



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

This is a scan of a document number DUN/Speeches/3539  
in the Dunstan Collection, Special Collections, Flinders University Library.  
<http://www.flinders.edu.au/library/info/collections/special/dunstan/>

**Title:**

ALP Broadcast by Mr. G. T. Virgo, MP, Member for Edwardstown 5KA

Please acknowledge the source as:  
Dunstan Collection, Flinders University Library.  
Identifier: DUN/Speeches/3539

© Copyright Estate Donald Allan Dunstan

A.L.P. BROADCAST BY MR. G.T. VIRGO, M.P., MEMBER FOR EDWARDSTOWN,  
5-K.A., 6.55 P.M., FRIDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 1968.

GOOD EVENING :

USUALLY AT THIS TIME EACH FRIDAY NIGHT, THE LEADER OF MY PARTY, MR. DON DUNSTAN, SPEAKS TO YOU, BUT DUE TO HIS ABSENCE INTERSTATE IT IS MY PLEASURE TONIGHT TO DEPUTIZE FOR HIM.

MR. DUNSTAN, SOME WEEKS AGO, INTRODUCED A BILL INTO THE PARLIAMENT CALLED "THE AGE OF MAJORITY" BILL, THE PURPOSE OF WHICH WAS TO REDUCE THE LEGAL AGE FOR ALL THINGS FROM 21 YEARS TO 18. IT IS SOMEWHAT REVEALING TO RECALL JUST A FEW OF THE REMARKS OF MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT, WHO, ALTHOUGH THEY SAID THEY SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE OF THE BILL, FINALLY VOTED AGAINST IT AND AS A RESULT, THE BILL WAS DEFEATED.

THE L.C.L. MEMBER FOR ROCKY RIVER PROBABLY DELIVERED ONE OF THE MOST REACTIONARY ADDRESSES MEMBERS OF THE STATE PARLIAMENT HAVE SUFFERED FOR MANY YEARS. HE ACCUSED THE LEADERS OF THE PARTIES, AND, AS SUCH, WAS NOT ONLY ACCUSING MR. DUNSTAN, BUT

PAGE 2.

ALSO THE PREMIER, OF ATTEMPTING TO HIT THE HEADLINES BY INTRODUCING REFORM MEASURES IN KEEPING WITH CURRENT-DAY THINKING. HE EVEN WENT FURTHER WHEN HE SAID THAT HE HOPED THAT THERE WERE SUFFICIENT EXPERIENCED STATESMEN IN THE HOUSE TO SAVE OUR YOUNG PEOPLE FROM THE FOLLIES OF THE YOUNG, NOTORIOUSLY INEXPERIENCED LEGISLATORS. AN ATTITUDE OF THIS NATURE IS TYPICAL OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT OF THE 17TH AND 18TH CENTURY. HOWEVER, THIS TYPE OF ATTITUDE WAS NOT RESTRICTED TO INSIGNIFICANT BACK-BENCHERS. THE PREMIER HIMSELF SAID THAT HE AGREED WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF THE BILL, BUT BECAUSE THERE WOULD NOT BE UNIFORM APPLICATION THROUGHOUT THE COMMONWEALTH, HE VOTED AGAINST IT. THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL EXPRESSED SOMEWHAT SIMILAR VIEWS AND VOTED AS DID THE PREMIER AGAINST THE BILL. SOUTH AUSTRALIA HAS MUCH TO BE PROUD OF IN THAT IT HAS LED THE WAY IN MANY FIELDS; AND TO OPPOSE A BILL MERELY BECAUSE IT DOES NOT HAVE UNIFORM APPLICATION THROUGHOUT THE COMMONWEALTH

IS BACKWARD THINKING. MR. HALL'S OPPOSITION TO THE BILL IS TYPICAL OF L.C.L. THINKING - IF IT IS SOMETHING UNDERTAKEN BY LABOR THEN THEY CANNOT AGREE WITH IT. THEIR EXCUSE AT THE MOMENT IS THAT WHILE THEY SUPPORT THE PRINCIPLE OF OUR MEASURE, IT SHOULD NOT BE UNDERTAKEN AT THIS TIME BECAUSE IT DEALS WITH THE VOTING AGE IN STATE ELECTIONS AND IT IS NECESSARY IN THEIR VIEW THAT THE CHANGE IN VOTING AGE SHOULD HAPPEN IN EVERY STATE OF THE COMMONWEALTH AT THE SAME TIME. IT IS HARD TO SEE WHY. WE DO NOT HAVE UNIFORM VOTING PROVISIONS AS BETWEEN THE STATES OF AUSTRALIA. IN UPPER HOUSE AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS, THE VOTING PROVISIONS IN EACH STATE ARE DIFFERENT. THERE WOULD BE NO DIFFICULTY IN PROVIDING FOR 18-YEAR OLDS TO BE MARKED ON THE JOINT ROLL WITH THE COMMONWEALTH SO THAT THEY COULD VOTE IN STATE ELECTIONS BUT NOT VOTE IN COMMONWEALTH ELECTIONS UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE COMMONWEALTH MAKES THE CHANGE. AT THE MOMENT, A

CERTAIN NUMBER OF ELECTORS ARE ON THE JOINT ROLL ENROLLED ONLY FOR COMMONWEALTH ELECTIONS BUT NOT FOR STATE ELECTIONS AND THEY ARE MARKED ON THE ROLL ACCORDINGLY.

IF THE MOVE IS NOT MADE SOMEWHERE, IT WILL NOT BE MADE FOR A CONSIDERABLE TIME BECAUSE OF THE DIFFICULTY IN GETTING UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT AS BETWEEN THE STATES. IF THE L.C.L.'S PRINCIPLES WERE CORRECT, NO PIONEERING EFFORT WOULD EVER BE UNDERTAKEN ANYWHERE IN AUSTRALIA, BUT WE WOULD ALL HAVE TO WAIT FOR EVERYBODY ELSE TO CATCH UP WITH OUR IDEAS.

IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT OTHER STATES ARE FOLLOWING MR. DUNSTAN'S LEAD AND HAVE PREPARED SIMILAR BILLS TO OURS FOR INTRODUCTION TO THEIR RESPECTIVE PARLIAMENTS. IF THEY ARE SO CONCERNED WITH UNIFORMITY, ONE IS FORCED TO ASK NOW WHY IS THE GOVERNMENT PRESSING TO REDUCE THE LEGAL AGE FOR DRINKING TO 18 YEARS, BUT DENYING THOSE SAME PEOPLE THE RIGHT TO CAST A VOTE AND TO ENTER LEGAL CONTRACTS. SURELY THIS IS TYPICAL OF THE

**INCONSISTENT THINKING OF A GOVERNMENT WHICH IS COMPLETELY  
AND UTTERLY HYPOCRITICAL.**

**GOOD NIGHT.**