

OUR NON-RESIDENT SENATOR.

Among the many virtues of the citizens of Fredericton, their patience is conspicuous. And among the objects of their patience there is none more conspicuous than senator O'Dell. It is a description of patience well adapted for eternity as its field of operation, but not well adapted for time and senator O'Dell.

The senator is a non-resident of the place which he purports to represent. He has property in Fredericton but he takes no interest in Fredericton. He has never shown the slightest sympathy with any of the aims of Fredericton. He has never within recent years voted here. He has never been known, even in the interests of Fredericton, except in the case of the Short Line. He has only one element of greatness that has ever been discovered. Like the late Marshall Von Moltke he knows how to be "silent in seven languages."

It is bad enough in all conscience to have a citizen like senator O'Dell, without his being a positive injury to the city. Yet, this is what senator O'Dell has been, now is, and ever will be, to the end of time—or of senator O'Dell.

Senator O'Dell owns a vast amount of real estate in the city of Fredericton. The property cost him little but seems to be valued by him very highly. It is valued by the senator very highly for purposes of sale; for purposes of taxation it is not valued so highly by the senator.

It is not about time that the assessors of Fredericton closed up this little fane of theirs with senator O'Dell's. It is not about time that they taxed him according to the value he himself puts upon his land? Should he not be compelled either to pay a rate according to the fair valuation of the land or else sell the land at a fair valuation? Whoever will purchase it? Mr. O'Dell has been for years obstructing the growth of Fredericton. He will not sell his land at a reasonable figure, nor upon reasonable conditions; he will not improve the land himself, nor will he allow others to improve it. Neither has he been willing to pay a reasonable tax upon it. He places an absolute prohibition upon the growth of the west end of the city.

If Fredericton wants a public park, senator O'Dell puts an exorbitant price upon his land and forbids its use for that purpose. If an exhibition is to be held the senator is equally impracticable and the result is that no exhibition can be held. There are only two things that senator O'Dell has ever put upon his land: One is the sign manual of meanness; the other sign reads: "Keep out of the street."

And the latest collision between senator O'Dell and the destinies of Fredericton is in line with the rest. It is Fredericton's turn to have the brigade camp here this summer, but Fredericton cannot have the brigade camp because the grounds of senator O'Dell above the city form the only suitable site for it, and senator O'Dell will not allow his sacred soil to be invaded.

In view of all which, the advice seems pertinent that Baron O'Dell should be brought to terms without any unnecessary delay.

A TARDY DEFENCE.

In another column of THE HERALD appears what purports to be a deliverance of the male students of the Normal school, in defence of H. D. Creed, the Tesoro informer. Whether all the students, save the "two dissenting voices" subscribed to this remarkable production is not stated. It would not be surprising, in view of the fact that the terminal examinations are hanging over the students at the present time, if they were desirous of propitiating the senior Creed by every means in their power. The "two dissenting voices" are very bold men indeed.

Whatever opinion the students or any number of them may have as to the conduct of H. D. Creed is of no value to the public. The facts as to his action are not disputed and every person is as competent to form his opinion as are the students of the Normal school. It does not appear from the students' conduct that any of them were willing at the time the Tesoro affair took place, to assume the role of informer themselves. It is known that Mr. Creed or his friends badgered Mr. Crockett a long time before they could persuade him to write his letter to the press in defence of Creed senior. How long, or how strenuously, they operated upon the male students of the Normal school to induce them to defend the unmanly course of Creed junior, does not appear. Their judgment as to the facts is of no more value than that of the outside public, and less so because the influences by which it was effected are not above suspicion.

A WESTERN LOVE-FEAST.

The Ontario legislature in the closing hours of the session passed a resolution with only one dissenting voice increasing the salary of premier Mowatt from \$5,000 to \$7,000 per year. It was pointed out that the addition was simply an act of justice and a recognition of Mr. Mowatt's meritorious services to the province, and that the position involved a great financial sacrifice as he could retire to private life and by his practice earn an income twice as large as that proposed. It was further pointed out that Australia, Victoria and New South Wales paid their premier \$10,000 a year, while the insignificant possession of Cape Colony paid \$8,000. Ontario did not pay its premier what was paid many of the judges and other officials of the dominion. The motion was loudly applauded at its passage by both sides of the house. Mr. Mowatt expressed his warm appreciation of the tribute paid to him, though he thought that the resolution would not be acted upon.

Not content with this, the house with equal unanimity passed a resolution conferring upon the leader of the opposition, in view of his arduous duties, a seasonal allowance of \$2,000. THE HERALD inclines to think that there is reason in the view that the leader of the opposition should receive a larger indemnity than an ordinary member, and would respectfully recommend Mr. Hanington to the government of New Brunswick in this regard.

The legislature of Ontario showed its disinterestedness in the action it had taken by voting down decisively a motion to increase the general indemnity of members from \$600 to \$800.

THE UNKINDEST CUT.

Mr. Blaine's absurd contention that the United States government has the right to police Behring sea because it received it from Russia, has just about received its quietus. The organ of the Russian foreign office, the Journal de St. Petersburg, demolishes the fabric from top to bottom, stone by stone. It says that Russia never ceded any rights in sea or land in Behring sea, except such as rested on the ordinary law of nations, because she never had any in force. It winds up by asserting that "the pretensions of the United States in this matter are in absolute contradiction to the most elementary principles of international law."

OUR OWN DOUGLAS.

The politics of Mr. Hazen, the youthful member for St. John, are not the politics of THE HERALD. Nevertheless, we are proud to observe that in the legislature of the nation, Mr. Hazen is winning high honors. They call him the member from St. John, but everybody knows that Douglas is a Frederictonian, body and bones. Here he was born, here he was educated, and when force of circumstances took him to St. John the citizens of that place lost no time in tendering their recognition of his superior origin.

In his address at the opening of parliament, Mr. Hazen did credit to himself and to his native city. We append a few extracts from the press.

[TORONTO GLOBE].

When Mr. Hazen, the member for St. John, rose to move the address he received a hearty round of applause. He is a young man with a pale face and a shapely nose. His voice is full and clear and reached every part of the chamber. He made a good impression on the house by the style of his delivery.

[ONTARIO CITIZEN].

The most noticeable feature of the debate was the decided hit made by the mover of the address, Mr. Hazen of St. John, N. B. It is many years since the house has listened to so finished an oration, delivered in such easy and finished style, by so fine looking a gentleman who was "fleshing his maiden sword" in the high court of parliament. Mr. Hazen not only made an excellent speech, good in plan and method, but he showed that he possesses great oratorical power, and thoroughly understands how to use the rising inflection in his voice without making it either harsh or discordant. If he fulfills the promise of his maiden effort, he will prove the most valuable addition to its debating power which the house has received for some time.

[TORONTO WORLD].

After the formalities of the day, Sir John turned round and, looking at a handsome young man three seats behind him, said audibly, "go on." Amid the plaudits of both sides, Mr. Hazen of St. John, N. B., arose. He is a little over 30. He was dressed in black clothes, small black tie and gold shirt studs. His features are pleasing and his forehead a noble one. His voice is strong and youthful and he knows how to use the rising inflection, so rare in those who aspire to parliamentary eloquence.

[MONTREAL HERALD].

Then the event of the day occurred. The young representative of St. John city and county rose to reply to the address. Mr. Hazen's face and form, as his fortune, the ladies in the gallery were unusually responsive whenever the mover essayed a graceful effort.

[TORONTO EMPIRE].

Mr. Hazen, the brilliant young member for St. John city and county, when he rose to speak, at once commanded attention. The rattle of desk life that welcomed his rising had scarcely subsided when he began a speech that will long be remembered as one of the best efforts ever listened to in the common chamber of Canada. He at once showed the skill of a practical debater, and his voice and appearance are both greatly in his favor. In person he has a tall, erect, square-built, commanding figure, with handsome, though strongly marked features, a high forehead surmounted with thick black hair, and he wears a brown moustache. His voice is medium tone, resonant and voluminous, and he speaks deliberately, though rapidly, with eloquence, excellent diction and pure English. Except when he turned with just wrath upon Sir Richard, he used no gestures, yet his position was not in the least strained. He had absolutely no notes to speak from, the only papers on his desk being the extracts which he read.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

C. H. Labilliois, M.P.P., was on Friday sworn in as a member of the executive by the lieutenant governor. Mr. Labilliois is an excellent debater, and since his appearance in local politics has developed more than ordinary capacity as a legislator. His appointment will be received with satisfaction by the friends of the government everywhere, especially by the Acadian population of our province.

Some of the hotel-keepers in Maine are so busy placing themselves in the same position in regard to the travelling public as did the Fredericton hotels a year ago. The liquor law is being so vigorously enforced in Augusta that the hotel men contemplate closing their houses.

Hon. Peter White, the new speaker of the house of commons, has sat continuously in the house for North Renfrew since 1876. He was first elected in 1874, but was unseated by the courts.

Hon. R. P. Haythorne of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, whose death took place at Ottawa on Thursday, was one of the most prominent liberals in the senate of Canada. He was born at Clifton, Bristol, England.

The debts of the colonies of Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia amounted in 1881 to £63,792,300; in 1888 to £123,715,000. This is much larger than the debt of Canada, but much of the debt of Australia was incurred for railways which are worked at a profit and thus help to pay the interest. As an instance of the way Canadian public works are managed we might refer to the Intercolonial railway which earned \$2,928,080 last year, while its expenses were \$3,481,392, leaving a deficit of \$553,392.

British genius and statesmanship is working wonders with the finances of Egypt as large as that proposed. It was further pointed out that Australia, Victoria and New South Wales paid their premier \$10,000 a year, while the insignificant possession of Cape Colony paid \$8,000. Ontario did not pay its premier what was paid many of the judges and other officials of the dominion. The motion was loudly applauded at its passage by both sides of the house. Mr. Mowatt expressed his warm appreciation of the tribute paid to him, though he thought that the resolution would not be acted upon.

THE GERMAN PROBLEM.

There is no more interesting problem in European politics at present than the rise of democracy in Germany. When the present emperor assumed the reins of state, he at once announced his liberal principles and held out the hand of friendship to the socialist party. He could not, of course, abate the aims of the socialists for they are revolutionary and directed to the downfall of despotism and the divine right of kings, and to the establishment of a republic. But he gave assurances that he would carry out some of the reforms for which the people had been clamoring and which Bismarck had persistently silenced beneath his iron heel. He dismissed Bismarck from the chancellery and, under great national emergencies arise, it looks as though that great oracle of absolutism had passed forever from the leading role in the great German drama. The effect of the emperor's policy appears to have been twofold. It has allayed the violence of the revolutionary party; at the same time it has encouraged them and rendered them stronger and more hopeful of attaining their ends by constitutional means. Germany to-day, therefore, ably calms and peaceable while at the same time the forces of socialism are showing increased strength at every appeal to the people.

The people of Germany as a whole are the best informed and most intelligent people on the earth. In clearness of intellect and honesty of purpose the German has no equal. It can hardly be doubted that the process of evolution now going on will result in the destruction of feudalism and the substitution of liberalism of a most aggressive type. The German mind, however, is above all things cautious and discriminating. While it may abrogate the divine right of kings it may cling to the monarchical system as the safest form of government. Yet, to the outsider the trend of German politics appears to be a republicanism which over the final issue is it can hardly fail to be of momentous consequences to mankind.

It would be interesting to know in what light Bismarck, who is now working up a constitutional opposition to the Emperor, regards the principles he formerly advocated. He was so opposed to parliamentary opposition that he recommended that it should be silenced with a roll of drums. The Emperor, in his ignorance, saw but one way out of difficulty; that was to rebuild the cars, make the bodies narrower and cut off the axles to fit the gauge of the rails. The present superintendent, a practical American engineer, was in Zeatocas at the time, and took in the state of affairs at a glance. He offered for \$500 to show the owners how to get over the trouble without altering an article on the cars. The money was paid, and with twenty men and proper tools the American took up a few rods of the track, made a gauge for the rest, and in one day had the cars running over the short distance. The managers of the road at once put the American in charge, and he has held the position ever since.

A SHREWD AMERICAN ABROAD.

On the trainway between the towns of Zeatocas and Guadalupe in Mexico, there are a few miles apart, the way from Zeatocas is down grade. The cars go at great speed by their own gravitation; no animals are attached, for the descent is as steep as a toboggan slide. It requires six miles, however, to draw each car back again. The animals are harnessed three abreast, like the horses in the Paris omnibuses. Even the projectors of the railway had no fixed idea as to how it should be operated, and an American overseer has been in charge since the beginning. The cars were ordered from Philadelphia, and while they were being built the steel rails, which came from Liverpool by way of Vera Cruz, were laid down from one end of the route to the other.

When the cars arrived it was found that they would not run on the track, as the rails had been laid on a gauge three inches narrower than that for which the cars were designed. The Mexicans, in their ignorance, saw but one way out of difficulty; that was to rebuild the cars, make the bodies narrower and cut off the axles to fit the gauge of the rails. The present superintendent, a practical American engineer, was in Zeatocas at the time, and took in the state of affairs at a glance. He offered for \$500 to show the owners how to get over the trouble without altering an article on the cars. The money was paid, and with twenty men and proper tools the American took up a few rods of the track, made a gauge for the rest, and in one day had the cars running over the short distance. The managers of the road at once put the American in charge, and he has held the position ever since.

A LIVING ISSUE.

Whoever thinks that reciprocity is a dead issue is as blind to the necessities of the people as to the signs of the times. Hardly a newspaper comes to THE HERALD office from the great American population on either side of the line, but contains a contribution to the subject. In parliament at Ottawa, the liberals, ever ninety strong, are a unit in favor of free trade, and intend to place themselves on record this session in an unmistakable manner. Many of the great American journals which formerly opposed reciprocity with Canada are now advocating it strongly. They have become convinced that the people of Canada do not want annexation, and cannot be coerced into annexation. The United States Times, noting this great movement of the public mind in that country, remarks: "Both sides to the controversy are agreed that annexation is hardly a living issue. The question of commercial union between Canada and the United States is emphatically an issue of to-day. It has been clearly demonstrated that the latter can be brought about without the readjustment of existing political relations. Hence it is unwise as well as impolitic for the annexation enthusiasts on either side of the border to jeopardize a great present gain by grasping at something that is not likely to be attained in this generation at least."

One of the clearest presentations of the case is that of senator Roger Q. Mills in the May Forum. If reciprocity with another country is good, and there can be no sound reason for enlarging our trade with the countries south of us that does not apply with greater force to the country north of us. Our northern neighbors number about fifty millions and those south of us number fifty millions; yet if all restrictions on trade between Canada and the United States were removed, the United States would lose more than double our trade in one year. The Canadians stand on the same plane of civilization that we do, and in the same language, have the same history, and possess almost the same political institutions. In the production of goods they are almost our equals, and they are very far ahead of our southern neighbors. They can easily produce in quantities and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15,000,000 worth of goods and provisions annually, while the southern countries take less than \$10,000,000 worth of goods from us. Why, then, should we not have reciprocity with Canada? All trade is carried on for profit, and there is no reason why it should be any different in the case of a trade of \$100,000,000 as in one of \$10,000,000. Canada takes from us more than \$15