

1964

—  
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

---

# REPORT

of the

## HONORARY ROYAL COMMISSION

appointed to inquire into

and report upon the

### FISHERIES ACT 1905-1962

in its application to the

### CRAYFISHING INDUSTRY

in particular

---

PRESENTED TO BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

---

**Honorary Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, in its application to the Cray Fishing Industry in particular, and make such recommendations as are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the fishing grounds and the industry generally.**

*To His Excellency Major General Sir Douglas Anthony Kendrew, K.C.M.G., C.B., C.B.E., D.S.O., Governor in and over the State of Western Australia and its Dependencies in the Commonwealth of Australia:*

*May it please Your Excellency,—*

We, the members of the Honorary Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, have the honour to present to Your Excellency our report, as follows:—

**HISTORY.**

1. On Wednesday, the 16th day of October, 1963, the Hon. R. Thompson moved in the Legislative Council:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, in its application to the Crayfishing Industry in particular, and make such recommendations as are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the fishing grounds and the industry generally.

2. The Legislative Council agreed to the motion on Tuesday, 26th day of November, 1963, and appointed the Honourable Norman Eric Baxter and Reginald Clair Mattiske and the mover as a Select Committee with power to call for persons, papers and documents and adjourn from place to place; to sit on days over which the Council stands adjourned; the proceedings to be open to the public and the Press; and to report when the House re-assembles.

3. On 4th December, 1963, the Council granted a request from the Honourable Reginald Clair Mattiske for leave to withdraw from the Committee, and on 5th December, 1963, appointed the Honourable Sydney Thomas Joseph Thompson to serve as a member of the Committee.

4. The Select Committee at its initial meeting on Thursday, 5th day of December, 1963, appointed the Honourable Norman Eric Baxter chairman and resolved that evidence be taken at various centres, commencing in Geraldton early in April, 1964.

5. Due to the possibility of the prorogation of Parliament it was deemed advisable to apply for Honorary Royal Commission status. This was done in a letter to the Hon. Premier dated 13th February, 1964, and the members of the Committee were duly appointed as an Honorary Royal Commission by Your Excellency on the 25th day of February, 1964.

6. The terms of appointment as published in the *Government Gazette* on the 28th day of February, 1964, were as follows:—

**ROYAL COMMISSION**

WESTERN AUSTRALIA, } By His Excellency Major-General Sir Douglas  
TO WIT, } Anthony Kendrew, Knight Commander of the  
DOUGLAS ANTHONY } Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and  
KENDREW, } Saint George, Companion of the Most Honour-  
Governor, } able Order of the Bath, Commander of the  
[L.S.] } Most Excellent Order of the British Empire,  
Companion of the Distinguished Service Order,  
Governor in and over the State of Western  
Australia and its Dependencies in the Com-  
monwealth of Australia.

*To Norman Eric Baxter, Ronald Thompson and Sydney Thomas Joseph Thompson, Members of the Legislative Council:*

I, the said Governor, acting with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, do hereby appoint you, Norman Eric Baxter, Ronald Thompson and Sydney Thomas Joseph Thompson, Members of the Legislative Council, to be an Honorary Royal Commission without payment of remuneration to do the following things, namely:—

- (a) To continue and complete the inquiries commenced by you, as a Select Committee of the Legislative Council, into the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, in its application to the Cray Fishing Industry in particular.
- (b) Having completed those inquiries, to make your report to me in writing and to make such recommendations as are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the fishing grounds and the industry generally.

And I hereby appoint you the said Norman Eric Baxter to be the Chairman of the said Royal Commission.

And I hereby declare that by virtue of this Commission you may, in the execution of this Commission do all such acts, matters and things and exercise all such powers as a Royal Commission or members of a Royal Commission may lawfully do and exercise, whether under or pursuant to the Royal Commissioners' Powers Act, 1902-1956, or otherwise.

Given under my hand and the Public Seal of the said State, at Perth, this 25th day of February, 1964.

By His Excellency's Command,

DAVID BRAND,  
Premier.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN ! ! !

7. The Honorary Royal Commission met at 12 noon on Tuesday, 24th day of March, 1964, to continue the inquiries commenced as a Select Committee.

#### PROCEDURE.

1. Although the Commission under the terms of reference gazetted on the 25th day of February, 1964, had decided to commence its hearing in public it rapidly became clear that important evidence would not be tendered by some individuals, and that it would be desirable for all witnesses to be informed that evidence could be submitted in camera. Sections 9 and 10 of the Royal Commissioners' Powers Act, 1902-1956, were made known to some witnesses who, prior to tendering evidence, had expressed concern as to what would result from giving certain evidence.

2. Prior to the commencement of taking evidence, a series of questions were compiled and it was agreed that each witness would be asked such questions (see Appendix "A"), the idea being that a consensus of opinions could be gained by the Commission in regard to certain facets of the Cray Fishing Industry. This proved to be quite a satisfactory method and has assisted your Commission in making the recommendations appearing at a later stage in this report.

#### EVIDENCE.

1. Evidence was taken from 107 witnesses covering 1,053 pages of transcript and necessitating 16 sittings (including one as a Select Committee (see Appendix "B").) Several exhibits were tendered by witnesses in support of statements made, and after examination by the Commission, were returned. On a number of occasions, a party of witnesses appointed a spokesman who tendered evidence on their behalf. As referred to above, some difficulty was experienced in cases with certain persons who were desirous of tendering evidence but were reticent about doing so on the ground that they thought (whether rightly or wrongly we cannot judge) that they might suffer some detriment as a consequence of their appearance before the Commission. This reluctance was, in the main, overcome when sections 9 and 10 of the Royal Commissioners' Powers Act, 1902-1956, were made known to witnesses and when the Commissioners decided to allow evidence to be submitted in camera.

2. Subpoenas were issued requiring the attendance of seven persons.

#### GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. The terms of reference of this inquiry could be divided into three parts—

- (a) to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act in its application to the Cray Fishing Industry in particular, and to make such recommendations considered necessary to safeguard the fishing grounds and the industry generally;

- (b) to ascertain what steps should be taken to protect this extremely important industry in either the form of amending legislation or enforcement of the existing Act to ensure such protection; and

- (c) to examine proposals submitted by witnesses, obtain information on the fishing industry as a whole, consider the possibility of establishing other fishing industries in Western Australia and, if thought necessary, make recommendations to you.

2. Your Commission is of the opinion that the Crayfishing Industry will deteriorate if its regulation and control remain in the hands of the Fisheries Department. The spate of activity during the life of this Commission, resulting in numerous prosecutions for defaults, only emphasises, we feel, that the lack of appropriate action in the past by the Department has been in no small measure responsible for the chaotic conditions which exist in the industry today.

3. As this industry is predominantly an export one, we have reached the conclusion that it should be strictly controlled by a body that is thoroughly conversant with all its aspects to ensure its progress and survival. Evidence which has been tendered and the examination of departmental files has convinced the Commission that penalties provided for offences are, in the main, not a sufficient deterrent to curb the activities of unscrupulous persons who are intent upon financial gain and who give no thought to the protection and future of the industry.

4. Your Commission has not found any evidence to justify the retention of the Fishermen's Advisory Committee provided for in section 5A of the Fisheries Act. It is considered that this committee is not sufficiently representative of the industry and as such is not conversant with all the problems associated with crayfishing. The examination of departmental files relating to the activities of the committee indicates that it has dealt in the main with trifling items rather than with matters vital to both the Crayfishing and Wet Fish Industries.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS.

##### *Legislation.*

1. The Commission strongly recommends that new legislation be enacted as soon as possible to remove from the Fisheries Act all references in respect to crustacean fish and to appoint a new body to control and regulate fishing of this species of marine life in Western Australia. It is recommended that the new legislation provide for an authority to be constituted as the "Fisheries-Crustacean Species-Authority" of seven members, each to serve a term of three years and be eligible for re-appointment. The Authority

to hold an average maximum of twelve meetings annually every three years and the seven members of the Authority to be—

- (a) three shall be fishermen actively engaged in commercial fishing for crayfish—to be elected on the basis of one fisherman from each of the three zones—by a ballot of licensed fishermen of the particular zone;
- (b) two shall be persons nominated by the Minister, selected from a panel of names submitted by the Rock Lobster/Crayfish Industry Development Association of Australia (Inc.);
- (c) one shall be a person nominated by the Minister to represent the consumers; and
- (d) one shall be a person nominated by the Minister, not being a person commercially engaged in the Crayfishing Industry, who shall be the Chairman of the Authority and shall be paid an annual remuneration.

2. The members of the Authority shall be entitled to be paid such remuneration and expenses as are approved by the Governor. Such remuneration and expenses to be paid out of the administration funds of the Authority.

3. The proposed Authority to be appointed by the Governor and responsible to the Minister and to have the following powers—

- (a) appointment of officers (see Marketing of Eggs Act, Section 17);
- (b) co-opting of Government servants—Police, Factories and Shops Inspectors, Transport Board Inspectors—to assist in policing the industry;
- (c) levying of up to one-halfpenny per pound on live weight to be paid by all shore-based processors accepting delivery of whole crayfish and up to 1½d. per pound on crayfish tails processed by freezer boats, to provide finance for the administration of the Authority;
- (d) establishing, regulating, and maintaining markets overseas, interstate, and local, on behalf of the fishermen as shall be to the best advantage economically;
- (e) restriction of fishing in accordance with regulations approved by the Minister;
- (f) upon apprehension for any offence, to suspend the fisherman's license until the case is heard;
- (g) issuing of licenses to—
  - (i) crustacean fishermen;
  - (ii) crustacean processors;
  - (iii) crustacean processors factories;
  - (iv) crustacean fishing boats;

- (v) crustacean freezer boats;
- (vi) cold storage freezers; and
- (vii) persons engaged in transporting of crustaceans to shore-based processing factories.

With reference to the power to issue licenses, it is recommended that conditions be laid down in regard to who shall be licensed fishermen and should include a provision that all applications be made in the prescribed form to the Authority at least six weeks prior to the date on which the crayfisherman desires to commence operations. The form to be prescribed to provide for such information relative to the applicant as the Authority requires and should, in our opinion, require that the application be accompanied by a certificate as to the seaworthiness of the boat to be used for crayfishing by the applicant. It is also recommended that the Authority have powers similar to those referred to in Section 20 of the Marketing of Eggs Act in relation to the granting and refusal of licenses and that an annual license fee be prescribed for crayfishermen.

#### *Prawning Licenses.*

It is recommended that the issue of prawnfishing licenses in the Shark Bay region be investigated by the Authority. We feel that the method used was wrong in principle and recommend that in future all approved applicants shall be determined by lot conducted by the Authority; that prawning licenses be restricted to prescribed areas; and that existing licenses be confined to the Shark Bay area.

- (h) Instituting action considered necessary to conserve the crayfishing industry.

#### *Penalties.*

1. Your Commission has ascertained from evidence tendered that the present penalties do not deter persons engaged in the industry from breaches of the existing legislation and strongly recommend that very severe penalties be adopted.

2. With regard to cancellation of licenses, it is apparent that many are imposed to take effect in the months of February to November which are off-season months and do not constitute any real hardship. We therefore recommend that all cancellations apply between 15th November and 30th March in the following year.

#### *Policing of Industry.*

1. Your Commission recommends that the departmental policy of supplying large expensive patrol boats be discontinued and the proposed Authority be empowered to provide

fast patrol boats that can operate in all weathers and waters, equipped to travel at speeds of up to 35 knots. It is our opinion that the existing fisheries inspection launches have been unsuitable and far too expensive, catering more for the accommodation of inspectors rather than the purpose for which they are required. The limited space available for seized pots and the fact that no winch forms part of the equipment only serves to emphasise the impracticability of the existing vessels.

2. It is recommended that consideration be given to using the type of vessel being used in New South Wales as illustrated in the Spring, 1963, issue of *The Fisherman* (official journal of State Fisheries of New South Wales), pages 16 to 19. In our opinion, this type of craft would be an admirable replacement of the vessels now being used in Western Australia for patrol work.

3. In view of our recommendation regarding the replacement of floats (see "Miscellaneous: Float cutting by Inspectors") the necessity for the provision of winches on patrol boats will not be necessary.

#### *Restrictions.*

1. It is apparent to the Commission, from evidence tendered, that restrictions are necessary and with this in mind we recommend that during the red crayfish season, with the exception of the Abrolhos region, catcher boats are to fish in areas of not less than 16 fathoms depth and freezer boats in areas of not less than 20 fathoms depth.

2. Severe penalties must apply in respect of this matter and we feel that for a first offence, a penalty of three months cancellation should be imposed on the boat, the skipper, and any other offending person. Subsequent offenders should be severely dealt with by immediate cancellation of license (boat, skipper and person) for life.

#### *Under-size Crayfish.*

1. Evidence was tendered to the Commission regarding excessive over-fishing in the form of taking under-size crayfish. Although such practice is illegal and must be stopped, we feel that other steps are essential to the conservation of the industry. It is our opinion that the stamping out of this "under-size racket" by the imposition of very severe penalties for offenders will assist, but is not necessarily the complete answer. Although research is being and has been done, it must be intensified to ascertain the breeding habits of this species of marine life. It is felt that consideration should be given to the establishment of an aquarium in a suitable position—perhaps in the Abrolhos region—which would assist greatly in research.

2. Considerable criticism of the manner in which inspectors interpreted the use of the gauge used for carapace measurement was submitted in evidence. It appears that some inspectors require the gauge to fit over the back of the carapace in such a manner as to allow the fish to be lifted; others require it to fit snugly over the back, and others say that a little play is acceptable. This controversy of opinion has led to much discontent among fishermen due to the fact that deliveries of catches are made at varying points on the coast and it has occurred where catches of fish are acceptable at one point and considered to be undersize at another. Evidence was received from a senior departmental officer that all inspectors were instructed in the method of measuring and it therefore appears that some inspectors are misinterpreting the instructions and causing confusion.

3. To overcome the situation it is recommended that the gauge size be reduced to 2-15/16th inches and that it be necessary for the measurement to be from between the centre of the horns as described in Second Schedule to the existing Act and to rest upon the rear of the carapace. Should the measure extend over the rear of the carapace the fish is undersize. The Commission suggested this as an alternative to many witnesses who were unanimous in stating that the proposal would be acceptable in lieu of the existing method. Many witnesses expressed the opinion that the method of measuring—gauge for catcher boats and tail-weight for freezer boats—was most unsatisfactory and that it should be one or the other. We realise, however, that such would be impracticable and consider that the proposed fathom depth restriction and the new method of gauging for catcher boats as outlined above would ease the situation by allowing a slightly smaller carapace measurement and thus obviating the necessity which now exists of catcher boats having to throw back slightly under-size fish which in a very large percentage of cases were legitimate catches for freezer boats and would help to overcome the friction which exists between catcher boats and freezer boats regarding the latter being able to process five ounce tails of undersize fish discarded by the former.

4. Thanks to the co-operation of the Fisheries Department in permitting Messrs. Wheeler Bros. and Annear of Fremantle to bring in a limited quantity of crayfish less than legal size for experimental purposes, we are convinced that in almost every case where a crayfish is slightly under-size the tail has been a legal five ounces weight or more. In a few isolated cases the tail of a legal size crayfish was found to weigh less than five ounces.

5. A further recommendation by the Commission in regard to this particular subject is for all gauges to be manufactured from stainless steel in lieu of the present

brass or brass alloy. It is recommended that the proposed Authority accept the responsibility of arranging for the replacement for a specific charge of the existing gauges with new stainless steel ones of 2-15/16th inch size, stamped as being correct by the Weights and Measures Department. It is felt that the steel type would overcome the trouble which now exists of damage being caused to the soft metal gauges resulting in incorrect measurement and subsequent prosecution for under-size fish.

6. The Commission recommends the following penalties for the catching of under-size crayfish:—

Up to 5 per cent. of catch—Fine: Minimum, £20; maximum, £100

5 per cent. and over of catch—Fine: Minimum, £100; maximum, £250

for a first offence.

For a second offence, a minimum of £250 and cancellation of license for three months; and

For a subsequent offence, minimum fine £500 and cancellation of license (boat, skipper, and fisherman responsible for gauging and weighing of catch) for life.

#### *Female Crayfish.*

1. We strongly recommend that the catching of female red crayfish be prohibited between the 15th August and the 1st March of the succeeding year.

2. It is our belief that the conservation of the industry can only be assured by the protection of the female fish so that the amount of spawn thrown will adequately ensure sufficient progeny to maintain a profitable and continuing industry.

3. The indiscriminate catching of females is in our opinion the cause of the decline and if not stopped will ultimately ruin the industry and we accordingly recommend that persons apprehended and convicted for a contravention of this rule shall have their licenses immediately cancelled for life. The reference to license to include catcher boat, freezer boat, processing plant, or freezer unit.

#### *Crayfish Tails.*

We recommend that it shall be an offence—

(a) for any processor or freezer unit to purchase crayfish tails that have not been processed by a licensed processor: Penalty for a first offence to be £250;

(b) for any processor to pack or offer for sale crayfish tails of less than five ounce weight. It is the responsibility of the processor to retain tails of less than five ounce weight and forward a return to the authority showing the number retained. If, in the opinion of the authority, the percentage of tails of less than five ounces is—

(i) in excess of a reasonable percentage, the authority shall seize the tails and dispose of them for consumption in Western Australia and credit the proceeds to the funds of the authority;

(ii) not in excess of a reasonable percentage, the authority may arrange for the disposal of the tails and forward the proceeds to the processor; and

until such time as the authority determines whether (i) or (ii) applies, the processor shall keep the under-size tails in a suitable container.

Recommended penalty for non-compliance with regulations regarding returns and storage of tails—£250 minimum.

#### *Identification of Gear.*

1. We recommend that all containers used for the conveyance of whole crayfish display the registered number of the licensed fishing boat in stencil lettering of at least four inches in height, in addition to the label required to be fixed pursuant to section 24B of the present Act. The stencil marking will serve to identify the owner of the container should the label be removed as witnesses claimed has happened in the past. The penalties should provide for a fine of £50 for each container used that is not stencilled as recommended above. The reason for recommending a minimum fine is to deter persons who traffic in illegal crayfish.

2. We also recommend that fish traps and crayfish pots shall have a brand burned into the neck or entrance of the pot showing the licensed fishing boat number or amateur license number. Penalty for non-compliance—£10 per unbranded pot or trap.

#### *Obstruction of Inspectors.*

It is felt that the penalty provided as a deterrent to persons resisting or obstructing inspectors in the course of their duty, provided in section 44 of the existing Act is insufficient. We feel that for a first offence the penalty should be a fine of £250 or imprisonment for six months and for a second offence a fine of £250, cancellation of license for life and twelve months' imprisonment.

### *Licensing of Freezer Units.*

1. It is recommended that factories, processing works, and all persons processing, storing and selling crayfish be licensed by the authority. At the present time it is apparent that anyone can establish a processing works or a receiving depot at will and it has got to the stage, in our opinion, where the quantity of crayfish being handled by the large number of established processing works is such that it is uneconomical for this side of the industry to be legally carried out. The result is that to obtain an economical turnover, undersize crayfish are handled by some processors in large quantities. Limitation of the number of processing works and control by license of freezer storage plants would enable protection to be given to pioneer groups to open up new areas.

2. With reference further to processing works, it is recommended that earnest consideration be given to the establishment of two processing works in the Abrolhos Islands Group—perhaps one in the north group and one in the south group. It is thought that the fishermen concerned would give consideration to the establishments on a co-operative basis. The reason for the recommendation is the high mortality rate of crayfish having to be consigned from this region to processing works at Geraldton causing financial losses to the fishermen.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

#### *Road Access.*

After traversing some of the roads which lead to the various crayfishing centres and over which it is necessary to transport fish, we strongly urge both the Commonwealth and State Governments to give consideration to providing financial assistance to local authorities to provide roads that would increase the efficiency of the industry. It is felt that better roads would allow fishermen to venture away from the more established areas which are rapidly becoming overcrowded, and thus utilise other fishing grounds.

#### *Primary Producer Concessions.*

As this is virtually a primary industry, perhaps some incentive could be given to fishermen to benefit in regard to purchase of equipment on a basis similar to that which applies to farmers in this State. This possibly could be applied in the purchase of four-wheel drive vehicles.

#### *Insurance.*

Your Commission recommends that it be compulsory for all crew members of fishing boats to be insured and that it be the responsibility of the owner to ensure that coverage is effected in the form of a comprehensive all risk policy with benefits similar to those included in the Workers' Compensation Act. It is felt that this would effect a great saving to the State.

### *Float Cutting by Departmental Inspectors.*

1. Numerous witnesses submitted evidence that Fisheries Department Inspectors had cut floats and left pots in the water. The evidence tendered has left no doubt whatsoever in our minds that pot cutting has in fact been carried out and this action, in our opinion, very much outside the legitimate duty of departmental officials and the persons concerned are deserving of severe censure for their indiscriminate action.

2. Your Commission recommends that where pots are discovered by inspectors in restricted areas regulations should permit the replacement of floats with departmental ones and the original floats be impounded and used as evidence against the offenders. Additional penalties should be provided for fishermen who do not return the departmental floats within a reasonable time.

### *Prosecution for Defaults.*

1. It is the candid opinion of your Commission that honest fishermen who have made unintentional errors in respect of undersize crayfish—due to the use of a damaged gauge or measuring fish at a time when rough conditions prevailing have caused errors to be made—have been prosecuted on the same basis as the indiscriminate person who deals in illegal crayfish—undersize, spawners, and cray meat—in terrific quantities. It is felt that the existing legislation should have been framed in a manner whereby some leniency could have been extended to legitimate fishermen who unwittingly have made mistakes as against the "racketeers" who indulge in indiscriminate handling of large quantities of illegal crayfish to the detriment of the industry. The honest fishermen who have made mistakes have been fined for having in some instances a mere six or seven undersize fish in a catch of thousands. The law-breakers who have been caught with a total catch of illegal crayfish have been fined similar amounts.

2. Evidence has been tendered indicating that many tons of cray meat have recently been consigned to Eastern States cities and sold quite openly in large departmental stores. A recent prosecution of a person found to be in possession of undersize crayfish in the form of cray meat resulted in a fine of £10. From evidence tendered this person has apparently been trading illegally for a long period and it is not understood how he has not been intercepted on previous occasions. Another recent prosecution of a processor for having undersize crayfish resulted in a fine of several hundred pounds. This man appeared and gave evidence to the Commission and referred to the impending case and stated that every one of the undersize fish was recorded by the Inspector as being of 4½ ounces weight. It seems remarkable to us that each and every one weighed the same. Another operator a few miles away whom many witnesses referred to as being an undersize trader has not been prosecuted for years. We would like to point out that in view of the evidence tendered

in respect to this particular processor he was subpoenaed to appear before the Commission but unfortunately, either by design or otherwise, he was overseas and not available for investigation. It is our opinion that possibly some inspectors are more diligent than others. We are at a loss to understand how some people are prosecuted and others appear to be immune.

#### *Reciprocal Arrangement with other States.*

We urge that the Government take the necessary steps to ensure that Fisheries Inspectors in other States are empowered to act on behalf of the proposed Authority and that reciprocal arrangements be made for local inspectors to act for other States.

#### *The Fishing Industry.*

1. Your Commission recommends that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a Fish Authority, similar to that of New South Wales, to handle all facets of the Wet Fish Industry in Western Australia. (A copy of the New South Wales legislation is appended—see Appendix "C".)

2. Although evidence was not taken on a broad basis in regard to the Wet Fish Industry, sufficient was tendered by reliable witnesses in Fremantle, Mandurah, and Albany to convince your Commission that many aspects of the fishing industry were in a chaotic state and organised marketing was an essential requirement.

3. The Wet Fish Industry is, in our opinion, at a very low ebb, as evidenced by the following comments:—

(a) *Marketing:* There is a complete lack of organised marketing, the only available markets at present being at the Metropolitan Markets, Perth, where the floor is very small and where refrigeration is not available for storage of fish. The Fremantle Fishermen's Co-operative and other buyers are only a haphazard method of marketing and do not on the average give an economic return to the fishermen. Large quantities of fish are being made available to the public by other than licensed fishermen.

#### *(b) Quantity of Fish:*

(i) There is more than enough fish to be caught on the Western Australian coast to completely flood the market, if fishermen were allowed to fish in a reasonable manner, and providing the fishing grounds are properly controlled and nursed, there would be an abundance of fish available at economic prices. This indicates that there is a wide scope for snap frozen fish, properly processed and packed to compete with the volume of imported snap frozen fish which is on sale at present in the State.

(ii) The Chairman of the Commission made inquiries on this aspect of the fishing industry in other States recently and found that the same position exists in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria. He was given to understand from persons in authority that those responsible would co-operate with any Authority established in Western Australia so that chaotic marketing conditions could be avoided between States in respect of snap frozen fish if this were approached in the proper manner.

#### *Complaints by Witnesses.*

1. The control of fishing grounds, particularly the closure of inlets, bays, and estuaries, was strongly criticised by witnesses who maintained that there was a serious loss of fish due to the present policy and provisions of the existing legislation, which, in their opinion, had in some instances been responsible for the death of large numbers of fish. Your Commission recommends that the Government give earnest consideration to the repeal of section 213 of the Local Government Act and investigate the restrictions which apply at present to estuaries on the southern coastline. It was also maintained that with proper research and control the licensed fishermen could economically fish in a large number of the closed waters and not affect fishing by amateur fishermen and tourists.

2. Photographs were shown to the Commission of thousands of fish that had died in some of the closed waters because sufficient interest had not been apparent and research had not been carried out, by which such losses could have been avoided.

3. The evidence tendered by witnesses, particularly at Albany, provides a very good précis of the fishing industry and is worthy of perusal as it indicates to a large degree the unsatisfactory condition of the industry.

4. Numerous complaints were received regarding the unavailability of copies of the Fisheries Act regulations. Inquiries by your Commission revealed that copies were unobtainable and we consider this to be an extremely poor state of affairs.

5. As far as the Wet Fish Industry is concerned, it is our opinion that the Fishermen's Advisory Committee, which has operated for some years in accordance with the provisions of the Fisheries Act, has been almost a complete farce. A perusal of the general file of the Fisheries Department regarding its activities over the past 20 years clearly illustrates that a lack of interest is evident by the administration in the major matters of



importance to the industry, and thus to the State. Since a conference in 1945 of persons interested in the fishing industry, no important decisions have been arrived at or put into effect which would promote the welfare of the industry and place it on a sound footing.

#### *Expansion of the Industry.*

1. Many witnesses advocated the expansion in the State of fishing industries other than crayfish. Fishermen with up to 40 years' practical experience to support their advocacy strongly recommended that research into the tuna industry in particular be carried out by the Government. Evidence was tendered indicating that there are vast quantities of sardines and pilchard available in Western Australian waters. Several witnesses referred to catches of large deep-water crabs which could develop into an excellent export industry. We have been told that throughout the world Governments are playing an active part in developing their fishing industries—if this is so, perhaps the State Government could approach the Commonwealth for assistance.

2. We feel that the fishing industry is the means of populating the north. At least ten settlements have come into existence during the past six years along the coast between Lancelin and Dongara due to the development of the crayfishing industry, at no appreciable cost to the Government. There is an abundance of fish in our northern waters, sufficient it has been stated in evidence to supply the needs of the whole of the Australian market which at present is inundated by imports.

3. Prior to the commencement of your Commission, we believed that, generally speaking, Australians were not very keen on fish food. After hearing the evidence tendered we are now quite convinced that the reason for our belief is the unavailability of the fish at a reasonable price due to the fact that a very big percentage is imported. The Japanese have been able to economically fish tuna off the Western Australian coast and it is our opinion that the Commonwealth Government could do likewise due to geographic situation and the fact that boats and fishermen capable of doing the work are available. This industry, which would require a great number of persons, could be a way of populating the north of our State.

#### CONCLUSION.

1. May we conclude by stressing that the Commission's task has not been an easy one. Your Commission, however, has done its best to appreciate the complexities of the situation and the problems which existing legislation has produced. It has endeavoured to make recommendations that are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the crayfishing industry and has made recommendations regarding the possibilities which

exist for the furtherance of the fishing industry generally in our State. It is hoped that the proposals contained herein will be of assistance to Your Excellency's Government and also to the Legislature in considering the many problems associated with the industry when further legislation is introduced, and that this report will be printed and made available to interested persons.

2. The Commission would like to record its sincere appreciation of the excellent and valuable assistance rendered by the Secretary, Mr. J. G. C. Ashley, and by Mr. L. A. Hoft, who assisted in the initial stages of the inquiry as acting secretary. These two gentlemen fulfilled a very difficult task with diplomacy, courtesy, and efficiency.

3. The Chief Hansard Reporter and his staff carried out their duties in a most efficient manner with the utmost promptness, and this facilitated greatly the task of your Commission, and to them our thanks are extended.

Dated the thirtieth day of July one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four.

N. E. BAXTER,  
Chairman.

R. THOMPSON,  
Member.

S. T. J. THOMPSON,  
Member.

#### APPENDIX "A".

##### Honorary Royal Commission Crayfishing Industry.

##### QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED BY CHAIRMAN.

1. Are you appearing on your own behalf, or for any organisation or group of persons?
2. Are you the owner, part owner, skipper, or crew member of a crayfishing boat?
3. What size is your boat, and what is the licensed fishing boat number?
4. How many pots was the boat operating with? This season—and previous season?
5. During what period have you been—or were you—engaged in the crayfishing industry?
6. At what points of the coast have you operated?
7. Where do you operate from now?
8. What would be the average daily catch on your boat?
9. To whom do you sell your crayfish?
10. Is there any comment you would like to make in connection with these questions?

11. Have you ever been convicted of supplying or of having undersized or spawn crayfish in your possession.
12. In your opinion, does the average boat take too many undersized crayfish?
13. Do you believe that the amount of undersize crayfish being taken will ultimately adversely affect the fishing grounds?
14. Do you realise the impact on the industry and fishing grounds, also the ultimate financial result to Western Australia, by the taking of more than a reasonable number of undersized crayfish?
15. Are you of the opinion that some persons are making a considerable amount of money by dealing in undersized crayfish?
16. Do you think that the penalties provided under the Fisheries Act are a sufficient deterrent to the taking of undersized crayfish?
17. Have you discussed the taking of undersized crayfish with other fishermen?
18. Have you also discussed with others any means of dealing with the problem?
19. And if so, have you any suggestions to make in this regard?
20. Is there any comment you would like to make in connection with these questions?
21. What is your opinion on having a closed period in the season while crayfish are in spawn?
22. Where do you believe crayfish breed and grow?
23. Do you think crayfishing should be totally prohibited inside of reefs, or prohibited for certain months of the year?
24. Do you think there should be shore-based factories along the coast, or elsewhere, when the number of boats warrant such?
25. Do you think that fishing boats should be limited to land only at certain bases on the coast, and that high penalties should be provided for landing other than in an emergency?
26. Is there any comment you would like to make in connection with these questions?
27. What do you consider should be the minimum measurement and weight for (a) White crays (b) Red crays?
28. Are you satisfied with the manner in which Fisheries Inspectors carry out their duties?
29. Do you believe that all fishermen are treated equally by the Inspectors in regard to their catch?
30. Have Inspectors been more active this year than previous years?
31. To your knowledge, have Inspectors cut floats off pots in the area you are fishing?  
(If so, could you name the Inspector or Inspectors concerned?)
32. How many times have Inspectors intercepted you this year?
33. Is there any comment you would like to make in connection with these questions?
34. Do you believe that the Fisheries Act, as constituted, provides sufficient safeguard to the industry?
35. What is your opinion of all crew members being registered to work on a particular boat?
36. When prosecuted for breaches of the Act, do you think the entire crew and boat should be de-registered?
37. Would you favour a levy of up to one half-penny per pound to create a fund for controlling and policing the industry?
38. What is your opinion of members of the Police Department, and Shops and Factories Inspectors, being appointed Inspectors under the Act?
39. Is there any comment you would like to make in connection with these questions?
40. What type of bait do you usually obtain and from whom do you procure it?
41. What is the average price you pay for bait?
42. Do you consider the price too high?
43. Do you think the bait could be provided at a more reasonable price?
44. Is there any comment you would like to make in connection with these questions?
45. Have you any further evidence to give which you consider would be of benefit to the Commission and to the Industry if adopted?

#### APPENDIX "B".

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council No. 45.

26th NOVEMBER, 1963.

#### 14.—Fisheries Act—Appointment of Select Committee.

The Order of the Day having been read for the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. R. Thompson, as follows:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, in its application to the Cray Fishing Industry in

particular, and make such recommendations as are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the fishing grounds and the industry generally.

Debate resumed.

Question put.

The House divided.

**Ayes—13**

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. D. P. Dellar	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	(Teller)

**Noes—12**

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. M. Thomson
	(Teller)

Question thus passed.

Hon. R. Thompson moved, That the Hons. N. E. Baxter, R. C. Mattiske and the mover be appointed to serve on the Committee.

Question—put and passed.

Ordered—That the Committee has power to call for persons, papers and documents and to adjourn from place to place; that it may sit on days over which the Council stands adjourned; that the proceedings be open to the public and the press; and that the Committee report when the House re-assembles.

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council No. 49.

4th DECEMBER, 1963.

**2.—Fisheries Act—Appointment of Select Committee.**

Hon. R. C. Mattiske requested leave of the House to withdraw from this Committee.

Debate ensued.

Leave granted.

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council No. 50.

5th DECEMBER, 1963.

**5.—Fisheries Act—Appointment of Member to Select Committee.**

Hon. R. Thompson, pursuant to notice, moved, That Hon. S. T. J. Thompson be elected to serve as a member of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962.

Question—put and passed.

Minutes of meeting of Select Committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, in its application to the Cray Fishing Industry in particular, and make such recommendations as are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the fishing grounds and the industry generally.

THURSDAY, 5th DECEMBER, 1963.

*Attendance.*—Hons. R. Thompson, N. E. Baxter and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Appointment of Chairman.*—On the motion of Hon. R. Thompson, seconded by Hon. S. T. J. Thompson, it was resolved that Hon. N. E. Baxter be the Chairman.

*Business.*—The Secretary was instructed to—

- (a) arrange for the insertion of an advertisement in *The West Australian* calling for persons desirous of tendering evidence to the committee;
- (b) request the "Fisheries Advisory Committee" to supply four copies of its report for the years 1962 and 1963; and
- (c) ascertain the quantities and cost of bait being used in the crayfishing industry and obtained from Midland Junction, Robbs Jetty and other abattoirs in the State and from the Eastern States, Hong Kong, Japan and Canada.

*Itinerary.*—It was resolved that evidence would be taken at Geraldton, Jurien Bay and Cervantes in April and in the Metropolitan area on a date to be fixed.

*Next Meeting.*—It was resolved that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 24th March, 1964, at 2.30 p.m.

*Adjournment.*—The Committee adjourned at 7.25 p.m.

Minutes of meeting of Honorary Royal Commission appointed to enquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962, in its application to the Crayfishing Industry in particular, and make such recommendations as are considered necessary to safeguard the future of the fishing grounds and the industry generally.

12 noon—TUESDAY, 24th MARCH, 1964.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hon. R. Thompson, Hon. S. T. J. Thompson.

*Confirmation of Minutes:*

Moved Hon. S. T. J. Thompson, seconded Hon. R. Thompson, that the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 5th December, 1963, be confirmed.

*Business arising from the Minutes:*

- (a) *Publicity*.—The Secretary reported that advertisements had been inserted in *The West Australian* on 11th January and 15th February, 1964. Notices had also been distributed along the coast at various crayfishing centres; the enquiry was the subject of a news item by the A.B.C. on 1st March, 1964, and articles were printed in *The West Australian* on 3rd March, 1964, and the *Daily News* on 12th March, 1964.
- (b) It was decided not to proceed with the request for copies of the reports of the Fisheries Advisory Committee.
- (c) The Chairman agreed to follow up investigation into the supply of bait used in the crayfishing industry.

*General:*

*Publicity*.—The Secretary was instructed to meet with the Secretary of the Royal Commission recently appointed to enquire into the boat safety aspect of the Fishing Industry, with the object of arranging suitable publicity to clarify in the minds of the public the different aims of the two Royal Commissions.

Preparation of standard questions was discussed, and the Secretary was instructed to provide sufficient copies of the proposed list of questions.

The Secretary was instructed to obtain a legal ruling regarding the admission of the public and the Press to the enquiry.

The Secretary was instructed to write the Fisheries Department inviting Fisheries Inspectors to give evidence at meetings along the coast, and for the Chief Inspector to give evidence when the Commission meets at Parliament House on 28th April.

*Subpoenas*.—The Secretary was instructed to arrange for the preparation of subpoenas to be served on certain individuals, in order that they might appear before the Commission with records showing:—

- (a) The number of crayfish processed during the past year.
- (b) The average number of crayfish packed in each box.
- (c) From whom the crayfish were purchased.

Meeting closed at 1.25 p.m.

FRIDAY, 10th APRIL 1964.

At Perth.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance*.—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hon. R. Thompson.

(An apology was received from Hon. S. T. J. Thompson.)

*Witness*.—Manuel DE SOUSA—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting*.—Dongara, Monday, 13th April, 1964.

*Adjournment*.—The Commission adjourned at 12 o'clock noon.

MONDAY, 13th APRIL, 1964.

At Dongara.

The Commission met at 2 p.m.

*Attendance*.—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses*.—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

James BAILEY—Fisherman.

Clement Leslie HILL—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting*.—Geraldton, Tuesday, 14th April, 1964.

*Adjournment*.—The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

TUESDAY, 14th APRIL, 1964.

At Geraldton.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance*.—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses*.—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Francis Robert LEMMON—General Manager, Geraldton Fishermen's Co-operative Ltd.

Aubrey Vincent GREEN—Fisheries Inspector, Geraldton.

John Claude BOWES—Managing Director, James Bowes Pty. Ltd. and W.A. Fish Filleting Pty. Ltd.

(At this juncture—12 o'clock noon—the Commission adjourned, and resumed at Port Gregory at 3 p.m.)

*Witnesses* (continued):—

Clarence William CHALLENGER—Fisherman.

James Edward HORSMAN—Crayfisherman.

Walter John WILLIAMS—Crayfisherman.

John William GRILL—Fisherman.

William Harold MARTIN—Fisherman.

John HERBERT—Fisherman.

Ronald BIRMINGHAM—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting*.—Dongara, Wednesday, 15th April, 1964.

*Adjournment*.—The Commission adjourned at 4 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 15th APRIL, 1964.

At Dongara.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Gordon Kenneth HOPE—Fisherman.  
Stanley Maxwell LEWIS—Fisherman.  
John Austin HENNEBURY—Fisherman.  
Keith Ernest Skipper MILLER—Fisherman.  
Richard Mahlon Berryman NIELSON—Fisherman.  
Francis Beddingfield MONEY—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Jurien Bay, Thursday, 16th April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, 16th APRIL, 1964.

At Jurien Bay.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Johanas Cornelis Van GELDER—Fisherman.  
Stephen DEL ROSSO—Fishermen's Co-operative.  
Domenico MARINO—Fisherman.  
Ronald SMITH—Fisheries Inspector.  
Jack MASTRO—Fisherman.  
Antonio CAVVALEA—Fisherman.  
Hugh HASTINGS—Fisherman.  
Angelo CALDERA—Fisherman.  
Edward PARKIN—Fisherman.  
Keith HOUSE—Fisherman.  
Willie SANDERS—Fisherman.  
Alexander Roy HARPER—Fisherman.  
Axel William KLEINBERG—Fisherman.  
James EDWARDS—Fisherman.  
Keith BOLITHO—Fisherman.  
Karre Tornes HANSEN—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Cervantes, Friday, 17th April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 9 p.m.

FRIDAY, 17th APRIL, 1964.

At Cervantes.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Joe MINERVINI, Fremantle Fishermen's Co-operative Ltd.  
Douglas John CORSER—Fisherman.  
Max William BEISSEL—Fisherman.  
Thomas MEAGHER—Fisherman.  
George MARGARIA—Fisherman.  
Victor RUSSELL—Fisherman.  
John McMAHON—Fisherman.  
James TIMMERMANIS—Fisherman.  
Charlie James STARR—Fisherman.  
George STARR—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Lancelin, Tuesday, 21st April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 3 p.m.

TUESDAY, 21st APRIL, 1964.

At Lancelin.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Russell Soudan BROWN—Fisherman.  
David Stanley EAYRE—Fisherman.  
James Richard OLIVER—Fisherman.  
Leonard Eric DRAY—Fisherman.  
John TAYLOR—Fisherman.  
Leonard PRIDEAUX—Fisherman.  
Alfred Edward Victor TANNER—Fisheries Inspector.  
Clarence Benningfield BATEMAN—Fisherman.  
Sandra Marie COOPER—Married Woman.  
Frank Charles BROWN—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Fremantle, Wednesday, 22nd April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd APRIL, 1964.

At Fremantle.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Alphonse MIRAGLIOTTA—Fisherman.  
Salvatore LOPRESTI—Fisherman.  
Salvatori MIRAGLIOTTA—Fisherman.  
Francesco IANNELLO—Fisherman.  
Kenneth FOSTER—Fisherman.  
Francesco MAZZEL—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Fremantle, Thursday, 23rd April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

THURSDAY, 23rd APRIL, 1964.

At Fremantle.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Oliver William WILSON—Fisherman.  
Runer Gustav CARLBURG—Fisherman.  
Eric Furey CARRUTHERS—Fisherman.  
Frank MIRAGLIOTTA—President of the Confederation of Licensed Fishermen.  
Michele ROTENDELLA—Fisherman.  
Lance Robert TUCKEY—Fisherman.  
Arthur Wilson TOUSSAINT—Fisherman.  
Lionel Elliot RENFREY—Fisherman.  
Guiseppe ROTENDELLA—Fisherman.  
Frank MENDOLIA—Fisherman.  
Pasquale Fedele VINCI—Fisherman.  
George ANICICH—Fisherman.  
Alfred Kristoffer MELSOM—Fisheries Inspector.  
Roland Myles CRAWFORD—Fisheries Inspector.  
Carlo MIRAGLIOTTA—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Perth, Tuesday, 28th April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

TUESDAY, 28th APRIL, 1964.

At Perth.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Francesco CORREA—Fisherman.  
Dr. Joseph Slavko MARIAN—Solicitor.  
Horace William McCORMICK—Fisherman and Processor.  
Vincent CARBONARO—Fisherman.  
Charles James STARR—Fisherman.  
John Victor GODWIN—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Perth, Wednesday, 29th April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 29th APRIL, 1964.

At Perth.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

William VALLI—Fisherman.  
Edwin Reginald NELSON—Fisherman.  
Nicholas PETERS—Poultry Processor.  
William Hugh EDWARDS—Journalist.  
Michael George KAILIS—Processor.  
Victor TOMBA—Cartage Contractor.  
Theo George KAILIS—Ross International Fisheries (Processors).

*Next Meeting.*—Perth, Thursday, 30th April, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

THURSDAY, 30th APRIL, 1964.

At Perth.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Gordon Donald NOBLE—Fisheries Inspector.  
Colin WHEELER—Processor.  
Edward Joseph ANNEAR—Processor.  
Ronald Philip Henshaw JACKSON—J. N. Taylor & Co. Ltd.—suppliers of gear.  
James Woodhead OSWALD—J. N. Taylor & Co. Ltd.—suppliers of gear.  
Roland Myles CRAWFORD—Fisheries Inspector.  
John Edward BRAMLEY—Senior Fisheries Inspector.

*Next Meeting.*—On a date to be fixed by the Chairman.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 4.50 p.m.

MONDAY, 6th JULY, 1964.

At Geraldton.

The Commission met at 10 a.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. R. Thompson (Acting Chairman), Hon. S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Christopher Robert LEMMON—Fisherman.  
Con Kenneth NICKOLAKIS—Fisherman.  
Harry SMITH—Fisherman.  
Richard Earl CARR—Fisherman.  
Kenneth George MAY—Fisherman.  
George James MAY—Fisherman.

*Next Meeting.*—Albany, 9th July, 1964.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission adjourned at 3.15 p.m.

THURSDAY, 9th JULY, 1964.

At Albany.

The Commission met at 1 p.m.

*Attendance.*—Hon. N. E. Baxter (Chairman), Hons. R. Thompson and S. T. J. Thompson.

*Witnesses.*—The following were called and tendered evidence:—

Norman Keith SWARBRICK—Fisherman.  
Francis William GOMM—Fisherman.  
Leslie MOUCHEMORE—Fisherman.  
Newton SHARP—Fisherman.  
Ronald Leslie HEBERLE—Fisherman.

*Adjournment.*—The Commission concluded the taking of evidence at 5.25 p.m. on Thursday, 9th July, 1964.

APPENDIX "C".

New South Wales.

ANNO DUODECIMO.

ELIZABETHÆ II REGINÆ.

Act No. 20, 1963.

An Act to provide for the constitution of The New South Wales Fish Authority and to define its powers, authorities, duties and functions; to make further provisions for the marketing of fish in New South Wales; for these and other purposes to amend the Fisheries and Oyster Farms Act, 1935, as amended by subsequent Acts; and for purposes connected therewith.

[Assented to, 10th April, 1963.]