

gan after the last census in either country. It is too soon to be able to judge with accuracy what stable effect will remain in women's employment from the War. The greatest addition to war-time industrial production by women in English-speaking countries was in Great Britain. Board of Trade figures, July, 1919, showed that the total number of occupied women in Great Britain had increased, as compared with 1914, twenty-two and one-half per cent., from 5,966,000 to 7,311,000. The latter figure included a reduction in the numbers of domestic employees of four hundred thousand. In each of these countries, the period of readjustment for men and women workers has not yet ended. But as far as women workers are concerned, they have common problems, and their problems are of the same character as before 1914.

The rate of payment for work, and freedom of choice in entering an occupation, are so closely joined in the minds of many leaders among working women that they are regarded as almost the same question. The formula "Equal Pay for Equal Work" has been endorsed by individuals and organizations. It is looked upon with doubt, however, by such leaders as Miss Mary McArthur and Mrs. Sidney Webb, who consider that it may be used to restrict the employment of women. The principle has been accepted by American and Canadian women apparently without the same reservations. It is evident, however, that the phrase "Equal Pay for Equal Work" does not always have the same meaning for men workers as for women. Many of its advocates are not wage-earners, and to them as well as to many working women the fundamental appeal of the expression is for justice. To repeat the formula is simple enough, but to arrange for its fair and useful application to everyday life is a different matter.

One of the most moderate statements of the case for women workers has been made by Sir Lynden Macas-

sey, a member of the British War Cabinet Committee on Women in Industry, who during the War worked in adjusting employment difficulties. In an article which appeared in *The Quarterly Review* for July, 1919, on "The Economic Future of Women in Industry" he points out in the first place that the woman worker is essential to the re-establishment of the prosperity of civilization and proceeds to ask a question as to the place of women in reformed industry. In his opinion there are three principles which should regulate the future status of women workers. They should be entitled to the employment for which they are economically and industrially equipped. The work at which they are employed and its conditions should be suited physiologically and psychologically for women. They must not be allowed to undercut and displace men. Generally speaking, those who have had most to do with the employment of women especially during the War have come to these or similar conclusions. It is agreed on the whole that women workers should have freedom of opportunity when that is possible, that all work is not suited to women and that it would be disastrous to bring down the rate of payment through a supply of cheap women workers. Concerning their ability as workers and rate of payment, it is interesting to quote Sir Lynden Macassey's own words: "Without any doubt, as things are to-day, a woman of efficiency equal to a man, if obtainable—as she is in many cases—can always be secured, especially in unorganized trades, for substantially less remuneration than the man. It is imperative that this should not take place."

A great deal might be written of the employment of women, their character as workers and the advance in woman as comrade which seems to come through well-conditioned employment. But the present effort is not so much to prove the justice of the claim of women workers as it is to