

"Just take one instance--Wellington at Waterloo. Here we have a highly trained, brilliant general, with the stupendous task on his hands of breaking the advancing power of Napoleon. Here is Wellington on the field against Napoleon, manoeuvres to be directed, attacks launched, cannon, gun fire, artillery, galloping horses. I ask you to consider in the midst of all this-- what would have happened if Wellington had been in the Officers' Mess making macaroni and cheese for supper?

"Now we do not want you to feel that we have planned an attack on mankind in general, but we must point out one more dangerous tendency arising from our opponents' ambition to teach men household economics. This time we must face the fact that there many women-- not any of us of course-- who would only be too glad to let somebody else do the household tasks, if there were anyone else in the house who could. There is a grave danger that the easy-going or lazy woman would be glad to sit back and slump-- if the husband showed any knowledge or sign of being as proficient as she at household affairs--then she could neglect her duties, hobnob off to bridges and teas and meetings of the Institute, and leave tasks and responsibilities to her husband--tasks and responsibilities which she must do, because she's the only one now who can.

"No--to protect ourselves, to keep our kingdom secure, our tradition alive, let men stay out of household affairs.

Mrs. T.J.Mulvihill, the second speaker for the affirmative, spoke as follows:-

"Our worthy opponents maintain that what is not done is a strong argument in their favour. I might remind our opponents that not so many years ago, nursing was not done, public health clinics, nor organized hospital nursing; not so long ago, people were not using telephones, cars, radios, aeroplanes, or all our modern electrical appliances, but all these progressive movements and ideas have to have a beginning. Missionaries, founders, pioneers and these pioneers have been scoffed at, ridiculed, argues, hampered, hindered-- but see what they have accomplished.

"Look at Florence Nightingale, Madame Curie, Pasteur. I could name hundreds of pioneers in every field, so perhaps my poor colleague and myself, in spite of the brilliant logic and overwhelming arguments of our opponents, may have our names honored for our desperate endeavours to-day to support a noble cause.

"The feeling that a home is a women's domain, that it is a manless paradise, is a false feeling. A man marries a woman to share his home, not work like a slave from morning till night, with no salary and few comforts. No man who goes to business, works as hard as a woman with a family and carrying on alone. If he were trained to share her duties at any moment of crisis or misfortune, in the good days he would be willing to do so, just because he can. Did you ever see a man with a clever hand for furnishing or cooking, who hid his talent under a bushel? Modesty is not the greatest of his virtues, he not only boasts about it, but does it and willingly so.

"Let us look into the home of the poor, of the unemployed. They can't afford nursing or hospital care, the work is harder, because of the worn walls and floors, greater skill is required in cooking a limited quantity, and often the same food. A needle and thread and a patch must take the place of new clothes, the leg must remain off the furniture, the stove must remain loosened at the joints, because there is no money for repairs, the husband is unemployed. How much better instead of standing around in idle groups, listening to the propaganda of the breeders of discontent, how much better if he were usefully employed at home doing repairs skilfully, minding the children with knowledge and gentleness, maybe using his skill on odd jobs around the neighborhood. A man should be trained in at least the rudiments of household economics.

"Nobody questions a man's ability to learn any trade or art, he isn't stupid because he can't cook. Cooking is just a trade, it is a profession