

the failure could be traced to the want of truth and principle of some of the Catholics themselves. When the member for Montreal Centre was introduced in this House he (Mr. COSTIGAN) expected to find in him a protector and advocate of their rights, and views when the member for Montreal Center had so changed his views. No Protestant member could be condemned for declining to support his (Mr. COSTIGAN's) motion when the member for Montreal Center, after warmly supporting it, had announced his intention to vote against it this evening.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Montreal West) The hon. gentleman is attributing to me an intention to vote in a certain way. I have not spoken on the subject to-night. I hold the same views I expressed last Monday and will vote in the way I then indicated.

Mr. COSTIGAN was glad to hear it. However, this did not alter the force of his argument, which was that when the member who was supposed to represent the views of the Montreal Catholics took such a course, the liberal Protestants could not be blamed if they abandoned the cause. The amendment of the hon. member for Quebec Centre, if accepted, would be added to the Premier's. If the amendment should then be adopted the Government and their supporters would go further than any political party in this House ever attempted to go. It was true Mr. GREY, formerly member for St. John, laid down the same proposition, but the House did not adopt it. He hoped the House would not do so now. Putting aside this question, he asked hon. members if some question might not arise at some future day with which this House might wish to deal. Would it be wise to thus bind their hands so as to render them powerless in such matters for all time. The Government had determined upon settling this question forever, and they were doing so by driving the Catholics of New Brunswick from the only court where they could look for justice. It had been maintained by some hon. members that the adoption of this resolution would be a violation of the compact entered into by the Provinces. That compact was the Quebec resolutions, which guaranteed separate schools, and the amendment proposed was not to the resolutions, but to the British North

America Act which was founded on them. The hon. member for Carleton asked whether he (Mr. COSTIGAN) had not taken advantage of the common schools of New Brunswick for his children. In his country the Catholics were in a small majority, though in the district in which he when the hon. gentleman raised his voice in loud tones last Monday night, and told the Government what the consequences would be if they attempted to crush out the motion before the House, he thought that the hon. member could be trusted. It was true, too much confidence should not be placed in those who waxed too warm in such matters. They soon cooled again. The Premier was one of those who avoided extremes, and always maintained the one tone. One reason why an adjournment should be granted, was to prevent the hon. member for Montreal Centre from rushing into a position which he must hereafter regret. The course of that hon. gentleman to-night was a complete reversal of the policy he had laid down last Monday night, and what was his excuse for the change? The real foundation of his explanation was, that unfortunately at that time he did not know what the intentions of the Government were. Was that the way in which hon. members of this House should arrive at a conclusion as to how they should frame their policy? There was as much evidence in the hon. member's speech of Monday night that he spoke his true sentiments on that occasion, as there was in his speech of this evening. Therefore, the principle was hardly a sound one that hon. gentlemen must first ascertain the views of the Government and then form their own opinions, or if, unfortunately, they should be so rash as to announce their own individual views, on learning the views of the Government, they must swallow their own. That was not sound doctrine. When he (Mr. COSTIGAN) gave notice of his motion this session, some of his friends said it was a forlorn hope, and that the only effect of it would be to create ill feelings. His answer was that if he thought it would have any such result he would withdraw it, but he had too much confidence in the liberality of the Protestant members to believe that such would be its effect. The speech of the hon. member for North Ontario and the support of other Protestant members representing