TELEGRAPHIC.

VIA BRITISH AMERICAN LINE.

[Reported for THE MONTREAL GAZETTE.*]*

ARRIVAL OF THE "PERSIA."

NEW YORK, April 29, 1856.

The Persia has arrived, in about 9½ days.
Very little general news.
The Paris Conferences have closed.
The debate on the American question in Parliament has been postponed, until the arrival of Lord Clarendon.
The rumor gains strength that Parliament will be shortly dissolved.
Breadstuffs depressed. Flour 6d to 1s lower; Wheat 2d. Corn unchanged.
Money tight. Consols 93¼ to 93½.

VIA MONTREAL LINE.
OFFICE—*Exchange Building, St. Sacrament St.*

ARRIVAL OF THE "PERSIA."

NEW YORK, April 29.

The "Persia" arrived off the Light Ship at 1 past 9 o'clock last evening and remained over night, reaching her berth at 1 past 6, thus making the passage in 9½ days. She brings 130 passengers and Liverpool and London dates to 19th April.

The Siroccos sailed from Liverpool for New York on the 16th.

News by "Persia" anticipated.

The Conferences at Paris have closed, and the debate in Parliament on the American question had been postponed until the return of Lord Clarendon.

A civic banquet has been given in London to Mr. Dallas, the American Minister.

In consequence of Mr. Disraeli's explanation why troops are being sent to Canada, and the slight defeat met by Government in the vote against the grant to Maynooth College, rumors have gained strength that Parliament will shortly be dissolved.

MARKETS.

LIVERPOOL, April 19.—Breadstuffs depressed. Flour declined 6d to 1s. Wheat declined 2d. Corn unchanged.

Beef quiet. Pork and Bacon firm. Lard in demand at a slight decline.

Money tight. Dividends range at 6 to 7 per cent.

Consols 93¼ to 93½.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

By Telegraph.—(Via Montreal Line—Office in the Exchange Building, Sacrament Street.)

[Reported for "THE MONTREAL GAZETTE."*]*

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TORONTO, Thur day, April 24.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.—*Continued.*

Mr. Brown—I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that this debate must have highly gratified such member of the house as have long contended for equality of representation, with little apparent support. Early success I think it may have convinced them that the day of deliverance is now for all. The hon. Attorney General East has been pleased to say that he looks upon this question of representation by population as a petite question—as a mere side theory." Sir, I could see no help contesting the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dorion) and I confess I did think it was the Attorney General who stood chargeable with a petty spirit—with dealing in little theories, and that on the contrary, the question presented by me to the House was the question of greatest and most important kind could possibly occupy the attention of this house, and that it was treated in a statesmanlike manner, worthy of the not just not of the speaker. I think hon. members from Upper Canada have been in the habit of voting against representation by population more have learnt a salutary lesson from what has been heard to-night. What has been the argument of those hon. gentlemen who have risen to oppose the motion brought before this house? Have they attempted to prove a word against the principle? No. Their reply to us has always been that we could not carry the measure; that hon. members from Lower Canada would never consent to rep resentation by population; and that it would be time enough for us to vote for it. But what have we heard on this point to-night? Why, we have had it manfully declared by the hon. member for Montreal on this side of the house, that he cannot deny the rightousness of the principle of representation by population, and that if he refuse to carry Federal-ly-sound, he for one will vote for it. (Hear, hear). What, too, have we heard from the Attorney General East? Why, that even he is prepared in great representation by population, and that the population of Upper Canada shall be shown to be largely in excess of that of Lower Canada. (Hear, hear.) That was the hon gentleman's statement, and I hope it will be recorded that the two leaders of Lower Canada—the men who are on both sides of the house—have announced themselves in favour of representation by population. (No, no.)

Hon. Mr. Drummond—I did not say that. I said that it was one particular time the population of either section of the Province might be, and that the other, that it would then be time for us to consider how far that section of the Province which was in an inferior position could be dealt with.

Mr. Brown—I am rather under an impression that the hon. Attorney General has placed the matter in a milder light than he did before, but I accept at once the light in which he desired to place it, and I apprehend that the hon. gentleman's second statement is essentially all that we could wish. If he (Mr. Drummond) of Canada shall be found greatly to exceed that of Lower Canada, the hon gentleman says he will consider the subject; well sir, when his considers it, what will he do? Will he deny justice to Upper Canada? Will he say that Upper Canada should not have representation by population? He will not say so—and the conclusions I have drawn from his remarks were therefore undeniably just, and I shall hold the Attorney General as an advocate of representation by population, and as the population of Upper Canada shall largely exceed that of Lower Canada. And when shall that time arrive? According to the views of the people of Upper Canada, it has arrived now. It will be a sad, sad day for Upper Canada, if the gross injustice done to Upper Canada beyond all possible cavil? That course ought to be taken at the end of five years from the time it was last taken—or on 11th January 1857. Why then shall we not legislate now with a view to that event? The house must bear in mind, that the advocates of representation by population have not said that we must have representation by population or to-day or to-morrow—we are entitled to take it at any fair general election. All we ask is that justice shall be done to Upper Canada. We cannot remain content with an inferior position in the Union. We have 300,000 more people than Lower Canada, and we pay $12 $13 into the Provincial chest for every $1 contributed by Lower Canada—all we ask is that an elector in Upper Canada shall have the same political influence as an elector in the lower province. The people of Upper Canada will never submit to a continuance of the Union, unless they have act of justice is granted them. Honorable gentlemen, sir, may think that by moving the previous question and choking off discussion in this house, they will kill the discontent throughout the country, but I tell them they are grossly mistaken. The people of Upper Canada of all parties are perfectly united on this question; and such motions as this of the previous question by the Prov. Secretary will only strengthen the determination to secure justice at our hands. The hon. Attorney General says the Government have no fear to discuss this question in all its bearings; but I think his statement will not go with very great force to the country. He (Mr. Brown) had hoped that he would be prepared to meet the question, so as to kill the amendment which I was about to place in your hands for a consideration of the whole question of the condition on which the union now is based. If the hon. gentleman acted wisely, and really desired to maintain the Union and the credit of the country, he would yet get his colleague to withdraw the previous question, and allow the whole subject to be considered. If he does not, the country will see that the government and their supporters are afraid to test the opinions of the House, and only adopt their present course to avoid meeting a vote on representation by population. My amendment would be that we send the whole question of the Union and representation from both sides of the House, and representing all sections and interests, and instructing them to inquire if they cannot discover some basis on which Upper and Lower Canada can go on harmoniously together, without injustice to either. If a large vote were given upon this proposition it would tend more to settle the differences among us than if we got a large vote to-night in favor of a dissolution of the union. I am free to say that I dissolution would always oppose a dissolution, and I shall continue to oppose it so long as there is any chance of justice being done to Upper Canada. But when that hope is at an end, I will not hesitate to advocate separation. If I had any hesitancy in coming to the resolution of voting against the motion of the hon member for Haldimand, it was entirely put to flight when I heard the speeches of the honorable members for Montreal and the Attorney General East. Admitting the principle of representation by population, and treating it as a mere question of time. I shall still continue to struggle for the great reform of representation by population; and I appeal to Upper Canadian members, who have hitherto opposed us upon it, to say whether they are true to their trust—true to the interests of Upper Canada, when they hesitate to come forward upon every occasion with their votes and influence, and strengthen the hands of those who for years have been urging on Parliament this great public subject? Honorable members say there is no use in voting for it. Why? "Because," they say, "we cannot carry it." And how, sir, shall we ever be able to carry this or any other measure, if those who are in favor of it vote against it? It did strike me when I heard the speech of the Attorney General East at the speech of the hon. member for Montreal, that the object was to smother the hon. gentleman made upon that speech might, with great force, be turned against himself. My hon. friend treated the subject as a great national question. He took a most statesmanlike view of our future destiny; he admitted the injustice done to Upper Canada under the existing arrangement; he did not conceal from him all the causes of discussion which exist; and he appealed himself to the task of finding some mode of meeting the whole difficulties which beset us. The honble. member seemed to feel the necessity of placing all the people of the country upon the same footing; of robbing out the dividing line between the two sections, or else adopting the principle of a federal union.—The Attorney General East seemed at the idea of having a federal union, and at our being divided into two or three petty principalities.

Attorney General Drummond—Yes; half-a-dozen.

Mr. Brown—Would these states be so petty in a country of such magnitude as Canada? We have territory enough now to form several large states, and when the Hudson's Bay Territory comes to us—as it undoubtedly must do at no great distance of time—there will be space for as many more. Have we never heard of states much smaller than ours would be?—states which have taken their stand creditably as self-governed commonwealths. Say, sir, had we not two states of Upper and Lower Canada at a time when our population was but a third of its present strength? I am not prepared to say that the Union of Canada has not produced great fruits. The material results have been very satisfactory, the country has progressed with wonderful rapidity—much faster than it would have done otherwise. But while I say this do I alone say to the country it has not failed? I do I conceal from myself the fact, that, instead of effecting those moral and political ends for which it was brought about, it has drawn the line between the two sections more distinctly than before, and demonstrated our public men in a manner most lamentable to contemplate? Is it not a fact that we are arranged in this House as two different nations, each separately represented—our public money squabbled for, and divided between the contending sections? We have one part of the country absolutely watching the other—trying to find fault because that it has not had its due share. All this is most ruinous to the perpetuation of the Union. Then we have two systems of legislation proposed for the two sections—and to carry it out we must have double consciences, one for Upper and another for Lower Canada. How can we help differing upon a great many subjects, while we have to a different systems of legislation? When a Bill is brought into this House founded upon a Lower Canada principle to-day, and one comes to-morrow on an Upper Canada principle—how shall members act? Shall a member give a vote to an idea a Bill which he cannot consistently approve of? And yet, how offer raise can members from both sections of the Province act together? Do we not see every day the determining effects of our position? It cannot go on this always. Mr Speaker, and there are but three ways of meeting the evil: by remodeling the Union of the Provinces, or by assimilating our systems of local legislation, adopt ng representation by population, and wiping out the absurd boundary line which now separates us; or, finally, by dissolution. Some talk of a federal union, and leaving local questions to local legislatures. One of these courses must be taken and however the Government may in a twinkle, it will not be long that it will be able to do so. The Attorney General East said yesterday that he would never consent to a retrograde movement; if there was to be a movement made at all I must be a union of the whole Provinces, with the ultimate intention of becoming an independent nation. (Hear, hear.) But I hope the day is very far distant when the connection between this country and Great Britain shall be severed. (Hear, hear.) I regret very much that we are forced to the consideration of the particular proposition moved by the hon member for Haldimand. I shall be compelled for the present to vote against that motion. Whenever, when the question is again presented, one may be called to vote, it is impossible to say but for one I shall never give such a vote without great reluctance. Upper Canada, I believe, feels intensely on this subject. And I would say to hon. gentlemen that it is far better to meet the difficulty now than to put it off as a future day; for long it will certainly present itself in a more formidable shape.

Mr Evanturel opposed Mr. Mackenzie's motion, and also declared his sentiments against representation by population.

Mr Sax participated in the regret expressed by the hon member for Lambton that the ministry had resorted to an unworthy shift merely to evade a question which must sooner or late be met by all parties. He felt surprised that the hon Attorney General East had directed a volley of sarcasm and affected ridicule against the wise and calm speech uttered by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Dorion) The shafts of ridicule would recoil on him who sought to be prominent in the House for his sarcasms, and temperate speech. The Government ought to have been prepared to meet this question in some shape or other. It is a pressing one, and must be grappled with at some time. He saw no use in delaying it; it only led to an agitation on a subject like this, new and popular. And although the hon. member for Haldimand voices upon every subject which will afford him food for excitement, and all the old topics have now grown stale; the fact therefore, of his stopping this question is sufficient evidence of its force and popularity, apart from its justness in a political point of view. There could be no doubt that the people of Upper Canada will obtain their demand for representation by population, made the basis of public, as it is in fact, a question of right. Upper Canada, if it is to seek to dissolve the union. The hon. member for the county of Quebec has declared his opposition to the change. The predecessor of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Chauveau) was of the opposite opinion. He had strongly argued and voted for that basis. (Hear, hear.) There was no need of the Lower Canadians being fearful of losing their influence, if this change were adopted; they are too united and compact to sustain injury. Honorable members from Upper Canada might be afraid of a grand confederation. It had more importance in name than reality. Nor would it suffice to meet the difficulties experienced every day. Representation in accordance with population ought to be granted to Upper Canada, after adjustment, if the would vote, however, against any motion having for its object a simple dissolution of the union; as he rather desired its perpetuation. The property of the provinces is that of all, and it would be unjust that one should be merely in both sections, and of a separate nature to the many abuses of which parties in either division so justly complain.

Mr. Ramsay agreed with the hon. member for Compton in the view that he expressed. He was sorry that the theory of representation must be by population, but that was a different thing from carrying it into practice. The question of the dissolution of the Union and that of representation were so intimately connected that they could be well discussed at the time. He contended that the population of Upper Canada only exceeded that of Lower Canada by 65,000. Tribute in Lower Canada in one year were 30,000, while in the same year in Upper Canada, although the population was larger, the number of tribes were only 30,000. From this he concluded the natural increase of the Canadian population of Lower Canada was greater than that of the Canadian population of Upper Canada. He then calculated the number of the colored, the German, and the American population of the Upper Province, and also the larger number of females in Upper Canada who had not increased the population, arguing from together he made out that in point of fact Lower Canada had a population 30,000 larger than Upper Canada, so far as Canadians were concerned, and the classes he alluded to being foreigners, were not entitled to the privilege of the franchise.

Mr Foley said that the classes alluded to by the last speaker were equally wealthy and intelligent, if not superior to the continuents of that hon. member, and equally well entitled to the privilege of the franchise. He protested indignantly against the insinuation of the hon. gentleman against the American and German portion of the population, who were among the most intelligent to be found in our country. In the county which he had the honor to represent, there were large numbers of these classes, and they had more schools in their locality than in the surrounding districts.

Mr C Dunsee condemned the Government for not taking up the matter in earnest and compromise the conflicting views of Mr. Dorion with those of the Attorney General East. He compared the position of Upper and Lower Can da with that of Holland and Belgium, which, after a union of sixteen years, had found that from the diff rences of race and religion it was better to separ te; the union ceased to be a blessing to Belgium, where so many reforms were promoted, and Holland, which rapidly united, suffered from constant strife and which, when separated had been happy and prosperous. He had been opposed to the Union when it was convenient, because he thought it was founded in injustice and he thought so still. At the same time, there were great difficulties in the way of a dissolution of the Union, and he was not prepared to vote for it unless it was desired by both sides. If the province but encounter one night in the very soon when that would be the case.

Mr D'Ewarrel (in French) commended the conduct of the member for Montreal, and others of the Rouge party, who followed in the wake of the members for Haldimand and Lambton, and joined in their opposition to the educational institutions of Lower Canada. He contended that representation by population was an part of the British constitution, and was not acted upon in England, and could not be carried out. The Act of Union was a contract accepted by Lower Canada which should be held upon as final.

Mr. Larkin said that the question was put in such an extraordinary manner that, although in favor of the principle, he could not vote for it in its present form unless prepared in such a way as to lead to a practical result. He was in favor of a dissolution of the existing Union if a proper proposition was made to obviate all the inconvenience that would arise from doing so. It would be necessary to make some provision for the payment of the public debt and the disposal of the public works. He considered that the question was not regarded in its proper light. It was looked upon as an *fait accompli*. They might be until d forty years, but under a liberal form of government there never could be any sympathy between them. The only thing they could meet by a union was fusion, which he did not desire. He wished that both races should have their bodies but that they should be united on great questions. He did not think that a union with the other Provinces would effect the question, as the population of those provinces was too small to make any difference. If the two provinces were divided into four, each section would have a population equal to that of all the other provinces united. Lower Canada would never consent that in a united Parliament Upper Canada should have a superior position. At present they had two Administrations, for when a majority from Upper Canada was against the Government, the Upper Canadian section retired, but not the Lower Canadian. He would appreciate the desire that was entertained by the British population that this should be one great country, but he could not, as a French Canadian, consent to give up his nationality. He put it to the people of Upper Canada whether they would have representation by population or a dissolution of the Union. They said yes to the first proposition, and no to the second. He recommended the ministry for evading the question of representation by population. There were certain difficulties in the way of a dissolution of the Union, which would increase every year, and both the debts and liabilities for works undertaken would every year be increased. Suppose the population of Upper Canada should increase in the ratio that it may be expected, would it be possible to maintain this Union He considered that it would not. As it is, half the time of the session is taken up with mutual recriminations between the people of the two provinces. In such a case it would be impossible to attempt to preserve any harmony. For a province to increase, the s should be only one government, which should all pull together, but that was impossible now. The theory of the member for Montreal had been treated as crude and absurd, but it was far more statesmanlike than that of the Attorney General.

On motion of Attorney General Drummond the debate was adjourned till Monday.

FRIDAY, April 25.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 p.m.

FIRST READING.

Mr. A. MORRISON introduced a Bill to incorporate the Lake Huron Transit Company.

Second reading on Monday.

Mr. Brown introduced a Bill to incorporate the British Book of Canada.

Mr. SIMON SNYDER introduced a Bill, intituled "An Act to establish the time necessary in between concurs lion 7 and 8 of the Township of Clark, and for other purposes."

Mr. A. MORRISON introduced a Bill for the protection of Fisheries in Upper Canada.

On motion of Mr. Simon Sayer

The Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled "An Act to provide for the payment of dividends by Insurance Companies," was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. McMurray,

The Bill from the Legislative Council, intituled "An Act to enable the Church-wardens of St George's Church, in the town of St. Catharines, to sell and convey four acres of land, originally purchased as site for a parsonage, and for other purposes," was read a first time.

Atty. Gen. MACDONALD introduced a Bill to alter the survey of that part of the third concession of Onondaga, commonly called Martin's Bend, and to confirm a survey thereof and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF SEIGNIORIAL ACT.

Atty. Gen. DUNMORE moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Seigniorial Act of 1854, and the Seigniorial Amendment Act of 1855, in order to further and facilitate the operation of the same. The hon gentleman briefly explained the alterations he proposed to make. He hoped that, by adopting these alterations, and carrying out the measure effectively, they would be able to do more towards settling the Seigniorial Tenure than they could in any other way. He hoped, in fact, that a large emigration would be induced from Upper Canada down to Lower Canada.

After a short conversation, the Bill was read a first time

ANOTHER GOVERNMENT DAY.

Hon. Mr Drummond moved, "That after this day measures for the Relief of Upper Canada in ministration do take precedence of all other matters on every Wednesday, until the close of the present session, in addition to Tuesdays and Fridays."

Some conversation arose as to whether the House should sit on Tuesday next

Atty. Gen. Dunmore did not think that a day set apart by the Toronto Corporation should be obligatory on the House

Mr. Brown quite agreed with the Attorney General, and he thought there was little necessity for the House sitting next Thursday. If they did not consider themselves bound to keep a day set apart by the Toronto Corporation, he did not see why they ought to keep one imposed by the Parliament of Upper Canada.

The motion was then agreed to.

THE CUSTOMS TARIFF.

On motion of Hon. Mr. CAYLEY,

The House again went into Committee on the Tariff of Customs—Mr Terrill in the chair.

Hon. Mr. CAYLEY said, the increase on the tariff was intended to meet the interest on the Grand Trunk debentures, and he proposed to separate that entirely from the ordinary revenue to which the ordinary revenue was applied, in regard to which he hoped to be able to bring down the estimates for the year in a very few days. In the Bill he intended to introduce, founded on these resolutions, he proposed that the Government should be authorised to take of the increased duties, so soon as the revenue from that particular source was removed from the country. He had heard it said in various quarters, that he might depend on the increase of revenue without raising the duties. But he did not think it would be financially correct to depend on a contingency at that sort. As all events, so far as the actual returns for this year had gone, they did not show any very great reason for anticipating much of an increase. In January 1855, the duties collected amounted to £45,494; in January 1856, they amounted to £31,617. In February 1855, they were £22,000; in February 1856, £29,700. In March 1855, there were £60,700; in March 1856, £44,400. In April 1855, as in the 11th inst. there were £21,866; in April 1856, in the same date, £33,100. Consequently, the total receipts from Customs duties for three months and a third of a month in 1855, were, in round figures, £130,000; and for the same period in 1856, £140,000—the increase on the present year being about £4,700

They were not, therefore, in a position to base on those returns any very large calculations, although he might remark that the month of March season having been unusually late, the returns for the current month and the next month or two, might be such as to keep up the superiority of this year over the last. But he did not think it would be justified in building on any large superstructure on any such expectations. He had calculated in round figures that the increase would yield about £316,000, which did not vary much from Mr. Holton's calculation of £204,000. But it should be remembered that the reductions effected last year amounted to upwards of £100, so that the real increase was only £90,000. In addition to putting back what was taken off last year, he might also remark that on some of the items on which he now proposed to increase the duties, he did not go back to the rate imposed by the late Inspector General in 1849. The duty on the superior class of sugar, for instance, in 1849, was 18s 11d per cwt: the increase he now proposed brought it only to 14s. On the second quality of sugar the duty then was 13s; he now proposed to make it but 10s. On the third quality the duty then was 11s 3d; now it would be 7s 6d. Also on the item of tea, the average duty by the Tariff of 1849 was 7d; the rate he now proposed was 21d. In regard to wine he might remark, that he had made a classification of bottled wine, somewhat approaching to that of wine in wooden. He proposed to reduce the duty on the wines below £1 per dozen to 7s 6d, and to increase it on all wines over £1 per dozen, to 12s 6d, instead of having a duty of 10s. He had had an opportunity of communicating with many gentlemen connected with trade, both in this city, and from Montreal and Hamilton, who had kindly favored him with their views on several points of much interest to the community and to trade. The gentlemen from Montreal, Toronto and Hamilton had all dwelt upon the proposed increase of duty on silks and manufactures containing any quantity of silk. The hon. gentleman read a letter from the Hamilton Board of Trade on the subject, representing that the imposition of a high duty on silks, by furnishing temptations to and facilities for fraud, would be injurious both to the revenue and to the honest trader, and that the imposition of the same duty on articles containing any infusion whatever of silk, would be productive of much vexation and inconvenience. He admitted that there was a good deal of force in those views, and that probably the proposed system would cause more trouble and annoyance than would be compensated for by any gain to the revenue. He might also take this opportunity of making an explanation of what he had said on a former evening, in regard to the origin of the publication of what might be called the Brassey correspondence. He had since had a visit from Messrs. Brassey & Betts, who conceived, from some of the remarks, that he had fallen into anerror, and had, to certain extent, done them injustice in the way he had put his statem at forward. Nothing could have been further from his intentions, than to cast any blame on those gentlemen, of whose character when he was in England, he had heard the highest reports and he had never for one moment had cause to believe that they had forfeited that character. They promised to send him a communication on the subject, which he would have been glad to have read to the house, but not having received that, he would read a communication addressed to him by Mr. Napier, stating the substance of the conversation on which he proceeded in making the statement he did. Mr. Napier said—"It is difficult for me to remember my exact words, but I can, of course give you the substance, which was as follows:—that some short time since (three or four months) the contractors had sold some of the shares which they received from the company in part payment of their contract—that after that sale the shares of the company declined in value—that the purchasers, some of whom were old, some new shareholders, became anxious, and discussed what steps should be taken—that they appealed to Mr. Brassey to take a part in the movement which, on examination of the circumstances of the case, they considered necessary, with a view to restore the financial condition of the undertaking. He would not take up the time of the committee longer at this stage, but would move the first resolution, that all articles now subject to a duty of 12½ per cent, be unless specially excepted, charged with a duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. Holton said, that the Inspector General had come before this House with a Tariff which he had arranged entirely with the assistance of his clerks, without consulting the mercantile community to see what their views were. This Tariff he had submitted to his own colleagues for their approval, and they were incompetent, from the nature of their pursuits, to give him any assistance. Yet they had adopted it, and brought it before the House as one of their measures, and wished to press it through upon a majority. The result of such a course was, that all discussion upon the subject was of no importance whatever, unless the Ministry consented to be sustained by the majority of the House. Under these circumstances he felt considerable reluctance to enter into discussion upon this subject. It was, nevertheless, the duty of hon. members, when such measures came down which were to impose new burthens upon the country, to examine with some minuteness a proposition so submitted, and the grounds upon which it was sought to be justified. But the Inspector General was bound to show, that the requirements of the public service demand such an increase of taxation as he proposes. He had not hitherto satisfied the House upon that point. He rested it entirely upon the demands made upon the public purse by the Grand Trunk (Company's liability to meet their debentures) interest. If this be a good ground, it was incumbent upon the honorable gentleman to show, first, how he proposes to deal with this company; what burthens are likely to be imposed upon the country by it, and to disclose to the House his entire policy with regard to the subject, in order that it might be in a position to determine what financial measures might be necessary to meet the emergency, and he should show further, that the ordinary resources of the country were inadequate to meet the ordinary demand upon the public chest. A reference to the public accounts would show that the ordinary revenue of the country, with the means now in hand, were quite sufficient to meet the ordinary demands. The