



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2328/27231>

This is a scan of a document number DUN/Speeches/3436  
in the Dunstan Collection, Special Collections, Flinders University Library.  
<http://www.flinders.edu.au/library/info/collections/special/dunstan/>

**Title:**

Handwritten radio script regarding 'Premier wants to obtain an absolute majority in the House of Assembly'.

Please acknowledge the source as:  
Dunstan Collection, Flinders University Library.  
Identifier: DUN/Speeches/3436

© Copyright Estate Donald Allan Dunstan

Good evening

The last <sup>two</sup> weeks in Parliament has given a clear indication to the people of this State if the Premier were to obtain an absolute majority in the House of Assembly. If Labor maintains its numbers, he will not have an absolute majority, it must depend on the vote of at least one independent member to get measures through the House.

Now in the first place when measures come before Parliament, ~~as~~ sponsored by the Government, which seek to amend the provisions of legislation already on our Statute Books, it is only natural that if a member of Parliament feels that amendments and additional amendments to the Principal Act should be made, he should have an opportunity of moving that amendment and explaining it, allowing the House to vote on it. ~~But this~~ This means that each matter can be dealt with expeditiously.

The Standing Orders of the Assembly permit members to move for an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on ~~the~~ a Bill giving them power to consider additional amendments.

But the Premier has adopted the stand that he will prevent members from doing this. On several occasions recently he has used his party's numbers in the House to defeat motions which I have moved for instructions to Committees, & thus has stifled a full debate in Parliament. On one matter I moved to provide that Courts, which have the power to re-open unreasonably wrong-lying transactions, should be required to hold that a vote of interest

in excess of 12% simple for annum was  
excession and to set the transaction aside  
unless special & exceptional circumstances  
could be shown. As many ~~were~~ many body  
companies today are fleeing the public at  
rates of interest which are fantastic and  
without any justification, this seemed a  
reasonable enough request. But the  
Premier refused to allow a full debate on  
the measure, & used the number of L.C.  
members to vote out any motion so  
that it could not even be considered.

Similarly, when I moved for an instruction  
to allow consideration of amendments to  
the Evidence Act suppressing publication  
of evidence at preliminary enquiries, he  
again used the number of the L.C. to  
stifle debate & prevent a consideration  
of the matter.

The Independent members, who have always  
supported the right of private members to be  
heard, voted with the Labor Party on these  
issues. If the Labor party had had its  
full strength in the House the Premier  
could not have stifled discussion - but  
because until after the Rowe by-election  
was done, he was able to carry the  
day.

Another example of the way in which  
he tries to brush aside opposition was  
given when he tried to persuade the  
House to disregard an amendment which  
I had moved to his kidnapping bill. The  
amendment was designed to see that people  
who had a bona fide claim to custody of  
a child should not be held to be kidnapers  
merely because they took possession of

the child in question. My fear, & it is a fear shared by responsible legal authorities, was that the Bill as it stood might take away the courts' right to investigate & adjudicate custody matters in certain cases - a most undesirable course. But the Premier assured the House that if it disregarded my amendments & voted for the Bill as it stood, he would have a look at my suggestions, & if he thought they were worth anything, might do something about them later. He would ~~then~~ go on to assure the House that he already had an opinion that my amendments would knock down the Bill, but said he wouldn't weary the House by reading the opinion. He was forced by questions, particularly from the members for Adelaide, to read the opinion, & when he did it was found to contain no such statement as he had told the House it did contain. He was then forced to adjourn the matter to get further legal opinions - but you can see what he was trying to do - to mislead the House into trusting to his will in the matter, and thus the House should merely rubber-stamp his view without making up its own mind.

The latest episode was the most shameful of the lot. The late Sir John O'Halloran had moved a motion that

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps to readjust the boundaries of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system of electing the House.

Certain members opposite arose with all the

...ment of this State will be defeated on this matter.

Let me turn to the subterfuge which has been put before the House by the Premier. The Premier decided he did not wish to have to vote, apparently, or did not want his members to have to vote on a motion that was before the House, so (as members on this side have pointed out) he introduced an amendment which bore no relationship at all to the substance of the motion: he went on to say that that amendment was designed to say that any reduction in country members would be undesirable, and that those words would cut out the contents of the motion. The idea, of course, was to get members on this side, who wished to retain the substance of the motion, to vote against something which they were not opposed to. It was cunningly contrived. I do not intend that this House should be put in the position that it has to do that. I believe that members on this side should have the right to say clearly that they believe there should be a more just electoral system; and that they do not believe that that more just electoral system should mean a reduction in the present number of country members in this House. To that end

I move

To insert after "that" the words "while a reduction in the present number of members of this House representing country areas is undesirable".

I support the motion.

Now the Government admit that the Speaker, who is a Government member, ruled my amendment out of order on the authority that it would be out of order if moved in the House of Commons. But House of Commons procedure only applies if this is working in S.A. standing orders about the matter. Our standing orders clearly allowed my amendment - but the admit make any difference - against 200 members, I not justice which prevail. Again both Independent members protested against the Speaker's ruling & supported the Labor Party on the issue. They both voted for the Labor Party's vote for a more just electoral system.

Now the drastic feature of all this is that the Government, which is riding so roughshod over the rights of Parliament is a minority government, incapable of doing the wishes of the majority on a right electoral system. Within that Government the Premier is a dictator, simply calling the tune so that even his own Ministers don't know about his dees.

until they are announced on ~~the~~ TV programmes.  
The most obvious example of this came when  
the Premier recorded a T.V. <sup>in the morning</sup> talk saying  
S.A. would have dining taxes. That  
afternoon the Minister of Roads Mr. Tudge,  
recorded a T.V. interview saying that  
Cabinet had not considered the matter.  
He could not say whether taxes would  
ever be introduced! Luckily for  
the TV station, it discovered the discrepancy  
in the nick of time - but it is a fair  
indication of how Govt. is carried on here.

Well, the Premier is now appealing  
to the electors of Fannie to ~~re~~ elect an  
LCL man so that he doesn't have  
to rely on the votes of Independents.  
If this happens his dictatorship  
will be ~~some~~ more complete - his  
word will be law, & no-one with  
a different view will be able to force  
him even to be second thought. That  
is a grave danger for the future of this  
State.