

of temporary positions—because theirs is temporary work—was in 1923, 8,966; in 1924, 6,941; in 1925, 6,139; in 1926, 5,598, and in 1927, 6,122. Then there are a certain number of continuous positions; in 1923 there were 302; in 1924, 174; in 1925, 175; in 1926, 168; and in 1927, 228. The significance of these figures is that these women, in 90 per cent of the cases, should not be out at work at all; they are simply deserting their families during the day in order to supplement the family income.

*By the Acting Chairman:*

Q. Were those Protestant women?—A. All Protestants. That is an absolutely Protestant Society, the Family Welfare Association. I cannot speak in specific terms of the non-Protestant work. The Jewish work is carried on on much the same basis, but independently. The Roman Catholics deal with their problem in a different manner; they put their people in institutions. Ours is confined to the work of Protestant families.

*By Miss Macphail:*

Q. Do you get any grant from the city?—A. \$1,500 a year. The Family Welfare Association gets over \$100,000 a year from the Financial Federation of which I am Secretary. It is a little over one-sixth of the entire budget of the Community Chest.

*By Mr. Letellier:*

Q. Do you get nothing from the province, or did you ever ask for it?—A. Yes, we certainly did. We have pleaded and pleaded with the Government. Where we are helping families in their own homes, preventing the break-up of the home, we should at least get the equivalent of what is being paid when the home is broken up and the children placed in public institutions. We are asking that the Charities Act be interpreted in this way, that it should consider the welfare of the child, whether placed in its own home or in an institution.

Q. What objection did they give, or what reason for their refusal?—A. Well, the Public Charities Act was, as has been explained by the Director of Public Charities, originally to help institutions. It does not recognize the agency as distinct from the institution, and it has not the same attitude. I am not criticising the French Catholic way of doing things. It is just different. We believe we should maintain the integrity of the family and the home wherever we possibly can. They do not spend very much for relief in the home, consequently we suffer.

*By Miss Macphail:*

Q. Has recent research proven that to maintain and keep the home together is better than placing the children in an institution?—A. We think so. We think it is more satisfactory. We think the child develops in the home.

Q. The Social Service Council of Canada has made that statement in public, that they consider that it is better to maintain the home than to place the children in an institution?—A. We have certainly found that institutional children, born and brought up to the age of fourteen there, do not make good in the world.

Q. Why?—A. Because they lack all the things that make for self confidence and everything else.

Q. Initiative?—A. Yes.