

saying a word in regard to our late friend Senator Murphy. I knew him intimately for over forty years, and what my hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Power), has said about him is strictly and perfectly true. Not only would it have been hard to find a better man, but I am safe in saying that as good a man as Senator Murphy is rarely to be found in any community; and, as the hon. Premier has very properly said, I do not think he had a single enemy. That is a very exceptional thing with a man who has dealt so largely with the public in many ways, having been one of the first merchants of Montreal, and a member of a firm which is probably better known throughout the Dominion than almost any other. But Senator Murphy, besides being a public benefactor, was accustomed to do good in a way that many people would not take the trouble to follow—that is to say, doing it in person. Though he was a weak and delicate man, it was his custom to go out to all parts of the city, both day and night, on errands of kindness. I doubt very much if there are many men in the Dominion of Canada more sincerely and truly beloved by their own families. His widow is still so overcome with grief that she can hardly receive or converse with any one, and his daughters were simply prostrated by the bereavement, so that the doctors despaired of their lives. He was a kind and good man in every respect and to my knowledge he occupied very many trying positions in the course of the last forty years. It mattered not to him to what party a man belonged: prejudices, either in nationality or religion, had no hold on him—if he could do good he was ready to do it everywhere and at all times.

The motion was agreed to.

Senate adjourned at 8.45 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, January 9th, 1896.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—
In the few remarks which I addressed to the

Senate yesterday, I indicated that I should be in a position to day to state definitely to the House what course the Government propose to pursue under the present trying circumstances. I need scarcely state that English history furnishes no precedent for the position in which we find ourselves to-day. There have been many occasions upon which members of a Cabinet have resigned their portfolios and have broken up governments, but there is no precedent that I have been able to discover, nor have those who are learned in the law, or who have made constitutional practice their study, been able to put their finger upon a single instance in which a Cabinet, apparently united, met Parliament and placed an address affirming the principles and policy of the Government in the hands of Her Majesty's representative and then, after having asked for an adjournment of three or four days, in the interim between the delivery of the address and the assembling of Parliament again, that seven ministers, or in fact any portion of a Cabinet, have sent in their resignations. I need scarcely say that we are, or have been, establishing a precedent which I trust in the future, no matter what party may be in power, will not be repeated. For our own credit let us endeavour to follow, as far as possible, the precedents which we find in the motherland. They have had a long experience in constitutional government. Precedents have been laid down under the constitution, which as you all know is very elastic. They are not limited as many other countries are, particularly the country to the south of us where they have a written constitution, within the provisions of which they have to abide upon all occasions, unless where disputes are carried to the Supreme Court for a decision; or the people of the nation by a two-thirds majority may change the provisions of that constitution. In this country we are not so hampered. We have had an illustration of it since the opening of Parliament. We have had a government meet Parliament with an avowed policy, and in a few days afterwards a majority of that Cabinet retire for reasons which were given to the public in a statement made by my late colleague, the Hon. Mr. Foster, ex-Minister of Finance, speaking as he did for those of his colleagues with whom he was acting. Those reasons had no relation, strange to say, to state policy. They were not reasons which would justify