

standing arrived at. But without a word of explanation the hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate, not deigning to inquire of a single one of his friends with whom he had been in consultation, and who were as much supporters of the Catholic interests as himself, as to the action he should take; but he did consult with the members of the opposition. If he were sincere in his desire to obtain the co-operation of his Irish Catholic fellow-countrymen was it not his duty to have come to him (MR. DEVLIN), and say an adjournment on this question would be useful, and we will be able to discuss the matter further; but the hon. member did not do so. His experience was very limited in the House, but he was determined to do his duty honestly and conscientiously; and he appealed to the hon. gentlemen who occupied the Treasury Benches if it were not true that he refused to let them know how he would vote on this question before he entered the House that day. In order to obtain the best possible information on the subject he consulted those who were the most deeply interested in the spiritual welfare of the Catholics in New Brunswick, communicating with the Right Rev. Prelate of that Province, who had intimated to him (MR. DEVLIN) that his opinion was that the resolution of the member for Victoria would fail to accomplish the object which they had in view, and therefore it was better to accept the next best alternative, namely: the amendment of the hon. member for Quebec Centre, in which he (MR. DEVLIN) had confidence, and which he believed would lead to a happy solution of the painful question at present agitating his co-religionists in New Brunswick.

MR. FLYNN could not give a silent vote on this question, more especially as he felt that he came within the scope of the remarks offered by the hon. member for Victoria. When that hon. member placed his motion on the notice paper he consulted the Catholic members from the Maritime Provinces. He (MR. FLYNN) frankly stated that the most embarrassing position he found himself placed in was with regard to the constitutional difficulty, but he felt, after hearing the representation made that the Catholic minority of New Brunswick were laboring under serious grievances, that if any measures could be adopted to remedy those

grievances it was his duty as a Catholic to give them his support. He, therefore, said that if no other alternative presented, he would vote for the motion of the hon. member for Victoria. That hon. member had said that if he failed it was from want of integrity among his own people; he presumed the hon. member meant the Catholic representatives in this House, for that was the only meaning that could be attached to his words. He (MR. FLYNN) distinctly disavowed that sentiment. There was no want of integrity on his part, and he had the interests of the Catholics of New Brunswick as much at heart as the hon. member, even though he represented a constituency in that Province. Nor could he permit the allusion to pass unnoticed, that the hon. member for Montreal Centre was the only gentleman who had aided to defend the Catholic rights and interests. He (MR. FLYNN) always felt it his duty as a humble representative of a constituency in Nova Scotia whenever he found those rights assailed, to defend them. The hon. member for Victoria had also applied the word hypocrisy towards some hon. members who had worked with him; and in all his intercourse with the hon. member for Victoria, he (MR. FLYNN) was actuated by the most sincere and pure motives.

MR. COSTIGAN denied that he had used the word hypocrisy in reference to any hon. member.

MR. FLYNN said the hon. member used the word, but if it was intended to be applied in the sense indicated the explanation would be accepted. From the first, he gave the hon. member for Victoria credit for his efforts in seeking to remove the wrongs under which the Catholics of New Brunswick were laboring, and thought those acts were above party spirit. He felt that the hon. member was honest in his convictions; but to-night he felt that the hon. member was otherwise, and that he moved the adjournment of the debate to harrass the Government and the hon. members who were acting with them. The hon. member, although representing a constituency in New Brunswick, where the grievance existed, must admit that both Catholics and Protestants were willing to do all within their power to remedy the grievance. But suppose the motion of the hon. member passed and was sent to Downing street, what was the