

ment has extended to us its protection and its means. Let us remember the length of time during which our civil list was paid from British taxes. Look at the protection afforded to us by the troops she has sent out to our shores. Look at the fostering care her naval force has extended to the fisheries on our coasts, whenever and wherever it was required. Why, Mr. Chairman, gratitude alone for the benefits we have received should induce us to vote a handsome sum for the relief and comfort of the widows and orphans of those brave men who fall in the struggle for the good of us all, and in which we are equally interested with those in Britain. Sir, the very fact that among those who have already met a soldier's death on the battle field, there are to be found names of men known and esteemed among ourselves, should excite our sympathies, and induce us to come forward in this matter in no niggard spirit. Sir, the battle field has its horrors and scenes of agony and suffering, but let hon. members reflect for a moment on the spectacles presented at many a hearth-stone, now rendered desolate by the casualties of war, and, sir, I do not think they would hesitate in supporting the motion for the whole amount proposed. True, sir, we do not witness the sad spectacle of the actual sufferings of the afflicted families, survivors of those who have fallen, but we can imagine the sad situation of those whose guardians and protectors have lost their lives in their country's cause, and the scarcely more distressed state of the wives and children of soldiers, left at home to live as best they can, while their natural guardians are risking their lives at the cannon's mouth.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY.—Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this resolution, and shall record my vote against it. I do so on principle. We have no right to vote the public monies for such purposes; and the Fund is not entitled to be called "Patriotic" if it is to be made up of the money taken from the people, without their consent. There is very little patriotism in that. This resolution assumes that the people approve the grant by the House, of the public monies for this fund. Now what is the true state of the case? In the first instance, the people were applied to, and they responded generously to the call—but not content with that, we find, after getting all that could be obtained from individuals, they come here for a public grant. It is simply asking a man, did you pay? if he says, yes, "then we will make you pay again," if no, "then you shall be made to pay whether you like it or not." It is very easy for hon. members to vaunt of their patriotism, when they can support the character of patriots at the public expense.

Mr. HAVILAND.—Mr. Chairman, I must express my surprise at the extraordinary argument of the hon. member who has just sat down, and I am indeed astonished that a member of the Executive Council should give utterance to such sentiments. Although I have not, and may never have the honor of a seat in that Council, my duty to my country, and my feelings as a British subject, would induce me to declare that the fund is eminently entitled to the designation "Patriotic." And, Mr. Chairman, in proof of that, I would only ask, how long would our liberties and institutions stand, if Britain should have to succumb to the Czar? And I contend that hon. members will be justified in voting the sum of £2,000, on principles of profit and loss; that the interests we have at stake in the issue of the mighty struggle, call for the exhibition of all the patriotism of hon. members who, I hope, will prove their real and genuine love of their country, by voting for the amount, and risking the approval or disapprobation of their constituents, and regardless of being returned to seats in this House hereafter.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—I have listened, Mr. Chairman, with surprise and sorrow to the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend, the member for the Second District of Queen's County. Sentiments such as he has expressed would be creditable to no man—much less to a British subject and a member of this House; but far, far less still to a member of Her Majesty's Colonial Government. He says he is opposed to a grant in aid of the Patriotic Fund "on principle." Sir, I am in favor of such a grant "on principle," and I think it will be found that my principle is much more defensible than that of the hon. member's. He says, likewise, that voting away the money of the people of this Colony to relieve the widows and orphans of our countrymen in the British Islands, involves no patriotic feeling. I differ with the honorable member. I think that if any thing ever deserved the name of patriotism—and patriotism, too, of the purest and loftiest character—it is the spirit which has prompted, and the spirit which responds to, the appeal made by Her Majesty to the benevolence of all her subjects, on behalf of those who are rendered fatherless and husbandless by the war now raging in the East, not for the honor and glory of her own name alone, but for the maintenance of freedom against the encroachments of a despotic and barbaric power. How often are we called upon to exercise the discretion with which, as representatives of the people, we are invested, in voting sums of the public money for purposes of which our constituents have had no previous knowledge. But this case is an entirely different one. Our constituents were not only aware that this subject would come before the Legislature, but in many instances, at public meetings, they took occasion to express their desire that the grant in aid of the Patriotic Fund should be a liberal one. That proposed by my hon. friend, the Secretary, is indeed eminently so. I myself should not have ventured to suggest so large an amount; but it being proposed, and meeting, as I know it will, the concurrence of both sides of the House, I will not propose a smaller amount. I declared before now my determination to vote for any sum which a majority of the House might think proper to offer, and certainly I will not falsify my declaration by asking for a less liberal grant. Nor do I believe my constituents will censure me for sanctioning so large an appropriation of their money. It is often wasted for far less useful and less honorable purposes—purposes, I regret to say, that are too often made subservient to the electioneering tactics of some hon. members. Sir, I did not expect that there would be much, if any debate on this subject, and consequently came to the House unprepared for it. I knew that the proposal for a grant of money was to come from a member of the Government, and was satisfied that it would be agreed to without much discussion. I joined in the hope expressed by the hon. and learned member for Georgetown, that when we came to discharge a duty sanctified by the pure spirit of charity, and which appealed to the holiest feelings of our nature, the demon of discord would have vanished from these walls—our rivalries and party feeling would have been forgotten, and that we should have cordially united in performing an honorable and generous act. But since the opposition to the proposed grant comes from my own side of the House, and from one whom I am ashamed to see differing, on this subject, with the Government of which he is a member, I shall take the liberty, sir, of saying something about the war, and more particularly about the brilliant achievements and dreadful sacrifices of those brave men who have fallen in battle, and whose widows and orphans are thrown upon the bounty of the British Empire—trusting that my honorable friend may learn to entertain more generous sentiments than those he has expressed to-night, and that he may form a more correct opinion as to what really constitutes patriotism. It is not necessary to enter into a review of the causes of the war, nor yet to criticise the management of it—an humble member of a Colonial Legislature like ours may entertain as strong opinions on these points as any other subject of the Empire; but he feels that, as the result of his dependent condition, his voice can exercise no influence over the counsels of his Sovereign, nor leave any durable impression on the minds of the nation. Whether this isolation of

interests and ideas is calculated to secure the strength and stability of the Empire, and to elevate the colonial character, is another topic, the discussion of which may be likewise appropriately deferred. The war I believe to be a just and righteous one—that England and France have entered upon its prosecution with no mercenary, selfish or ambitious designs, is evident from the conduct and language of ministers at Westminster and Versailles throughout the protracted and vexatious negotiations which preceded the expedition to Varna—negotiations of which the people of England and France had become heartily weary long before the declaration of war. Never did the British public so vehemently clamor for war—never did they rush into a contest with so much enthusiasm, nor display such boundless liberality in providing the means necessary to secure success. The British nation thought—and events have since proved them to be right—that Lord Aberdeen's government placed too much reliance on their diplomatic skill, and by their tardiness in preparing for offensive operations, were permitting the Czar to seize advantages which would be of the utmost importance to him in carrying on the war. Turkey was not merely menaced by her powerful antagonist, but her territory was invaded and despoiled—the authority of the Porte over the Greek population audaciously usurped, and its subjects massacred, before Turkey and the Western Powers fully awoke to the perils which environed them. Even then, England and France—who were bound by treaty to protect and defend their invaded ally, but were more solemnly enjoined by a sense of what was due to the threatened liberties of Europe, to arrest the progress of the despotic autocrat—even then England and France were disposed to humor the ambitious Czar, and to restore peace on terms the most disreputable and the most disastrous to their injured ally—terms which conceded every thing to Russia, and afforded no satisfaction to Turkey for present injuries, nor constituted the smallest guarantee for future security. These terms were: 1st—the immediate evacuation of the Principalities; 2d—the renewal of the old treaties; and 3d—the communication of the firmans relative to the spiritual advantages granted by the Porte to its non-Musulman subjects. These were the bases of negotiation a little more than a year ago. The Porte modified these terms, but the Emperor Nicholas rejected them in toto. It is well he did so; his power might still overshadow Europe—the prestige of his name still overawe weak cabinets, and retard the progress of free institutions—the cloud of despotism would hover over the continent as darkly as it did when the conquering legions of the first Napoleon swept its fertile fields and sported with the crowns of feeble despots—when unhappy Poland became the victim of a conspiracy the most foul that ever disgraced crowned heads and ministers of state—and still later in 1848 and '49, when that Austria, which, true to its old perfidious policy, is now about turning its arms against Russia, found assistance in the bayonets of that powerful, but not more despotic, neighbor to extinguish the flame of discord and subdue the spirit of independence with which the Magyars threatened to overwhelm the House of Hapsburg. It is well that Russia did not conclude a peace on the terms proposed in January, 1851—the gallant and successful defence of Silistria would not have occurred to raise the drooping spirits of the Moslem troops—the Aland Islands would not have been captured and their apparently strong forts destroyed—nor would the Crimea have been occupied, nor the glorious battle of Alma fought and won, nor displays of heroism made, such as were witnessed at Bala Clava and Inkermann, nor surpassed for their brilliancy and success during the most warlike and chivalrous period of the world's history. The evacuation of the Principalities—the first condition of the proposed treaty, of January, 1854—immediately followed the defeat of the Russians before Silistria, and must be regarded as the immediate consequence of that defeat,—the other two conditions, if agreed to, would leave Russia as powerful in the East as she had ever been; and the "renewal of the old treaties," (the second condition) would only perpetuate the pretext which Russia had advanced for constantly undermining the authority of the Sultan, and harassing his subjects—treaties which secured to Russia the navigation of the Danube, and which excluded the ships of other European nations from the Bosphorus. The "communication of firmans" regarding the Greek Christians (the third condition), was a mere screen, for Russia would still exercise as much control as ever over the Greek population. But since the war has assumed an aspect favorable to the allies, notwithstanding the disasters in the Crimea—the sad consequences of no timely and efficient provision having been made for the health and comfort of the troops,—since Russia has been defeated in every engagement fought upon her own territory as well as upon Turkish soil,—since she has been forced to fly from the Principalities, been ejected from the Aland Islands, and her almost invincible fortress in the Crimea well nigh dismantled, which cost millions of money in its construction, and from which she could securely menace the commerce of every other European nation in the Black Sea,—since her herds of Cossacks, led by her ablest generals, and stimulated to desperation by copious draughts of raki, were unable to bear up under the steady valor of the British and the dashing gallantry of the French, whose combined forces were hardly one to five of the enemy,—since the ports of the enemy have been blockaded, her towns bombarded, her commerce crippled, her magnificent fleet—the "invincible armada" of modern Europe, partly submerged in front of Sebastopol, and partly powerless within the harbour of Cronstadt,—since such have been the results of the first campaign, it is no wonder that Russia is now disposed to make peace on terms favorable to the allied powers. The last English mail but one brought intelligence that Prince Gortschakoff was empowered to negotiate a peace on the following terms:—

"First, That the protectorate hitherto exercised by Russia over the Principalities of Moldavia, Wallachia and Servia, shall cease; and that the privileges granted by the Sultans to those dependencies shall, in virtue of an arrangement with the Sublime Porte, be placed under the collective guarantee of the Powers.

"Second, That the navigation of the Danube, as far as its outlet into the Black Sea, shall be delivered of all restriction, and submitted to the principles consecrated by the acts of the Congress of Vienna.

"Third, That the treaty of July 13, 1841, shall be revised in concert by the high contracting Powers, in the interest of the European equilibrium, and in the sense of a limitation of Russian power in the Black Sea.

"Fourth, That no Power shall claim the right to exercise any official protectorate over the subjects of the Sublime Porte, to whatever sect they may belong; but that France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia, shall lend their mutual co-operation, in order to obtain from the initiative of the Ottoman Government the consecration and observance of the religious privileges of the various Christian communities, and turn the generous intentions manifested by his Majesty the Sultan to the account of their various co-religionists, so that there shall not result therefrom any infringement of the dignity and independence of his Crown."

My hon. friend opposed favours me with a sneer, and is, perhaps, inclined to ask, what has all this to do with the question of providing for the relief of the widows and orphans of those who have fallen during the campaign? It has this to do with it: the war being a necessary and righteous one—a war forced upon Great Britain and France, and on the success of which depends the liberties of Europe—it is well we should bear these facts in mind, because they are calculated to induce on our part a more liberal spirit in throwing in our mite towards the relief of those whose holiest ties have been torn asunder, and whose humble homes have been rendered desolate and drear by the cruel ambition of the Czar. The close alliance which has taken place between France and England, and the recent entire severance of Austria from Russia, are not the least momentous events of the present war. The magnitude of the resources of the two former countries—those of each being doubled, as it were, by the alliance—the readiness with which those resources could be directed against a common foe, and the valor which a forty

years' peace could not enervate or diminish—have given us much surprise to the allies themselves as to the rest of the world. Russia, baffled and beaten on her own territory—her fleets rendered useless—her ports blockaded—her fortresses destroyed—her prestige departed, and her despotic tendencies checked by the ingratitude of her ancient ally Austria—while Britain and France, in close alliance, are the authors of those achievements—are circumstances well calculated to fill with hope those other nations of Europe whose liberties had been altogether destroyed, or trembled before the frown of the oppressor. It cannot be expected that Russia will display so magnanimous a disposition as ever again to back Austria in her crusades against liberty, and her stupid and denigrating attempts to perpetuate despotism. Italy, Hungary and the inferior German Powers will no longer stand in such awe of Austria as they did while she could lean upon Russia for support. The heterogeneous population of Austria—if Austria desires to preserve the integrity of her empire, and desires to become stronger and mightier than ever—must be ruled in such a manner as to secure their willing obedience and attachment. She must abate her iniquity to Hungary—she must discontinue and disavow such barbarities as have rendered the names of Haynau and Radetsky deservedly infamous in Hungary and Italy. And surely these will be advantages to the cause of freedom and civilization. The sympathy of Russia not only lost to Austria, but Russia irritated and ready to take advantage of any outbreak in the Austrian empire—with Italy panting for an opportunity to assert its independence—and no prospect of encouragement to her despotic views from England and France, Austria must either cease to be the barbarous scourge of weaker nations, or must cease to be a nation of any considerable power herself. But whatever territorial changes and alterations in the map of Europe may be caused by this war, there is one change which we may all sincerely deprecate—a change in the mutual relations of France and England. Two of the most polished and enlightened countries of Europe, with constitutions which guarantee civil and religious liberty to all—and, united, constituting a power too mighty to be resisted, their proximity to each other admirably fits them to be the guardians and encouragers of free institutions elsewhere. Opposed to each other, they have fought the most memorable battles recorded in history, and now joined by the closest bonds of friendship and of interest, they have accomplished, side by side, feats of arms in the Crimea, which will not pale when contrasted with the glories of Creecy, Poitiers and Azincourt. The French chivalry, with their countless hosts, did not confront the armies of the Black Prince and the Fifth Henry—which bore about the same proportion to the numbers of the French armies as the allies bore to the Russians—with more assurance of signal triumph than animated the hosts of Cossacks led on by Menschikoff and Liprandi at Alma and Bala Clava; but the instances of personal daring displayed by the allies in crossing the Alma, while its narrow stream, now become classic, ran crimson with their blood, and driving the Russians from their almost impregnable position on the heights, and their subsequent achievements at Bala Clava and Inkermann—surpass all that history records of Creecy and Azincourt. The hon. member opposite questions the patriotism of contributing to the relief of the widows and orphans of those who have been struck down in the terrific conflicts to which I have just alluded. Was there no true patriotism in the breasts of the gallant troops who, fighting for their Sovereign and their common country—for liberty and right, encountered and overcame the most appalling disadvantages in their first battle in the Crimea? The heights of the Alma—where Menschikoff, with every assurance of success, had entrenched his legions—were deemed inaccessible, or from which he thought at least the allied armies could not dislodge him if the conflict continued for weeks; nevertheless, in three hours those heights were captured—the Muscovite hosts were scattered like chaff—the valorous spirit of the allies rose superior to every danger—difficulties of position were forgotten, or if thought of, overcome as soon as thought of—the cool intrepidity of the British and the dash and enthusiasm of the French battalions, were elements of power more serviceable than mere numerical strength or superiority of position. The valor which distinguished the knights of Creecy and Azincourt never shone with brighter lustre than when the same spirit nerved the arms of their descendants and their rivals on the blood-stained heights of the Alma. Is it patriotism in us, then, to refuse the widows and orphans of those valiant men the poor pittance that may help to keep them from starvation? It is not necessary for me to remind you of the still more sanguinary, and perhaps more splendid engagement fought a little more than a month later at the now ruined village of Bala Clava. In reading, as I have done, repeatedly, the details of that engagement, I have felt proud to think that my countrymen there displayed more than their accustomed heroism—I have been proud to consider myself even a subject of the Sovereign who had such soldiers in her service. It is an interesting coincidence that the battle of Bala Clava was fought on the anniversary of the battle of Azincourt—so often the theme of song and the groundwork of romance. That memorable event occurred on the 25th of October, 1415—the French were more than five to one of the English, but they were signally defeated, as every schoolboy knows. On the 25th of October, 1854—four hundred and thirty-nine years later—the descendants of the two armies, now associates and brothers in arms, achieved a victory over the Russians which will shed a greater lustre upon the page of history than that of Azincourt. But though our French allies at Bala Clava evinced no lack of their ancient spirit when brought into the heat of war, the brunt of battle bore upon the arms of the British and Irish troops. They, indeed, gathered nearly all the laurels, as they sustained nearly all the loss. We all remember the magnificent charge of the Inniskillen Dragoons and the Scotch Greys—when they rushed at the compact lines of Russian cavalry, twice as long and three times as deep as their own, the latter affecting to despise and threatening to annihilate the dauntless hearts of the Greys and Inniskilleners. But with a cheer which thrilled to every breast, and a shout that rang out through the valley, they dashed into the midst of the enemy—his flanks closed upon them—for a moment they were lost, but in the next, with uplifted sabres, the remnant of them were seen cutting their way through his broken and confused squadrons. It was a wonder that even one of that little band escaped through the apparently solid rock of Russian cavalry. But British valor had not yet been put to its severest test, until Lord Cardigan's Light Brigade—counting only six hundred sabres—made that stupendous charge upon the Russian gunners, which was the crowning feat of the battle of Bala Clava.

"Then shook the hills with thunder riven,
Then rushed the steeds to battle driven,
And louder than the bolts of heaven,
Ear flashed the red artillery."

With thirty guns, belching forth destruction in front, and an oblique fire from the batteries on both sides of them, which mowed down rider and horse at every stride they took, that handful of men rushed into the smoke of the batteries, cutting down the gunners at their posts, and returned, all that was left of them, breaking through a column of Russian infantry, and scattering them like chaff. I need not remind you of the fearful loss sustained by the gallant brigade on that occasion. We all remember it too well. Of six hundred who went into action, scarcely two hundred returned. The heroic exploit of those who survived, as well as of those who perished, will live in the remembrance of posterity as long as the language survives which chronicles their chivalrous deed. This disastrous charge may not have been necessary to bind victory to the banners of the allies, and may

have been the result of a lamentable blunder on the part of Lord Lucan, or of Capt. Nolan, whose life was sacrificed at the commencement of it; but it nevertheless gives proof of the most extraordinary heroism and self-devotion on the part of the English and Irish soldiers. It is an episode in the annals of warfare for which there is no parallel. I will not trespass upon your attention to recall any of the incidents which distinguished the subsequent battle of Inkermann. We all know the odds against the allies were fully as great, if not greater than at the previous battles,—that the British and French numbered only about 14,000 men, opposed to a force variously estimated from fifty to seventy thousand, who were encouraged by the presence of two sons of the Emperor, but notwithstanding, the triumph of the allies was as complete as on any of the previous occasions. I must, however, ask your permission to say a few words upon another and totally different branch of the subject. Many persons seem to think that this war is not a popular one with Her Majesty's Irish Catholic subjects. If the allegation be untrue, as I sincerely think it is, now is the time to meet it. I cannot see why the war should be unpopular with the Catholics of the Empire. At least one-third of the army now in the East are Irish Catholics—some of them being led by the ablest and most distinguished Irish generals, such as Pennefather, Torrens and Sir DeLaey Evans—the latter having received in person the thanks of Parliament for his gallant services in the Crimea. A large contingent of the army are Scotch Catholics—the 92d and 93d Highlanders, for example, who performed at Alma and Inkermann such prodigies of valor under their veteran and devoted leader, Sir Colin Campbell. The Fighting Eighty-eighth—the Connaught Rangers—all Catholics, that have moistened every battle field in Europe with their blood, maintained more than their ancient glory in the Crimea—and the Welsh Fusiliers, that were so desperately cut up at the battle of the Alma, were nearly all Catholics. Then there were the Inniskillen Dragoons, a mere handful of fire-eating devils who charged and routed a myriad of Russian cavalry at the battle of Bala Clava—the warm Celtic blood fired their hearts, and the ancient faith of the Celtic race beamed upon their souls. It would be difficult to enumerate a title of the sacrifices made by Catholics since the commencement of the war. Why, the fall of Silistria, in which the Turks displayed so much bravery, was mainly stayed by the arm of an Irish Catholic—poor James Butler, whose life fell a sacrifice in the gallant achievement with which his name is now inseparably connected. And in the wild charge of the Light Brigade at Bala Clava, how many a Catholic spirit winged its way to the other world—poor Captain Nolan, who conveyed the rash order to charge, being nearly the first Irish soldier that paid the penalty of that disastrous exploit. But then there are the French army—they are all Catholics. They do not hesitate to fight against the ruthless oppressor of the followers of their ancient creed. It is impossible that Catholics, indeed, as a body, can have any other feeling than that of deep-rooted aversion towards the autocrat of Russia, who has tolerated, perhaps commanded, the most atrocious barbarities against Catholics in his empire. A monster that would allow a large number of poor helpless nuns to be publicly whipped at Minsk—to be left to suffer the most excruciating torments from cruelties repeatedly inflicted—to be dragged and kicked about by ruffian hirelings, and to be finally left to starve, because they would not conform to the Greek schism—can have no claim to the sympathy of the smallest portion of civilized society. I deny, then, Sir, that this war is unpopular with Her Majesty's Irish Catholic subjects. Why, in Ireland the Irish Catholic Bishops and Archbishops were the very first to lend their powerful influence to the movement for raising a Patriotic Fund on behalf of the widows and orphans of the British and Irish soldiers in the Crimea. If the war were unpopular—if fatal to Catholic interests, the heads of the Catholic Church would not be the first to manifest their desire for its success, as they have done. If there be, however, on this side of the Atlantic any prejudice against the cause of the allies—and if there be, I certainly trust it is not widespread—it must be owing to the irritated feelings against the English Government with which the unhappy children of Erin so often fly from oppression and wretchedness in their native land to find a refuge and home in the New World. Ireland, unfortunately, has not been ruled as she ought to have been, at the hands of the Government whose supremacy her loyal sons are now fighting to maintain, and it may be natural enough that a sense of wrong and the remembrance of a cruel oppression should awaken feelings in the exile's heart not favorable to England, feelings which no change of time or scene can obliterate. Whatever my own feelings may be as an Irish exile, they never did and never can check my warmest aspirations for the success of the allied arms, and the complete and overwhelming humiliation of Russia. Sir, I apologize for having delayed the Committee so long, especially since, as just brought to my recollection by an hon. friend, some hon. members have an engagement out to dine.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may be in a hurry to go to Government House to dinner after the attack he has made on me, but I shall endeavor to give him his supper before he goes. He seems to think more of the Czar than he does of his own constituents; and, sir, when I heard the hon. member for Belfast cry "hear," "hear," to some parts of his speech, I thought of Mr. Lawson's favorite quotation "*tempora mutantur*." The times are changed, indeed, when that hon. member takes the Hon. Mr. Whelan under his wing. But he is welcome to him, and may transfigure him into anything he pleases. I am sure I do not care what he makes of him. But I can tell him that charity begins at home, and there are plenty of widows and orphans in the Island who require all the sympathy and benevolence we can apply to their misfortunes. It is only the other day that a tree fell upon a poor man and killed him; that man's family needs our sympathy quite as much as the widows and orphans of the soldiers who may die during the war. The hon. member has been very liberal of late years, but I remember in 1853, when it pleased the Almighty to send hailstones through the length and breadth of the land, that hon. member could not succeed in getting even £30 for some of his own constituents, to enable them to procure seed grain and potatoes for the ensuing spring, as the destruction of their crops had left them destitute of both; yet he can stand up in his place in the House and waste our time in long speeches to persuade us to give £2,000 to the Patriotic Fund, as it is called. Why, only the other day he opposed the grant of £7,000, for roads and bridges, as being more than we could afford, but now, we can easily spare £2,000 to send to England! But whenever an application is made to the charity of the House on behalf of any poor cripple, then his cry is—"Oh! we cannot give money for any such object; if we do, we shall be ruined entirely." And, Mr. Chairman, I do say most distinctly, that no Irish Catholic ever dictated to me how I should vote, nor even asked me what course I intended to take. I oppose the grant on my own independent conviction that it is wrong to support it.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for the Second District of Queen's County has thought proper to censure my conduct for the vote I am about to give on this question. For that vote I shall be responsible to my constituents, whose judgment I do not fear, and while such is the case, I have little respect for the censure of the hon. member. When rising to address you he promised to give me a supper, but it turned out, sir, to be a little of the old and rather unsavory hash which the hon. gentleman is so much in the habit of doing out to members of this House, and administering, perhaps, with a little additional cooking, to his admiring friends at Flinty Glen. He charges me with having wasted the time of the House in making a long