Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Connor	Mr. Brown
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Burges
Mr. Ellis	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Gill
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Henshaw	Mr. Holman
Mr. Horan	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Lynch	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Gordon (*Teller*).
Mr. Needham	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Scaddan	
Mr. Thomas	
Mr. Watts	
Mr. A. J. Wilson	
Mr. F. F. Wilson	
Mr. Troy (*Teller*).	

Question thus passed.

A committe appointed consisting of Mr. Burges, Mr. Diamond, Mr. Needham, Mr. F. F. Wilson, also Mr. Moran as mover; to report this day fortnight.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER moved that the House do now adjourn.

Question put.

THE SPEAKER declared the Noes had it. Division called for by the PREMIER and taken, with the result that all members present voted with the Ayes.

THE SPEAKER: As there were no members on the other side of the House, it was not necessary to appoint tellers. The Ayes had it.

The House adjourned accordingly at 12·29 o'clock, until Thursday afternoon.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 3rd November, 1904.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—RAILWAY WATER SUPPLY, GREAT SOUTHERN.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER asked the Minister for Lands: Why are the Great Southern Railway trains supplied with water conveyed by trains in tanks all the way from Spencer's Brook, when an abundance of good fresh water is obtainable all along the railway line to Albany?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: Water from Spencer's Brook is only used on the Great Southern Railway in districts where the local water supply has been proved by analysis to be unsuitable and detrimental to the locomotive boilers. Dams at available places are required, and, when funds are available, will be put in hand. The necessity for water haulage would then cease.

RETURN—SHIPPING BROKERS (LONDON AGENCY).

On motion by Hon. M. L. Moss, ordered: That a return be laid on the table of the House showing the amounts paid by the Government to their London Shipping Brokers for services rendered as such during the years 1896 to 1903, both inclusive, the amount of each yearly payment to be shown separately.

PAPERS—GWALIA STATE HOTEL, PARTICULARS.

HON. W. KINGSMILL (for Hon. J. W. Hackett) moved:

That there be laid on the table of the House statements showing—1, The balance-sheet of the Gwalia State Hotel up to the year ending 30th June, 1903. 2, The balance-sheet for the year ending 30th June, 1904, distinguishing between the receipts derived respectively from the bar and from the hotel proper. 3, The amounts spent during those periods in salaries and wages, and in the general upkeep of the hotel. 4, The tariff of rates charged for drinks, meals, and bedrooms.

He felt sure there could be no opposition to the motion, and that the information asked for would be extremely useful and interesting to members of this House.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD moved an amendment, that there be added to the motion the words:

With the profit and loss account for the year 1903-4.

The balance-sheet would not include all the information which was desirable, and he hoped the mover would accept the addendum he had proposed.

HON. W. KINGSMILL accepted the addendum as part of the motion, as it would be very useful.

Question (with addendum) put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On the Order of the Day for the third reading of the Bill,

HON. L. MOSS moved that the order be discharged and the Bill recommitted for amendment.

Question passed, and the Bill recommitted.

[HON. H. BRIGGS in the Chair.]

New Clause—Wages, how payable:

HON. W. KINGSMILL moved that the following be added as Clause 2:—

Section 2 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the addition at the end of Subsection (*a*) thereof of the following words:—"And the intervals at which such wages, allowances, or remuneration shall be payable."

Members would recollect that when the House was recently discussing the Mines Regulation Bill, a clause in that measure provided that it should be in the power of the Governor-in-Council to order the times for payment of wages, whether fortnightly or otherwise, in connection with mining in any place. It would also be recollected that he (Mr. Kingsmill) moved that the clause be struck out, for these reasons—firstly that the particular Bill was not the proper place in which to make that provision, and secondly because undoubtedly the tribunal which ought to fix the times for payment of wages should be the tribunal which had been set up for dealing with all matters of industrial dispute. The payment of wages at certain intervals was undoubtedly a feature of industrial disputes, and although it had been argued, apparently with reason, that it was well within the power of the Arbitration Court to decide as to whether wages should be paid fortnightly or monthly in any place in connection with any industry, still there was no explicit provision in the Arbitration Act for the court to exercise such power. He understood it had been ruled by the court that in the absence of specific provision the court would not undertake to order how wages should be paid. This motion was intended to place it within the power of the Arbitration Court to say at what intervals payment of wages should be made in connection with any industry in any district. The interpretation of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act defined wages, allowances, or remuneration as matters within the power of the court; but there was no explicit provision in the Act by which the court could deal with the period at which wages should be paid. The amendment would provide in an explicit way the power which the Arbitration Court ought to have for determining the period at which wages should be paid in any industry in any district. It was important that such a question should be dealt with, because in many instances, especially on the goldfields, tradespeople were liable to suffer when they found it necessary to give credit for a longer period than a fortnight. With this farther power added to the existing powers of the Arbitration Court, it would be open to any aggrieved party to cite a case before the court for an order to pay wages fortnightly, in any industry, in any district or area.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS accepted the amendment, which he strongly favoured for reasons he had explained when the Mines Regulations Act Amendment Bill was under discussion.

THE HON. W. KINGSMILL: It had been argued in another place that the Arbitration Court could not give a decision in a case of this sort which would not be binding throughout an industrial district. That statement was without doubt incorrect. Section 84 of the principal Act provided that the court might in any award made by it limit the operation of the award to any municipality or area in an industrial district.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause—Members of Parliament not to appear in court as advocates:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added as a clause:—

Section 73 of the principal Act is amended by the addition of the following proviso:—"Provided, however, that such agent, counsel, or solicitor be not a member of Parliament, and has not announced himself as a candidate for a seat in Parliament.

It was intended to have moved in another place for the insertion of a similar provision, but through some oversight it was not done. This was an opportune time to submit the clause for consideration, because it could not be contended that it was brought forward with any idea of hampering either the employers or the emyloyees, since we found that the employers engaged the services of a member of Parliament, and that the employees engaged the services of various Ms.L.A. of the Labour party. In industrial disputes it was desirable that members of Parliament should keep themselves perfectly free from bias. Many industrial matters were so wrapped up in political questions that members of Parliament might be called upon to give an unbiased opinion on, that it was not expedient that members of Parliament should take up the attitude of advocates. It was perfectly impossible for a man taking up such a position to give an unbiased decision in Parliament. Another reason actuated him in bringing this clause forward, and he could not help if those who appeared in the court chose to treat it as an offensive argument. Industrial disputes had been brought about for political purposes and for stirring up animus. There was an instance in Fremantle. The carters employed by merchants were perfectly content; but when it came near the general election a certain candidate thought it would be a good thing to get up a carters' union. No sooner was the union formed than the employers were cited before the Arbitration Court.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: Did the gentleman get in?

HON. M. L. MOSS: No. The Arbitration Court said that the carters were well paid, and better paid than the minimum the court would fix.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: No wonder the gentleman did not get in.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Three members of another place, nominees of the Labour party, appeared in the Arbitration Court in the capacity of advocates, and largely for political purposes. This was a strong accusation, and he (Mr. Moss) expected that he would be tackled outside Parliament for making it; but he would not think one thing outside and say another inside the walls of Parliament; and he was prepared to take the responsibility for making the statement. These men were actuated by a desire to stir up strife, keep it going, and make the position one which would add to their political favour. Members of Parliament should keep clear of this sort of thing. Amendments to the Arbitration Act were likely to come before Parliament, and we had also the Truck Act, Employers' Liability Act, and Acts dealing with co-operative societies, etcetera, and it was highly desirable that members of Parliament should approach these Acts with unbiased minds. Section 73 of the Arbitration Act was inserted with the idea of cheapening procedure or avoiding technicalities of all kinds, and in order that members of the legal profession should be kept out of proceedings; but now a new kind of advocate appeared without the necessary amount of education and training to assist the court to come rapidly to a conclusion. On the other hand, we found that this new class of advocate possessed, in a very marked degree, the ability to string cases out.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: The nonunion advocate.

HON. M. L. MOSS: They were not union advocates. The president of the Arbitration Court observed that they charged greatly in excess of what a solicitor would charge. The section of the Act was passed to cheapen procedure; but this mushroom growth of advocates made a good thing out of it, and their fees were not liable to be taxed. It was fair to assume that, as some of the advocates were of a type that would be anxious at the time of an election to keep up industrial strife, they would keep strife going in order to see that the fees they got were commensurate. He (Mr. Moss) would have hesitated to bring this clause forward if only Labour members had appeared in the court, because then he would have been open to the suggestion that he had brought it forward for political purposes and to put obstacles in the way of workmen being represented by almost professional advocates; but he could not be accused of that now.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Were the advocates paid?

HON. M. L. MOSS was not looking at it from that point of view. It was in the

interests of the country that members of Parliament should not be biased and should not on certain questions take up the attitude of advocates.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Mr. Moss had made a very able speech, but could not be complimented on the stability of the arguments advanced, which arguments could also be used against lawyers. A lawyer would be prepared to take a case, so long as there was nothing discreditable in it, for either side; and no doubt Mr. Moss, if there were a case in the Supreme Court in which the members of unions were interested, would not refuse, so long as the fee was high enough, to represent the union, and would not be doing anything that could be considered dishonourable. Members of Parliament employed in arbitration cases were chosen by unions because of their special fitness and because the unions thought them best able to represent them. The same thing applied to lawyers. The political aspect of the matter should not enter into consideration, for it would apply equally as well to a lawyer. If we prevented members of Parliament from taking part in industrial disputes before the Arbitration Court, we might as well prevent them from taking part in land arbitration cases. He (the Minister) had been engaged in a land arbitration case, and he found that the attitude he took up in no way interfered with or biased his political position. If we accepted this clause we should go farther and introduce a Members Restriction Bill, compelling members to hide underground when the House was not sitting.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Mr. Moss had taken great care to impress upon members that he was acting in a spirit of fairness when he introduced this amendment; but that hon. member was not acting in such a fair spirit as he would like the Committee to believe, because the hon. member must know that the representatives of the employers had a very wide scope in the selection of gentlemen they might appoint to represent them before the Arbitration Court. Plenty of people were prepared to represent the case of employers before the court, if paid for it; but the workers were in an altogether different position. In the first place, perhaps because of want of sufficient funds, they were not able to engage expert men to place their cause in a proper light before the court; nor even if they were in a position to pay would they, unless they could get one of their own people who had the interests of the workers at heart, be at all times satisfied they were getting the best assistance possible? Members of the parliamentary Labour party who represented the employees before the court would not expect any fee for their services, because he should say that in nearly every instance there would be no funds.

HON. M. L. MOSS asked the hon. member not to say things like that, and said he would read a balance-sheet presently.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: At all events it would be very unfair and unjust to debar members of Parliament from appearing before the Arbitration Court.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: This question was not looked at by him from the aspect of the employers or that of the workers. He did not know that the men who were employees and who at present appeared before the court had done anything very dreadful in consequence of which they should be debarred from appearing again. He was not aware that our present experiences justified us in moving in this direction; and if it was a good principle that members of Parliament should be debarred from taking part in these cases, why not extend it almost indefinitely to other cases. The fact that members had experience in the court might be of assistance to Parliament in the discussion of these matters. According to the latter part of the proposed new clause a person who at any time had announced himself as a parliamentary candidate would be debarred from acting in the Arbitration Court.

HON. M. L. MOSS: That was not the grammatical reading.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: That was how he read it.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	...	4
Majority for			...	7

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon J. D. Connolly	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. Kingsmill	Hon. J. A. Thomson
Hon. Z. Lane	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. B. D. McKenzie	(*Teller*).
Hon. M. L. Moss	
Hon. C. A. Piesse	
Hon. G. Randell	
Hon. R. F. Sholl	
Hon. C. Sommers	
Hon. W. Oats	
(*Teller*).	

Question thus passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

Bill reported with farther amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL, THIRD READING.

Larkin Street (Kanowna) Closure Bill, read a third time and *passed*.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous day.

Clause 45—[Amendment had been moved that the words, "or such machinery as may be prescribed," be struck out"]:

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The amendment before the Committee was in accordance with the views expressed by Captain Laurie, and had been moved by himself (Mr. Moss) because Captain Laurie did not move it.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER moved an amendment:

That the words "or engine" be inserted after "boiler," in line 1.

The object was to include winding engines used for raising and lowering miners.

Hon. Z. LANE: We had struck out "machinery," and were now putting it in as an "engine."

Hon. R. LAURIE: "Machinery" was surely not equivalent to "engine." There were other than winding engines.

Hon. Z. Lane: There were more than 40 varieties of engines.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The legal meanings of "engine" seemed endless. The Fisheries Act spoke of "a fixed engine for catching fish," and this term was held to be applicable to a long line with numerous hooks on it. Without an interpretation the word "engine" was too widely significant, and the amendment would be dangerous.

Hon. J. A. THOMSON agreed with the two preceding speakers. It would not be wise to include machinery in general. If "engine" were clearly defined he would support the amendment

The MINISTER: It was necessary that the inspector should keep winding engines in view; and therefore he must be notified of their sale.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Then insert "winding engine."

The MINISTER altered the amendment to read "winding engine."

Amendment (as altered) passed.

Hon. M. L. MOSS moved an amendment:

That the words "or machinery," in line and lines 4 and 5 of Subclause 2, be struck out.

Amendment passed.

The MINISTER moved an amendment:

That the words "or winding engine," be inserted in lieu of "or machinery" in line and lines 4 and 5 of the subclause.

Hon. G. RANDELL: If it were customary to let out winding engines on hire the amendment was reasonable.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: They were often let out on hire.

Hon. J. A. THOMSON: In the old country and in the Eastern States machinery of every sort was let on hiring agreements, and did not become the property of the hirers till payments were completed.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 46 to 52—agreed to.

Clause 53—Drivers in charge of engines:

Hon. W. OATS: The clause was very stupid. Most of the winding engine drivers in this State were well qualified but why classify them as "engineers"? An apprentice to engineering had after special training to pass an examination. Surely not one in a thousand engine-drivers in this State could pass that examination. If they could, let them pass it in the regular way. He moved an amendment

That the whole of paragraph 1 of Subclause 1, also the words "an extra first-class or," in line 1 of paragraph 3 of the subclause, be struck out.

The MINISTER: The object in providing for three different kinds of certificate was to allow a first-class engine-driver or boiler attendant to obtain a certificate of a higher class than

could be procured by a man working a smaller plant. This system had, he understood, worked satisfactorily in New Zealand.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment would go farther than the mover intended. Would it not strike out the provision for examinations?

HON. W. OATS: No.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Evidently the hon. member desired only first-class and second-class certificates.

HON. W. OATS withdrew his amendment, and moved:

That in line 2 of paragraph 2, the word "three" be struck out, and "two" inserted in lieu.

HON. R. LAURIE: There were many men in the State holding third-class certificates for driving small engines. The Bill did not only deal with the mining industry.

HON. Z. LANE: There were only two classes of certificates recognised by the State.

HON. R. LAURIE: Men now holding third-class certificates would have to pass a higher examination to get a second-class certificate if the amendment were carried, and these men might not be able to do so. Perhaps Mr. Oats would be agreeable to the striking out of all the words from "respectively" in line 3 to "engineer" in line 10 of the paragraph.

HON. W. OATS: There was no objection to that.

HON. R. LAURIE: If men had sufficient skill to take charge of a large stationary engine, they should be allowed to do so. There was only one class of engine which had to be in charge of a driver who held a first-class certificate.

HON. G. RANDELL: The provision seemed an excellent one. It was a step up the ladder for men who now held first-class certificates, and it was only reasonable that men should be allowed to see some prospect in front of them. It was also desirable that as many men as possible should be allowed to obtain third-class certificates.

HON. Z. LANE: If an engine-driver worked for 15 years he could not become a mechanic, because if attending to his business he would not be in a workshop. Where did the third-class certificated men come in? It was simply a loophole for another classification under the Arbitration Act, and if a man obtained a third-class certificate he would ask for the same wages as the man holding a second-class certificate, and would be entitled to them. To drive any class of engine a man should have a proper certificate. In almost all big places where men could learn anything, the drivers were not allowed to go into the workshop at all.

HON. G. RANDELL: There was an analogy between a first, second, and third class officer on a vessel, and a first, second, and third class engine-driver. It did not require a first-class certificate for a man to drive an engine of a few horse power; therefore a third-class certificate should be allowed.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: The paragraph should be passed as it stood. An extra certificate would be granted to a person who was skilled as a mechanical engineer in addition to his qualifications as an engine-driver. A company need not have an extra first-class certificated man to drive an engine, but the manager of a big mine would be able to choose the most competent driver to take charge of the machinery. It would be for the manager to say whether he would have a man with the extra special qualification or the man with only the necessary qualification to look after the engines. A third-class certificate should be allowed because there were many small concerns where small engines were employed, but which did not require specially qualified men to look after them. These small engines required men with common sense and some practical experience in driving engines to look after them.

HON. W. OATS: Many men who were very useful about an engine, especially on the goldfields, could drive it and do all the mechanical work, and yet could not pass a technical examination. A man applying for a first-class certificate should be put to an engine and required to describe to the examiners the practical working of it. Many drivers who were really useful men about an engine would be excluded if required to explain the technical working of it. As to the point stated by Mr. Lane, there was a lot to be said in favour of that, and some friction would be likely to take place.

HON. C. SOMMERS was in favour of three grades of certificates, if a third-class was to be granted. It would be as easy

for the Arbitration Court to fix wages for men holding certificates of the first and second-class, as it would be to fix wages for a man holding certificates for the three grades. The Bill did not define what constituted an "engineer"; and if members of this House were asked their opinion, there would be great differences of opinion. As to what was a competent mechanic, a man might be employed in a machine workshop and be doing one kind of work for years, without knowing anything about other parts of the work going on in the same shop; yet under the Bill he would be called a competent mechanic. Such a mechanic might be any ordinary workman about a machine shop; and in coming to this opinion he (Mr. Sommers) had taken the advice of machinery people. He would prefer to see the words "first-class certificate" struck out of the Bill.

HON. R. LAURIE: The amendment he intended to propose later would probably meet the objections urged by two hon. members who had spoken. In regard to marine engineers, the holder of a Board of Trade certificate on a vessel must have been at sea twelve months to obtain a certificate of the second class; and one applying for a first-class certificate must have been at sea for at least two years. On a large steamer there might be five to eight engineers employed, and several of them holding first-class certificates; yet it did not follow that each and all of the first-class would be paid the highest rate of ages on that steamer. The holder of a second-class certificate as described in the Bill would simply drive a stationary engine.

THE MINISTER, as a compromise, would accept the amendment suggested by Captain Laurie.

HON. W. OATS would also accept it and withdraw his amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

HON. W. OATS proposed an amendment:

That the words "provide" down to "first class or" be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the subclause as amended agreed to.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER moved an amendment in Subclause 2, line 24:

That after "engines" there be inserted the words "portable boilers or machinery."

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment was not in accordance with the meaning of the clause, which did not apply to the kinds of machinery proposed in the amendment.

THE MINISTER opposed the amendment. All reasonable concessions had been made to the agriculturists; yet some members wanted more. No argument had been given in support of the amendment.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It was not necessary to put in the additional words proposed, because the clause was not intended to cover such machinery as boilers. The clause dealt only with steam engines, and did not refer to any other class of machinery. Therefore what necessity could there be to exclude from its operation portable boilers to which the clause did not refer?

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: It seemed evident that all boilers must have certificated engine-drivers.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: For that reason farmers' boilers were exempted.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Farmers should not be compelled to employ certificated engine-drivers. Anyone who could work a portable boiler should be sufficient for all requirements.

HON. R. LAURIE: That was the very reason why he had tenaciously tried to retain third-class certificates. The examination for such certificates would be of such a character that any employee working an engine for a short portion of the year, such as a farm hand, could get a certificate. It was much better for the owner of an engine to have one of his hands the holder of such a certificate. The engine usually employed by a farmer would not have the cylinder that the Bill specified. The paragraph applied to engines and not to boilers.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: But the engine and the boiler were always together. The clause was not intended to apply to steam-engines owned or hired for agricultural purposes and not worked more than six months in the year; but it was wrong to provide that there should be a certificated driver in charge of boiler and engine worked perhaps for only three weeks.

HON. M. L. MOSS: This clause said nothing about a boiler, and simply dealt with the driving of engines; while the

next subclause provided that the provision should not apply to an engine owned by an agriculturist. What was the good, therefore, of putting in words to say that the provision should not apply to boilers? We might as well say it should not apply to pianos.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. Z. LANE moved an amendment:

That in Subclause 2, paragraph (*b*), the words "or air compressors" be inserted after "steam pump" in line 1.

The object of the amendment was to include air compressors among the exemptions. It was not necessary to have certificated engine-drivers to look after steam pumps or air compressors which ran themselves. Sometimes they were put under the charge of a youth or a cripple. It would be an injustice to the community to compel owners of this class of machinery to employ certificated drivers.

THE MINISTER: This was a most unreasonable amendment. Compressors required just as much skill from the driver as portable engines; and the Mines Regulation Act 1895 provided that they should be in charge of holders of second-class certificates. Large steam pumps were virtually steam engines, and if they were to be exempt it would mean that large pumps, such as those on the Coolgardie Water Scheme, would be exempt.

HON. R. LAURIE: An air compressor was a large piece of machinery. As a rule air compressors were kept in the engine-house, but sometimes they were kept in separate houses, in which case it would be a safeguard to have a certificated driver in charge of them. Mr. Lane did not tell us how the clause would affect the mining industry. If it would do so the hon. member should give us that knowledge.

HON. M. L. MOSS: As many members were absent on important business it was a pity that the Bill should be discussed. He moved that progress be reported.

Motion passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at thirteen minutes past 6 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 3rd November, 1904.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—COURTESY TO THE CHAIR.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES: (Claremont): I wish to make a personal explanation. Yesterday there appeared on the Notice Paper a motion asking for a return with regard to certain waterworks erected at Claremont. This notice had appeared on the Notice Paper for four or five days, and when the notice was reached the Speaker called on me to move the motion. I rose in my place and moved it, and gave particulars of the various questions arising out of that notice of motion. There were 12 paragraphs in that notice of motion, and I dealt with no less than 7 out of the 12; the seven most important. I did not want to weary the House by reading the whole of those 12. You, Mr. Speaker, told me afterwards that I must read the whole of that notice, and according to the report in the papers—I do not know whether that report is correct, because I did not hear myself fully what you did say—you appear to have accused me of discourtesy in not having obeyed your ruling. It appears you have given a ruling in my presence in the House that Notices of Motion should be read in full. I have looked up the Standing Orders and have looked up *May*, and they are both silent as regards the necessity of reading the whole of a motion. I have also made inquiries, and find that in Sir James Lee Steere's time when he