

Correspondence.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for opinions expressed under this heading.

To the Editors of *The Civilian*:

Dear Sirs,—May I make a few remarks on the article in the "Women's Column" of June 26. Unmarried ladies are apt to forget that all domestic trials are not borne by wife or widow. The case cited is pathetic enough but the query to men, "Just how would you manage were you required to do all these things, and to be a good office clerk as well?" could be answered by dozens of men. Who remains to perform these duties when the mother falls ill, and the means are insufficient to pay for help? I know of cases where the husband has had to do all these things and attend to a sick wife as well. Think of the hundreds of men earning between \$700 and \$1,200 per annum, and I am sure that anyone will understand that this must be so.

No fair-minded person will deny that equal pay for equal work is but simple justice, but does such a rule obtain even amongst men in the service? I think not. Though only a "relative by marriage," I know of many instances where men, working side by side, doing equal work with equal ability, not only receive unequal pay, but are classed in different divisions. Other cases there are where a man, the actual head of a room, receives less than others working under his supervision, and yet again men who are doing work, and doing it better, than their predecessors, whose salaries are smaller by several hundred dollars. So this is not solely a feminine grievance.

Ladies are not rigidly barred from the higher divisions, but their demand for the open door is open to argument. To those who look upon this question from the individual standpoint only, the answer that

"We would pay the unmarried men only half what we pay the married men" may be sufficient, but I contend that this is a national question, and such a retort mere claptrap.

The greatest need of any young county is a continual supply of sturdy native-born children. This is particularly true of Canada, offering, as it does, special attractions for the poor of every nationality, and whilst I do not for one minute suggest that a man of inferior ability should receive higher pay, because he is the father of a family, I do contend that it is necessary for the future of our country that men shall be assured the chance of positions with such salaries attached as shall enable them to marry and bring up a family in comparative comfort. Nor do I believe that such encouragement would entail any real suffering on the women of the service. Very many of them receive, or are in line to receive, \$1,200 per annum. Even on \$800 a woman can live well and help to support a family.

The number of men who not only support a family, but are compelled to partially or wholly provide for aged or invalided relatives would no doubt balance the number of women who support a family. It has been said that the cost of living increases pro ratio with the people's spending capacity, and certain it is that as women enter, more and more, into the higher paid positions, the necessities of life become increasingly difficult for married people to obtain.

Yours very respectfully,
SISTER-IN-LAW.

* * *

For Mr. Fowler.

To the Editors of *The Civilian*:

The Koran lays it down that any ruler who appoints an incompetent man to office when he could have got a better one to take it is virtually guilty of treason!