

flour, eggs, and other necessaries of life should come in free. If the time had been opportune he would have made a proposal to obtain an expression of opinion in regard to the food duties.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: The hon. member would go back on federation.

MR. DAGLISH: As a representative in this House, he had not committed himself to certain opinions which had been stated by other members in seeking election. He was committed only on those points to which he pledged himself before the electors. He was returned to vote against the food duties, if opportunity offered, and he would do so.

MR. J. GARDINER: The Bill would receive his support. He had taken as much interest in federation as any member, and right through he had said that he would not interfere with the sliding scale, but would give Western Australia every benefit conceded under that section. He would like to insert the third Sub-section of Section 5 of the Commonwealth Act, as the clause did not cover the intention of that section. The sub-section read:—

If at any time during the five years the duty on any goods under this section is higher than the duty imposed by the Commonwealth on the importation of the like goods, then such higher duty shall be collected on the goods when imported into Western Australia from beyond the limits of the Commonwealth.

He had always been an opponent of what were known as the food duties, but he was pledged during the federal campaign to keep that section in its entirety; and seeing that the referendum in favour of the Commonwealth Act was supported by people who changed their views on the assurance of a large number of members, we would be acting unwisely if we went back and tried to take advantage and reduce the duties on food. It was an honourable compact that had been entered into, although the members from the fields were not pledged in the same way as we were on the coast.

THE PREMIER moved that progress be reported. He regretted to announce to the House that he had received some intelligence which, in the circumstances, justified the motion. He regretted to say that an hon. member of the Legislative Council had just died.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

OBITUARY—HON. H. LUKIN, M.L.C.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): I regret to inform the House that news has just been received by me from Beverley, that the Hon. H. Lukin died this afternoon. It is within the knowledge of hon. members that the hon. gentleman has been dangerously ill for the last few days, and it was only yesterday that I myself, in response to a special message which I sent to his wife, was informed by her that Mr. Lukin was still in a very critical condition. A few moments ago a telephone message reached me from the member for Beverley (Mr. C. Harper), saying that the Hon. H. Lukin had passed away this afternoon. Under the circumstances I ask the House not to continue its sitting farther this evening. It is seldom, I know, that in Parliament reference has been made twice on one day to deaths within our ranks. It is almost a unique occasion, it is a solemn one. I consequently move the adjournment of the House.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House accordingly adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 25th September, 1901.

Obituary: Hon. Henry Lukin—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

OBITUARY—HON. HENRY LUKIN.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): I deeply regret that since

last we met, death has claimed another of our members in the person of Mr. Lukin. I am sure the House deeply deplores the loss of our member. He was one of those hardy settlers who have done so much for the advancement of land settlement, and for the good of the State as a whole. His opinion was always very highly respected by the House; he brought to bear upon most of the subjects discussed here a practical knowledge of affairs; and I am sure his assistance was always highly valued by hon. members. Practically in the prime of life, he has been cut off; and his loss is one that will be felt not only by us but by the whole of the district he so ably represented, and by all settlers throughout the country. He was deservedly popular both inside and outside this House; and although it may be only a small matter, I may mention that the Ministry, as showing the esteem in which they held him, intrusted Mr. Lukin, on the occasion of the opening of this session, with the moving of the Address-in-reply. Though this was a small matter, still the compliment the Government desired to pay Mr. Lukin evidenced the respect in which he was held by Ministers. Quite recently, I personally accepted Mr. Lukin's hospitality, and can thoroughly realise what his death must mean to his family. He had a home which it would be the desire of everyone to establish; and his wife and family are looked up to in the district in which he lived so long. My object in rising is to ask this House, out of respect for his memory, to adjourn until Tuesday next, for the purpose of giving members an opportunity of attending the funeral, which is to take place to-morrow at Beverley, and to which hon. members can travel by a special train which will leave Perth between 10 and 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Due notice of the exact time of starting will be given in the morning papers. The train will return as early as possible to-morrow night. Knowing that I have the feeling of the House with me, and that it is only fit that we should adjourn out of respect to the memory of Mr. Lukin, I move:—

That this House adjourn until Tuesday next.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan):
I very sincerely indorse the appreciative

remarks made by the leader of this House regarding our friend and colleague, Mr. Henry Lukin. Most of us knew him well, and esteemed very highly the sterling qualities of his nature; and his opinion in many matters was received with all possible respect. Being a native of this State, and brought up in the country districts, he was well acquainted with many subjects which come before this House for its consideration; and I am sure we were all anxious to know his opinions upon such subjects, which opinions he was able to give honestly, intelligently, and helpfully to the House. And it does seem a strange stroke of Providence that a man in robust health should be stricken down by what is generally considered an infantile disease—measles; which, however, produced other complications in his system; and he has gone from our midst. We can ill spare such a man. His district will be a loser by his death; to his family the loss is, of course, irreparable; and as regards this House I am sure, no matter who may take his place, we shall feel we have lost an earnest-minded, honest and straightforward member of the community in the late Mr. Lukin. I am sure all hon. members will fall in with the desire that we should adjourn out of respect for the dead. And this reminds me that during the short time since this Parliament assembled, we have lost two of our number out of 30, and death has visited another House also. That is, I think, somewhat exceptional in the history of Parliaments. It is true our late friend Mr. Spencer, who was considerably advanced in years, being over 75, might have been considered as having arrived at a good old age. But I believe Mr. Lukin was only 53; therefore he was, as the leader of the Government has said, cut off in his prime. He could naturally have anticipated another 20 years of active work on behalf of his family and of attention to his private affairs, and a considerable time, at any rate, for the service of the country which I believe he loved so well. I knew his father intimately, as did the leader of the House; and we know that Mr. Henry Lukin was a worthy son of a worthy father. I think it would perhaps be desirable that the condolences of this House should be conveyed to Mrs. Lukin and family in

the terrible loss they have sustained. I do not know whether it be necessary that a motion to that effect should be moved. If so, I shall do it before I sit down.

THE PRESIDENT: The best plan would be for the Minister for Lands to add that to his motion.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have pleasure in adding to the motion:

And that a message of condolence be sent by the President on behalf of this House to the widow and family.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM (South): It is with extreme regret I have to support the motion. Mr. Lukin has been sitting next to me in this House the whole of the time I have been a member. I have always considered him one of the most straightforward and honourable men in this Chamber, and I am sure his death will be a great loss to the country. As a goldfields member I wish to indorse everything that the Minister for Lands and the Hon. G. Randell have said. When I look at the vacant chair opposite me which the hon. member filled only a fortnight ago, I am sure his death is a very great loss to us, and I have great pleasure in supporting Mr. Randell's suggestion that the condolences of the House be sent to the widow and family of the late Mr. Lukin.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I feel hardly able to express the deep regret I experience on the loss of my dear friend. I have known him from boyhood, and he always was a true, faithful friend, a kind husband, a good father, and a good neighbour. He was always straightforward and honest, and I deeply regret his death.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I have much pleasure in supporting what has fallen from previous members with regard to the late Mr. Lukin. The name of Mr. Lukin has been familiar to me for many years, but I have only had the pleasure of his acquaintance within the last ten or twelve years. During that period I have been fairly intimately acquainted with him, and I can only add my testimony that he was a really good sound man, a kind friend, a genial character, and he also was a man of very varied experience. Such men cannot pass away without leaving a very great gap in the community. Having known Mr. Lukin, and been in the bush

with him a good bit, I can certainly bear testimony to his really good qualities, and support everything that has been said in regard to them. Such men as he are men we want. We want men of good, sound practical experience, men who are good neighbours, and men whom the community at large will miss. I fully support the motion and the suggestion that a letter of condolence be sent to the family of the late Mr. Lukin.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): As a representative of the Central Province, I beg to add my words of sympathy to those which have been already uttered by the previous speakers. I feel that we have lost in Mr. Lukin a friend whom we will miss not so much at first as afterwards. His kindly advice upon any question connected with agriculture was open to any person who sought it, and his social qualities were of the highest order. That he was a man actuated by one desire—to benefit his country and advance it—we are, I think, all agreed upon. But what I most admired in Mr. Lukin was that when he had an opinion he expressed it without fear. He never shrank from taking the unpopular side, and he was man enough always to stand by his friends when they were attacked. I do not think any member in this House was more universally liked than the late Mr. Lukin. We all respected him. He was a man of strong will, strong opinions, but underneath was a kindly heart. I feel that we have lost in Mr. Lukin a dear friend.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): As one of the oldest members of the House, I wish to add my tribute to what has already fallen from so many members. The State and this House have experienced a grave loss, a serious loss, which it will be difficult to supply. In Mr. Lukin we had not only one of the most estimable gentlemen in this House, but one of the most useful, independent, and at the same time broad-minded members. I heartily join in the expressions of sympathy that have been offered to the State, to this House, and also to his family.

THE PRESIDENT: Before putting the question, as President I would like to say a few words in reference to the sad motion now before the Council. As Mr. Randell in supporting the motion said, I knew Mr. Lukin's father in the early days of the State, and I have known Mr.

Lukin from his boyhood, and have seen the way he has advanced. By his own energies, and by the good grasp that he always obtained of everything he undertook, he raised himself to the position he held at the time of his death. The death of a man like Mr. Lukin is a loss to the State. He was one who took a liberal view of all matters that had for their object the advancement of Western Australia. Speaking as President, in my communications with him as a member I always found him most ready to endeavour to obtain advice as to the rules of the House, when he first entered as a new member, and I have noticed the way in which he carried out whatever was intrusted to him. He was a credit to this House, and we can ill afford to lose men of his character.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at seven minutes to 5 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 25th September, 1901.

Question: Food Supply Select Committee, Witnesses' Expenses outside the State—Question: Railway Trains, Coolgardie-Kalgoorlie Line—Question: Pleuro (alleged) in the North-West—Question: Asiatics, Importation—Papers presented—Papers: Railway Fatality, Lion Mill Station-master—Paper (plan): Midland Railway Guarantee, Land Security—Return ordered: Midland Railway, Receipts and Expenditure—Return ordered: Midland Railway, Lands Sold and Rental—Return ordered: Railway Accidents, Kalgoorlie to Boulder—Motion: Guano Export, to Remove Restriction; Amendment passed—Alluvial Miners, to Compensate for Imprisonment: Motion lapsed—Motion: Police Uniforms, etc., to Employ Union Labour in making (Amendment passed)—Order of Business, Remarks—Customs Duties (Reimposition) Bill, in Committee, third reading—Excess Bill, second reading, in Committee, reported—Adjournment; Death of Hon. H. Lukin.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—FOOD SUPPLY SELECT COMMITTEE, WITNESSES' EXPENSES OUTSIDE THE STATE.

MR. F. C. MONGER asked the Premier: 1, Whether the Government are aware that witnesses are being invited from the other States and New Zealand, to give evidence before the select committee appointed to inquire into the food supply? 2, Whether the committee have power to call such witnesses? 3, What amount of money will this committee be permitted to expend?

THE PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Committee cannot compel the attendance of persons outside the State. 3, "Reasonable payment," as provided under Standing Order 359.

QUESTION—RAILWAY TRAINS, COOLGARDIE-KALGOORLIE LINE.

MR. A. E. THOMAS asked the Commissioner of Railways: 1, Whether the Department are aware that trains frequently take from 70 to 80 minutes between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. 2, Whether in view of the fact that the line between the two towns is now duplicated, the journey could not be completed in 40 minutes. 3, Whether the Department will introduce a better service at an early date?

THE PREMIER (for the Commissioner of Railways) replied: 1, Yes; mixed trains are allowed 75 minutes to run between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, and stop at three intermediate stations; stopping passenger trains are allowed 63 minutes; and express trains 55 minutes. 2, No; the maximum speed is already maintained. 3, The Department is not aware that a better service is required, nor has one been asked for.

QUESTION—PLEURO (ALLEGED) IN THE NORTH-WEST.

MR. G. TAYLOR asked the Premier: 1, Whether his attention has been drawn to an article appearing in the last issue of the *Sunday Times*, asserting the prevalence of pleuro on stations in the North-West. 2, Whether the Government is aware that pleuro exists there, as alleged in the article in question.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, No. The Inspector of Stock at Wyndham wrote that he had investigated a report of the existence of pleuro at three