

has more opportunity to meet those who will be her friends by going to work than by doing nothing.

Now, as to the supposed dangers of this women's movement towards employment. Does it make the girl think less of having a home of her own and of marriage? How little anyone knows of womanhood, who would suppose this! Women are profoundly, if inarticulately, loyal to the race and to the home. The only dangerous person, one sometimes thinks, is the person with nothing to do. But this statement is neither here nor there. It would not be possible for the majority of women in paid employments to think more highly of home life than they do. Another danger sometimes spoken of may be put in the form of a question. Will the increase in the numbers of women in paid employment tend to lower the wages paid to men? Economically, an increase in production and in money earned should benefit everyone. Any question about wages is extremely difficult to answer. But I will venture to say this. Wages below a decent living standard paid either to men or to women are a national danger. There is evidence to show that one way to combat the tendency to pay low wages to women is to be found in this change of attitude towards work on the part of young women of well-to-do families. A woman who has placed thousands of girls in paid employment, when discussing this question the other day, said: "The girl who is accustomed to living well at home won't take low wages. She insists on getting the best that are paid. But the poor, little girl, whose necessities are great, and whose training is inadequate, will take anything." There is at least, it seems to me, great promise in the entry of all kinds of young women into skilled work. I believe that this tendency towards paid employment on the part of well-to-do women will eventually help to improve wages and working conditions for both men and

women. I think our experience in the war has shown this in some degree. I do not mean to give the impression that there are not problems to be solved: problems of wages, problems connected with opening higher positions to competent women, and problems which involve standards of right living, for which I believe the general body of women at home are more directly responsible than they are for wages or opportunities of employment. Why should not women investigate and make known the standards of living in our communities? They are the real experts on this subject.

Before we leave employment, I should like to give you two pictures. The first is a representation of a woman scrubbing out an office building after hours. She is not a new development in work. Get her picture in your minds. In time it will make something happen. The other is a group of young women discussing a subject in which they are interested. One of the group is a member of a Telegraphers' Union; the next is a teacher of better methods of salesmanship; the next a member of a Shop Clerks' Union; the next an employment expert. The subject under discussion was the form of organization most helpful to women workers. I ask you who will help the charwoman first: the young woman who is neither a home maker nor a paid worker, or the young woman who is a trained worker, either in the home or outside of it? If you are interested in the discussion referred to above, you may care to know that for the average girl, the form of organization favoured was the Club rather than the Union. The Union was warmly commended, and it was unanimously agreed that some form of organization is necessary.

After some investigation of relative wages for girls in Canada and the United States, I believe that there is evidence to show a better record in Canada of the righteous