

I have a deep and genuine admiration, should utter a remark which identifies me with a well-known Communist.

Mr. MEAGHER.—I was offering to use my influence with him; I was not identifying you with him.

Mr. SUTTON.—I am not sure that I should accept the honorable gentleman's offer.

Mr. MEAGHER.—I was only trying to be helpful.

Mr. SUTTON.—The problem of an ideology suitable to a modern democratic community presents us all with the need for hard, clear thinking. The honorable member for St. Kilda urged that we must find one and make it work. I take leave to offer one suggested by a newspaper which is neither "right" nor "left" and will not hastily be impeached for doctrinal unorthodoxy. In its issue for 5th July last, the *Catholic Herald*, London, posed the question: "Can a Christian be a capitalist?" It said—

We cannot sidestep the question any longer. There is only one reason why the world is not feeding its population, and that is the greed of the "haves", individuals and nations alike. The questions we must ask are basic, and we suspect that the Christian world has been sweeping them under the carpet for generations, too terrified to admit that they are there at all. We suspect that our rightful horror of communism has gone so far that we have lost the sense of death-to-self for society's sake.

Perhaps the real answer will come when the nation, and ultimately the world, becomes one gigantic kibbutz, a fraternal society voluntarily accepting social ownership yet recognizing the truth that the State exists for the individual and not the other way round.

That may be taken as a testament of anti-communism. In content it was rejected in advance by Marx. We must choose between ideologies, we must strike a path between capitalism and communism, remembering that Marx said that capitalism led inevitably to communism. There is a third course, and that is constructive reform—the maximum of personal liberty in a flexibly planned society.

Session 1964.—32

If it is not an impertinence—he can be assured that it is not intended to be—may I suggest that the honorable member for St. Kilda try to overcome the obstinate opposition of the St. Kilda City Council to the movement for the establishment of a free public library in its area. To help him to arouse it to a sense of its responsibility, I shall be glad to arrange for him to inspect the libraries conducted by the South Melbourne City Council.

Mr. HUDSON (Toorak).—I wish to support the expressions of loyalty to our Sovereign Queen, Elizabeth II. expressed in the motion so ably moved by the honorable member for St. Kilda, and supported by the honorable member for Lowan and subsequent speakers. When I took my oath of allegiance I was conscious that I was taking it to my Queen as Queen of Victoria, because this is a sovereign State. His Excellency the Governor is the representative of Her Majesty when she is not in Victoria. I pay tribute to the wisdom of Her Majesty the Queen and her predecessors in the choice of Governors of Victoria. There has been a long line of famous and able men who have contributed in a large measure to the development and greatness of Victoria. In that regard, I pay tribute to our present Governor who has enhanced his high office.

I was very much encouraged by the earlier remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke of the necessity for new members to take cognizance of the dignity and sovereignty of this Parliament. We are descended directly from the Mother Parliament of Westminster, and in that respect we have inherited many of the safeguards and privileges of hundreds of years of Parliamentary experience. In this House we are protected and are able to lead normal lives, but many years ago the office of a member of Parliament was a highly dangerous one. I refer more to physical dangers. In between the period of the changeover of power from the absolute monarchy to constitutional monarchy, members of

those early Parliaments who found themselves in opposition to the monarchy were often incarcerated and frequently lost their heads. At one stage Parliament retaliated by taking the head of the sovereign. But over those years the relations between Parliament and the Sovereign were hammered out, the various protective devices were developed, and our present constitutional monarchy was achieved. But I would remind honorable members that, although in this Parliament and this House we enjoy the privileges of that evolution, in many parts of the world to-day members of Parliaments are suffering in the same way as our predecessors suffered in England many hundreds of years ago.

As a result of this struggle, Parliament acquired certain safeguards. First, it safeguarded itself against the actions of the Sovereign. We are all aware that at the opening of Parliament the Sovereign or representative of the Sovereign is not permitted in this House, and before we receive the report of the Governor's Speech we show our independence by bringing in a *pro forma* Bill to assert our independence of debate. Our person is protected in this House and when proceeding to and from it. We are also protected by privilege in what we say in this House. All that leads towards our safeguards to protect our deliberations. There is one other point, and that is that before we are elected to this House we are protected in many ways. As honorable members are well aware, it is an offence to hold a military parade on a day on which an election of this Parliament or the Federal Parliament is held. This is not widely known, but I had experience of it some years ago. This right of deliberation is very important—one of the most vital that exists in this Parliament.

I took the trouble to look up the *Hansard* report of the Second Parliament in the year 1860, when a debate took place following riots outside this building. In the course of those riots stones were thrown, windows

Mr. Hudson.

were broken, and police were injured, and the deliberations of this House were interrupted. As a result of that debate, an Act was passed and received the Royal assent, the essence of which was to make it unlawful for more than 50 persons to assemble in the area bounded by Lansdowne-street, Victoria-parade, Exhibition-street, Flinders-street and Wellington-parade, on any day when either House of Parliament was sitting.

In the short time that I have been a member of this House, I have seen a march on this Parliament on a day when this House was to sit. This House was broken into. Following that, a meeting was held in the gardens adjoining this building. I happened to be passing at the time, and I saw placards and heard speeches of a very inflammatory nature. All this went on in defiance of that Act for the protection of the deliberations of this Parliament. Following that, one thing happened which I thought was very good. The Leader of the Opposition raised his voice to condemn that action. He stood in defence of this Parliament. I should have expected to hear every voice raised, because that is the thin edge of the wedge. No matter whether we are members of the Government or the Opposition in this House, we must protect ourselves against any effort to coerce our thoughts. Such coercion is invariably the precursor to totalitarian government. We must not yield one vestige of that safeguard.

In this House I have heard accusations that a man might be a Victorian and not an Australian, that there is conflict between support of this sovereign Parliament and of the Federal Parliament. I do not believe there is any conflict in loyalty between the two Parliaments. They are both sovereign Parliaments, with their powers clearly defined. In this very Chamber the debates which led up to the formation of the Federal Parliament were heard—the Federal Constitution and all that led up to it.

I remind honorable members that members of this Parliament played a very big part in the events leading up to the founding of the Federation of Australia. To appreciate that one has only to look at the development that has taken place in Australia in the short period of progress from the small initial settlements under military rule, the growth of free settlers, their demands for some say in their own affairs, the development of subsidiary Governments, colonial Governments, and then the development of the sovereign States. These States were developed from necessity, and a good example is our own State, which was originally the Port Phillip district of New South Wales. Later it was found expedient to subdivide and form a separate sovereign State of Victoria. However, the far-sighted men of those days were aware of the need to have a Federal Government, responsible for those functions most appropriate to it, including external affairs, defence, and postal communications. I must point out, however, that the State Governments did not hand over to the Federal authorities matters of intimate local control. Ours is a large country in which centralized control in one area is a most difficult matter. In the Northern Territory, there is a clamour for self-government, and in the Territory of New Guinea, a new Government is in the process of being formed.

One matter arising out of the sovereignty of this State which has received much publicity is finance. No one doubts that whoever controls the public purse controls the Government, and that belief was very clear in the minds of the framers of the Federal Constitution. When the Federal Parliament was founded, it was given sources of revenue so that it would be completely independent financially and not subject to any outside control. Moreover, it was realized that when a Government has its own taxing powers it must bear responsibility for the taxes it applies. Conversely, it is unnecessary for me to remind honorable members of the

odium that can come from the misuse of those powers. However, I believe the financial situation which now obtains was never envisaged by the framers of the Federal Constitution.

Premiers of all political parties have at various times proceeded from Victoria to Canberra, begging and wrangling for finance on behalf of this State. I cannot reconcile that action with the powers of a sovereign Parliament. I can see no possible justification for a requirement which is designed to prevent the Victorian Parliament from raising the whole of its own revenue. Any such action by another Parliament is quite incompatible with the sovereignty of this State.

I am particularly conscious of the honour that has been bestowed upon me in my election to represent in this House the Toorak electorate. Moreover, I am especially grateful for all the support that I received during the recent election campaign. It is a signal honour for me to represent a constituency such as Toorak—the more so because of the illustrious members who have preceded me in that capacity. My immediate predecessor, Sir Horace Petty, is now Victorian Agent-General in London, a post which he occupies after having had a distinguished career in this Parliament.

I would particularly refer, however, to the man who, I think, was the most famous member for Toorak, namely, the late Sir Stanley Argyle, who represented that electorate for more than twenty years from 1920 to 1940. He died as a sitting member. Moreover, he was Premier of this State from 1932 to 1935 and was Leader of the Opposition from that time until his death. He was a friend of my father, and he had considerable influence on me in my early days. He endeavoured to instil into me respect for the institution of Parliament and the authority of this legislature. I pray that I may be given

the strength to perform my duties in the best interests of this House, my constituents and the State of Victoria.

On the motion of Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East), the debate was adjourned until next day.

### ADJOURNMENT.

**Mr. RYLAH** (Chief Secretary).—  
I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next, at half-past Three o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

*The House adjourned at 10.58 p.m.,  
until Tuesday, October 13.*

## Legislative Council.

Tuesday, October 13, 1964.

The **PRESIDENT** (**Sir Gordon McArthur**) took the chair at 5.1 p.m., and read the prayer.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ST. KILDA AND ELWOOD LAND RECLAMATION) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly.

The **PRESIDENT** (**Sir Gordon McArthur**).—I have examined this Bill, and in my opinion it is a private Bill.

The **Hon. R. J. HAMER** (Minister for Local Government).—In another place, this Bill was ruled to be a private Bill, but was treated as a public Bill. I propose that the same procedure be followed in this House. Therefore, I move—

That this Bill be dealt with as a public Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

On the motion of the **Hon. R. J. HAMER** (Minister for Local Government), the Bill was read a first time.

### HOUSING COMMISSION.

**SOUTH MELBOURNE RECLAMATION PROJECT: COMMONWEALTH ACQUISITION: REDEVELOPMENT OF AREA.**

The **Hon. ARCHIBALD TODD** (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister of Housing—

(a) What exemptions have been applied for or granted in the South Melbourne reclamation project bounded by Bank, Cecil, and Park streets, and what persons have applied for or been granted exemptions or any other form of consideration under the final scheme?

(b) Has any Commonwealth Department sought or acquired any portion of the said area; if so, what is the Department, and for what specific use is it being sought or acquired?

(c) When is the Housing Commission likely to announce its plan for the re-development of the area?

The **Hon. L. H. S. THOMPSON** (Minister of Housing).—The answers are—

(a) The only party to apply for exemption is the owner of the Crescent Hotel situate on the corner of Park and Cecil streets, South Melbourne. A decision on this matter has not yet been made.

(b) The Department of the Interior, on behalf of the Postmaster General's Department, has acquired properties 265 to 271 Bank-place, 1 and 2 Crown-street and 4 Green-street for extensions to the existing telephone exchange in Bank-street.

(c) Plans are in course of preparation and are expected to be completed by December, 1964.

**FAWKNER ESTATE: PRICE OF HOMES.**

The **Hon. J. M. TRIOVICH** (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister of Housing—

What was the selling price of two-bedroom Housing Commission homes built in—(i) brick veneer; and (ii) concrete at Fawkner and sold to eligible applicants during the years 1960 to 1963 inclusive?

The **Hon. L. H. S. THOMPSON** (Minister of Housing).—The answer is—

No two-bedroom homes built in brick veneer or concrete were erected at Fawkner during the years 1960-63 inclusive.

I understood that Mr. Tripovich's question was whether houses, other than those recently completed, had