

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 3 MAY 1865**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Wednesday, 3 May, 1865.*

Presentation of Address in Reply to Opening Speech.—  
Meetings of the House.

PRESENTATION OF THE ADDRESS IN  
REPLY TO THE VICE-REGAL SPEECH.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the House do now adjourn to present the Address to His Excellency in reply to the Vice-Regal Speech.

The question was put and passed, and the House adjourned accordingly.

At five minutes to three the House resumed, when

The SPEAKER, on taking the chair, said that he had the honor to inform them that a deputation of the House had accompanied him to Government House, and at half-past two o'clock had presented to His Excellency the Governor the Address of the Assembly in reply to the Vice-Regal Speech on the opening of Parliament; and further, that His Excellency had been pleased to receive the Address, and had made the following reply thereto, which he would read to the House:—

“MR. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN,—

“I thank you for this Address, and for your congratulations on the continued prosperity and progress of Queensland. I am confident that you will make adequate provision for Her Majesty's service in this Colony, and that you will promote all works and measures of public usefulness.

“G. F. BOWEN.

“Government House,

“Brisbane, 3rd May, 1865.”

#### MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved, pursuant to notice,—That, unless otherwise ordered, this House will meet for despatch of business at three o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and at 10 a.m. on Friday, in each week. He said that the morning sitting at ten o'clock a.m. had been found the most convenient generally.

Mr. BLAKENEY trusted that the Colonial Secretary would not press the latter part of his motion, as, in that case, he should feel himself compelled to call for a division. There had as yet been no session in which this rule had not been changed. He put it that the morning sitting on Friday had been found to work very inconveniently as regarded the many mercantile and professional men in that House. On Friday the Judges sat in chambers; and from this and other reasons, that day, as far as the sitting of the House was concerned, often became a *dies non*. He would take the opinion of the House upon the question, and would move that the words “at ten a.m. on” and the word “and” between “Wednesday” and “Thursday” be omitted.

Mr. PUGH seconded the amendment.

Dr. CHALLINOR said the question was merely one between the Brisbane members and the country members; to the former ten o'clock was an inconvenient hour for their attendance on one day in the week, but there were merchants and professional members who did not reside in Brisbane, and they gave up four days in the week to the business of the country. It was unreasonable for the city members to refuse three hours of their time

on the Friday, and showed very little self-abnegation on their part in the discharge of their duties. He should oppose the amendment.

Mr. PUGH said the honorable member for Ipswich had attributed the wish of the town members to alter the hour of meeting on Friday to selfishness on their part. He supported the amendment, because he knew, from conversation with country members, that they did not like the morning sitting on Friday, and would rather have it altered; many, indeed, would rather have three days' sitting in the week than have the Friday sitting at ten in the morning. As to what had been said about selfishness, and of honorable members having a professional eye to business, it might be thrown back in the teeth of the member who implied it. That honorable member (Dr. Challinor) and the honorable member for East Moreton (Mr. Cribb) were the only two who had any desire to go away on Friday afternoons, and it would become them to give way to the majority.

Mr. R. CRIBB thought the morning sitting on Friday would only inconvenience the honorable member for North Brisbane (Mr. Blakeney) while it would allow those members who resided near Ipswich to visit their families on Friday, so that, after all, the sacrifice would not be so great as the benefit. They should consult the convenience of the majority of the House. It was not, he thought, exactly the thing to taunt the honorable member for Ipswich, who gave up so much of the week, with selfishness for desiring a morning sitting on Friday. Let the country members speak for themselves—(cries of “They are not here”)—and not the member for North Brisbane. He would support the original motion.

The SECRETARY FOR LANDS AND WORKS said he rose for the purpose of drawing attention to the fact that, in the event of their coming to a division, they would not arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on the merits of the question that night; he would, therefore, propose the adjournment of the debate till Thursday. No doubt it was supposed by the honorable member for North Brisbane (Mr. Blakeney) and his colleagues that the morning sitting was due to the instigation of those connected with Ipswich and the Government. The Government had not, however, the slightest interest in the question at issue, for during the Session they had always resided in Brisbane. It appeared that the mere circumstance of the honorable gentleman having business on Friday that affected himself, made him eager to sacrifice the convenience of others. He would ask that honorable member to sacrifice his practice for three hours on Friday morning, seeing that others had to sacrifice three days out of the week to the business of the country. There was another class of members, who came from a distance, and resided in Brisbane,

with no other business to attend to but their duties to the country. Could they afford to sacrifice the evenings of those Fridays? Honorable gentlemen should remember that the same amount of Parliamentary business could be got through by a morning sitting on Friday, as by sitting till twelve o'clock at night on other days. The question resolved itself into a simple one,—should not the few sacrifice three hours of their private business on one day of the week to those who sacrificed their profession and business for three days of the week? He would propose the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BLAKENEY said, as he was informed that the Secretary for Lands and Works would support the adjournment of the debate, he would remark that the honorable member Mr. Taylor —

Mr. MACALISTER said that when he rose to speak there was no House, but now there was one, he would withdraw his motion.

The question was put, that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question. The House divided, with the following result:—

Ayes 10.	Noes 6.
Mr. Herbert	Mr. Fitzsimmons
„ Bell	„ Stephens
„ R. Cribb	„ Blakeney
„ Watts	„ Edmondstone
„ Jones	„ Brookes } Tellers.
„ Miles	„ Pugh }
„ Coxen	
Dr. Challinor	
Mr. Pring	
„ Macalister } Tellers.	

The original question was then put and passed, and the House adjourned till Tuesday, 9th instant.