

gave rise to the original scheme, in relation to this Bill and has also discussed the proposal with the Adelaide City Council. Only 430 permits have so far been granted—a figure much lower than originally anticipated. I therefore believe that the proposed broadening of the eligibility criteria would not put any undue pressure on the city's turnover in parking spaces. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the reference to impairment in the use of a person's limbs, and substitutes a more general reference to any physical impairment in the use of a person's limbs, and substitutes a more general reference to any physical impairment. It should be borne in mind that the impairment must still be permanent, and must still result in an inability to use public transport and a severe restriction in speed of movement.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980, was introduced in 1934 to prevent the possibility of German Shepherd dogs getting out of control, breeding with dingoes and becoming a threat to the sheep industry. The Act prohibits the keeping of Alsatian or German Shepherd dogs in certain parts of South Australia. The prohibition applies within the pastoral areas of the State generally north, north-east and north-west of Port Augusta, the area of the District Council of Hawker, the pastoral areas within the boundaries of the City of Whyalla, and on Kangaroo Island.

In 1980 the Act was amended to allow interstate travellers to obtain permits to take their German Shepherd dogs with them when travelling through the prohibited areas in the north. In addition, a number of townships have now been exempted from the provisions of the Act.

The restrictions against German Shepherds have recently been called into question. Little evidence has been found to back a common claim that German Shepherds could breed with dingoes and become a danger to livestock. The C.S.I.R.O. reported that, theoretically, inter-breeding could occur but that trial matings have been unsuccessful. There are now a number of breeds in South Australia such as Belgian sheepdogs, Groenendaels and Norwegian Elkhounds, which are similar in size and conformation to German Shepherds, as well as other large dogs such as Dobermanns and Rottweilers. These breeds do not suffer the same restrictions. Since the lifting of the prohibition in the northern townships the Government has not received any reports that it has been to the detriment of the pastoral industry.

The Dog Control Act now provides a number of provisions for the effective control of dogs throughout the State. In particular, section 46 (2) provides:

The owner or occupier of any enclosed paddock, field, yard or other place in which any horse, cattle, sheep, swine, goats or poultry (in this section referred to as 'livestock') are confined, or any person acting under the authority of that owner or occupier, may lawfully shoot or otherwise destroy any dog that is found therein and is not accompanied by some person.

South Australia is now the only State with a specific Act that discriminates against German Shepherd dogs and their

owners. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 23 March. Page 563.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the second reading of this Bill. The purpose of the Bill as explained in the second reading is that it is necessary to appoint a new Chairman and Executive Officer to the commission. The Executive Officer, Mr McKay, has resigned and gone back to New South Wales. I take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the work that he did in the commission in South Australia.

The particular aspect referred to in the explanation is worthy, and I am informed that the Minister is already in the process of appointing a new Chairman. The new Chairman will not be prepared to accept the security of tenure of only the remaining part of the term of office of the preceding Chairman, and that is quite reasonable.

In recent times there has been quite a lot of talk in this Council about the position of the Parliament and of the Executive. I refer, particularly, to the speech of the Hon. Mr Lucas in his Address in Reply contribution when he highlighted this feature and suggested that in recent times the Executive has been running all over Parliament. Here is an example: just because the executive Government wants at this time to appoint a new Chairman we are being asked fairly hastily to amend the Health Commission Act.

I have no objection whatever to amending the Act in the particulars of the Chairman and the executive officer. I acknowledge that we will not get a new full-time Chairman of the quality we would expect in that high position unless he has security of tenure. Therefore, I support the second reading and I am prepared to support the change that there be a full seven-year term of office for the Chairman, but not for the other members of the commission because the other members of the commission are part-time members; they are not career persons. There is no urgency and there is no reason why, if their positions become vacant, they should not be taken up for the balance of the term. Also, I postulate the suggestion that—not with this Government and not with this Minister, but at some time—it could happen that a Government could adjust matters so that various part-time members of the Health Commission resigned and it could replace them for seven years and therefore impose them on a succeeding Government.

But the more important part is that the Bill is said to be necessary because of the need to appoint a new Chairman. I accede to that, but I cannot see any need to extend it, as the terms of the Bill do, in the case of part-time commissioners—the other commissioners are all part-time now. If a commissioner resigns, I do not see why his successor needs to be appointed for seven years or any other fixed term; he can be appointed for the remainder of the term. So, I support the second reading, but in the Committee stage I will move the amendment which I have placed on file.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I support the second reading, and in doing so I support the Hon. Mr Burdett's remarks. The Minister explained to the Chamber that the pressing need was for this matter to be cleared up immediately so