

ion about the Western Province being "a mere wilderness," and Quebec alone possessed of "the means of acquiring wealth," as they thought, would cause them "inextinguishable laughter." The revolting nature of the raids on Canada years ago caused the New York "Journal of Commerce" to say: "The conduct of the American authorities and citizens would justify Canadians in burning Detroit and Buffalo."

**Love Me,
Love My Dog.**

Although the readers of THE CHRONICLE do not need the hint, they have opportunities of spreading the information that under the new penal laws of Canada, the punishment for dog-stealing is much more severe than formerly. The fine for this offence is now \$50 and a maximum term of imprisonment of two years, except in case the value of the stolen animal is under \$20, when the former penalty is retained. The principle upon which the non-payment of fines is regulated is not clear. It seems an easy way of escaping two years' incarceration to pay a \$50 fine. Probably this sum was fixed as being so far beyond the financial resources of any dog-stealer, as to ensure his retirement for two years where "no dogs are allowed to enter the premises," though the place is full of curs. The attachment between some persons and their pet dog is only paralleled by the affection between human beings. Indeed, many a good dog has sacrificed its life for its master, or for some child to whom it had become attached. To steal such a creature is almost as infamous as abducting a child. It is not a mere theft of property, it is the deprivation of a source of daily pleasure and of protection. Many a dog, not worth a cent as a mere canine, has saved its owner from burglary, probably from murder. One valuable dog was stolen in December last in this city, and returned owing to the thief's dread of the new law, the severity of which he learnt from a policeman. Every culprit of this class should be tried before a lover of dogs, he would then get part of his deserts, at least. There seems an opening for insurance in this connection.

**Secret
Commissions.**

A Bill is about being introduced into the British Parliament of a similar character to the one known as Lord Russell's Prevention of Corruption Act. The Bill is in the hands of two distinguished members of the House of Commons so that it has a good prospect of being passed. The object of this proposed Act, as quoted by "The Review," is, "An effort to check, by making them criminal, a large number of inequitable and illegal secret payments, all of which are dishonest, and tend to shake confidence between man and man, and to discourage honest trade and enterprise." That the practice of giving secret commissions is often attended by fraud is known. Employees, for instance, are bribed by tradesmen to

bring them custom from their employer, who, all unknown to himself, pays the commission received by his servant by increased prices. Housekeepers and others who are careless in their methods, are very liable to being defrauded by a secret arrangement existing between traders and their servants. Whenever there is an intermediary between the actual buyer and the actual seller, there is an opening for "inequitable and illegal secret payments." In the old land, this evil is much more common than here, as there are so many persons in Great Britain who have never been associated with business and who leave almost everything of a business nature to their employees. The custom of solicitors and others who have charge of estates taking a commission from insurance companies with whom they place business was condemned by Lord Russell, who first introduced the Prevention of Corruption Act. Our esteemed contemporary, viewing the proposed Act from an insurance stand-point, remarks:—"Under the provisions of the Bill every one who gives or offers, or any agent who asks or receives commission without authority from or without the knowledge of the insured would be liable to fine and imprisonment, with or without hard labour. Such an enactment would deter a great many useful agents from continuing to introduce business for well-earned and rightfully-paid commissions, and the volume of new business would undoubtedly be seriously diminished, even to such an extent that ultimately there would be an appreciable increase in pauperism in the country, owing to the discouragement of the usual propaganda of thrift." As legislation in Canada and the interpretation of our laws are materially affected by English precedents and practices, it is well to keep an eye upon what is being done, or proposed in the old country.

**Distribution
and
Production.**

The Director of the United States Mint in a recent address made the following remarks in reference to the complaint that the distribution of wealth is not keeping pace with the production, as reported in the New York "Journal of Commerce." "The system of distribution is by no means so bad as persons with more sympathy than knowledge and reflection suppose. But, if it were as defective, as great a perversion of justice, as persons with socialistic leanings imagine, the vital fact would remain that the total production of the entire race is very small, very little more than is necessary to keep the race in healthy working condition. By far the greater part of all that men produce they necessarily consume as they go along. The bequest of each generation to the next one is small, and if the large aggregations of wealth, which excite the fear and anger of social reformers, could be distributed, the condition of the greater part of the people would be only moderately changed.