

fore been a great factor in educating the people to look with favor upon the Commercial Union proposals. Aside from the monopoly, it is easy to show that the protective tariff of the Dominion discriminates against the West in many particulars, and that consequently the people of the West are made to pay a heavier tax per capita than the people of Eastern Canada. Indeed, one of the great arguments used in the East in favor of protection is, that it holds the West as a preserve for the East. It is therefore, not to be wondered at, that Mr. Wiman was given such an enthusiastic reception in Winnipeg.

In introducing Mr. Wiman at the meeting the other evening, Mr. G. F. Galt, president of the board of trade, remarked that the Winnipeg board had not discussed the question of Commercial Union. In inviting Mr. Wiman to lecture in Winnipeg, the board did not necessarily endorse his views. Mr. Wiman commenced his address by referring to the present isolated position of Winnipeg and Manitoba, and used this to make a point in favor of his subject by showing the isolation of Canada from the rest of the continent, through the operations of the protective tariffs of this country and the United States. Canada, he argued, was, owing to her geographical position, largely dependent upon her neighbor. This neighbor is a very large one and has a valuable market. In order to gain access to this market, we would be obliged to take some of her manufactures. Mr. Wiman next dealt with the state of the country under the reciprocity treaty of 1854-66, which he declared was the most prosperous era in the history of Canada. He thought reciprocity would be an excellent thing now, but the United States would not agree to its re-enactment. Nothing but Commercial Union would be acceptable to them, and it was therefore useless to talk about reciprocity. In reference to the argument that Commercial Union would be ungrateful to Great Britain, he thought charity should commence at home. It was a case of loyalty against prosperity. However, he did not think that Commercial Union would diminish loyalty to Great Britain. He pointed to the fact that Canada already has a hostile tariff against British imports. He thought Canadians could hold their own against the United States, under Commercial Union. The protective policy was like a man trying to lift himself by

his boot straps. The fact that \$2,000,000 worth of eggs were exported to the United States last year, was used as an illustration to show the possibilities of international trade, under Commercial Union, eggs now being admitted duty free. Mr. Wiman held that the progress of this country had been retarded on account of its being cut off from its natural market. This country was exceedingly rich in mineral wealth and had enormous resources and great natural advantages, but these could not be developed until a market was provided. Special reference was made to the mineral wealth of the country. Canada had greater resources in iron than the United States, but was doing scarcely anything to develop this industry, whilst last year 6,000,000 tons were manufactured in the United States. Regarding the oft repeated statements that Commercial Union simply means annexation in disguise, Mr. Wiman thought it would have quite the opposite effect. Commercial Union would make the country prosperous, and would do away with any necessity for annexation. On the other hand a continuation of the present policy would create dissatisfaction, which would ultimately lead to a desire for annexation. There were \$667,000,000 of British capital invested in Canada, which would be rendered vastly more valuable by Commercial Union, thus making it a benefit to British investors. Mr. Wiman admitted that the revenue feature was an objection to Commercial Union. The tariffs of the two countries would require to be the same, and naturally Canada would be obliged to yield the control of her tariff to the United States. He thought, however, that this difficulty could be overcome, and at any rate the objection was slight in comparison with the great advantages to be gained.

This is but a brief reference to some of the more important points made by the speaker. The question is undoubtedly one upon which a great deal can be said on both sides, and in view of the recent action at Washington favorable to Commercial Union, the matter deserves the most earnest attention of our people. It is not a question upon which a conclusion can be jumped at. Recent events have shown that public opinion in the United States is rapidly changing in favor of freer trade relationship with Canada. On the other hand, it is the almost unanimous belief in Canada, that more favorable trade intercourse with the

United States would be beneficial to both countries. The only difference of opinion here is as to the nature and degree which this increased freedom of international commercial relationship should attain. To Mr. Wiman is due in no slight degree the credit for this improved feeling in the United States toward freer trade arrangements with Canada. He has delivered many lectures in the United States upon his favorite theme, and in that country his lectures have partaken largely of the nature of discourses upon the extent and resources of Canada. In this way he has awakened interest in the subject, and very materially altered the ideas of many United States citizens, in their conceptions of this country. On this account his services deserve recognition even from those in this country who do not accept his Commercial Union theories.

DISHONEST EMPLOYEES.

The retail grocers' association of Detroit, Michigan, has asked employers of labor to refuse to employ men who endeavor to evade the payment of their store bills. This is a somewhat novel move, but if acted upon, it would no doubt have a desirable effect. Men who endeavor to evade the payment of their honest debts, are almost invariably people of an extravagant habit, and who have no hesitation in contracting debts. If such persons were aware that dishonesty of this nature were likely to deprive them of a situation, they would be more careful about running into debt. The principle of refusing to employ dishonest men is a just one. The very fact of a man's being employed in a responsible capacity, adds to his possibilities of obtaining credit. The employer is therefore responsible in principle to some extent for the honesty of his employee. By giving a man employment, especially in a responsible capacity, the employer improves, and in a sense assures the credit of his employee. He therefore has a right to expect that his employee shall not abuse the position by profligacy and dishonesty. This is a matter which is worthy the attention of employers, both private parties and corporations. It is still more applicable to employees of governments and councils, who by the nature of such employment are placed in a public position, whereby they can the more readily obtain credit by nature of their supposedly honorable position. Government's municipal, provincial and federal, certainly share in the character of their employees. The more important or responsible the position of the official or employee, the more is the responsibility of the employer. The employer who knowingly places a dishonest and dishonorable man in a position where he will naturally be respected and trusted, is committing a moral wrong, the result of which to no slight extent he is morally responsible. This is a principle which should be recognized to a greater extent, especially in civil service and public appointments.