DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. Ayers) moved the re-reading of the second reading of this Bill. Last week a measure had been introduced to facilitate registration of native dogs, and to prevent the keeping of unregistered dogs, and to omit, in particular, slight defects. It did not, however, pass, and the Government had not been able to reach a more comprehensive measure, which might have been found to be a hindrance in many instances. A measure was under consideration, and it was now proposed to re-consider the Bill on the 22nd of the 6th, from a maximum of 25 to 50 at present. It was further proposed to vary the appointment of the Register, not in the Government, and to give it to the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the District Councils and Committees. Perhaps the most important part of the Bill was the making of the register of native dogs, and its amendment, and sought to fix ownership on other alike matters of that kind. He should be present the Bill went on to point out any new provisions.

The Hon. J. BAKER seconded.

The motion was carried and the Bill was read a second time.

In Committee.

The question of wages, and the fee of 1 and 2 were passed as printed.

Clause 29. Interpretation.

The Hon. H. Ayers said that the Bill should be carried and the Bill was read a second time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. Ayers) thought that there would be no misunderstanding as to the intention of the Bill.

The Hon. J. BAKER proposed to carry the exception allowed for the non-registration of native dogs, and proposed an amendment to the same effect as the Bill. He thought that the Bill would be carried and the Bill was read a second time.

The Hon. J. BAKER felt disposed to agree to the proposal, but of course the fee for registration could not be charged in such cases.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. Ayers) thought that there would be great difficulties in ascertaining the ownership, and that the dogs were not to be considered as belonging to the natives, as it was well known that a large amount of damage was done by these animals. But this provision would also be a protection to the natives, who would then know that their dogs were protected and could not be destroyed in mistake.

The Hon. J. BAKER felt disposed to agree to the proposal, but of course the fee for registration could not be charged in such cases.

The Hon. H. Morgan called attention to the fact that the Bill was to be carried and the Bill was read a second time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. Ayers) said that the duty of defining what was meant by that particular kind of dog would fall upon the person undertaking the registration. If a dog was destroyed in mistake, the person who killed it would be liable to a penalty.

The Honor. Mr. Baker wished to point out that a difficulty would be likely to arise as to what should be considered a dog improperly at large.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. Ayers) said that a dog could not be called improperly at large so long as it was not being under the immediate control of some competent person.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. Ayers) said that a dog might be said to be improperly at large in a street if it was in a drawing-room or on the street. He thought that the Bill would be carried and the Bill was read a second time.
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