**FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1905**

**House of Assembly, 6 December 1905, pages 963-5**

Second reading

**Mr. TUCKER,** in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it was to add to and not to take away from the provisions of the Act of 1904, which, while it had I been a success in certain directions, had worked hardships in others. Clause 2 repealed Part III. of that Act, and to put in its place the following provision:—The following fees shall be charged for licences —For every quarterly licence, 5/; for every half-yearly licence, 10/; for every yearly licence, 20/: Provided that the Minister, on being satisfied that any person bona fide employs any other person as his servant, may direct the issue to such employer in respect of the person so employed of a licence to be called a ‘servant’s licence, and the fee for each such servant’s licence shall be at the rate of one-half the fees respectively prescribed herein. All fees shall be paid to the person duly appointed by the Minister to receive the same, and shall be forthwith paid by him to the Treasury. Clause 5 gave the power of transfer to the holder of a licence. It had been found that when a fisherman paid 15/ for a licence for a servant very often the latter absconded, or otherwise left his employ, with the result that the fisherman had to pay for another servant’s licence. In some cases this had to be repeated two and three times a year. It was therefore only fair that the power of transfer should be granted, and the new clause provided the safeguard that such transfer should not be effectual until endorsed by the issuer of the licence—an en­dorsement which would have the effect of cancelling the licence to the previous servant. Clause 6 provided that one licence should be sufficient for the holder and one member of his family under 21 years old, so long as both were working with the same plant. That provision was already part of the Act of 1904, but it appeared in Part III., and as Part III. was hereby repealed it was necessary to re-enact this portion of it. The Bill applied more to the Murray River than to deep sea fisheries, the latter being more of a permanent industry. He was sure the desire of the House was to encourage the fishermen, whose calling was as much a source of production as any other industry. As the result of the visit of Mr. Duffield (Chief Inspector of Fisheries) to New South Wales a year or two ago the South Australian fishery laws had been largely brought into line with those of the mother State, and this Bill was a further step in that direction. He moved the second reading.

Mr. McDonald supported the Bill. It was only by putting an Act to the test that its weak points were disclosed, and the present measure was for the purpose of strengthening the existing laws. It was strongly favoured by the fishermen in his own district. He would make its provisions even more liberal than as framed. They did not want to collect excessive fees from the fishermen, but simply to ensure the proper regulation of the industry, and it would be much fairer if the licences were issued at the following rates:—5/ for a quarter, 7/6 for a half-year, and 10/ for a year. That amount was sufficient for the purpose. He agreed with the amendments suggested by Mr. Tucker, as they would improve the Bill. The alteration to clause 3 was justified, as a number of men fished for three months only, and engaged in other occupations during the year. The Bill was necessary, and he hoped it would be carried.

Carried.