

century the treaty moulds our fiscal policy if it is accepted. No matter what changes may take place in our condition during that time, no matter what experience we may gain in that time, we leave ourselves powerless to take advantage of either. Our people may grow restive under the burden of direct taxation which the treaty will certainly impose, but they will be bound hand and foot to it, without the possibility of escape. The United States can afford the risk of this experiment, because even if it should prove injurious to them it will be but a drop in the bucket, but to us the question is a vital one; if we make a mistake in this matter it is a vital one."

On the 23d of September a large and intelligent meeting assembled in St. Lawrence Hall, Toronto, on the call of his Worship the Mayor, for the purpose of considering the treaty. The time of holding the meeting was selected with reference to the simultaneous assembling at Toronto of an important political convention, and the holding of a provincial exhibition of the mineral, mechanical, and agricultural productions of the Dominion. Quite a number of gentlemen addressed the meeting, and I will detain you on this point long enough to quote briefly from some of their addresses:—

Mr. Hewitt said that, "in looking back to the history of their country they would find out that it had not long emerged from a wilderness. The thing they now ought to do was to try to develop the mineral resources of the country, and also to develop manufactures. It would not be well for Canada to remain simply an agricultural community. It has never been asserted by those who desired to see the treaty passed that it would benefit the iron, leather, or paper trade, but it had been said that the agricultural classes would be benefited." He also observed that "it was well for a country to develop its own resources, and also to consume its own productions. The treaty, if passed, would entail many difficulties on this country; for if it were found to be impossible for Canada to fulfil the obligations contained in the treaty regarding the deepening and building of the canal, it would probably bring about a quarrel with the United States."

Mr. Reynolds said that "the treaty would probably bring about direct taxation, and that the farmers would not desire to promote such a state of things."

Mr. E. O. Bickford said "George Brown was the cause of this treaty, he having originated it, and he only did so for the sake of self-aggrandizement. It had been argued that England did well under a policy of free trade, but he should like to point out that the trade of England had been built up under a protective policy, and England only desired free trade when her manufactures had