

# PARTNERSHIP, NOT SALARY, FOR HOUSEWIFE, PRACTICAL PLAN, PHILADELPHIA WOMEN SAY

**Impossible to Give Monetary Return for Sacrifice and Labors of Love**

**BESIDES, MEN HELP FILL BABY'S BOTTLE**

**Nice Words of Unexpected Gift Far Outweigh Money, Club President Avers**

**TIMES change.**  
Consider for a moment the baby's bottle. In icy security it waits at 6 o'clock in the morning. Seas of black, cold linoleum surround it. Gray dawn steals in through the kitchen window and outlines a figure gingerly but firmly engaged in crossing the oil cloth.

The figure draws his bathrobe more closely about him. Pretty soon, sagely remarks the thinking woman, man will be putting in his bill for a fixed salary for these labors of love performed after hours in his home. Twenty years ago the head of the house did not get out of his warm bed in the early morning and go downstairs after his small son's provender. Today he does. In an emergency he wields a facile tea towel, too.

When representative Philadelphia women were asked if they thought housewives ought to receive a clear-cut salary just as any other officials for services rendered in the home several of them shook their heads emphatically:

"This is a new age in the home," their composite answer read. "A generation ago men provided only. The woman who does her share now in intelligent planning is as much a provider as the man. And the man has through the process of seeing his wife take a hand in the affairs of the Nation suddenly decided to take a hand in hers. Perhaps it is because of the tremendousness of the woman movement. Perhaps it is only because of the enormity of the servant problem.

At any rate, never in the history of affairs has man given such intelligent comprehension to what a woman actually has to contend with in her home. It makes him want to help! It is, you might say, the age of man's pushing the baby carriage, of man's cheerful wiping of the supper dishes. It is an age of partnership.

### Why Not a Salary for the Housekeeper?

The question in its entirety as put to eight home-making women was: Whereas woman's work never ends and requires just as much if not more energy and presence of mind and is certainly as indispensable as that of her freer sisters in offices and schools, should there not be a fixed, measurable financial reward?

The answers were interesting. They came from those secret places in women's minds not frequently opened for inspection. The president of a literary club said a woman would rather have an unexpected box of flowers or some nice words about a freak salad she had concocted than any sort of a pay envelope that could be offered. The next minute she was wondering why a man's salary was called his salary anyway. He brought it home and turned it into shoes for the children and an awning for the porch. Whose salary is it anyway?

And what if a man should charge for painting the back fence?

The president of another woman's club said she didn't believe in them, but by the simple process of trying to replace a certain woman's services in her home it had been discovered that the salary of that particular house-maker anyway could be estimated at \$57 a week.

The man who goes to San Francisco and brings home his wife a \$45 silk kimono when she needs a pair of good-looking fall shoes was scored. The man who does not provide life insurance for his wife was flayed.

The discussion the question aroused went through all of the ramifications of home life as it is lived and then entirely without relevancy, but with a superabundance of womanly directness, hung itself humorously on this peg: "Who asked women to marry anyway?"

services. Emphatically they do not want to Gomerise their homes. In the first place they don't think it would be fair. In the second place it couldn't be done. The women who worked hardest would have the husbands least able to afford salaries adequate to their efforts. Moreover, the husbands who most need this corrective measure now would be the ones always in arrears in paying the salary.

In the second place it couldn't be done! The combined service of an interior decorator, floral designer, caterer, kindergarten teacher, social worker, nurse and humorist couldn't be paid for in gold any more than the life contribution of an artist working faithfully away in the studio light of his garret.

On their own admission women do not want to unionize their hearthstones.

**Mrs. Charles Irving Purnell**



They have a dearer wish than that. They want the profession of home-making dignified. They want it lifted out of its regard as a humdrum affair and raised to its altar of righteousness—something bright, essential and entirely worth while to living.

It was Mrs. Lewis R. Dick, recording secretary of the New Century Club, who sounded this first note in what women wanted.

"I think," she said, "there in America we have not dignified home-making. There are women who loathe the kitchen and hate the sight of a thin-bladed knife. That is such a wrong, harmful attitude to take. I think it is so fine in France to see their lovely girls waiting on the table and not considering it to be demeaning in any way. Anything we set our hearts on here in America to do we can do, too. And that ought to be our aim—to make our women and our girls feel the joy and the righteousness in intelligent home-making."

Mrs. Dick, who rumor has it can put a professional cook to shame, feels that applying the salary idea to home-making would rob it of all beauty and dignity.

"There are many beautiful things in life," she said, "on which no price can be set. The only reward is an inward joy and satisfaction."

She paused to think it over quite clearly. "Woman do not want salaries for their



**Mrs. Lewis R. Dick**

**Photo Grafton**



**Miss Anna Jarvis**



**Mrs. H. H. Birney**  
*Morceau Photo*

salary implies that we aren't getting a square deal. It means we want to start quibbling about that word 'obey,' and when you do that you tear at the very foundations of the home. No, most men are fair in their dealings with women and, anyway, those who haven't been fair would be just the ones to always be in arrears with the pay envelope."

She laughed. "What would the employee of the kitchen, dining room and living room and upstairs do then? Lay down her bricks like McGinty and not work another half hour. It couldn't be done! And if it was, the woman who deserved the most salary for her careful planning and stinting would get the least because her husband could least afford to live up to the 'union demands.'"

Mrs. Purnell paused to wonder if women would be willing to live up to "union" hours themselves and forfeit their flexible privilege of not always doing today what could possibly be squeezed in tomorrow. She pointed out a margin of freedom the home woman enjoys that is never the lot of the office worker.

Next she remarked that an unexpected box of flowers or a few words of praise about a freak salad concocted in his honor would go further with a woman than any pay envelope that ever stalked.

### No Way to Measure Services of Housewife

Mrs. Herman H. Birney, president of the Philomathean Club, put herself solidly on record as to the impossibility of measuring the service of women with money. Yet she had this illuminating little story to tell:

"The question," she said, "reminds me of that story about the wife and mother, who was wanted by a county committee to do some political work. The woman said she would gladly give the two weeks if the committee could find some one to take her place in her home for that time."

**Respect of Children and Pleasure of Giving Considered Sufficient Pay by Mother of Eight Boys and a Girl**

one of that story about the wife and mother, who was wanted by a county committee to do some political work. The woman said she would gladly give the two weeks if the committee could find some one to take her place in her home for that time."

Before the committee got through it cost them \$114. Fifty seven dollars a week to take the place of mother in her home!

"But it is impossible," Mrs. Birney, who is a gold star mother, added, "to a measure in money the service of women in the home, since no one can measure love nor sacrifice nor service—those uncounted elements that enter into all human relations. It's interesting, however, for any woman who has been accustomed to being nurse, house-keeper and cook to try to replace these positions by trained service and realize the actual amount of money that must be spent."

Mrs. Birney was one of those who believed that in marriage we are working toward partnership as a goal, and she thinks in America we have developed the idea of partnership financially as well as in other ways, as it has never before been developed in history.

"I think," she said, "the majority of American women feel the honor of this full sharing in the good or evil fortunes of the home. Every woman who does her share in the home is as much its provider as the man who

### Womanisms

A woman would rather have a box of flowers than a pay envelope.

Not husbands but servants are causing the trouble.

Men push the baby carriages these days.

They will be putting in a bill for labors of love if women don't watch out.

Not salaries, life annuities for mother.

A woman would spend her salary on father and the children, anyhow!

Who asked women to marry, anyway?

On the whole, Mrs. Newkirk believes that men are fair with their wives, but she called attention to that particular species of the male who likes to indulge his ego by buying the things he likes for his spouse without consulting her. "I knew a man once," she reminisced, "who went in town and bought his wife a very handsome and expensive dress. When she sewed up her courage she went in and exchanged it for a winter suit, a simple gown and some underclothing, all of which she needed very badly."

The high cost of servants has more than anything else, Mrs. Newkirk believes, taught men to value what their own women do in their homes. It is the ill wind seeming to blow no good which has advanced the idea of partnership in marriage as much as the tenets of equal rights for women.

The rest of the problem is up to the women themselves, it was pointed out. Surrounding homemaking with an atmosphere of dignity and happiness would raise it to the level and beyond the level of the actual salaried work of educated women.

That clarion call for partnership, and not salaries, in the home was echoed in the sentiments of Mrs. John B. Roberts, president of the New Century Club.

"The home must be conducted on a fifty-fifty basis," Mrs. Roberts said. "I do not believe women would care to or should consider payment founded on a professional basis."

That clarion call for partnership, and not salaries, in the home was echoed in the sentiments of Mrs. John B. Roberts, president of the New Century Club.

"I do not believe women would care to or should consider payment founded on a professional basis."

### Husbands the Least Of Woman's Worries

Not husbands but servants are providing the average home-maker with annoyance these days. In the opinion of Mrs. James Andrews, formerly chairman of the Home Economics Committee of the Woman's Club of Germantown. There never was a time when men seemed to comprehend as well the problems of women in their homes. Mrs. Andrews said, but there could be little hope for ease in home-making until sentiment regarding work done by the hands be changed.

"In these days of household budgets," this wife and mother observed, "it is not so much the question, it seems to me, of having her service paid for which is engaging the average home-maker as her eagerness to eliminate the annoyances that hamper the better performances of her many duties.

In many, if not in most, homes this is due to the very inefficient service rendered today. No one, generally speaking, comes into your home in the spirit of service, and until we can bring about a change in sentiment regarding work done by hand there can be little improvement."

Mrs. Andrews believes our hope rests in the new generation of house-keepers who perform simply their home-making, proving themselves superior to their duty rather than making themselves slaves to it. The es-



**Mrs. Walter M. Newkirk**

operation and intelligent interest of their husbands, she pointed out, did much toward helping them solve their problems.

Should women receive salaries for the work they do in their homes?

### Children Her Salary, Says Mrs. Northrop

It was the mother of a boy and one girl, Mrs. Herbert Northrop, who gave answer to this. Out in her spacious home in Oak Lane she said:

"Salaries for women in their homes! I have taken mine out in the love and respect of my boys and my girls. I have given myself body, and looking around at them I feel sort of worthwhile because it has been given to me to give. At the end of each day I am happy and at the end of my life I feel I'll be satisfied."

Salaries for women in their homes! Many words had been exchanged on the subject, but what Mrs. Northrop said had shone in the eyes of all of the women as they talked. The priceless goods of the world must forever go on being gratuitous.

for the faithful wife and mother. Her work lasts beyond her husband's working hours and in country times through the night. It is a bitter experience for a bride to leave the loving care of a good parental home or a well-paying position in the business world and later be sentenced to a life of hard labor without recompense."

### Turn Over the Salary To Wife, Is Suggested

The impossibility to evaluate their services on a business basis was given by Mrs. Walter M. Newkirk as one reason against unionizing the home and the homemaker. Mrs. Newkirk is chairman of the Industrial Relations Committee of the Civic Club.

"The very simplest plan to follow in the modest home is the one that is largely followed—that of turning the entire pay envelope over to the woman. It is certainly a successful way, because it is a notorious fact that a woman can make a dollar go farther than a man. She doesn't spend the money on things that aren't needed before she

When a man follows this plan he