

ments in clause 6. Clause 5 sets out a minor amendment to section 6 of the principal Act, consequential on the amendment in clause 3.

Clauses 6 and 8 establish the new system for paying compensation in respect of cattle destroyed or carcasses condemned. The owner will receive the assessed market value of the cattle (subject to the statutory maximum) but will assign his rights to the carcass and hide. If the owner objects to an assessment of market value, he has a right of appeal to the Minister (and I can think of no more reasonable person to whom he might be required to appeal). If the residual value of the animal exceeds the assessed market value (or the statutory maximum) the balance will be paid to the owner.

Clauses 7 and 9 effect amendments to sections 8 and 10, respectively, of the principal Act, consequential on the amendment in clause 3.

Clause 10 removes the requirement that a person testing for tuberculosis must be a veterinary surgeon. I am not sure what would be the reaction of veterinary surgeons to that erosion of their businesses, but that is how it is to be. Clause 11 provides for an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act consequential on the amendment in clause 3, and clause 12 empowers the Chief Inspector to authorise a payment from the fund covering the cost of destroying diseased cattle. I look forward to the support of the Opposition in the passage of this Bill.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

### WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 813.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The Opposition considers this to be a serious matter that should be attended to. The reasons given by the Minister were convincing. Having talked with our various agricultural experts, we support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 6 November. Page 761.)

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): During yesterday's debate, as honourable members may recall, I was trying to project an image to members' minds of the possible future and likely growth of tourism in this State. I was also indicating that in the past the tourist industry in South Australia could have been likened to the story of Cinderella and was awaiting a fairy godmother or fairy godfather to waken it and take a positive interest in it. I also gave a slight insight into the efforts in the past few years of the bureau when compared to those in the private sector, and I indicated that private enterprise had spent \$2 000 000 in the past two years to get South Australians to leave South Australia and visit far away places. Also, I said that only \$200 000 had been spent to get those South Australian tourists to stay and see South Australia first.

I also pointed out that the South Australian Tourist Bureau had spent only about \$150 000 to get people to come to South Australia from interstate, or 36.83 per cent

of its advertising budget. Very few people in this State have devoted much time and effort to promoting the State to any large degree, but I compliment and say "well done" to those who have.

Two local papers, the *Advertiser* and the *News*, have promoted South Australia, and they have done something concrete. Let us look, first, at what the *News* has achieved. If one looks back over the past 10 years one sees that that paper has published a travel supplement as a regular Tuesday feature. Time and space have been devoted in that paper to publicising, selling and promoting South Australia. Last Tuesday week (30 October) it devoted 10 pages to tracing the river voyage of Captain Sturt. Each town, tourist resort and tourist association joined with the advertisers to maximise the selling impact and effort of selling South Australia to South Australians.

The newspapers also give valuable space in editorials and articles to promote the State. This has been a regular feature once a week for many years. The *Advertiser* has established a travel feature page which has appeared every Saturday for countless years. The South Australian Government Tourist Bureau has been approached many times to participate in those weekly features, but has, I understand, declined to do so. The regional tourist associations have urged the newspapers to coerce the South Australian Tourist Bureau to participate but, seemingly, to no avail. The question I ask myself is: "Why?"

It becomes obvious when one sees that, from a budget of \$400 000, only \$800 was spent last year with one newspaper—the equivalent of \$1.95 a day or .2 of 1 per cent of its total advertising budget. This could be construed as blatant hypocrisy of a tourist bureau function. I do not blame the bureau or its staff; I can only blame past policies laid down by past uninformed Ministers of Tourism. Previous Governments have urged development and urged expenditure by others for development of tourist parks, resorts, hotels, etc. They urged promotion expenditure by those whom it seeks to influence and who are based within the State. It suggests that South Australian companies advertise within South Australia urging South Australians to see their State first, yet the bureau was able to spend, last year, only \$1 890, or \$5.91 a day.

This scandalous thumbing at the efforts of others to promote this State clearly indicates that the bureau has been held back. If it had been forced to go any slower, it would have been going backwards. We must not think the bureau is insensitive to these problems; in fact, I can state that the State Department of Tourism is planning an incentive to encourage South Australians not to overlook the travel and holiday opportunities and venues within this State. This item was reported in the hotel magazine which was received yesterday by the Parliamentary Library.

Last Wednesday, a report appeared in one of the dailies under the headline "We chase the rich tourists", which stated:

Adelaide is in a \$1 000 000 campaign to bring big-spending tourists to Australia. The move underlines the importance to Adelaide of a new international class hotel. The campaign—the first major move to bring big-spending tourists from Europe in groups—involves British Airways including Australia in its Speedbird programme. Until now the cheap advance purchase fares have mainly generated what is known as "visiting friends and relatives" traffic which is on the bottom of the spending scale. Britons will be offered three weeks in Australia for \$1 550, including air fares. The holiday includes a coach tour from Sydney to 11 cities and towns. Two days are spent in Adelaide. Departures are in January. Self-drive holidays are offered from \$796 for two