



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

This is a scan of a document number DUN/Speeches/0287  
in the Dunstan Collection, Special Collections, Flinders University Library.  
<http://www.flinders.edu.au/library/info/collections/special/dunstan/>

**Title:**

Radio Broadcast - Legislative Council Enrolment Card

Please acknowledge the source as:  
Dunstan Collection, Flinders University Library.  
Identifier: DUN/Speeches/0287

© Copyright Estate Donald Allan Dunstan

287  
1-24

TALK BY THE PREMIER, MR. DON DUNSTAN, 5-K.A., FRIDAY, 9TH JUNE, 1967.

GOOD EVENING :

MANY OF YOU IN THE LAST WEEK OR SO HAVE RECEIVED IN THE POST A LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ENROLMENT CARD. THIS CARD STATES THAT IT APPEARS YOU ARE AN INHABITANT OCCUPIER. NOW WHAT IS AN INHABITANT OCCUPIER? AN INHABITANT OCCUPIER IS THAT PERSON WHO LIVES IN ANY HOUSEHOLD EITHER AS TENANT OR AS OWNER - HE'S THE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD.

NOW OF COURSE IN SOME CASES A MISTAKE MAY HAVE BEEN MADE AND THE CARD SENT TO THE WRONG PERSON. YOU SEE, THE LIST OF APPARENT INHABITANT OCCUPIERS WAS PREPARED BY COMPUTER. THE COMPUTER COMPARED THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ROLL WITH THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ROLL AND PICKED OUT THE APPARENT INHABITANT OCCUPIERS. IN A FEW CASES NAMES MAY HAVE BEEN MISSED BY THE COMPUTER.

NOW IT DOES STATE ON THE CARD THAT THERE IS A PENALTY IF THE PERSON WHO SIGNS IT IS NOT REALLY ELIGIBLE. BUT IN THIS CASE

PAGE 2.

THERE IS NO PENALTY BECAUSE ANY MISTAKE WILL BE THE COMPUTER'S FAULT NOT THE PERSON WHO SIGNS THE CARD. IN ANY CASE THE CARDS ARE CHECKED WHEN THEY ARRIVE AT THE ELECTORAL OFFICE SO THERE SHOULD BE NO CONCERN ON THIS SCORE.

SOME PEOPLE ARE ALSO UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT ENROLMENT IN THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ROLL MAKES THEM ELIGIBLE FOR JURY SERVICE. THIS IS NO LONGER TRUE. JURORS ARE SELECTED FROM THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ROLL AND, OF COURSE, IT IS COMPULSORY TO BE ON THAT ROLL. IT IS NOT COMPULSORY TO BE ON THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ROLL BUT IF YOU ARE QUALIFIED I STRONGLY URGE YOU TO SIGN THE FORM AND SEND IT IN.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL IS THE UPPER HOUSE OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT AND UNDER OUR CONSTITUTION IT HAS THE RIGHT OF VETO ON ANY MEASURE PASSED BY THE DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED LOWER HOUSE. FOR EXAMPLE, THEY REFUSED THE GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSALS FOR

ELECTORAL REFORM - SOMETHING FOR WHICH AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIANS HAD VOTED ... BUT THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, REPRESENTING A LIMITED NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND THEIR OWN VESTED INTERESTS - TORPEDOED THE BILL.

WE DECIDED THAT THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SHOULD BE MORE REPRESENTATIVE. IN THE PAST, CLAIM FORMS HAD ONLY BEEN SENT TO OWNERS OF PROPERTY. ... BUT THERE ARE FIVE QUALIFICATIONS FOR ENROLMENT. WE PICKED THAT ONE WHICH WOULD APPLY TO MOST PEOPLE AND HAVE SENT OUT THE CARDS.

OF COURSE, RETURNED SERVICEMEN AND WOMEN ARE ALSO ELIGIBLE FOR ENROLMENT AND THE ORGANIZATIONS CONNECTED WITH THESE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED.

RETURNS SO FAR HAVE BEEN VERY SATISFYING. THIS SHOWS THAT VOTERS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA ARE REALLY ON THE BALL. OF THE FIRST 1,000 CARDS EXAMINED ONLY THREE WERE NOT SIGNED. IN SOME

CASES DETAILS OF BIRTH WERE OMITTED BUT THE ELECTORAL DEPARTMENT CAN GET THESE DETAILS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH. HOWEVER, IT DOES HELP US IF BIRTH DETAILS ARE PUT ON THE CARD. THE USE OF THE COMPUTER HAS ALSO BEEN JUSTIFIED ... IN THE SAME FIRST 1,000 ONLY 13 PEOPLE HAD MARKED THEIR CARDS AS "NOT ELIGIBLE". UP TO TWO-THIRDS OF THE CARDS HAVE NOT BEEN ALTERED SHOWING THAT THE COMPUTER INFORMATION WAS CORRECT.

I URGE EVERYONE WHO HAS THE RIGHT TO ENROL TO CLAIM THAT RIGHT AND I URGE THOSE PEOPLE WHO HAVE RECEIVED CARDS TO SIGN THEM AND SEND THEM.

IT IS IN YOUR OWN INTEREST TO HAVE A VOTE FOR THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

I URGE YOU TO CLAIM YOUR RIGHT TO A VOTE.

GOOD NIGHT.

R.L. REID'S TV REFERENDUM BROADCAST FOR

WEDNESDAY, 20TH MAY AT 6.55PM

GOOD EVENING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.

THE LAST TIME I SPOKE TO YOU I EMPHASIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF A "NO" VOTE TO QUESTION ONE ~~ON~~ SATURDAY IF THE GOVERNMENT'S WELL-LAID PLANS FOR AN ELECTORAL GERRYMANDER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WERE TO BE FRUSTRATED. IT WAS MY CONTENTION THEN AND I REPEAT IT NOW THAT BY A ~~STRANGE~~ CHANCE, THIS NEXUS PROVISION IN OUR CONSTITUTION, WHEREBY INCREASES IN THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE MUST BE MATCHED BY INCREASES IN THE SENATE, IS OUR LAST POLITICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL BARRIER TO A REGULAR FIDDLING OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES, GUARANTEED TO KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DAY IN POWER, REGARDLESS OF THE POPULAR VOTE. THE GROUND-WORK HAS ALREADY BEEN LAID IN THE 1965 AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT, BY A SHAMELESS ALTERATION OF THE TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONS TO BE ISSUED TO THE FEDERAL ELECTORAL COMMISSIONERS WHEN THEY COME TO REDRAW FEDERAL BOUNDARIES, AND BY THE PROVISION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERESTED PARTIES (PARTICULARLY POLITICIANS) TO APPLY PRESSURE ON FORMERLY INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONERS.

IT ONLY REQUIRES NOW THAT YOU ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT TO INCREASE AUTOMATICALLY THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE WITHOUT THE EXPANSION OF THE SENATE TO PUT THE FINISHING TOUCHES TO THE PLAN. TO VOTE "NO" TO QUESTION 1 IS ESSENTIAL IF YOU WISH TO TRY AND PRESERVE A FAIR ELECTORAL SYSTEM.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I AM NOT ONE WHO DELIGHTS IN RUNNING DOWN OUR POLITICIANS OR IN SEEING CONSPIRACIES UNDER EVERY BED, BUT EXPERIENCE IN TWO COUNTRIES HAS CONVINCED ME THAT WHEN IT COMES TO THE BUSINESS OF DRAWING UP

AND REARRANGING ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES YOU JUST CAN'T TRUST POLITICIANS TO DO THE JOB FAIRLY — THEIR OWN SELF-INTERESTS ARE TOO INTIMATELY INVOLVED.

MY SUSPICIONS ABOUT QUESTION 1 WERE INTENSIFIED WHEN I READ WHAT WAS PROPOSED IN PLACE OF THE NEXUS PROVISION, AND WHAT WAS LEFT OUT. THE PRACTICAL EFFECT OF THESE PROVISIONS IS THAT, BEGINNING IMMEDIATELY THE MACHINERY IS PUT INTO OPERATION AND AFTER EVERY CENSUS THERE WILL BE A NICE LITTLE BONUS OF SEATS TO BE ADDED TO THE HOUSE, AND ONCE THE FORMULA HAS PRODUCED THE STATES NEW NUMBER OF SEATS, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL BE ABLE, THROUGH EFFECTIVELY TAMED ELECTORAL COMMISSIONS, TO SAY HOW THOSE SEATS ARE TO BE ALLOCATED, BOTH FROM POINT OF VIEW OF AREA AND POPULATION. WHAT A NICE LITTLE PRESENT FOR ANY GOVERNMENT TO HAVE AT ITS DISPOSAL!

PURE SPECULATION, YOU SAY; MERE PSEUDO-INTELLECTUAL THEORISING; "THEY'D NEVER HAVE THE CHEEK TO DO IT"! ON THE CONTRARY, THE VICTORIAN ELECTIONS OF A FEW WEEKS BACK PROVE THE DEADLY EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS FORM OF GERRYMANDERING, THAT AVOIDS THE CRUDITIES AND MISTAKES OF MORE SIMPLE SYSTEMS. IN THE VICTORIAN ELECTIONS THE LIBERAL PARTY LOST GROUND TO THE A.L.P. IN TERMS OF VOTES CAST, BUT IN TERMS OF SEATS IT ACTUALLY INCREASED ITS MAJORITY OVER THE OPPOSITION. WHAT HAD HAPPENED? IN BETWEEN THE TWO ELECTIONS THERE HAD BEEN A REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS AND AN ADDITIONAL SEVEN ADDED, JUST AS THE PROPOSED FORMULA FOR OUR CONSTITUTION SUGGESTS WILL HAPPEN.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEFT OUT OF THE PROPOSED ALTERATION IS EVEN MORE INTERESTING. IN 1959 AN ALL-PARTY CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED THE INCLUSION IN THE CONSTITUTION OF PROVISIONS ENSURING THE REGULAR REVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL

DIVISIONS OF EACH STATE AND ALSO GIVING NEAR UNIFORMITY TO THE VALUE ACCORDED  
 TO THE VOTES OF ELECTORS FOR EACH OF THE STATES. IN OTHER WORDS, A  
 CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION OF GERRYMANDERING. WHERE IS THIS LAST KEY PROVISION  
 IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT? THERE'S NOT A WORD ABOUT IT. THE OMISSION IS  
 DELIBERATE.

TO SUM UP, <sup>NEXT</sup> ON SATURDAY YOU ARE ASKED TO BREAK THE NEXUS AND REMOVE THE  
 LAST POSSIBLE EFFECTIVE BARRIER TO GOVERNMENT GERRYMANDERING OF HOUSE SEATS. IN  
 ITS PLACE YOU ARE ASKED TO PUT PROVISIONS IN OUR CONSTITUTION THAT GUARANTEE  
 THE GOVERNMENT IN POWER AT THE NEXT ELECTIONS A NICE LITTLE BONUS OF SEATS, AND  
 A SIMILAR BONUS AFTER EVERY CENSUS. YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO WRITE FDR EVER MORE  
 INTO OUR CONSTITUTION ~~A CLEVER AND SUBTLE GERRYMANDER~~  
 REMEMBER TO GIVE A FAIR GO TO AUSTRALIA'S ABORIGINES VOTE "YES" TO QUESTION  
 2, BUT TO PRESERVE A "FAIR GO" IN OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM VOTE "NO" TO QUESTION 1.