**FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1889**

**House of Assembly, 14 August 1889, pages 600**

Second reading

Mr. REES said he would not detain the House long, as the matter had been thoroughly placed before the public. On our jetties there were large numbers of people in pursuit of sport and health. They used the railways, and should have some consideration shown them. He had seen no less than 400 or 500 people fishing on the two jetties at Largs and the Semaphore, and fishermen had been seen to cast nets under their lines and interfere with the fishing for days. He had the pleasure of meeting Sir Thomas Craven, an Irish Fish Commissioner, on whose recommendation a Bill similar to that introduced by him had become law in Tasmania. After having brought this matter before the Attorney-General a number of gentlemen called a meeting and invited him to be present, and they had complained in very bitter terms of the injury that was done to them. One argument in favor of the Bill was that people used the railways and yet their sport was wantonly spoilt by these followers of Isaac Walton. The Fisheries Act passed in 1878 was by no means a perfect measure. The wholesale destruction of fish by dynamite was still largely prevalent, and as a preventative he would suggest we should have an inspector of fisheries. Many men who were out of employment were able to provide their families with fresh fish, and this was interfered with by the fishermen casting their nets round the jetty and under the very lines of those fishing off the pier In the interests of the public and of the Government railways it was essential that we should legislate in the same direction as Victoria and New South Wales. It had been pointed out that this Bill would deal with crab nets. This was not his intention. He only wished to deal with seal nets and dynamiting. We should certainly be forearmed against the grievance by such a Bill as he had introduced.

On the motion of Mr. BARTLETT, the debate was adjourned till Wednesday next.

**FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1889**

**House of Assembly, 21 August 1889, pages 671-2**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

Mr BARTLETT said he wanted an explanation of a few clauses of the Bill, as, if it became law, a considerable number of his constituents would be injured. He was sure that the petition that had been presented to the House would not have been presented had the petitioners not felt that their rights were being infringed. At the present time fishermen never drew their nets at the time when anglers were on the jetties, so that no harm was done to them except in such places as Largs and the Semaphore. The jetties were all situated in sheltered places and where the bottoms were sandy, and in these places the fish generally assembled. He had been informed by a fishmonger that 1,500 lb. of fish per week was brought from the Peninsula. The fishermen made their hauls previous to the departure of the steamer so that the people in the interior could get a fresh supply. Mr. Rees had pointed out that a large revenue was obtained from angler journey from Adelaide to the seaside, but he would point out that a large revenue was derived from the haulage of fish from Yorke’s Peninsula. He trusted the House would not pass the Bill.

Mr. NASH moved the adjournment of the debate.

Negatived.

Mr. HOPKINS moved—“That the House do now divide.”

Negatived.

Mr. HOPKINS said he had presented a petition against the Bill and he would vote against it. It was an unfair Bill and was unnecessary. There were gentlemen who took their wives to the Semaphore who were put to considerable discomfort owing to the anglers. Mr. Rees must remember that there were many fishermen who derived their living from fishing, while the people who journeyed to the Semaphore did not require the fish for their own living. He asked the House to vote against the Bill, as the people at Port Adelaide were against it and it had only been introduced in the interests of a few people in Adelaide.

Mr. GILBERT said he would like to know whether it would interfere with the fishermen’s living if they were kept away from the jetties. (Mr. Hopkins—\*4 It would.”) As to the discomfort to which Mr. Hopkins had referred he thought it could be got over by proper regulations. He had not heard any reason that would induce him to vote against the Bill. He failed to see that a limitation of any distance from the jetty would do any harm to the fishermen, who would do much better by going further out. He had done a little angling himself, and it was pleasant and healthful, and in addition to that there were many poor men who assisted their incomes by fishing for their own household after their work was done. (Hear, hear,)

Mr. KINGSTON claimed to speak with an amount of authority on this Bill. (Laughter ) Yes, as a “Compliant Angler," although he was not able to angle the Barrier policy out of the Government. (Laughter.) In regard to this Bill he pointed out that there were various kinds of fishing, and if this legislation were adopted it would be a great hardship to not only those who angled for pleasure but to those who relied upon getting a few fish for their tables. They had to look to the interests of the general public; and it would never do to allow the professional fishermen to sweep down and net all the fish which the amateurs might attract to any particular place near the jetties. Why, the net fishermen were laziest laborers he knew of. He claimed to understand more about fishing than any member in the House, (Laughter).. The fishermen could go any favorable night at Henley Beach and catch all the fish they wanted without lazily taking advantage of the efforts of those who fished only off the jetties Therefore, to apply this Bill to all jetties would be a great mistake. He would suggest that the second reading should be agreed to, and then that they should provide that the localities to which it should apply should be fixed by proclamation at the instigation of the local authorities. If this were done there would not be so much objection to the measure.

Mr CALDWELL agreed that the application of the Bill should be restricted in any case. In the District Councils Act, however, provision was already made in the direction by means of by-laws, and he supposed the Municipal Corporations Bill would contain similar provision. Consequently this would be a piece of unnecessary legislation, and he would oppose it, for he intended to set his face against encumbering the Statuie-books with more dead-letters.

Mr. COLES would certainly oppose the third reading of the Bill unless the amendment indicated by Mr. Kingston was introduced in committee. Mr Caldwell had argued that the district councils already had the power suggested, but he did not think they had the right to prevent fishing on the jetties. He had risen, however, to call attention to the way in which the public sometimes suffered. The Fishing Company had some time ago bound over all the fishermen not to sell their fish to any one but the company. The result was that the people at Queenscliffe on Kangaroo Island could not get any fish, for the fishermen monopolised the fishing ground around the jetty, and they were prevented from selling to any one except the company. The residents at Queenicliffe accordingly applied to have the fishermen prohibited from going within a certain radius of the jetty, but he being then Commissioner of Crown Lands could not do so. He, however, communicated with the company, and it had the effect for a time of keeping the fishermen away from the jetty, but it was necessary that some distinctive restriction should be enforced, and for this reason he would support the second reading, with the proviso he had indicated.

Mr. GILES would vote against the Bills because it was unnecessary legislation, because it was class legislation, and because the sea belonged to all classes of Australians.

Mr. LANDSEER would support the Bill. There was nothing more annoying to persons who were fishing from a jetty than to have their operations stopped by a man coming amongst their lines with a boat, and driving the fish away for the day. Fishing was as much a pleasure to some people as football was to others, and surely there was plenty of water away from the jetty in which the fishermen could cast their nets. He did not think the distance stipulated in the Bill was too great. If they did not give some protection to people fishing off jetties the traffic on our railways would be in a measure affected, and this in itself was worth some little consideration.

Mr. SCHERK moved the adjournment of the debate.

This having been declared negatived, Mr. KINGSTON called for a division, which resulted as follows

Ayes, 27—The Chief Secretary, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Treasurer, Commissioner of Publio Works, and Messrs. Bartlett, Bews, Caldwell, Castine, Cohen, Coles, Furner, Gilbert, Giles, Gillen, Gould, Handyside, HusBey, JenkinB, Kimber, Kingston, Krichauff, Landseer, Moule, Osman, Solomon, Ward, and Scherk (teller).

Nobs, 7—The Hons. A. Catt and T. Play ford, and Messrs. Duncan, Glynn, Homburg, Hopkins, and Rounsevell (teller).

Majority of 20 for the Ayes.

The debate was adjourned until Wednesday next.

**FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1889**

**House of Assembly, 28 August 1889, pages 740-1**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

Mr. SOHERK expressed his pleasure at the introduction of the Bill, and wanted to take the opportunity of answering several objections which had been raised to it. Mr. Hopkins, for instance, had contended that it would do harm to the fishermen, and that visitors would be put to a lot of discomfort by the Act, but he thought these objections could easily be removed by the district councils making proper regulations. He could not see that the fishermen would be prevented from making a living by being kept away with their nets from the jetties, because he thought they would obtain a good deal more fish by going further out from the jetties. Besides, he had often seen many of the little children of the unemployed waiting for the return of their fathers from the jetties with some fish for their dinners, and it would be wrong to deprive the poor of this means of obtaining some part of their food. He agreed that the application of the Act to any locality should be made oy proclamation. A similar measure had been passed in Tasmania, and the principle had been partly adopted in Victoria and New South Wales. It must be remembered that, not only was fishing a healthful pastime, but it brought a considerable revenue to the railways, as he was assured that at least 1,000 anglers travelled over the lines per week. For these reasons he hoped the measure would be agreed to.

Mr. MATTINSON could not support the second reading of the measure, because he looked upon it as legislation against a class who fished for a living in favor of those who fished for pleasure. Besides, he would point out that the jetties were erected for the convenience of trade, and not for the benefit of amateur anglers. It was well known that the fish congregated more about the jetties than at any other place, and it was for this reason that the fishermen were compelled to go near to the jetties. He understood it was suggested that the jetties should be placed under the control of corporations and district councils, but that was not the law. and he would oppose the Bill.

E

Mr. HUSSEY said this was an attempt at class legislation, and as such he would oppose it. (Mr. Coles—“The people of Kangaroo Island want the Bill.”) He knew nothing about that (Mr. Coles— “There was a petition five months ago.”) Who sent the petition ? (Mr. Coles—“ The people of Queensoliffe.’) To whom? (Mr. Coles—‘‘To the Commissioner of Crown Lands.”) He would oppose the Bill, because it seemed to him that this was a question of pleasure and sport against sustenance and bread, and be could not understand how intelligent members could support such a pettifogging measure. Were persons like Mr. Kingston, who perhaps made his hundreds a week, to debar fishermen from fishing near the Glenelg jetty because they wished to angle off the jetty? Mr. Kingston was an expert fisher of men, and no doubt he was an equally expert fisher of sprats (Laughter.) He was surprised that Mr, Scherk, who always posed, and properly posed, as a working man's friend, should have taken the action he had done. He regarded the whole Bill as a huge joke, and if it were intended to be serious he could only express regret that such legislation should have been introduced. He would oppose the Bill.

Mr. GOULD would point out to the last speaker that there were many poor working men who had to fish from the jetties for the purpose of getting food for themselves and their families. He had known men in Hindmarsh who had had to walk to the sea: side to try and catch fish to provide a meal for their families. It seemed to him that those who opposed the Bill were wishing to protect the few—the fishermen—against the many who went down to the jetties to angle either for pleasure or profit. The jetties were intended for the public use, and it was an interference with the pleasure of people to allow the fishermen to come alongside the jetties with their boats.

Mr. DUNOAN moved—“That the House do now divide.”

Carried.

The motion for the second reading having been declared carried Mr. HOPKINS called for a division, which resulted aa follows :—

Ayes, 21—The Chief Secretary, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Treasurer, Commissioner of Public Works, and Hon T. Playford, and Messrs. Cohen, Coles, Dashwood, Duncan, Gould, Grayson, Handyside, Jenkins, Kimber, Kingston, Landseer, Moule, Nash, Osman, Scherk, and Reea (teller).

Noes, 12—Hon. A. Catt, and Messrs. Caldwell, Giles, Gillen, Homburg, Hopkins, Horn, Hussey, McDonald, Mattinson, Ward, and Bartlett (teller).

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

The Bill was then read a second time.