simply to cater for an area previously not catered for. Had this matter been dealt with before, some of the problems that have arisen would not have arisen.

Clauses 22 to 24 passed.

Claimant holds public license to sell liquor. Mr. CHAPMAN: (for Mr. T. VIEGRO) I refer to a classic example where an instruction is to be given to a council. Surely the member for Fowey has made up members of boards who are elected by ratepayers. Do not these people, consciously or otherwise, be left to the discretion of the council whether or not such members are licensed. The provision simply gives to local government a power for which it has asked.

Clause passed.

Clause 25 passed.

Clause 27—"Power to license bazaars." Mr. MATHWIN: (for Mr. T. VIEGRO) The plain, English meaning of the word. The member for Fowey has offered the honourable member a dictionary, and there are other dictionaries in the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. T. VIEGRO: I think you should go to the library, as you did before.

Clause 28 passed.

Clause 29—"Unsuitable condition of land." Mr. MATHWIN: Section 666(b) (e) provides: By striking out paragraph (e) of subsection (3) the provisions relating to incineration in defraying the expenses incurred in so doing, or by the council in so doing, that is the proposal.

Paragraph (e) of this clause provides:

By striking out paragraph (e) of subsection (3) the word "incineration" in defraying the expenses incurred.

To which "in defraying the expenses incurred" in section 666(b) (e) does this paragraph apply?

Clause passed.

Clause 31 to 33 passed.

Clause 36—"Particulars of charges upon property." Mr. CHAPMAN: Section 875 refers to inquiries by ratepayer and council. This provision increases the fee for this service from 10c to 1s.

As the section was originally fixed in 1934, the increase at first seems reasonable. However, the provision relates to any person who inquires about these unpaid rates, and "any person" includes ratepayers and the council. Therefore, if a ratepayer chooses to inquire of his own council about unpaid rates on any property in his area, he will be required to pay 1s. This is another example of unreasonable domination of local government bodies by the Minister who wishes to protect local government and bring the principal Act into line with current Treasury trends, surely it is reasonable to stipulate that a maximum of 2s be paid.

Mr. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The hon. member refers to the principle in the Act of 1919. If the honourable member has read section 875 of the Act he will realize that as it stands, the council of which he was a member, which is presented for the income of the council and 10c for handling an inquiry which involves an authentic return, that rates and other monies are due and payable to the council, and the interest of a property at the date of giving the certificate; when they became due and payable, which, if any, of the rates and other monies are chargeable upon the said property, or stating that no rates or other monies are payable. This information must not be written and, if necessary, in registered form. All this for 10c.

Mr. Chapman: No one is suggesting that.

The Hon. G. T. VIEGRO: That is what the Act provides. We are ensuring that this matter is operated at a loss, giving them a reasonable return and a fair go, something the honourable member knows little about.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (37 and 38), schedule and title page passed.

The Hon. G. T. VIEGRO (Minister of Local Government): That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to register my objection to the method by which the Bill was introduced and to the omission of the name of the committee. It was introduced originally at a late hour, giving members no time to consider the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can speak only to the Bill as it came out of Committee. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Bill deals with a principal Act of 908 sections, plus a schedule of 19 pages. It has been virtually impossible for members to do their homework thoroughly and to do their job as they are obliged to do as representatives in this Parliament. That is my main object in speaking to this Bill, I was interested at Government members when I spoke in Committee on clause 25, which amends section 666(b) (e) of the principal Act. The Report stage has been completed. I may add that this Minister would not explain the position when I asked him, and I therefore register my objection to the Bill read a third time and passed.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly an appropriation of $25,000 per annum. I hasten to point out that relieving the fund of its obligations will in no way prejudice the grants which are made, and should those grants be reduced the superintendents will be able to meet their obligations from other sources both State and Commonwealth.

The second section, which has been agreed to by the independent members, I refer next to the levy under the principal Act. At the moment this levy stands at $4 for cattle or curvasses having a sale price of up to $70 and $6 for those having a sale price of more than that amount. At current market prices this has been an effective levy of 10c a head.

It is now proposed to increase this levy to 5c for each $20 port thereof of market value up to a maximum of 50c. This will result in a beast or curvass having a market value of $200 or over attracting the maximum levy, and this accords with the maximum market value of $200 on which the compensation fund is based. Clause 2 brings the measure into operation on July 1, 1974. Clause 3 relieves the fund of the obligation referred to above. Clause 4 increases the levy payable under the Act.

Mr. ALLEN secured the adjournment of the debate. Later.

Mr. ALLEN (Pronouncements): This is a short Bill brought about by the Cattle Compensation Fund having become short of money. Indeed, in his explanation, the Minister said that the urgent need for this Bill was brought about by the position of the fund. In this House on September 19, 1972, I issued a warning that this could happen. Speaking in the debate on the Appropriation Bill I said:

I also issue a note of warning about the Cattle Compensation Fund. It is based on the present position of the fund, and I think that every cattle owner in the industry.

The balance in the fund at June 30, 1971, was $277,594. Because of actions taken by the Minister, there was a result of record slaughterings of cattle in South Australia and New South Wales. The fund had been much higher had not many cattle been transported from one State to another for slaughter. Payments in 1972 amounted to $108,713, which was about three times the sum received. The balance at June 30, 1972, was $164,342, and if the current year's receipts were added, it would be about $200,000. However, if current claims are made this year as they were made last year, and the fund was practically exhausted at the end of the financial year.

I refered, of course, to the financial year 1972-73. At the end of 1973-74, the fund had to supplement the fund by $10,000. At the commencement of the current financial year, the fund stood at $81,643, and if payments are the same this year as last (and most indications are that they will be) the Government will have to supplement the fund again at the end of this year with a further $100,000. This state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue, and it is one of the reasons for the introduction of the Bill.

It is intended that stamp duty, which at present is about 10c a head of cattle, will be altered; stamp duty in future will be $0.20 a head of cattle. Every $20 up to a maximum of $200 total price for the animal, bringing in a total of $40. The change is necessary to raise enough funds to keep the fund financial for some time. One reason for the large payments of compensation in the 1972-73 financial year was the result of a campaign of emoting ovine, bovine, brucellosis and tuberculosis. In the Far North of this State we have a serious problem. The smaller cattle stations in the North appears to be able to avoid quite a good must, and the incidence of disease on those stations is lower to such an extent that the fund will actually stations, however, it is difficult to get a good must, with the result that some cattle that miss the must could be carried on in the disease, spreading them throughout the whole of the herd.

Conditions in the North of the State are good, and so many cattle that are not suffering from the disease that they move off in groups of 15 or 20 and it is difficult to get a good must. As the disease becomes more widespread because fences have been washed away by recent rains. Many cattle have become mixed with others, and much of the fencing work done will be null and

The work may be set back to some extent as a result of the floods. The increased stamp duty will be hard on cattle owners, but I see this as a matter that is to be dealt with. It is not likely that this Bill will be successful. It is to be watched closely, and only a few cases are reported. Unless the diseases are brought under control, we stand every chance of losing some of our valuable overseas markets. It behoves all, everyone, whether in the inner country or in the outer areas, to continue to contest and try to rid the State of the diseases. I feel sure that cattle owners in the inner country will not object to the increased stamp duty in order to supplement the sum in the Cattle Compensation Fund. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—Establishment of Cattle Compensation Fund.

Mr. FASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I point out that there is a variation and that we are amending section 11 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (b) of section 11 (b) of the principal Act, (b) and this is a Bill.

Indeed, the Minister's second reading explanation refers to the substance of subsection (3), and it is only by striking out paragraph (4) of the subsection that we can show to achieve what is intended by the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Leader drew my attention to this matter, which has been corrected.

In clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS

AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): That Standing Orders be set as far suspended as to enable him to introduce a Bill forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for suspension. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The question is "Are": Against "No". There being a dissonant voice, it is necessary to ring the bells.

The Division was called on:

Ayes (24)—Mrst. Broun, Hallbrook, Mr. Brown and Barnard, Mrs. Byrne, Maxon, Corcoran, Crisne, Duncan, Durack, Ellwood, Franklin, Franklin, Gunns, Kenny, King (teller), McKess, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simpson, Slater, Viegro, Welford, and Wright.