

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Council**

**WEDNESDAY, 9 JULY 1884**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.***Wednesday, 9 July, 1884.*

Address in Reply.—Days of Meeting.—Joint Committees.  
—Bills of Exchange Bill.—Pharmacy Bill.—Motion  
for Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at twenty-five minutes to 4 o'clock.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY.**

The PRESIDENT said : I have to report to the House that the Address as agreed to yesterday has been presented to the Governor by me,

and that His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply :—

“ MR. PRESIDENT AND HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN  
OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,—

“ I thank you for your Address, and for the assurance of your desire to unite with me and the other branch of the Legislature in the adoption of such measures as will tend to promote the prosperity of all classes of the community.

“ A. MUSGRAVE.

“ Government House,

“ 9th July, 1884.”

**DAYS OF MEETING.**

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. C. S. Mein), in moving—

That, unless otherwise ordered, this House will meet for despatch of business at half-past 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday and Wednesday in each week—

said these were the days on which it had been customary for the House to meet, and he believed they were convenient to most if not all hon. members.

The HON. W. H. WALSH said most of the members who were chiefly concerned were absent, and it appeared to him that this motion would take them by surprise and be very inconvenient to them. He did not think the practice had been to meet on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, but he was speaking from memory only. If the motion was an innovation, the Postmaster-General should have explained it as such, and the country members who were not there at that moment should have had an opportunity of expressing their views. If the Postmaster-General could show that the business of the Chamber would be better conducted by meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday, well and good, but if he could not do so then it would be better to postpone the motion until those gentlemen who were personally interested had an opportunity of discussing the matter.

The HON. T. L. MURRAY-PRIOR said that last session was the first occasion on which this innovation had been made, and he, in conjunction with other members, had then explained the great inconvenience they would be put to. Speaking for himself, if he wished to be present on Tuesday he had to leave home on Sunday. However, the motion was carried at that time, and he did not rise now for the purpose of making any objection to it; and although he thought Wednesday and Thursday would be much more convenient days, he would not presume to study his own convenience before that of members of the Chamber generally.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the motion was no innovation whatever. He had fixed upon the days named in the Sessional Orders last session, and he assumed they were convenient. The Hon. Mr. Walsh must have been thinking of some years ago when the House met on Wednesday and Thursday, but since that time Tuesday and Wednesday had been found more convenient, and he was inclined himself to favour those days. The motion was in the hands of the House, and if there was any desire to go back to the old state of affairs he should offer no objection.

The PRESIDENT : I may inform the House that since the 5th of July, 1882, the sitting days have been Tuesday and Wednesday. Mr. Morehead moved on that date—

“ That, unless otherwise ordered, this House will meet for the despatch of business at half-past 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday and Wednesday in each week.”

Since that time the practice had been continued,

Question put and passed,

## JOINT COMMITTEES.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL, in moving—

That the Standing Orders Committee for the present session consist of the following members, namely:—The President, Mr. Hart, Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Walsh, and the Mover, with leave to sit during any adjournment of the House, and with authority to confer on subjects of mutual concernment with any committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Assembly—

said the only changes in the names had been necessitated by the absence, which was likely to continue throughout the session, of two hon. gentlemen who had previously been on the committee.

Question put and passed.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL, in moving—

1. That the President, Mr. Walsh, and Mr. King be appointed members of the Joint Library Committee.

2. That the President, Mr. Heussler, and Dr. O'Doherty be appointed members of the Joint Committee for the Management of the Refreshment Rooms.

3. That the President, Mr. W. Forrest, and Mr. A. C. Gregory be appointed members of the Joint Committee for the Management and Superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings.

4. That the foregoing resolutions be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly by message, requesting that they will be pleased to nominate a like number of members from their body, with a view to give effect to the 8th Joint Standing Order.

—said all the gentlemen mentioned had seats on these committees last year, with the exception of the Hon. Wm. Forrest, whose name had been substituted for that of the Hon. J. Cowlishaw, who was absent from the colony.

Question put and passed.

## BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL presented "a Bill to codify the law relating to Bills of Exchange, Cheques, and Promissory Notes," and moved that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the Bill was ordered to be printed, and the second reading was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

## PHARMACY BILL.

The HON. P. MACPHERSON (in the absence of the Hon. A. J. Thynne) presented a Bill to establish a Board of Pharmacy in Queensland, and to make better provision for the registering of Pharmaceutical Chemists, and for other purposes, and moved that it be read a first time.

The HON. W. H. WALSH said the motion had certainly taken him by surprise, and he was not sure that it was formal. The Hon. Mr. Thynne, who had given notice of his intention to introduce that Bill, might absolutely repudiate the action of the Hon. Mr. Macpherson; that was not probable, but it was quite possible. He was inclined to think that a precedent was being established for which there was no example. The only things he had known it possible for one member to do for another were to put questions, or move that a motion on the paper be postponed to a future date. This was the first case of the kind he had ever heard of, and he felt it to be his duty to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to it.

The HON. P. MACPHERSON said his hon. friend, Mr. Thynne, who was unable to be present on account of domestic affliction, had asked him to move the motion, which was purely a formal one, to which he could see no possible objection,

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the Standing Order dealing with the subject could be interpreted both ways. The 49th Standing Order said:—

"It shall be competent for any member, after notice given at a previous meeting, to present any Bill to this House, and thereupon move the first reading thereof."

That did not say that the notice must be given by the member who presented the Bill, but simply that the House must be apprised of the intention by a member to present a Bill.

The HON. W. H. WALSH said the hon. the Postmaster-General was quite right. It was quite competent for any member to introduce a Bill, but it was not competent for him to present a Bill on behalf of another member. Endless confusion would be the result of allowing any such thing, and they would have members coming down to the House and repudiating the action of hon. gentlemen who, *bona fide*, had been acting for them. If the Hon. Mr. Macpherson would introduce the Bill himself, and then relegate it to the Hon. Mr. Thynne, the difficulty could be got over.

The PRESIDENT: There is no rule on the subject that I know of, and I do not know of any precedent. I am perfectly aware, however, that I have seen a similar thing done in the other House, and I remember when the Hon. Mr. Walsh was in the chair in the other Chamber, I took up a Bill of Mr. Buzacott's and was allowed to carry it through. This being simply a formal motion I think the hon. gentleman is quite entitled to introduce a Bill for another member. If it was a matter of great importance; if the Bill had been discussed and there was any great difference of opinion about it in the House, I should be inclined to say that it required the consent of the House to enable any member to go on with it for another member; but the matter being purely formal, I really think it is a matter of no consequence who presents the Bill.

The HON. W. H. WALSH said he was aware that any member could take possession of a Bill when it had once been placed before the House. But his contention was that the hon. member had no business to introduce a Bill for another member. When once the Bill was introduced, it became the property of any member, and anyone could go on with it if the member introducing it afterwards abandoned it. It was possible that in this case the Hon. Mr. Thynne might come down and say that he never intended the Bill to be introduced. If the Hon. Mr. Macpherson introduced it as his Bill then it became the property of the House; but he contended that the hon. gentleman was out of order in introducing it for another member.

The HON. W. GRAHAM said the Hon. Mr. Walsh had told them that the Hon. Mr. Macpherson would have a perfect right to postpone the introduction of the Bill, and under the circumstances perhaps that would be the best course.

The HON. W. H. WALSH said he would advise the Hon. Mr. Macpherson to move the Bill as his own, and allow it to become the property of the House.

The HON. W. GRAHAM said he would advise the hon. gentleman to do no such thing. As a friend of the Hon. Mr. Thynne he had undertaken to do a certain thing, and as that was objected to the next best thing was to postpone the motion.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said he thought the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Walsh was appropriate. He did not think the Hon. Mr. Macpherson, when he moved the first reading of the Bill, intended it to be placed on the

records of the House that he moved it on behalf of the Hon. Mr. Thynne. As the Hon. Mr. Walsh had said, as soon as a Bill was read a first time it ceased to be the property of any member, and anybody could take it up. The Hon. Mr. Thynne, of course, would naturally be the person to take it up afterwards, and the Hon. Mr. Macpherson need not therefore feel embarrassed or feel it to be his duty to carry the Bill through.

The Hon. P. MACPHERSON said, with the permission of the House, he would withdraw his motion and would move instead, that the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Mr. Thynne be postponed until Tuesday next.

The PRESIDENT: I should like the House to hear what "May" says on this subject:—

"When a member is at liberty to make a motion he may appeal in its favour before he actually proposes it; but a speech is only allowed upon the understanding—First, that he speaks to the question, and, secondly, that he concludes by proposing his motion formally. In the case of unopposed returns, or other formal or uncontested business, one member is permitted, by courtesy, to bring forward the motion of another; but it has been pointed out from the chair that it would be highly inconvenient to extend this practice to motions open to controversy and debate, nor has the making of motions by proxy ever received sanction. In the absence of one Minister, however, another Minister has been allowed to make motions standing in his name."

I think the latter part of that goes to show that the Hon. Mr. Walsh is right, because although a Minister has been allowed to move a motion for another Minister, I do not think the practice should extend to private members. The better plan in this case, is not to make any motion on the subject, and the motion as it now stands will appear on the paper as usual on the next sitting day.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

The Hon. W. H. WALSH said, before the House adjourned there was a question connected with the Government service, upon which he should like to elicit some information from the representative of the Government. He referred to the sailing of the "Jessie Kelly" labour schooner from Mackay, as far back as February last. That vessel was in charge of a most efficient Government Agent, Mr. de Latour, and from the day on which he sailed, up to the present time, his friends, although they had made repeated enquiries, had been unable to hear of him. He thought, that when the Government took such an interest in a trade that they appointed their own agent to accompany a vessel, they should be able to furnish the public from time to time with whatever knowledge they possessed with respect to that agent. He believed a rumour had reached here to the effect that Mr. de Latour had died, but nothing had been heard officially. He understood the vessel left Mackay about February 24; they next heard that the Government Agent had condemned her, and that was the last information the public had received. He put it to the Postmaster-General whether it would not be well, in order to allay the anxieties of the relatives of Mr de Latour, that the Government should lay any information they possessed before the public. He begged to move the adjournment of the House.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said the subject not being in his department he could not be expected to know all about it. He had not had any inspection of official papers on the subject, but he had seen a document in one of the public departments which indicated the whereabouts of Mr. de Latour, and he could hardly think that his friends had made any inquiries, otherwise their anxieties would have been very readily relieved. It appeared that the

"Jessie Kelly" met with bad weather, which necessitated her going into some port in New Caledonia. A survey was made of the vessel, and it being found that the repairs could not be effected in Noumea, she was, on the recommendation of the board appointed to hold an inquiry, sent back to Sydney. Mr. de Latour chartered another vessel, and took the South Sea Islanders back to their homes. What had become of Mr. de Latour he did not know, but he had not the least doubt that the information could be obtained. He would make inquiries into the matter, and if the hon. gentleman thought proper to raise the question again on the next sitting day he should be able to give him all the information which the Immigration Department could supply.

Motion for adjournment, by leave, withdrawn.

On the motion of the POSTMASTER-GENERAL, the House adjourned at twelve minutes past 4 o'clock.