

ences to salaries contained in the bill are confined to the clauses which define the limitations of the proposed new classes and prescribe the methods by which the present service is to be transferred thereto. The first undoubtedly provide in many instances for a more liberal scale of pay. It is the second division of the subject—that involving the status of the present service under the new provisions—that will be viewed with the greatest amount of interest by the service. At the present moment, these provisions cannot be said to be of the character which the situation demands. Apparently the service is to be transferred *en bloc* from the old to the new regime without changes in salary other than such as may arise out of the readjustments of maximums and minimums, and in some cases even changes of this kind will not be present. There is the clause, of course, to the effect that the Ministers are to define the organization of their several departments immediately after the coming into effect of the Act; but it is hard to see the exact force of this if the re-classification under the other provision is to be carried out automatically. In point of fact, the automatic transfer of the present service to the new dispensation will fall foul of both of the horns of the salary dilemma as we have defined it above. It makes no specific provision on the score of cost of living for the wholly altered conditions of the present era, and it will perpetuate the old, meaningless classification of the service under which there is little or no necessary correspondence between the nature of the duties performed and the salaries paid. When it is again remembered how the whole question of civil service reform had its root in the recognized necessity for adjusting salaries to the new economic conditions, the omission from the bill of any provision which will meet directly or indirectly the cost of living situation is a very serious one. If the proposed transfer *en bloc* is intended only as a preliminary move in the process of reconstruction;

if it implies that in the act of transfer consideration is to be made of the necessities of the service and of merit, in the way recommended by the commission as above described, well and good. In any event, however, it is not a time for disappointment on the part of the service. We must not rashly believe that our case in its essentials is not understood by Parliament, and that being understood some action will not be taken to relieve it. It should be the object of the association, following the same commendable methods which it has used so effectively in the past,—methods which recognize both its duty to itself and its position before the country—to secure this perfect understanding both in Parliament and in its own ranks. With a cause founded so visibly on justice and right reason, there should be no occasion for fear.

EVERY SHIELD HAS TWO SIDES.

(Contributed by certain ladies of the Service.)

In the article, "The New Era," which appeared in the last number of *THE CIVILIAN*, was a section devoted to "Female Employment." The attitude of the writer was certainly not unfair, and there was nothing in the treatment of the subject to which anyone could justly take exception. It may not be out of place, however, to discuss the question generally in its broader aspects, particularly as the service includes not a few whose minds are somewhat prejudiced against the employment of women under any circumstances. On the present occasion, therefore, it is intended to speak with more or less generality, reserving anything of specific nature for another time.

The position of women in business is not yet sufficiently long-established to be free from anomalies. It is difficult to reconcile the two careers —