

humorous he dwelt on that "gorgeous, magnificent easy chair," whose value he figured out at \$48.15.

The Controller of Customs seemed to think that instead of presenting him with one chair at \$48, Mr. McMullen's friend should have made the gift one of 120 chairs at 40 cents apiece. It might be pointed out that the duty would still have been \$16.85, so that in no case would Mr. McMullen have escaped the insatiable tariff. The Controller then went on to hint that Mr. McMullen had tried to smuggle the chair, and to declare that in no country was furniture cheaper than in Canada. The latter assertion at once suggests the reflection that a protection of \$16.85 should not in that case be required on an article valued at \$48.15. Although aware that Mr. McMullen had received the chair as a gift, Mr. Wallace persistently represented him as having bought abroad a luxurious article of furniture which he might have bought in Canada. Surely this is unworthy of a man holding Mr. Wallace's position.—*Toronto Globe*.

Mr. McMullen, in a strain that he presumably intended or hoped his hearers would believe, endeavored to impress upon the minds of his hearers that because there is a duty of 35 per cent. on Yankee chairs when imported into Canada, the price of Canadian chairs must necessarily be 35 per cent. greater than it would be if there was no such duty. If he did not intend to convey this idea why did he illustrate his argument by alluding to a personal matter and telling about the value of his own chair which he brought from Chicago, and upon which he had to pay duty. If Mr. McMullen had not indulged in his personal illustration, thus giving the facts to the public, Mr. Wallace would have had no opportunity to criticize the matter as he did. The fact is, Mr. McMullen attempted to create a false impression regarding the cost, or value of chairs in the United States and in Canada. He desired to create the impression that chairs are 35 per cent. dearer in this country than they are in the United States. No doubt if Mr. McMullen had desired to purchase an easy chair he would have done so at home, well knowing that he could have done so for as little money as it would have cost him in Chicago. He did not purchase the chair, however—it was presented to him by friends abroad; and it is in rather questionable taste for him to advertise to them, through a public political speech, that he had to reach down into his own pocket for money to pay the duty before he could repose his wearied bones upon it at home.

The *Globe*, however, endeavors to assist Mr. McMullen in deceiving the people in this matter. Mr. McMullen endeavored to deceive them by trying to make it appear that the price of the home-made chair is increased 35 per cent. because of the tariff. The *Globe* knows that this is not the fact, and it knows that the people know it also, and therefore it does not attack the tariff just as Mr. McMullen does, but it attacks it nevertheless by suggesting that if chairs are as cheap in Canada as in the United States, no tariff protection on the article is required.

But protection is required. The *Globe* admits that chairs are as cheap in Canada as in the United States, and it knows the fact that because of protection the Canadian manufacturers of chairs virtually possess the home market, shutting out the foreign article; and when chairs are imported, as in Mr. McMullen's case, the amount of duty collected goes directly into the Dominion treasury. Why, then, does the *Globe* and Mr. McMullen desire to have the duty on chairs removed? It is not that the dozen or so manufacturers in Canada may have access to the sixty-five million American mar-

ket, but that the thousand or so manufacturers in the United States may have access to the Canadian market. The people of Canada would not be benefitted by the change, nor would our manufacturers, but the American manufacturers would reap all the benefit by having their market widened to the extent of five million consumers.

Mr. Wallace showed these facts, and that is what hurts Mr. McMullen and the *Globe*; and all this virtuous indignation at the so called dragging of a private matter into a public discussion is simulated.

#### A SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAY.

A MOVEMENT is on foot in Toronto for the purpose of securing to working people, as far as practicable, a Saturday half-holiday; and an association of citizens has been formed for the furtherance of that end. The association have appointed a committee to collect information, receive suggestions and report upon the subject generally. The committee are anxious to secure the co-operation of all influential classes of the community, including the manufacturers, who are large employers of labor; and the wish is expressed that whatever may be done towards the accomplishment of the object in view, it shall be in a manner that will create the least possible friction and interruption of business, and will be in harmony with the interests of all classes of the community.

The character of those who have become interested in this move, and the manner in which they have addressed themselves to it, are guarantees of sincerity and honesty; and it is to be hoped that in investigating the matter they will have due regard for the interests of all concerned. We say "investigating" because we suppose that before those who are becoming identified with the move, and who desire to do all they can with propriety do to obtain the half-holiday for working people, will penetrate into the matter and discover if there are any other interests that may be adversely involved.

We understand that the proposition is to ask the Ontario Government to make half of every Saturday a statutory holiday; and by this, we suppose is meant that there shall be a general suspension of business on those occasions such as is observed on the Queen's birthday, Dominion Day, Christmas, Easter, etc., when employers are supposed to be quite willing that the employees shall have the half day off without loss of wages on that account, and when employes are quite willing to be thus favored. If such legal holiday is instituted it would, of course, apply to all working people and not to particular classes of them—to the girls in a clothing factory as well as to bricklayers; to the female clerks in stores as well as to the laborers on the street; to all alike and without distinction.

If this is the correct view of what the movers in this project hope to accomplish, while it would undoubtedly be a pleasant event for the employes, it might not be so acceptable to the employers. If the Government is requested to create this statutory holiday it would be understood to mean that it could not be enjoyed without the intervention of the law; and the question arises: Would it be in the interest of all concerned to enact such a law? With the exception of the street car men, perhaps, the different trades declare that through their unions and organizations, they are able, to some extent, to abbreviate their hours of labor; and this they have done almost univer-