matter in
an endeavour to stir up trouble.

Tossen has given evidence of various checks he made,
to ascertain if petrol were being taken and I can see no reason
to doubt him. Furthermore, Railway Road Services conducted an
inquiry into the amount of petrol used by the vehicles and
reported that, over the years, it was consistent with the age of
the vehicles and the mileage which they should be doing.

Tossen further says that, on occasions, officers have
drawn petrol without signing for it and the officer in charge
of the Road Services store had subsequently asked him to sign
for it. I ascertained from the Superintendent of Road Services
that in the past, this had occurred but the practice has now
ceased.
Despite the allegation that petrol shortages were the subject of general conversation in the section, it is to be noted that before Mr. Barrashaw, Summerton gave evidence of only one occasion, which was about twelve months before, on which he had drawn Tomson's attention to a shortage. This was the case of the utility in respect of which Railways Road Services submitted a report.

Tomson and Pedgeon are on call 24 hours a day and are frequently called out at night. Accordingly, the Chief Traffic Manager has insisted on them, each, taking home a service vehicle. Both of them have asked to be relieved of the obligation but their requests have always been refused.

I find the allegations in this matter to be disproved.

An Assistant Railway Investigator falsifying his time sheets and thus receiving money to which he was not entitled.

This refers to an incident which has given rise to a considerable amount of dissatisfaction amongst a number of officers of the Investigation Section.

The complaint is made directly against Railways Investigator Pedgeon and Assistant Railway Investigator Pearce and indirectly against Tomson, as head of the section.

Pedgeon and Pearce live opposite one another in Scarborough and it was customary for the former to drive the latter to work.

On Saturday mornings, it was necessary to maintain a roster at the Perth Railway Station concourse and the signing-on time was 8 a.m. All the other officers commenced duty at this hour but Pearce would arrive at any time up to 9.15 a.m. but sign on from 8 a.m. Because of this, he became known as "The Pensioner" or "The Little Mate". 
It was admitted by Pearce that he did arrive late but usually between 8.30 to 8.45 a.m. and that he actually signed on from 8 a.m. To counterbalance this, however, he says he signed off at 11.30 a.m. and worked on until 12.30 or 1 p.m. This may have happened on one or two occasions but I am satisfied that, generally, he finished with the others at the time of signing off and the evidence is altogether too strong on this point.

Under his Award, Pearce's hours of duty are 37½ per week and the Department, under a "No fixed hours of duty" clause, is entitled to work him up to 96 hours in a fortnight. Time worked in excess of 96 hours in the fortnight shall be adjusted within the following week on a 40-hour basis and all time not so adjusted, shall be paid for at the rate of time and a half.

If he worked on a Saturday between 8 a.m. and 1 p.m. he would be entitled to the 50 per cent penalty rate but no overtime, or, in other words, 2½ hours' pay.

He did not claim to have worked more than 96 hours in a fortnight but he said that, frequently, he worked many hours in excess of 37½ per week, without any adjustment, and that even with the discrepancy in the timebook, the Department would owe him about £40 per year, on Saturday work, alone.

This is entirely erroneous and he is not entitled to any adjustment until he has worked more than 96 hours in a fortnight.

The actual hours worked should be signed for in the timebook and in not doing so Pearce has, in my opinion, been guilty of an irregularity.

Mr. Barashaw found that Pearce had erred in signing on from 8 a.m. but that as he finished later, he had no intention of defrauding the department.
Evidence in far greater detail was given before me and I have had the added opportunity of checking the timebook. From this check, it is apparent that if Pearce worked until 1 p.m. he signed accordingly.

Whilst he may have had no deliberate intention to defraud by signing on at 8 a.m., he was paid for a longer time than he actually worked and his conduct was highly irregular. This is to be said in his favour, however, that when he realised his late coming was causing dissatisfaction, he did not rely any further on Pedgeon and drove himself to work.

Pedgeon says he did not know anything about the actual times signed for by Pearce, but if he didn’t, he should have. Mr. Barnshaw found that if any blame were attachable to Pearce it was equally attachable to Pedgeon, who was aware of the facts and condoned them.

I find the allegation proved against Pedgeon and Pearce.

Pedgeon has been considerably worried about the matter and this was obvious from his evidence. He has been severely reprimanded by Mr. Gates, in respect of his administration of the section generally and I recommend no further action be taken. I feel sure no such incident as this will again happen.

Tomson said he did not receive a complaint about Pearce commencing late on Saturdays and I accept his story.

Irregular use of W.A.G.S. vehicles by Pearce and Pedgeon to carry salvage material, purchased from Yeas and Yerks.

Whilst Summerton actually raised this complaint, the matter was first brought up by Foreman.

The gravamen of the charge is that Pedgeon and Pearce used a service vehicle to cart salvage material home to Scarborough.
As I previously pointed out, Pedgeon and Tomson were each required to take home a section vehicle, in case of a call-out, and this is undisputed. On three occasions, at the end of his shifts, Pedgeon quite frankly admits that he took home salvage material, which he had purchased, in the vehicle. Pearce was working on those shifts and naturally helped Pedgeon.

The vehicle had to be taken to Scarborough, the material was put on quite openly and I cannot see any great harm in it. Foreman was on patrol duty, saw the vehicle being loaded at Wuya & Works and made no inquiries from Pedgeon to see if he had a receipt or pass-out.

Furthermore, despite all his allegations of negligence on the part of Tomson with regard to Wuya & Works, Foreman had to admit that whilst on patrol duty there, he himself had never made a thorough check of the contents of vehicles leaving the area.

An interesting sidelight of the whole affair is, that Summersen, himself, purchased salvage materials and they were delivered to his home in Baywater by a service vehicle. His only explanation was that he had not requested the materials to be delivered and that he subsequently spoke to Foreman Carr of Wuya & Works about it. Carr, however, denies any such conversation.

Pedgeon, whilst acting as Senior Railway Investigator, reported to the Chief Traffic Manager that Summersen had instructed Patrol Officer Foreman to go to the Wuya & Works in the head of the section, in connection with an inquiry into the Wuya & Works.

The rule in the Investigation Section is, that, officers who desire the help and co-operation of the C.I.E., should make the necessary contact through the Senior Railway Investigator or, where the latter is unavailable, through the next senior officer. This is readily understandable, because the senior officers of the section must know what is going on around them.
From the evidence I am unable to find that Summerton instructed Foreman to make direct contact with the C.I.B. and it is of little importance, because undoubtedly they agreed between themselves to make the contact.

The incident happened some time between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. on 24/1/58. Tomson was on leave and Pedgeon, who was Acting Senior Investigator, was proceeding to Fremantle in a vehicle equipped with two-way radio.

Foreman became possessed of certain information pointing to the theft of materials from the Ways & Works Section. Pedgeon was not informed and Foreman went direct to the C.I.B. with the information. Summerton said he tried to get in touch with Pedgeon by radio but could not raise him. He has told several conflicting stories. In one part of his evidence, he said he agreed with Foreman that no they could not contact Pedgeon; the facts should be immediately placed before the C.I.B. In another part, he said he did not know Foreman had gone to the C.I.B. and later on he again said it was the only thing to do and that he knew all about it.

Foreman never intended to contact Pedgeon because he believed the latter might stifle action against Ways & Works personnel. There was no justification for this belief, because Tomson, whom he did not trust, was on leave and Pedgeon, who, he had to admit, had always been most helpful in inquiry matters, had done nothing to warrant the suggestion that he might be "in with" Ways & Works.

Another reason why Pedgeon was not contacted is, in my opinion, because neither Summerton nor Foreman wanted anyone else from the section to be in on the "kill". Throughout his evidence, Summerton has made it very apparent that he considered he was not getting sufficient kudos from his various inquiries and this petty jealousy has influenced his conduct to a most marked degree. Foreman had the reputation and not
Without good cause, or being a "lone wolf", unwilling to share his information with other members of the section and at least one case was established to my satisfaction, where he had failed to pass on vital information to his colleagues who relieved him on shift.

**Extensively rumoured that Summerton gave information resulting in the search of Pedgeon’s residence for a W.A.G.E. table.**

Inspector lamb of the C.I.R. received an anonymous letter, accusing Railway Investigation Officer Pedgeon of having a W.A.G.E. table in his possession, at Scarborough.

On receipt of this letter, Inspector Lamb detailed Detective Ammon to make inquiries and the latter, on 4/1/38, interviewed Mr. Gates, the Acting Chief Traffic Manager.

On being called before Mr. Gates, Pedgeon at first denied having a table in his possession at all but immediately followed the denial with an admission that there was a very old table belonging to the W.A.G.E. which Senior Investigator Gibson had permitted him to take home. Gibson denied this and Pedgeon then said it was Mr. Brodie who had given the permission.

It transpired that Tomson also had a W.A.G.E. table in his possession. When taxed with this, he immediately admitted it and said Mr. Brodie had given him permission to take it home and use it.

Both Tomson and Pedgeon said they had been given permission to take a table home because a great deal of W.A.G.E. work was carried out after office hours.

The tables were taken home about 8 or 9 years ago. Mr. Brodie remembers that the investigation section was very poorly housed at the time and he knew that both Tomson and Pedgeon did a considerable amount of railway work at their homes. Whilst he does not remember specifically giving them permission to take the tables home, he says he may have done so.
The table at Tomson's house was not in use and was stored under the house. Both tables, which were of little or no use, have been returned.

Both Mr. Gates and Mr. Brodie were satisfied that neither Tomson nor Pedgeon had any dishonest intentions, and I heartily agree.

Mr. Gates sharply reprimanded both officers for what he considered a foolish act, especially in the positions which they held, and he told them that the tables should have been returned when the use for them no longer existed.

Evidently, Summerton heard of the incident and also heard rumours that he was responsible for sending the anonymous letter to Inspector Lamb, which he denies.

Neither Tomson nor Pedgeon accused him of sending the letter, but in view of the many troubles he had caused between various officers in the section, the finger of suspicion was pointed at Summerton. Summerton has very little of which to complain in the matter and I really believe this allegation was made, merely to inform me that Tomson and Pedgeon, each, had a W.A.C.N. table in their possession.

As far as Tomson and Pedgeon are concerned, their action was merely foolish.

The next allegation refers to Tomson and the Ways & Works generally, but as many incidents affecting this issue have been made the subject of separate complaints, I shall deal with these first.

Members of the section had to drive Pedgeon to and from work in Investigation Section vehicles.

There are four main witnesses in support of this allegation, Summerton, Foreman, Lauder and Sutcliffe, another Assistant Investigation officer.
They all say that on very many occasions, Pedgeon has required officers of the section, either to drive him home to Scarborough from work or to pick him up there in the morning and drive him to work.

The evidence is too strong for me to disbelieve that this did not occur on occasions but, I feel, not nearly, with the frequently alleged.

As I previously pointed out, as a general rule, Pedgeon and Tomson were each required to keep a section vehicle at home in case they were called out in an emergency.

On some occasions, either in the morning or afternoon, various officers might be working with a vehicle in the Scarborough area, and this is generally admitted. Pedgeon, accordingly, availed himself of the opportunity to get a ride to or from work and there is surely nothing wrong with this. As a matter of fact, many other officers in the section, including Summerton, often received a lift to or from work in this way.

I cannot help but feel, however, that on other occasions, Pedgeon did use his position to have himself brought to and from work by a service vehicle.

Each officer was asked how many times he had had to drive Pedgeon, and despite the sweeping allegations, it turned out to be on very few occasions and generally, when a summons had to be served or some other investigation work carried out in the district.

Complaint by Summerton to Tomson about Jews &ework

personal removing a ladder and clippers from a V.J.W.E. house in West Darlington and Tomson would not take any action in respect thereof.

This incident is alleged to have occurred over three years ago.
A woman was renting a W.A.G.R. house in East Perth and after some repair work had been effected on the house, she found a pair of clippers and a ladder missing.

Alexander Allan, a railway employee, living next door, passed on the information to Summerton who says he then informed Tomson but that the latter merely ignored it.

Tomson denies ever having been told anything about the incident but that if he had, he would have said it was entirely a matter for the police.

There is insufficient evidence to make a finding one way or the other and the onus being on Summerton to prove the allegation, it is found in the negative.

Theft of eggs from the Perth Goods Shed and information allegedly passed to the Goods Agent by Pedgson.

Summerton and Foreman both join in this complaint.

The gravamen of the complaint is that after considerable investigation, the theft of eggs from the Perth Goods Shed was traced to a particular shift and a particular suspect. Whenever the suspect was on duty, eggs were stolen and when he was not on duty, no eggs were taken.

It is alleged that Pedgson wrote to the Goods Agent pointing out these facts, with the result, of course, that the suspect was never picked up.

Pedgson denies ever having written the letter, and careful search by my Secretary, Mr. Andersen and others, has been unable to locate it.

Foreman says, definitely, there was such a letter but admits never having seen it.
Later on in his evidence, Pedgeon says it was customary to take the head of a particular section into one's confidence in any investigation being carried on in the section. This evidence, coupled with his earlier denial of having written the letter, only makes it more difficult to decide the matter.

In all the circumstances I shall give Pedgeon the benefit of the doubt and I find the allegation to be unproved.

A complaint that Assistant Investigator Dixon had W.A.R.E. rugs in his possession and was cancelled to return them.

When Mr. Gibson was Senior Railway Investigation Officer, members of the section, evidently, had permission to take a couple of W.A.R.E. rugs home in case they were called out on duty, in cold weather.

One day, Mr. Gates received an anonymous telephone call that Dixon had a couple of these rugs at his home. Tomson had to interview Mr. Gates as a result of the call, and on his return to the section said, "All you chaps who have blankets will have to bring them back." Dixon and Sumerton were both present and the latter is alleged to have said, "I brought mine back three or four days ago."

Sumerton denies having said this and says he was on leave at the time. He did admit, however, having a rug in the utility and on one or two occasions taking it to his home for safe keeping, whilst the utility was parked outside.

I have no doubt that permission had been given to use the rugs, that there was no dishonesty on the part of anyone, and the fact that Sumerton has made an issue of the incident is bordering on childishness.
Pedgeon requested Summerton to give false evidence in connection with a prosecution for parking.

On 11/2/59, Summerton raised this matter for the first time before me.

The incident is alleged to have occurred over three years ago and Summerton said Sutcliffe was a witness who heard all the relevant conversation.

Pearce reported a case of a car being parked on the railway concourse, contrary to regulations. Summerton says that Pedgeon prepared a brief in which it was stated that he (Summerton) had spoken to the defendant who had admitted parking his car and then doing some shopping in Boona, finally making off up Forrest Place. This, of course, would have been sufficient proof of a case against the defendant, but Summerton says he never had any such conversation and all he ever did in the matter was to serve the summons.

Later in his sworn evidence, Summerton said Pedgeon wanted him to swear that the man on whom he had served the summons was the man who had parked his car on the concourse.

Summerton says he was incensed at the suggestion, that he vehemently protested and that Sutcliffe heard the whole argument. Sutcliffe, however, can remember an argument starting between Pedgeon and Summerton over some parking matter but after a few words had been said, he left the room. He therefore could not carry the matter further, one way or the other.

Pedgeon seems to have a hazy recollection of the incident. Pearce had forgotten to interview the driver of the vehicle at the time and Pedgeon asked Summerton to serve the summons and see if he could get an admission that the defendant was the driver of the vehicle. This is a common procedure and there is nothing wrong with it.
If Summerton's allegation is correct, Pedgeon is guilty of a criminal offence. In view of two lies told by Summerton in connection with other incidents to which he has referred, I would not be prepared to accept his evidence in this matter. In any case, I do not think Pedgeon is dishonest and I find the allegation not proved.

*Allegation that an employee from the Civil Engineering Branch had in his possession 40 sleepers and that Tomson, who knew all about the matter failed to take any action.*

Considerable stress was laid on this incident both by Summerton and Lauder, to show that Tomson was actually abusing his position of trust.

Information was received that there were a number of sleepers located at a block in Canning Highway, Como. The police were called in and after investigation, the owner of the block was found to be an engineering cadet, employed by the Chief Civil Engineer. The sleepers had been purchased for £1.0.0 as salvage, but on examination, proved to be new.

As the cadet had a receipt for the purchase of the sleepers, the police could not possibly sustain a prosecution for stealing and suggested that the cadet be dealt with Departmentally.

As head of the Investigation Section, Tomson reported the facts to the Chief Civil Engineer who made further inquiries. It transpired that the carrier had picked up the wrong sleepers from a dump at Goodwood and that the cadet was not present at the time.

The sleepers were only required to allow ingress and egress to the block whilst a house was being erected and it did not matter whether they were new or old. In the circumstances, the Chief Civil Engineer - not Tomson - decided that no action would be taken and as the sleepers were returned, the matter ended there.
Lauder and Summerton, in particular, have held the facts of this case against Tomson ever since. They did not know the full facts and whilst Tomson had told them nothing as to why no action had been taken, they could quite easily have asked.

Tomson had done his duty in reporting the facts to the Chief Civil Engineer and if the latter decided to take no action, that was his responsibility, not Tomson's.

Naturally enough, the allegation is unproved and Tomson is completely exonerated.

This case is typical of many in which the allegation is made first, without proper knowledge of the facts. Summerton and Lauder actually went over Tomson's head in this matter and reported it to the Industrial and Staff Manager, as a result of which they were severely reprimanded, as they should have been, by the Chief Traffic Manager.

Pedgeon requested Summerton to give evidence that he had reported certain information anonymously, which was false.

On 4/11/55, Summerton was on leave and he saw Driver Brown from Perth Goods Shed driving a Departmental vehicle towards Scarborough, loaded with timber and firewood. He immediately rang Pedgeon and reported the matter. He knew Brown and gave Pedgeon, the vehicle number and Brown's name, but according to Pedgeon asked him not to mention the incident to Assistant Investigator Sullivan, who was a friend of Brown's. The reason for this was that he thought Sullivan might warn Brown.

As a result of the information received, Brown was dealt with Departmentally and fined £5.0.0.

There was some question of an appeal and Summerton says that Pedgeon asked him to say that he had submitted the complaint anonymously, which he refused to do.
Pedgeon, on the other hand, says that as he was on leave, Summerton asked him to make out a report that he received the information anonymously and he did this. At the same time, he said there were other officers standing by his end of the 'phone and it was well known to them that it was Summerton who had supplied the information.

The report has been submitted in evidence and there is no doubt that Pedgeon went to great pains to stress the anonymity of his information and the reader of the report would unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that the information was, in fact, anonymous.

On his own story, Pedgeon submitted a report to his superior officer, which was untrue. In view of this report, written on the same day as the incident occurred, what would have happened if the offender denied the charge and decided to plead not guilty? It would have been necessary to call an eye witness and this would certainly have been awkward for Pedgeon.

Summerton is a great lover of kudos and it is hard to imagine that he would ask for his name to be suppressed as the informant. On the other hand, he was on leave and was about to go fishing so that there is a possibility, as stated by Pedgeon, that he did not want to be brought back to testify against Brown.

If Summerton's story is true, Pedgeon, in asking him to swear false information before an Appeal Board, has been guilty of a criminal offence. All I can say is that in view of this, and on the evidence, I must give Pedgeon the benefit of the doubt and find the allegation disproved.
FOREMAN'S COMPLAINTS ANALYSED.

Complaint that Pavlinovich, an employee of the Chief Civil Engineer, had unlawfully taken six sheets of iron, the property of Foreman, and that 'Tomson failed to take action against Pavlinovich.

In March 1954, Foreman purchased six sheets of second-hand galvanised iron from Sandovers. This firm had recently had a fire in their premises which adjoined the Civil Engineering Garage and without doubt, a quantity of old iron and timber was thrown into the garage yard from these premises. It was very difficult to distinguish the boundary between the two places and it is readily understandable that materials could quite easily be mixed up.

When he went to pick up his iron, Foreman found that it was missing. He inquired round the yard for it and Pavlinovich, a storesman, admitted having taken it home with the permission of Inspector Tolliday of Ways and Works. Foreman says he immediately rang Tolliday, Foreman Carr and Foreman Plumbers Hackie and they all denied having given Pavlinovich permission to take the iron.

Foreman then made a report and says he was dressed down thoroughly by Pedgeon and that Tomson said he was not to conduct inquiries into Ways and Works on his "own bat".

Mr. J.L. Martin, a Foreman Mechanic, of the Garage, heard Foreman questioning Pavlinovich and considered that it amounted to browbeating. Accordingly, he rang either Pedgeon or Tomson to come down.

The whole incident, to my mind, reeks with suspicion.

When the facts were very fresh in his mind, Pavlinovich said that Tolliday had given his permission to take the iron. Before me he swore that it was Tolliday or Carr but he could not remember.
Pavlinovich took home Foreman's and another very battered piece of iron together with a load of salvage wood by service vehicle. He had a receipt for having purchased the wood but, of course, had none for the iron. He was permitted to use the service vehicle because it was allegedly on a trial run, after having undergone repairs.

Foreman Mechanic Martin was Pavlinovich's immediate superior officer and had a very high opinion both of his integrity and ability. He considered that there was no dishonest intention on the part of Pavlinovich, he discussed the matter generally with Tomson and it was decided to take no action.

The inherent value of the iron was insignificant but Tomson knew there was a correct method of purchasing salvage and that employees were not entitled, virtually, to help themselves, and perhaps, some action should have been taken. He was guided, however, to a very large extent by Martin's high opinion of Pavlinovich and I feel that he had no dishonest intention in the matter whatsoever.

I do not blame Foreman for inquiring into the loss of his iron and Tomson had no right to castigate him for making his own inquiries.

Information given to Tomson verbally about cement, paint and timber being unlawfully removed from train and forms and that an employee named Pendlan was the principal offender. The gravamen of his complaint is that Foreman did not hear anything from Tomson as to any inquiries made.

Foreman certainly told Tomson of his suspicions but gave him no concrete evidence on which he could act. The powers of the Railway Investigators are extremely limited and there was no information which would warrant a detention and a search of Pendlan's premises.
Foreman, himself, had to admit that he had nothing but suspicion and insufficient information on which to act. How then did he expect Tomson to act?

Fentland and others were subsequently dismissed as a result of calling in the C.I.D. on 24/1/58, but once again, Foreman had to admit that he had no definite evidence until about 10 minutes before the police took action.

I have no hesitation, whatsoever, in finding this issue against Foreman.

**That Tomson had friends at Ways and Works, etc.**

I shall deal with this later on.

**That Tomson was approached by Foreman about lack of security at Ways and Works.**

I shall also deal with this later on.

**Tomson was negligent by not calling a particular witness in a case against a plumber named Tester.**

The facts in this case have always been held by Foreman against Tomson and have helped, quite unjustifiably, to engender a feeling of suspicion that Tomson was "in with" Ways and Works.

Foreman's allegation is, that, Tomson refused to call an informer, who was an eye witness, in a case against a plumber, named Tester, an employee of the Chief Civil Engineer. Tester was charged with unlawful possession of earthenware pipes, the property of Ways and Works.

Foreman made his allegation without knowing anything about the true facts. He admits now he is wrong but makes no apology to Tomson whatever.

The police were called into this matter and Detective Sergeant Daniels took charge of inquiries. The conduct of the prosecution was entirely in his hands and rightly or wrongly, he decided not to call the eye witness.
I have interviewed Detective Sergeant Daniels and he tells me the responsibility for not calling the witness was entirely his and had nothing whatsoever to do with Tomson. On the facts, he made up his mind, on the course to be taken and unfortunately the case was dismissed.

Tomson is entirely free from blame and must be exonerated.

The facts, however, prove the old adage that "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing" and also confirms Foreman's suspicious mind.

Cyclone wire delivered to Gwydyr Rd, South Perth.

I have already dealt with this incident.

The Checker Baker Incident.

On 13/10/54, Foreman apprehended a Checker named Baker, for stealing vegetables. He took him to No. 1 Shed and thereupon rang Tomson. The latter told Foreman if the Checker were to admit the offence in the presence of a witness, as well as Foreman himself, he could be charged with stealing.

Foreman said, to his surprise, he next saw the checker talking to Tomson between two trucks on F road and that as far as he knew, no action was ever taken.

Evidently the fact that he saw the two men talking, aroused suspicion in Foreman's mind and that this is so, is a very poor state of affairs. A simple inquiry by Foreman could have quite easily elucidated matters but Foreman obviously preferred to harbour suspicion and distrust.

The real facts are these: Chief Traffic Manager's file 9056/54 discloses that on 14/10/54, Tomson forwarded Foreman's report to the Chief Traffic Manager. The latter, after a recommendation to mercy, made by the Goods Agent, fined Baker £1.0.0.

Tomson, therefore, did his duty but there is no expression of apology by Foreman.
The allegation is unfounded and Tomson completely exonerated.

Cement was delivered to Tomson's private residence by a Government vehicle.

There is no substance in this allegation and once again Foreman should have verified his facts before making the allegation.

He was merely given information that the cement had been carried by a Government vehicle. Finally, however, he had to admit that Wares, the man who carried the cement, had a vehicle similar to those used by the railways and that he was not actually sure in what vehicle the cement had been carried.

Wares actually used his own vehicle to convey cement slabs to Tomson's home. They had been ripped up from an old urinal and purchased by Tomson as salvage.

On another occasion, Tomson freely admits that he had purchased some cement and had it conveyed to his home by the section utility which he was required to keep ready for a call-out.

I find the allegation disproved.

Foreman found a small piece of paper at a saw bench in the ways and Wares which purported to be an order for a ton of firewood and a piece of Oregon for "S. Tomson".

This incident has also been explained to my satisfaction. The firewood was salvage and the piece of Oregon was for a map to be used in the Investigation Section, and apart from finding the allegation, if it may be called such, in the negative, I will say no more.

Tomson told Patrol Officer Keady that he would see Foreman on the street carrying his sawag.

Foreman alleges that Keady repeated the above statement to him.

43.
Keady, who was an impressive witness, denied ever having told Foreman this and I accept his evidence.

Keady says that not very long ago, Foreman taxed him with having previously made the statement, which he immediately denied doing.

There is some substance, however, in Keady's allegation that Foreman suggested to him that it was perhaps Pedgeon who made the statement and that he should go and think it over.

**Allegations of graft against a very senior W.A.G.R. officer.**

In fairness to the officer concerned, his name should not be made public. Foreman admits that he was merely told this scandal by another W.A.G.R. employee and that he did not know whether it was true or false but that nevertheless it had influenced his opinion of the particular officer concerned.

I have looked into the matter and I am absolutely convinced there is not a shred of truth in the allegations. When a man's opinion of another can be swayed by such utter nonsense, he should not be employed in a position requiring the exercise of judgment.

Foreman says he will no longer work in the section with Tomson and Pedgeon, and I will make a recommendation about this, a little later.

An officer of the Ways and Works named Martin was apprehended, removing timber from the Ways and Works, by two Patrol Officers, Joss and Toll. These two officers were instructed by Pedgeon to say nothing about the matter and no action was taken against Martin.

Foreman's allegation is based entirely on hearsay and no witnesses in support of it were called. Patrol Officer Joss himself was dismissed for stealing petrol and Patrol Officer Toll has since died.

Pedgeon says Joss and Toll reported a private vehicle parked outside the Ways and Works after 5 p.m. and that it had a
small quantity of soft wood on it.

Pedgeon ascertained that the utility belonged to Martin and that he had purchased the timber at Whittakers. In the circumstances, therefore, no offence had been committed and no official report was required. He denies ever suggesting to Joss or Toll that they should say nothing about the incident.

The allegation has been disproved to my satisfaction.

A truck driver named Rupe removed timber from the Goods Shed area and Foreman reported this. No action, however, was taken.

Rupe apparently had permission to take home some pieces of timber to the Cannington area. Foreman reported the facts and was not so interested in the timber but in the fact that Rupe used a W.A.G.R. vehicle to take it home.

Tomson was on leave at the time and Pedgeon, who was acting in his stead, says he reported the matter to the foreman of the Goods Shed and the Goods Agent, and that if no further action were taken, it was not his fault.

I have been unable to discover if action were taken, but as a W. A.G. R. vehicle had been used irregularly, some action should have been taken.

Pedgeon had taken good timber from the Wavy and Works on two or three occasions.

I have already dealt with this matter.

Information in the possession of Foreman that Pedgeon had taken asbestos from Wavy and Works.

In this case, Foreman relies entirely on what Joss told him. Joss was dismissed for stealing, Pedgeon strongly denies taking the asbestos, and the allegation is found to be disproved.

Pedgeon told Foreman that Tomson would not take action against Wavy and Works.

It is Foreman's word against Pedgeon's in this matter. I am not satisfied and find the allegation disproved.
AGGRAVATIONS ABOUT TOMSON AND THE WAYS AND WORKS.

I have already dealt with some of the specific allegations which go to make up the general case against Tomson and the Ways and Works.

Without any doubt, the administration of the Ways and Works, in many respects, was very loose. Orders for materials were often originated on pieces of paper and the system was open to all kinds of abuse and was, in fact, abused.

Tomson was friendly with Inspector Tolliday of the Ways and Works to the extent that they visited one another, perhaps, once or twice a year, and in the old days, Tolliday had been a friend of Tomson's father.

Furthermore, Tomson was quite friendly with Carr, the Foreman of Ways and Works, but their association was not very close.

Summerton seized on these friendships, played them up whenever he could, discussed them ad nauseam with his fellow officers, and was continuously suggesting to one and all, that Tomson was "in with" the Ways and Works.

Matters which he says were topics of general conversation, particularly about Tomson and the Ways and Works, were always, as a rule, introduced by Summerton himself. He harped on them day after day and if an officer finally said "Yes" to one of his suggestions, in order to get a bit of peace, he would repeat the conversation as emanating from this officer.

He adopted the same procedure in matters of gossip and would repeat rumours he himself had spread, as emanating from others. He found in Foreman a ready ally who believed everything told about a man, if it were to his detriment.

This then is the atmosphere within the section, and it can be readily understood that one officer was put against the other, suspicion was rife and the section itself was most unhappy.

46.
In their evidence, Foreman and Summerton swore they were continuously giving Tomson information about stealing within the "yays & works" but they were not able to enumerate many specific instances.

They said they gave him information and that he always refused to let them do anything about it and did nothing himself. I do not accept this evidence and when pressed for details of conversations, they were extremely vague.

Frequently, in his evidence, Foreman had to admit that he had passed his suspicions on to Tomson but no definite information on which action could be taken. There is, of course, a vital distinction in police circles, between suspicion and information.

Before Mr. Burnshaw, Foreman said he had come to the conclusion that the only way he could get action against "yays & works personnel was to do it himself, and that is why he finally went direct to the C.I.E.

Mr. Burnshaw asked him why he did not put his suspicions in writing and he said it would be unwise to put in writing suspicions that had not been proved to be facts.

As he did not trust Tomson, he was also asked why he did not pass on his suspicions to Mr. Brodie or complain to Brodie about Tomson. His answer was that he only had suspicions and nothing concrete.

This answer was untrue, if his evidence before me is true, because he now says he did not trust Brodie, that Brodie was in with Tomson and Pedgson and if he had complained to him, he was sure no action would have been taken. He then made scandalous allegations against Brodie, admitted he did not know whether they were true or false but had allowed them to influence his opinion of him.

47.
Tomson is not to blame for the loose system of ordering which previously existed in the Ways & Works section and this was entirely an administrative matter within the Civil Engineering Branch.

In my opinion, he has done what he could to prevent theft and irregularities within Ways & Works.

He and his officers made routine inspections of the area. He suggested the removal of timber and materials from vulnerable spots. He recommended the remodelling of the cement shed after a theft of cement, the erection of a compound for vehicles, the branding of cement slabs to make their theft more difficult; he had a patrol officer appointed to the gate to check outgoing materials and he had certain locks changed for better security.

Furthermore, he drew attention to loose sheets of iron and other materials in storerooms and sheds and requested that they be made more secure.

Apart from interfering in the internal administration of the Ways & Works, Tomson could not have done much more. He had patrol officers in the section and it was their job to bring him information. Foreman was a wideawake officer, yet despite years of careful watching and inquiry, he was unable to get anything tangible on which action could be taken, within ten minutes of the final arrests.

After the arrests, when a committee was appointed to inquire into the Ways & Works section, a "deficiency" in materials, amounting to £13,186.11.5 was discovered.

The Committee was satisfied that the big proportion of the deficiency was a result of "out of course" bookings, i.e., entries made in one year for stocks which have been taken...
to account in the previous year. In other words, the deficiency was not brought about by physical shortage of stocks but was, in effect, a book deficiency.

Tomson is not a great administrator and frankly admits the fact. He has held various jobs prior to being appointed to the Investigation Section, none of which gave him administrative experience. After being in the section a very short time, he was appointed Senior Railway Investigator and almost immediately, by the appointment of over twenty patrol officers, the strength of the section was increased from eight to about twenty-seven and it was subsequently increased to thirty.

Tomson's one great fault is lack of firmness and this has been commented on by practically every witness, including those who respect and admire him.

In addition, Messrs. Burnshaw and Gates expressed the same opinion.

Mr. Brodie, who of all people, should know Tomson, says he has done a good job but that he has not been firm enough with his staff. Mr. Brodie found his helpful and co-operative and was of the opinion that he had an able lieutenant in Fedgeon.

I agree with these opinions and I am satisfied Tomson is honest, he bears an excellent reputation within the service and I find that Summerton and Foreman have been most malicious in their allegations against him.

Summing up on Summerton.

Tomson and Fedgeon both say they will no longer work in the section if Summerton is not removed. Summerton himself says either he or the other two will have to go. In my opinion, for the peace of the section, it should be Summerton.
As long as Summerton remains in the section, there will be trouble. He admits that he has raised many childish matters, at the same time, saying the others have done the same.

On one occasion he met my secretary, Mr. Andersen, in the street and told him all he wanted was to get Tomson and Feddeon the sack. Mr. Andersen is absolutely unbiased and a witness beyond reproach, and I believe his evidence implicitly. At first, Summerton denied having told Mr. Andersen this and tried to break him down in every way. Later, Summerton watered his own evidence down considerably and admitted he may have said something similar about one of them and finally, I took him, to have mumbled agreement about both. The fact that, at first, he had sworn quite positively, on oath, that he had not made the statement, meant nothing to him.

I believe officers when they say that Summerton would have a "grizzle" from the moment he arrived at work in the morning, and I believe those who say that he tried to set one officer against the other. If, for the sake of peace, any officer were to say "Yes" to his innumerable, the particular officer was then quoted as their author.

Summerton’s method of working was very apparent from the way he questioned witnesses in front of me and I can well imagine how he "operated on" his fellow officers. If a witness did not agree with his version of an incident (which was very frequent) he kept at and at the witness and endeavoured, virtually, to ram the answer he wanted down his throat.
One such witness was Detective Johnson. He gave a very clear denial to one of Summerton's questions but nevertheless the same question was repeated at least five times until the witness and myself became sick of the repetition.

In the past, Summerton has had ample opportunity of airing his grievances in front of Mr. Brodie, but he offered the same excuse as Foreman, that he would not get a "fair go" as Brodie was "in with" Tomson and Pedgeon.

On one occasion, Pedgeon took Summerton before Brodie for abusing him in the Station Concourse and calling him, inter alia, "a pommy bastard." Summerton's version as to what happened at the concourse, was altogether different from Pedgeon's, yet he had little to say in front of Brodie. When pressed as to what happened before Brodie, he was very vague, which was rather unusual, because he can give quite intimate details of other conversations, occurring eight and even nine years ago.

On another occasion before Brodie, Lauder, Dixon and Summerton were airing certain grievances about a round roster, and an excellent opportunity to ventilate grievances, generally, was afforded but Summerton did not ventilate any.

Some of Summerton's suspicions about Tomson taking no action against Wages and Works personnel, was based on information supplied by a certain welder. It turns out, however, that the welder had been warned fourteen times for various acts of misfeasance, including drunkenness, before being sacked. Summerton would prefer to have his mind saturated with this sort of information rather than have it out with Tomson.

Even the clerk of the section, Mr. Gilberston, who lost both legs in an accident, gave evidence against Summerton.
He appeared to me to be an honest witness and his evidence is to the effect that Summerton was always badgering him and starting controversies in the section. He also said that Summerton was constantly making suggestions and innuendoes against various officers and it was very unpleasant for everyone.

Evidence has been given of one very suspicious incident involving Summerton.

Some years ago, the Investigation Section had information about railway employees at Kalgoorlie being unlawfully in possession of W.A.R. property. One of the men involved was a checker named Drew, a friend of another checker named Luke. Luke was a friend of Dixon.

Summerton gave evidence, that, at the time, Dixon said he had a good mind to warn Luke.

Luke, however, was called as a witness by Tomson and said he received an anonymous letter warning him and Drew that a check for stolen property was to be made. He did not receive the letter, however, until after his own and Drew’s residences had been searched. No stolen property was found in Luke’s possession but Drew was convicted of an offense.

Several years ago, Luke was at the Perth races and was introduced to Summerton by Tomson. Later in the afternoon, in the absence of Tomson, Luke says that Summerton asked him if he ever wondered who wrote the anonymous letter, warning him and Drew. Luke admitted to he had and he then alleges Summerton told him he had sent it.

If this is true, of course, Summerton should be dismissed from the W.A.R. and in any case, the matter is
so serious that I would only apply the criminal test, proof beyond reasonable doubt. This being so and as it is merely Luke's word against Summerton's, I must give the latter the benefit of the doubt and find the allegation disproved.

If Summerton's story is true, which I very much doubt, that Dixon discussed the possibility of warning Luke, he, Summerton, should have immediately informed Tomson, as head of the section. On his own story, therefore, by not doing so, he was guilty of a grave dereliction of duty.

Another suggestion has been made that Summerton was mixed up with a certain jockey who at one stage, had been disqualified for life. Summerton, although it was no part of his duty, was busying himself about the erection of a ramp to be used by Fry's trucks in connection with some contract he had with the W.A.G.R.

The suggestion, however, like many of Summerton's own, has nothing tangible to back it and it would be very wrong of me to make a specific finding.

Many other incidents have been raised, with which, I do not propose to deal. I think sufficient has been set out, to show what can only be described, as the dreadful atmosphere, which pervaded the Railway Investigation Section. I agree with Tomson that the position disclosed can no longer be tolerated.

Senior officers cannot do their jobs properly with their juniors constantly "stabbing them in the back" and this has been altogether too prevalent in the section.

Mr. Yarnsaw found Summerton to be a trouble maker
and as a result, Mr. Gates had no hesitation in transferring him, for investigation duties, to the Commercial Section. This did not cure the trouble, however and in my opinion, the Railway Investigation Section can never be a happy family with Summerton in it.

I strongly recommend, therefore, that immediate steps be taken to remove him from the section. His duties as an Investigation Officer, require him to give evidence in court and his showing before me, as a witness, has been such, that no great credence could ever be placed in him.

Tomson and Pedgeon have, at all times, spoken most highly of Foreman and cannot understand his attitude. His replies under cross-examination can only be described as amazing. The following extract from page 2394 of evidence shows the manner in which his mind worked:

"My the Commissioner:"
"But you said no action would be taken?—Yes."
"That is a serious allegation. You say they would deliberately fall down on their job?—Yes."

By Mr. Tomson:
"Has there been any doubt that Pedgeon is in with the Ways & Works?—I think he is the same as you.
"But you don't think we are dishonest?—No."
"But you said you didn't report it because we wouldn't take any action?—Yes."

"Then we must have been dishonest?—I don't follow."

Foreman says he no longer desires to work in the section whilst Tomson and Pedgeon are there. This being so, his wish should be granted and I recommend his transfer elsewhere.

In my opinion, Tomson has done nothing to warrant his transfer from the section. He has made mistakes but they are what I call "honest mistakes" and from which, I think he has gained considerable experience for the future. Despite all the allegations made by Summerton and Foreman, I sincerely believe Tomson to be an honest man.
Pedgeon is a satisfactory officer, carried away a little perhaps, with the importance of his position and on occasions also inclined to repeat gossip of one officer about the other. Me too, I think has now learned from bitter experience that this does not pay. In my opinion, however, he does a good job and is conscientiously interested in the section.

General Comments And Recommendations:

Officers of the Railway Investigation Section have no police powers and strictly speaking cannot even detain or search a suspected thief on railway premises.

From time to time, the Commissioner of Railways has requested the Commissioner of Police to swear in certain members of the section as special constables under the Police Act.

In recent times, only one officer has been sworn in and he has since retired.

The Commissioner of Police rightly takes the view, that, he will not swear in men, as special constables, who have had no basic police training and over whom, he has no jurisdiction.

From what I have seen, he would certainly be taking a risk in appointing one or two officers in the Railway Investigation Section, as special constables.

Section 74 of the Government Railways Act, permits the Commissioner of Railways to appoint special constables in the circumstances and for the purposes, set out in the section.

Special constables appointed under the section shall not be members of the Police Force and shall be the servants of the Commissioner of Railways and under his direction and control.

Some consideration, might, perhaps be given to the appointment of the head of the section, as a special constable under the above section.
Another suggestion made, was that a special C.I.B. officer should be permanently attached to the section. The Commissioner of Police is not in favour of this and it certainly has its difficulties. If any such officer were appointed, he would have to be paid by the W.A.O.R. and the Commissioner of Police would have to look around for another capable officer to take his place.

The Commissioner of Police rightly points out that the C.I.B. is on call at any time and has always co-operated to the full, in the past and this is very true.

In discussion with the Commissioner, he has agreed to take any nominated W.A.O.R. officer and give him the basic police training in a proper police school. In addition, he has offered to take any nominated officer and attach him for experience to the C.I.B.

I strongly recommend that consideration be given to the acceptance of the offer. At the present time, all the Investigation Officers have come from positions in the railway which hardly fit them for police and administrative work. Bearing this in mind, most of them have done a particularly good job.

At the moment, the Senior Railway Investigator gets a salary of £1,275. 0. 0 per annum or £50 above a police constable with 10 years service. He has upwards of 30 men under him and is responsible for the protection of all W.A.O.R. property and equipment.

Mr. Brodie suggests that the head of the section should have the status and salary of a "Sub-Head" and this would add to his prestige both within and without the section.

In the future, there must be firmer and better administration and details of all cases should be carefully recorded and preserved. The facts show very clearly that this was not always done in the past.
Conclusion.

As this is the last opportunity I shall have to do so, I desire to thank all those W.A.G.N. officers who have helped me in so many ways.

I have named many of these officers in previous reports but I do want to thank, very sincerely, Mr. Cedric Stewart, the Chief Civil Engineer, who has given me such valuable help over a long period of time.

I also want to thank my Secretary, Mr. Andersen, who has displayed very great ability in so many ways and whose real and practical knowledge of railway routine, has stood up to every test. Senior officers both here and in other States have expressed considerable surprise at his ability to grasp and appraise very complex railway problems.

I desire to thank the present Minister for his courtesy and assistance since he has assumed office.

I also desire to thank Mr. Walter Chinery and all the Hansard Staff for their assistance.

Lastly, I desire to thank publicly, the Hon. H.C. Strickland who as Minister for Railways, gave me such wonderful help and co-operation. Particularly, I want to stress this, that over the long period we were so closely associated, he, as Minister had but one object, the improvement of the Western Australian Government Railways.

I have the honour to be Your Excellency's Most Obedient Servant,

[Signature]

Senior Standing Registrar.
ROYAL COMMISSION.