

colleagues who had retired from the government. I was understood to impugn the truth of the statement made by the late Finance Minister in regard to their position upon the great question which is dividing the people of Canada to-day. I had no intention of leaving the impression upon the minds of my hearers, or insinuating that those gentlemen were not honest, or that they intended to abandon the policy which had been adopted last year and which was re-affirmed this year in the speech from the throne. If any such impression was left upon the minds of those who heard me, I wish to disabuse them of any thought that there was a desire on my part of casting such an imputation upon them. I take it for granted that after being parties to the speech which was placed in the hands of the representative of our sovereign, and after the statement made by Mr. Foster in the House of Commons, they were in full accord with the policy therein enunciated, and that there was no difference of opinion upon that great question between myself (whom they rather belittled and to which I shall not refer at the present moment) and themselves. Another false impression has been published in the papers and insinuated by members; in justice to Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet, I wish to say that his visit to Canada was at my special request and for the purpose of giving us his valuable assistance and advice upon two great questions which we proposed to consider—to give us information, so far as he could, as to the policy of the British Government in aiding the establishment of a fast line of steamers between England and Canada and the proposed Pacific cable. I make this statement in justice to the High Commissioner, who is now in Canada, and to whom many improper motives have been ascribed. I have nothing further to say upon that point beyond assuring the Senate that his visit to Canada was upon a cable sent to him by myself for the reasons that I have indicated. These are questions which will be discussed in the future and which I have no doubt will receive that consideration due to subjects of such magnitude. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—In reference to the allusions which the leader of the House has made to the death of two senators, I feel that I voice the sentiments of every member in

this chamber when I join the premier in giving expression to our sorrow at the loss which this country, and this chamber particularly, has sustained in the death of the two hon. gentlemen to whom he has referred. The death of Senator Kaulbach came with such extreme suddenness that it has been a shock to all of us. Death at all times gives a shock, but to-day at three o'clock, when many of us were present at the time the spark of life was leaving our friend, the shock was a very severe one. Senator Kaulbach had, up to a few moments before his death, been as light hearted as usual, giving expression to jovial sentiments, joking with his friends, several of whom were with him at the time he fell in the corridor. I had myself a pleasant conversation with him but a very few hours before, and arrived at the scene just at the time life was departing. Senator Kaulbach, under a somewhat brusque exterior, was a gentleman who had very kindly feelings. He was an eminent lawyer, and took a very great interest in the affairs of parliament, and it was universally admitted that in the committees his sympathies were always with the weaker party. I am quite sure that every member of this chamber will unite in giving expression to feelings of sympathy at the terrible loss which his family have sustained in his sudden death. Referring to our friend, Senator Murphy, I am sure there is a universal regret among all of us at his being taken away. Senator Murphy was very much more advanced in years than Senator Kaulbach. I think there must have been a difference of at least fifteen years. Senator Murphy had gone beyond the three score and ten span of life, but his activity up to the last moment of his life was singularly great. A kindly gentleman, having no enemies, full of ambition to perform benevolent acts, he was ever doing good. Associated with many—in fact nearly all—of the charitable institutions of Montreal, he was not only a well known, but a very much liked person in that community. He had endeared himself to every one who knew him. His manners were so gentle, so sympathetic, so touching, so kindly, that, as has been observed by the premier, he was actually without an enemy. His family have our deep sympathy, and I am quite sure I am giving expression to the feelings of every senator here when I say that we deeply regret his loss.