

Educating Women for Work: Government Training Programs for Women before, during, and after World War II

**by Ruth Roach Pierson
and Marjorie Cohen**

Some contemporary opponents to women's employment in non-traditional occupations argue that women are not in such jobs because they choose not to be.¹ Underlying that argument is an assumption of freedom of choice and equality of opportunity that flies in the face of historical experience, for even the briefest look at the historical record reveals the powerful social and economic forces channelling women's labour into certain areas and erecting barriers to keep it out of others. The type and accessibility of job training constitute one such force, at the same time as it is linked to, influenced by, and indicative of others. An examination of three vocational training programs developed in Canada under federal legislation between 1937 and 1947 - the Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Program of 1937-40, the War Emergency Training Program of 1940-44, and the rehabilitation component of the Canadian Vocational Training Program, 1945-47¹ - demonstrates the relationship between economic conditions, social definitions of femininity, and women's employment.

During this ten-year period, Canada underwent three distinct labour market phases. Of particular interest are the effects on women as training programs changed to accommodate labour glut, labour scarcity, and the transition from wartime to peacetime economy. The type of training provided for women did indeed vary with changes in demands on the labour market, but what was considered "normal" work for women remained sur-

prisingly constant, even after the experience of war. In fact, throughout the period the training possibilities for women were limited by conceptions of women's social role and fears of female competition for men's jobs. Furthermore, it will be seen that middle- to upper-class women's organizations,¹ recognized by government as the representatives of women's interests, placed their influence behind the prevailing inclination of public policy to preserve sex-typed occupations, the sexual division of labour, and the class-based occupational structure.

THE DOMINION-PROVINCIAL YOUTH TRAINING PROGRAM

The first program, the Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Program, was introduced in 1937 as a means of alleviating unemployment among people between the ages of sixteen and thirty. Four main types of training project were developed: (1) training in the primary resource industries of forestry and mining; (2) urban occupational training, for "skilled" or "semi-skilled" jobs; (3) rural training designed to keep young people on the land; and (4) physical recreation and health training. Within the program as a whole, the courses for men and the courses for women were kept separate and distinct. Women were totally excluded from training in mining and forestry. The fourth was not really vocational training at all, but rather physical education intended to raise the morale and increase the physical fitness of Canada's young people, with only two provinces, Alberta and British Columbia, participating. Domestic training for women predominated in the remaining two categories, especially in the rural training courses for women, where it was seen as preparatory to a life as farm wife. While young men were given courses in general agriculture, farm mechanics, rural community leadership, and even egg and poultry grading and beekeeping (occupations traditionally within the preserve of farm wives and daughters), young rural women were offered courses in handicrafts and homecraft. Domestic training for women also came first in urban occupational training. While men were offered industrial apprenticeships, and training courses in such fields as motor mechanics, carpentry, electronics, machine shop, building construction, welding, and even ski instructing, the most prevalent form of training for women in almost all provinces was that provided in Home Service Training Schools. Indeed, approximately 60 per cent of the women in urban occupational training were enrolled in these schools to be trained as

domestic servants. The remaining 40 per cent were scattered through an array of other sex-typed courses including dress-making, retail selling, catering for tourists, waitressing, home nursing, interior decorating, "commercial refresher," and "industrial learnerships" in power sewing machine operation.¹

This emphasis on domestic training as primary vocational training for girls and women was no historical aberration. Faced with a chronic shortage of domestic servants since the late 1800's, organized women, both urban and rural, pressured governments to meet the need through immigration policies favouring female domestics and through the promotion of domestic science instruction in the public schools.² With immigration restricted after the onset of the depression, emphasis by necessity shifted onto training as the method of recruiting domestics, and many women's organizations, such as the National Council of Women and the YWCA, appealed to the government with a new urgency for the establishment of state-supported schools for domestic servants. Members of women's organizations were believed to have special knowledge of training requirements, as well as the ability to influence potential employers regarding working conditions. Thus, they were directly incorporated into the program's administration once the schools were established.

Setting up schools for domestic servants had also been the advice of the Women's Employment Committee of the National Employment Commission.³ In studying the effects of the depression on women's employment opportunities, the Women's Employment Committee had found unemployment in almost every classic women's occupation except domestic service.⁴ Indeed, domestic service was one of the few areas in which there was actual expansion in employment for women.⁵ Contributing to this were the changes in income distribution during the depression: some lower-middle-class housewives could now afford a maid, given the low pay many desperate women were forced to accept.⁶ Despite the employment opportunities in domestic service, the supply did not outstrip the demand, primarily because of the unattractiveness of the occupation: the low pay, irregular and long hours, isolation, poor working conditions (including employer-employee relations), and social stigma.

The Home Service Training School program had as its objective eliminating all those rebarbative features and raising the status and prestige of domestic work. A presupposition underpinning the program was that proper training was necessary, not to stimulate demand for female domestic workers but to stimulate supply. The architects of the household training schemes reasoned that once women were properly trained and certified, then

employers would begin paying them higher wages and more respect, with the result that more women would seek jobs as domestics.¹⁰

The Home Service Training Schools drew on the model of servant courses set up by such women's voluntary organizations as the YWCA earlier in the depression. Approximately half the schools were fully residential; in the others, trainees took turns living in a "practice house." Instruction was provided in the basic skills of housework: preparation and serving of food, daily and weekly cleaning of rooms, laundry, sewing and mending, and answering the door and telephone. Certain subjects, such as table setting and use and care of electrical equipment, clearly indicate the perceived gap between the accustomed standard of living of the trainee and that of her prospective employer. Marketing and budgeting were not taught universally; and child-care training, where it appeared, was connected with home-nursing and occupied a relatively insignificant place on the curriculum. Classes on deportment, personal attitude, employer and employee relationships, and personal habits and appearance were designed to promote "the development of right attitudes to work, clearly, a high priority among employers."¹¹

The term "hostess method" was applied to the approach adopted by some schools of having the trainees go out to work in selected local homes to obtain practical experience. The federal Department of Labour official report of November 1938 acknowledged that the possible benefits of the hostess method could well be outweighed by its inherent dangers, the chief of which being that the trainees could too easily be exploited and used to replace char-women or other casual household help.

Despite the project's stated objective, the Home Service Training Schools had limited success in improving the status, pay, working conditions, or employer-employee relations of domestic service. One report noted that talks to women's organizations were necessary to educate "employers to their responsibility in the treatment of girls who come into their homes for home service work" for it was "quite apparent that some employers have much need of education along this line."¹²

On the issues of working conditions and pay, there were clear differences in perspective between labour and management.¹³ While the women in Vancouver who organized the Domestic Workers' Union No. 91 in 1936 were demanding a forty-eight-hour week and inclusion in the minimum wage laws, the Victoria Branch of the YWCA, the first in Canada to inaugurate a "Household Training Course" to train young women for domestic service, was recommending that the hours of work for "girls"

employed in homes should not exceed sixty per week and the national YWCA was only willing to endorse a recommendation for a maximum eleven-hour day or sixty-nine-hour week.¹⁴ Similarly, while the Saskatchewan Provincial Executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada sought inclusion of domestic workers under the Minimum Wage Act, the 1940 Household Employment Study Group of Preston, Ontario, composed of housewife employers of domestic help, concluded "that the situation is not ready for legislation as to hours and wages" since "it is better for a girl to be in a home with room and board, even at low wages, than to be without work."¹⁵ Clearly, self-interest motivated such pronouncements.

Nor did the Home Service Training School project succeed in removing the social stigma attached to domestic service in the eyes of prospective household workers. The November 1938 survey reported that:

In many localities it has been found difficult to get girls from families in receipt of direct relief to undergo such a course of training, or to accept work on its conclusion. There is a deep-seated prejudice against this type of work, not only among the young women themselves, but among their parents.¹⁶

Although the Youth Training Program was implemented specifically to help young people "not gainfully employed and certified as being in necessitous circumstances, including deserving transients,"¹⁷ the administrators of the Home Service Training Schools took a dim view of recruits who were overly "necessitous," such as "'problem' girls" sent to the schools for training by social welfare agencies. A general assumption in operation by late 1938 was "that the more necessitous the trainee, the less suitable she is for the work."¹⁸ There thus remained an unresolved contradiction between the employer's desire for "a finer type of girl" and the stubbornly unattractive nature of the live-in servant's job, which repelled all but the most vulnerable and least advantaged women in the labour market. While official reports at the time stated that the Home Service Training School project was successful, the small number trained (3,683 by May 1940) and the fact that the schools' enrolments rarely reached capacity indicate that it was not the raging success its planners had hoped it would be.¹⁹

This solution to female unemployment was generally viewed, however, as both sensible and feasible. Domestic service was an occupation traditionally associated with women where there would be no competition with men and where demand perpe-

tuallly outran supply. Members of women's organizations found the promotion of domestic training compatible with their conception of the proper niche for a certain class of women; with their perception of the only alternative for unfortunate women forced onto the job market; and with their charitable impulse to help needy women find work during difficult economic times, an impulse that dovetailed more often than not with their own demands for domestic help. Neither government nor women's groups questioned the assumption that housework was women's responsibility, whether performed directly or supervised by women, and neither questioned the class structure that made paid housework the obvious occupation for poor females. Moreover, that women's organizations pushed for domestic training programs was as much a function of the members' own confinement to the domestic sphere and of their own responsibility for housework as it was of the lack of alternative job opportunities for women.

THE DOMINION-PROVINCIAL WAR EMERGENCY TRAINING PROGRAM

The second program, the War Emergency Training Program, formally came into being in 1940. Under it women were trained for employment in some trades previously operated as male enclaves, but that training was still designed to prepare women differently from men, above all for a more circumscribed working life.

As early as 1938-39, when war was only a strong possibility, the government began adapting the Youth Training Program to national defence purposes. Specifically, in 1938, arrangements were made for certain provinces to train men in aircraft manufacture and, in the spring of 1939, to train ground mechanics for the air force. With the actual outbreak of war in September 1939, the Youth Training Program was further altered to meet the growing needs for war industrial training and trades training in the armed forces. A plan for a special War Emergency Training Program was drawn up during the summer of 1940, and the War Measures Act was invoked to make it possible for the federal government to assume most of the cost of war-related training projects.²⁰ Provinces and municipalities contributed the shops of their vocational and technical schools during summer vacation and after regular school hours. By the end of 1940, "the War Emergency Training Programme ... formally came into being after a year and a half of progressive evolution

... "21 Projects formerly carried on under Youth Training were allowed to lapse while schedules of new projects to be undertaken were attached to new federal-provincial agreements.

Labour power *per se* did not become a problem in Canada until almost two years after the start of the war. By the late 1930's the depression had eased somewhat, but in September 1939 the official unemployment rate still included some 600,000 to 900,000 unemployed, depending on the source. In the early stages of the war, Canada's production effort, principally in the primary sector providing raw materials and food, was not strained, but after the fall of France in June 1940, as Canada's production of war equipment for allied armies was stepped up, her industrial sector began increasingly to suffer shortages of skilled and semi-skilled labour. Hence, there was a need to expand and formalize a War Emergency Training Program.

At the outset practically all the trainees were male. "All other factors being equal unemployed men will be first assigned provided they have the requisite capacity to benefit from the training or to perform the work," the *Labour Gazette* reported in January 1941 as one of the principles that would govern the implementation of the War Emergency Training Program.²³ Preference was to be shown to veterans of the Great War, soldiers discharged from the armed forces in the current war, and men over forty years of age. The minimum age of admission was sixteen.²⁴

Female trainees were enrolled only in Ontario classes, and they numbered a mere 271 out of a total 10,156 enrolled in classes throughout Canada during the first four months of 1941.²⁵ At that time women were being accepted for training only when "specifically sponsored by employers."²⁶ In such cases, the employer would select the trainees and specify the kind of training desired. Since training was usually quite specialized, the time the trainee spent at the school could be as little as two weeks, in contrast to the normal course of more general training, which lasted three months.²⁷

At least until the end of 1941 women continued to be trained for domestic service under the Youth Training Program. More than 847 received training in Home Service Schools in Manitoba, Quebec, Alberta, and British Columbia in 1941.²⁸ During that year women in New Brunswick, Quebec, Manitoba, Alberta, and British Columbia were also given specialized training in dressmaking, power sewing machine operating, and handicrafts. In November, however, the Director of Training in the Department of Labour informed the Minister that instructions

had been sent out to all regional directors to arrange for war industrial training for women as soon as the local supply of male applicants ran out.²⁹ By the end of 1941 war industrial training had been given to 3,341 women, albeit mostly in Ontario, and they constituted approximately 17 per cent of the total then enrolled.¹⁰

The industrial training program itself was expanding. In June 1941 training was being offered at seventy-five vocational schools across the country. By the end of the year there were 101, located in all provinces except Prince Edward Island." The number of training centres in operation fluctuated with the changes in demand in different areas, but settled by mid-1943 to an average of about 120. Where there were not enough vocational shops in existing technical schools, former Youth Training centres were taken over for the War Emergency Training Program or additional special centres were opened and equipped. "When the demand for training was at its peak most of the centres operated two shifts and some of them three shifts per day."³² For instance, Toronto's Central Technical School, which helped pioneer the Program, operated on a three-shift, twenty-four hour basis, with regular public school classes for boys and girls from 8:45 a.m. to 3 p.m., and two shifts for war trainees, the first from 3:30 to 11:20, and the midnight shift from 11:30 p.m. until 7:30 a.m. No women were allowed to attend the midnight class."

In September 1941, training within industry was also brought under the jurisdiction of the Training Branch of the federal Department of Labour. And in early 1942 the War Emergency Training Program acquired authority to co-operate with industry in the organization and operation of plant schools that would provide types of training not available in the pre-employment centres. By mid-1943, 105 approved plant schools were in operation and receiving financial and technical assistance from government. In addition, part-time classes to facilitate the upgrading and promotion of persons already employed in industry were started and quickly expanded during 1942.

Besides training for war industry, the War Emergency Training Program was also designed from the start to supplement the trades training of the armed forces. Shortly after the creation of the women's services³⁴—the RCAF (Women's Division), the Canadian Women's Army Corps, and the Women's Royal Canadian Naval Service—between the summers of 1941 and 1942, female personnel also became eligible for training. The trades training in the service was offered in separate classes for men and women, and, although it increased over the years, the

number of trades in which women could be trained remained only a fraction of those open to men. A large proportion of servicewomen were trained as clerk stenographers for the army and air force. In the spring of 1942 a class of women cooks was receiving instruction at Toronto's Central Technical School in preparation for service with the Canadian Women's Army Corps.³⁵

As the expansion in the War Emergency Training Program was occurring, Canada's sources of labour supply among men, however preferred, continued to decline steeply. When Prime Minister Mackenzie King announced on March 24, 1942, the establishment of National Selective Service to co-ordinate and direct the near total mobilization of Canada's labour power for the war effort, he designated bringing women into industry as "the most important single feature of the program," and specified a series of ten measures to be undertaken, including the provision "of training programs specifically designed for women."³⁶ Even before he spoke, arrangements had been made to increase the numbers of women in pre-employment industrial training, especially in Ontario but elsewhere as well. By the end of February 1942, training schools in Quebec, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia were also enrolling women in industrial classes. From April to December of 1942 the female proportion of full-time pre-employment trainees overall rose to 48 per cent (total men: 12,453; total women: 11,579). Meanwhile the proportion of female trainees in full-time and part-time plant school classes as well as in part-time classes in technical schools was also increasing.³⁷

The trades in which instruction was being given to women included: machine shop practice; ammunition filling; fine instrument mechanics; power machine operating; welding (arc and acetylene); aircraft sheet metal and aircraft woodworking; aircraft fabric and doping; bench fitting and assembling; electric wiring and radio and electric assembly; industrial chemistry; drafting and mechanical drawing; inspecting; and laboratory technician work." Clearly, women were being trained in skills previously confined to males. Nonetheless, the policy was to protect men's privileged position as "skilled" workers in industry and thus keep women's admission to "skilled" jobs to a minimum.³⁹ This policy was implemented in a variety of ways.

First, there was the general policy of giving priority to eligible men over eligible women. The first Director of National Selective Service made assurances to that effect in April 1942, when he explained that "we don't intend to bring women in one door and have skilled men forced out the other." Acknowledging that

skilled male workers were still unemployed in some sections of Canada, he agreed that "it would be folly to recruit women in these places, until the men have been absorbed." Furthermore, he declared that it would be "contrary to the principles of the selective service regulations that an employer utilize those regulations to replace men with women merely for the sake of having the same work done at lower cost." He ended with an emphatic endorsement of the principle of the primacy of the male breadwinner.⁴⁰

Another way in which women's access to skilled work was circumscribed resulted from a reorganization of production. This was most easily effected in plants that had to undergo considerable reorganization in any case to convert from peacetime to wartime production. Impressed by "scientific management schemes" developed in Britain and the United States, the Inter-Departmental Committee on Labour Co-ordination recommended in December 1941 that, to reduce the demand for skilled labour,

Jobs will be broken down, and the trained mechanics will devote their time to the most skilled part of the work. The rest of the work will be divided among others next [to] the mechanics in line, each of whom ought to be broken in on his part of the job with a few weeks training. New employees will be taken on at the bottom on the least skilled jobs and moved up as rapidly as circumstances and their abilities permit.⁴¹

This increased subdivision and stratification of the production line made it possible to reserve the most "skilled" jobs at the top for long-term male employees while bringing in at the bottom new employees to perform minute and monotonous operations requiring a minimum of training.⁴² Despite the promise of advancement contained in the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Labour Co-ordination, the actual possibility of many of the minimally trained new workers moving very far up the ladder of skill was strictly limited by the imperatives of the war emergency with its short-term goals.

The introduction of improved machinery facilitated reorganization. Praising the revolution in technology necessitated by the war effort, a *Maclean's* article spoke reverently of the new machines developed to remove the responsibility for accuracy from human beings and rigged with so many stops and checks that the possibility of error was reduced almost to the vanishing point. The novice operator, "schooling in a few simple tasks and motions," could hardly go wrong unless he or she fell asleep on

the job.⁴⁵ These changes in the organization and technology of production meant that industry could rely increasingly on inexperienced and minimally trained workers. By 1942-43, as production was stepped up in munitions, ammunition, aircraft, and fine instrument manufacture, their ranks were increasingly female.

The media played up the connection between the greater use of women in war industry and the introduction of machines compatible with women's learning capacities. Thus a female trainee was quoted in *Maclean's* as saying of her lathe, "with a look of amazed delight on her face, 'Why, it's easier to run than a sewing machine.'"" And according to *Canadian Aviation*, Vultee Aircraft Incorporated had made a careful study of the problems involved in employing women and found that if machines could be developed to compensate for women's alleged inferior co-ordination and inferior weight, height, and strength, then "women make loyal and productive workers, and can handle a surprising number of type of jobs." Another *Canadian Aviation* article gave detailed examples of "methods improvements" introduced into the production of the Harvard advanced trainer at Noorduy Aviation Limited, which allowed female operators to work more efficiently than male operators using the old methods.

Training provided for women under the War Emergency Training Program was designed to fit them for specific jobs for the duration of the war, not for lifetime careers as skilled workers, much less skilled mechanics who might compete with men in the post-war job market. This was obvious in the generally shorter training period for women. At the beginning of the program the length of the normal course was set at three months, but increased specialization in industry and the attendant need for workers trained in a very narrow range of skills led to the introduction of a wide variety of shorter courses. Two weeks was set as the minimum training period. This reduction in the training period, as *the Labour Gazette* reported, was "particularly evident in regard to women, where the majority of the training courses last from two to six weeks." "Inevitably," the *Labour Gazette* continued, "this type of training produces people who can only perform one job and are lacking in a wider range of skill."⁴⁷

At Toronto's Central Technical School, the average length of industrial training courses was from ten to twelve weeks, but some highly technical subjects, such as industrial chemistry and machine drafting, went on for twenty weeks. "On the other hand," a *Maclean's* article noted, "three weeks instruction is

sufficient to teach most women to run a power machine, or to work efficiently on assembly jobs requiring only a single main operation."⁴⁸ At Small Arms Limited, makers of the Sten gun and the Lee-Enfield rifle, new female employees found themselves on the production line after only one day in the classroom. Instruction was limited to four basic machines, a milling machine, turret lathe, drill, and surface grinder, and, with some continuing supervision from patrolling instructresses, women who had had no previous industrial experience were found to perform well after the single day's training. As one woman recalled, "they showed you on your first shift" - that was the extent of her training.

In general, war had necessitated a revolution in vocational training because, to meet the demands of war production, "Skill had to be created overnight." Justifiable only because the war emergency left no alternative, the crash training courses were seen as a radical departure from the "normal vocational training" that aimed at producing a well-rounded (male) worker with a wide range of skills. During the war, men as well as women underwent "hurried training in specialized tasks, but women's training was by and large the more hurried and the more specialized of the two."⁵⁰

Women's access to skilled trades was also restricted by the job-specific training they received. One way in which the reluctance to hire women was overcome was through the designation of certain work processes as ideally suited to innate female traits. Women workers could then be concentrated in those "feminized" tasks. Improvement of machinery in the direction of increased automation and mechanization, which was fundamental to the subdivision and de-skilling of production also made possible the "feminization" of those operations.

It was widely believed that women were by nature more patient, more dexterous, and more capable of detailed, eye-grueling work than men." *Canadian Aviation*, for example, conceded that there were certain advantages to employing women: "Women thrive on routine, continued repetition of which would drive men to distraction," and "Women are faster than men at sorting small objects and any operations requiring digital dexterity." Thus, women came to be regarded as eminently well suited for precision work in any kind of fine instrument assemblage, in electronics and optics, in various stages of aircraft, gun, or ammunition manufacture, and in the inspecting of war equipment. Thelma LeCocq wrote in *Maclean's*, for example, about the "deft-fingered" women who excelled at fine precision work in a plant that made airplane instruments, including finely

adjusted meters to register voltage, current, and fuel. About 40 per cent of the workers in the plant were women. On the meters they did

close machine work, winding wires only a few thousandths of an inch in diameter on tiny spools the size you'd find in a child's sewing set. They set jewels, synthetic sapphires hardly larger than a granule of white sugar, using fine tweezers to convey them to the lathe. They run machines that cut screws almost as delicate as the screws in a watch.

And to provide training for these jobs, management did not even have to draw on the War Emergency Training Program because the precision work could be learned by the women, given their natural endowments of "dexterity, patience and keen eyesight," in "only two or three days training right in the plant."⁵³ It was precisely the dull, repetitious, eye-straining jobs created by the greater subdivision of the production process that could be "feminized" and that women could be prepared for with a minimum of training.

Although the specific war industrial jobs for which women were recruited and trained extended into a large range of occupations formerly confined to men, the woman in the non-traditional job had probably received less extensive training than her male counterpart. The narrow, job-specific instruction that characterized women's training under the War Emergency Training Program handicapped any woman who desired to continue in a non-traditional occupation at war's end.⁵⁴ That narrowness of training was based in part on the assumption that women had come forward to work in machine shops out of patriotic motives and only for the duration of the war. As the Nova Scotia Director of Technical Education wrote of the women trained in his province, the general and theoretical aspects of the machine tool trade "did not interest them as much as the practical shopwork because they had no long-term ambition to become journeymen in order to continue in the trade after the war."⁵⁵ Whether such statements were based on facts or prescription, they nevertheless reflected a set of attitudes and practices that served to curtail any such "long-term ambition."

A minimum of training had brought the largest proportion of women war workers onto the production line at the lowest levels of skill where they could be concentrated in "feminized" tasks that depended for smooth performance on the allegedly superior female capacity for monotony and intricate work. During the war more than 50,000 civilian women had taken training for

work in war industries, in addition to the women who had been trained for trades in the armed forces. The tendency of that training to be different and unequal prepared the way for the separate treatment of women in the rehabilitation training programs of the post-war world.

CANADIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND REHABILITATION FOR WOMEN

However truncated and task-specific, War Emergency Training for women had extended into non-traditional trades. Rehabilitation training of women for the post-war world, in contrast, reverted to more conventional pre-war conceptions of labour suitable for women. As early as January 1943, when war employment was nearing its peak and a shortage of even women's labour was beginning to be felt, the Director of Training in the federal Department of Labour stressed, in a routine letter to regional directors, that in arranging for vocational training for ex-servicewomen, they should "keep in mind the employment opportunities as they may exist in the post-war period, and the likelihood that employment of women may be discontinued entirely or at least greatly diminished, in the metal trades and other heavy industries."⁵⁶

It was estimated that at the height of women's involvement in war production in October 1943, 261,000 women had been recruited into war industrial jobs. Already by April 1, 1945, thousands of those jobs had been eliminated, resulting in the layoff of more than 80,000 women war workers.⁵⁷ In addition, approximately 50,000 women had served in the armed forces, of whom all but some Nursing Sisters faced discharge as the women's services were slowly reduced in strength after V-E Day until finally being disbanded in the second half of 1946.

Fears that massive demobilization at war's end would lead to a recurrence of post-war slump as after the Great War, or to a return to the dismal conditions of the 1930's, were counterbalanced by a heightened confidence in capitalism's ability to produce and in government's ability to plan.⁵⁸ As it was believed that planning in a democracy should not be arbitrary,⁵⁹ planners conducted surveys of post-war employment intentions. The 1944 Weir Report on post-war employment prospects in Canada sought to ascertain what type of occupation armed forces personnel were planning to enter or train for after discharge. With respect to servicewomen's preferences, "an extraordinary preponderance," as the Minister of Pensions and National Health

expressed it, put stenography as the occupation of their choice. Even marriage, as indicated by the choice of "home-making," was "a poor second, followed by nursing, university courses, teaching, book-keeping and clerical work."⁶⁰ These results are not surprising, given the apparently sex-typed list of choices offered the servicewomen and the fact that the overwhelming majority of women in the armed forces had been trained as clerks and clerk-stenographers.⁶¹ Furthermore, stenography was, after all, at the top of the hierarchy of clerical skills. Unfortunately, Weir did not survey the post-war employment preferences of the over 200,000 women war workers. There never was a reliable survey made of how many women employed during the war at non-traditional jobs would have wanted to stay in such work after the war.

On the equally crucial question of whether or not women wanted to stay on in paid work outside the home, the surveys came up with conflicting results. On the basis of questionnaires distributed among women war workers and interviews with employers and business experts, the 1943 government Sub-Committee on the Post-War Problems of Women estimated that between 45 per cent and 55 per cent of the 600,000 women who had entered the paid labour force since 1939 would be responding to "the normal urge towards marriage, and home, and family life" and therefore would be leaving their paid jobs once the war was over.⁶² In contrast, one Labour Department survey of the "post-war working intentions" of 19,710 civilian men and 10,135 civilian women, conducted in 1944, showed 28 per cent of the women, as compared with 2 per cent of the men, intending to quit work after the war to take care of a home. That left 72 per cent wanting to stay in the work force.⁶³ A Gallup poll of the Toronto area found that 80 per cent of all women employed full-time intended to continue after the war and that one-half of the married women workers hoped to keep their jobs. Moreover, some unnamed but "large" trade union had recently surveyed 1,000 of its female members asking whether or not they would continue to work after the war, if a job were available. Eighty-four per cent of the married women, 95 per cent of the single women, and 100 per cent of the widows answered yes.⁶⁴

Faced with such survey results and committed to the principle of freedom of choice, post-war planners might conceivably have done everything within their power to safeguard a woman's right freely to choose her occupation as well as whether or not to work for pay. The possibility for change in the post-war economy, including change in the direction of improving women's economic position, was enormous. Women's contribution to the

war effort had been impressive and they had received recognition as capable workers in areas normally the preserve of men. Important also was the vision of a more egalitarian society that the war effort had generated. Dr. Olive Ruth Russell, appointed in January 1945 to the Department of Veterans' Affairs as an executive assistant, specializing in the rehabilitation of servicewomen, was fond of quoting Winston Churchill's claim that "War had taught us to make vast strides forward toward a more complete equalization of the parts to be played by men and women in society."⁶⁵

But undercutting any commitment to equality was the conviction on the part of most post-war planners that for most women the primary role should be the dual one of wife and mother, a role not to be combined, except in the direst circumstances, with paid employment outside the home. That belief coloured the major statements of reconstruction social policy that dealt at all with women, from the Final Report of the Sub-Committee on the Post-War Problems of Women to Leonard C. Marsh's Report on Social Security for Canada 1943. While asserting the principle of women's right to work, whether married or not, the government sub-committee nonetheless deferred to the contradictory principle of male economic primacy, regarding the creation of "sufficient well-paid employment for men" as of primary importance and as the necessary precondition for the best solution to the problem of women's crowding the labour market after the war - their withdrawal from wage work to devote themselves to home and family.⁶⁶ In its look at the post-war future, the Wartime Information Board based its "full employment campaign" in part on the expectation "that a good many *women* in the Services and in civilian jobs are looking forward to changing their tunics and overalls for aprons, as soon as the woman-power shortage is over."⁶⁷

So, in spite of the vision of a more egalitarian society in the future and a professed confidence in the ability of government to plan for post-war full employment, there was no attempt in the post-war planning schemes to maintain the gains for women in social and employment policy that had been made during the war.⁶⁸ Rather, the aim was to return to a pre-war social reality, but without the disability of the pre-war economy, that is, without unemployment. The result was rhetoric that stressed the equal application of the training schemes to men and women; at the same time, a program was instituted that stressed women's traditional roles as paid or unpaid workers in the home and that reinforced the segregated participation of women in the labour force.

Government officials responsible for the post-war rehabilitation training program, initially designed for armed services personnel but extended in March 1945 to civilian workers displaced by the close-down of war industries,⁶⁹ were proud of Canada's progressive treatment of women. Dr. Russell doubted that any country had gone as far as Canada in "abolishing sex discrimination and the granting of equal status to women" in its legislation pertaining to ex-service personnel.⁷⁰ A Department of Labour booklet listed as one of the principles governing Canadian vocational training that "Women have equality with men in all opportunities for training."⁷¹

Equal opportunity, however, was not understood to mean the same opportunity or the same training. Commonly it was assumed that when women were given the freedom to choose, they would conform to traditional expectations. For instance, Dr. Russell told a Department of Veterans' Affairs counsellors' training course in February 1945 that it was unlikely women would "be interested in pursuing some of the training open to men," because of the "physical requirements, or other conditions of the job," although it would be "poor psychology to close any courses to them." She also quoted the advice of Mrs. Edgar Hardy, president of the National Council of Women, to the Training Branch of the Department of Labour: "'Open all courses equally to men and women and you will find only very few women will enter what might be classed as courses typical for men.'¹¹⁷² Comments like these revealed a growing recognition that an "open-door" policy would not necessarily guarantee a return to pre-war sex roles. Therefore, deliberate steps were taken to ensure that the structure of the program limited the choice women could make: the selection process; the distinctly unequal treatment married women received in rehabilitation measures; and the designing of training courses specifically for women all served to make women's choice a narrow one indeed.

If interested in vocational training, an ex-serviceman or woman would consult an Employment and Selective Service office. From there an application for training would be forwarded to a District Rehabilitation Board, which would consider the individual's request for a specific type of training and approve it if the training desired conformed to what "would be most desirable in view of each applicant's background and aptitudes."¹¹⁷¹ The District Rehabilitation Board was instructed to keep the following criteria in mind: (1) the trainee's physical condition; (2) previous education; (3) occupational experience prior to enlistment or while in the forces; (4) trainee's own preference and aptitudes; and (5) employment opportunities.⁷⁴ These criteria built

the potential for discrimination against women into the selection process.

In addition, the unequal treatment of married women in provisions for subsistence allowances constituted another restriction on women's access to training. Unemployed civilians being trained in full-time classes were paid subsistence allowances at the following rates: \$1.15 per day for a single person living at home; \$1.50 per day for a single person living away from home; \$2.15 per day for heads of families living at home; and \$3.00 per day for heads of families living away from home.⁷⁵ The scale of maintenance grants to be paid to veteran trainees provided for payment of \$60 a month to single men and women and \$80 a month to married men. In addition, monthly allowances were to be paid for each dependent child up to six and for dependent parents. Although the language of the rehabilitation pamphlets issued by Labour and Veterans' Affairs was ambiguous on this point, it would appear that neither married female veterans nor married civilian women out of work were entitled to their own maintenance or subsistence grants while in training. It also seems reasonable to infer that, because servicewomen were not entitled to dependants' allowances for husbands or children while in service, they would not be as ex-servicewomen. Certainly in the case of the out-of-work benefit available to ex-service personnel, it was clearly specified that a married female veteran whose husband was "entirely or mainly capable of supporting her" was not eligible.⁷⁶ In post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction policy generally, married women with husbands deemed capable of maintaining them were not regarded as independent agents.

Equally insidious in the post-war world were the barriers being erected or re-erected to keep women out of certain jobs. The Re-instatement in Civil Employment Act of 1942 provided that ex-service personnel be given back their old pre-enlistment jobs with full seniority rights on discharge.⁷⁷ While this was to apply equally to ex-servicewomen and men, it tended to work to the disadvantage of women: not only were there many fewer female than male veterans, but also many civilian women had worked during the war in replacement positions." Furthermore, a Civil Service Act provided that preference be shown in all Civil Service Commission appointments to ex-service personnel who had seen active service overseas or on the high seas.⁷⁹ As stated, the law placed ex-servicewomen at a disadvantage, since approximately 7,000 had been posted to overseas duty and none had seen service on seaborne vessels. But worse than that, there was an unlegislated rule that "'overseas veteran' means a male per-

son." Indeed in employment placement generally, this was how the term had been interpreted by National Selective Service since 1943.

Another significant barrier for women was the renewed enforcement of the civil service regulations barring married women from working for the federal government. Dr. Russell, in opposing this policy, argued that if the civil service set the example of refusing to employ married women, the government could scarcely blame other employers if they also refused to employ married women and pursued "policies of retrenchment based on fear, rather than policies of expansion based on courage, confidence and initiative."⁸⁰ But her protest was not enough to reverse this component of the post-war drive to return women to the home. The regulations barring married women from federal civil service employment were not rescinded until 1955.⁸² Such barriers had a strong indirect effect on women's opportunities for training, since women were unlikely to be granted permission to train for jobs in which they were unlikely to be employed.

While women were technically eligible for all training courses, the government, through various surveys, predetermined what would be the best areas for women to train in. The surveys were notable for the extent to which the procedure prejudiced the information received. For instance, a 1945 Committee on Post-War Training carried out a special survey to ascertain what pre-employment vocational training programs would be appropriate for women given local employment opportunities across Canada. The questionnaire "guided" those conducting the survey by providing a list of employment areas, all classically female, to be looked into: (1) household employment; (2) hotels and restaurants (room service, waitressing); (3) hospitals (ward aides); (4) sales work; (5) stenography; (6) power machine sewing; (7) hair-dressing; (8) dressmaking. The results of this survey were submitted to Canadian Vocational Training "to serve as a basis for further inquiry and planning."⁸³

Across the country, the local offices of the National Employment Service, through the machinery of their women's divisions, regularly attempted to assess the projected labour demands for women. The monthly reports submitted to the head offices of National Selective Service in 1945 gave prominence to traditional women's trades: the consensus was that textile workers, nurses' aides, and domestic servants would be needed in the post-war period in far greater numbers than were likely to be supplied.⁸⁴ Local women's groups, still regarded by Labour Department officials as uniquely knowledgeable about "employment demands and opportunities" for women, were also of the

opinion that chronic shortage of domestic labour offered a ready-made solution to the anticipated post-war problem of an excess of female labour.⁸⁵

While during the war the shortage of domestic servants had been endured patriotically, the perception of this problem as acute immediately resurfaced once the pressure of war production priorities was eased.⁸⁶ The urgency of the problem was brought home in March 1945 to Employment Service officials in Toronto by the requests for assistance that poured in from prominent residents, such as senators, MPS, the U.S. consulate, and the chancellor of the University of Toronto, who had been without domestic help for six months.⁸⁷

The demand for household training came overwhelmingly from women's organizations, prospective employers, and government officials. It had been one of the main recommendations of the Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Post-War Problems of Women. The other ready-made solution to a surplus of women workers on the post-war labour market was the departure of the independent waged or salaried female employee into marriage and economic dependency.⁸⁸ Herein lay the two-pronged thrust of Canada's rehabilitation training program for women, what Dr. Russell called the "special challenge for women in planning for the post-war period": "to develop ways and means of making employment in housework, waitress work, etc. 'attractive and desirable occupations'" and to convince married women that "*household management and the successful care and management of children is an art and a science that has endless possibilities and requires unlimited training and skill if it is to be managed successfully in the new world of to-morrow.*"⁸⁹

The need to reconcile the private role as wife and mother with the more public role gained during the war was a prominent feature of post-war discussions of women's training. These, however, reflected no awareness of the fact that a rigid sexual division of labour that automatically and categorically assigned child-rearing and housework to women restricted women's access to paid jobs and limited the choices women could make. Dr. Russell is a good example. While she fought against sex discrimination in employment and for recognition of women's right to work,⁹⁰ and spoke up publicly for the women, including married women, who had found "a new, hard-won economic independence" that they did not want to lose,⁹¹ she nevertheless argued women's "special responsibility for family life" and advocated a homemaking course for the brides and prospective brides among women leaving the services.

Within the rehabilitation training program of CvT, provision

of household training initially was to begin "just as soon as sufficient requests are received from young women to justify the opening of schools or special training centres."⁹³ But it soon became apparent that only a "very, very small number of service women" had any intention of working as domestic servants when they left the armed forces. Rather than abandoning the scheme to re-establish home service training schools for women, the Director of Training proposed expanding the program to include "not only training for home service work," but also "training in home making" for those women being discharged from the forces who were married or about to be married.⁹⁴ This was the same idea that Dr. Russell had been pushing from within Veterans' Affairs ever since her appointment. While various surveys taken of women in the armed forces and of those already discharged indicated that there was no interest in training for paid domestic employment, there did appear to be some interest in a short course in homemaking among those women who expected to be running their own homes soon after discharge.⁹⁵ Because of the very different objectives of training in home management and training for household service, two distinct courses were developed - a homemakers' course for brides and prospective brides and a home assistants' course for wage labourers.

The "brides' course" became a pet project of Dr. Olive Russell. Initially she envisioned a program involving both men and women, thus putting "appropriate emphasis on marriage and homemaking as a partnership," and which would last, at least for the women, as long as a year.⁹⁶ As the discussions regarding the course progressed, however, both suggestions were quietly dropped. Dr. Russell stressed that these courses should "not be confused with the pre-war youth training programmes, which though admirable in many ways, are associated in many people's thinking with depression years and training for 'domestics.'" The intention was to focus the course on the more psychological, emotional, and social aspects of marriage and family relations rather than on the more physical aspects of housework, like cleaning and ironing.⁹⁷ Under the title "Home Making and Family Living," the course for brides and potential brides among ex-servicewomen was designed to last three or four months. Toronto was the first place it was offered, starting in February 1946. By April home service training schools were planned or in operation where the course could be offered in Vancouver, Calgary, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, and Quebec.⁹⁸

All homemakers' courses followed a common outline that Dr. Russell had invited Doris Runciman, president of the Canadian Home Economics Association, to draw up. It had fallen to vari-

ous home economists connected with extension departments of provincial universities across Canada to develop the subjects suggested by Runciman's topical headings.⁹⁹ The Toronto home-making course operated out of a practice house at 216 Huron Street where ex-servicewomen took classes five days a week from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. for four months at a stretch. There was instruction in interior decoration (with emphasis on "how to make a home beautiful on a limited budget"), meal preparation and nutrition, consumer education, home planning and management, and child care (for which "small guests" were "borrowed for observation and demonstrations"). In addition, trainees were given tips on entertaining and party refreshments. Once a week husbands and fiancés were invited to attend "special" evening lectures on home life and family relations given by "well qualified speakers."¹⁰⁰

Some, like Dr. Russell, believed that helping to "develop better, more happy homes" belonged in Canada's rehabilitation program every bit as much as training for gainful employment.¹⁰¹ Others, particularly in the Department of Labour, had serious misgivings over including a "brides' course" in a program designed to train for paying jobs. When he finally got wind of it, the Deputy Minister exploded in a letter to Fraudena Eaton, National Selective Service Associate Director in charge of the Women's Division: "How in the world did we get into the training of homemakers? I thought we had enough responsibility without taking on the 'Instruction to Brides.'" His reaction is not surprising given his association with a Department of Labour that recognized only work for pay as labour and that was in the business of providing training only for paid work. From his perspective, therefore, training for unpaid domestic labour was not part of his mandate and unpaid housework in general, by departmental definition not labour, was not a matter of concern, except when advocating women's confinement to the home as a solution to male unemployment. In her response to the Deputy Minister, Mrs. Eaton even lost sight of this last connection, and condemned the brides' course for not being able to "solve any employment problem" as she saw the courses for paid household workers doing.¹⁰² But other women officials in Labour, the Women's Services, and Veterans' Affairs had no difficulty accepting that the government should provide training in homemaking for ex-servicewomen. A Labour official warned the Deputy Minister that it was too late to "retreat on this training," for not only "Service women heads" and "D.V.A. women training people" but also "our own female training staff are 100 per cent behind this."¹⁰³

Meanwhile there was unanimity among the leaders of women's organizations and government officials that the greatest unfulfilled demand for female labour was in the field of paid housework. The result was that the most ambitious and most widely touted training schemes for women centred on household service (training in the needle trades came in a distant second). No other training schemes consumed so much time and effort on the part of the planners or persisted so long in spite of obvious failure: among servicewomen and women war workers there remained pretty nearly universal and unvaried resistance to accepting paid work as maids and housecleaners.

This led women's organizations to recommend changes in legislation to improve the status of domestic workers and publicity efforts to make employers realize their responsibilities.¹⁰⁴ The National Council of Women at its annual meeting in July 1945 passed a resolution urging "the Dominion Government to extend the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act to include household workers." "The month before the National Council of the YWCA, in addition to having passed the identical resolution, had also resolved to "work to secure Provincial legislation establishing minimum wages, workmen's compensation, and maximum hours for household workers." ¹⁰⁵

In their repeated representations to federal and provincial governments to enact legislation that would regulate the wages and hours of domestic servants and have them covered by unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation, the women's groups of the post-war period went beyond their pre-war position. In a repetition of depression strategies to raise the status of household workers, women's organizations also undertook, with government urging, to launch educational campaigns among their own members about the problems and points of view of their household assistants. It was felt that the development of "a relationship of mutual concern, co-operative interest, and initiative on the part of both employer and employee in the management of the home" would be an important step toward improving the social status of household workers.¹⁰⁷ Another frequently recommended tactic was to avoid the term "domestic servant" or even "domestics."

From the point of view of the employers and government, which was more inclined to view the problem from the employers' than from the employees' perspective, training itself, of course, was thought to be critical to improving the status of household work. The push for improvements in wages and conditions of work could meet with success only when the quality of the supply of labour was guaranteed. This the government felt it could do if it could find enough women to train. Equipped with

three- to six-month training courses (depending on the experience of the trainees) and proficiency certificates entitling them to recognition as skilled workers, household assistants, it was believed, could then establish their claim to the same respect and benefits as other workers.¹⁰¹ The contradiction, of course, was that the precondition for enticing trainees into the program proved to be improved wages and conditions of work, while the objective of the program was to improve the quality of the supply of labour so that the conditions would improve.

Ultimately, no changes were made in protective legislation or in the eligibility of domestic workers for unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation. Nor did employers have need to worry about the wages of household help becoming exorbitant.¹⁰⁹ In spite of much publicity for the household assistants' training program, few women could be convinced to enrol in the courses. Even after the CVT rehabilitation training program was extended to civilian workers, the domestic workers' courses failed to draw.¹¹⁰

In the pre-war home service schools, women were trained specifically for live-in positions, and that type of training was resumed in the CVT home assistants' course. But by the post-war period, the construction of smaller houses, combined with a growing distaste among housewives for the lack of privacy and among household workers for the lack of personal freedom associated with being a live-in maid, led some planners to consider schemes to promote live-out household labour. Live-in domestics were still widely advertised for, but the new trend toward daytime, hourly work could not be ignored as a solution to the problem of domestic labour shortages. The most ambitious training scheme to stimulate the supply of this type of labour, especially among former war workers, was the "Home-Aide" project developed by Fraudena Eaton in the Women's Division of National Selective Service. "

In contrast to the cvT-sponsored course for brides and the home assistants' course for paid workers, which involved full-time training varying from six weeks to six months, the training provided by Selective Service's "Home-Aide" project consisted in only three or four one-hour lectures or films to supplement the practical experience to be gained on the job. CVT regional directors refused to incorporate the "Home-Aide" scheme into their program, because, as so little actual instruction was involved, it was "almost entirely a placement project rather than a training plan."¹² In the end, an inadequate supply of trainees doomed the "Home-Aide" project to failure, just as it had the other domestic training programs of the post-war period.

Although few women veterans responded to the government's

initiatives to push training for paid or unpaid work, of the almost 50,000 former members of the women's services, more than 25 per cent took advantage of rehabilitation training and education benefits, a higher proportion than that of the male veterans. Over 10,000 availed themselves of vocational training or high school courses to prepare for university or to meet educational requirements for a job. More than 2,600 enrolled in university, with what Dr. Russell regarded as "encouragingly large groups in Public Health, Social Service and Education."¹³ Fully 85 per cent of those taking vocational training chose the following top five out of the ninety-one occupations in which women were taking courses: commercial (which included training for work as secretaries, stenotypists, clerks, and office machine operators); hairdressing; dressmaking; nursing; and pre-matriculation. At least half chose to be trained for one of the jobs under the heading "commercial."¹⁴ The attraction to commercial courses persisted in the face of a decided attempt to deflect women from them in the belief that clerical jobs would not expand as they had in the past. Mrs. Eaton, for example, assumed that increasing automation, in the form of "the dictaphone, electrotape, and automatic calculator," was reducing the demand for clerical workers.¹⁵ Counsellors were also instructed to warn trainees that more women were training as hairdressers and beauty operators than the market could absorb. The task of the counsellors, then, was to discourage large numbers of women from training in either area.

The only areas where women's demand for courses appeared to correspond to government's perception of where they should be finding jobs was in dressmaking and practical nursing. The demand for pre-matriculation courses, for example, was considerably higher than expected. Consequently, in some places, this training for ex-servicewomen was so over-subscribed that only those who needed it for university qualification were being accommodated, not those who required it for a purely vocational goal.¹¹⁶

Meanwhile, the courses for home assistants had gone begging. The main cause was that the occupation was one of desperation, only to be contemplated when all other employment possibilities were exhausted, a situation that did not materialize after the war. Unemployment among ex-servicewomen simply did not reach the proportions feared by some. The explanation, according to government officials, was that servicewomen enjoyed a reputation for efficiency and hard work.¹¹⁷ This may have been partially true, but there is considerable evidence to show that government policy to eliminate both child-care services for

working mothers and tax concessions for working wives was fairly effective in driving women from the labour force altogether, thereby also removing them from unemployment statistics."

While government officials had been unsuccessful in their attempt to channel women's post-war training into the traditional field of paid housework, they enjoyed greater success in keeping the training sexually segregated and confined to occupations perceived to be appropriate for women. In February 1946, Canadian Vocational Training was offering training in over 100 types of trades in vocational schools and over 300 types under training-on-the-job schemes, yet women were to be found in only thirty-five types of trades in vocational schools and in only ninety-two under training-on-the-job schemes.¹¹⁹ And even within this range, there was considerable concentration, as we have seen, with most training for women confined to a limited number of traditionally female occupations.

CONCLUSION

One of the myths about World War II holds that it broke down the sexual division of labour and removed the sexual barriers to occupations. Although not all evidence is in on this question, what we have learned from our examination of a decade of job training programs is that, while the demarcation lines were in some cases redrawn during the war, they remained distinct. In light of this, the re-emergence in the post-war world of the traditional, sexually segregated occupational structures becomes more understandable.

Underlying the fact that the extraordinary experiences of the war did not have dramatic repercussions in the immediate post-war period was a consistency in government ideology toward women's work that persisted throughout the years 1937-47. One unchanging assumption was that women had a special responsibility for and tie to the domestic sphere. Added to that was the related assumption that the male was the primary breadwinner and therefore should have his position in the paid labour force protected. Also unquestioned was the belief that there should be a sexual division of labour in the paid labour force and that this division of labour by sex should be hierarchical, with men at the top. Together with these was an acceptance of the existing class structure, which is evidenced in the fact that when in doubt government consulted upper- and middle-class women's organizations as to what would be appropriate for female labourers.

Members of these women's groups did not challenge the ideological structure but rather shaped their advocacy of women's interests to fit within it. These normative beliefs were so deeply entrenched that a female government official was unaware of the contradiction between them and an espousal of equal opportunities for women.

The training programs reflected these assumptions. For instance, government-supported vocational training tended to be segregated by sex, even when women, as in the war, were sometimes being prepared for non-traditional occupations. Similarly, women were rarely trained to the same extent or to the same degree of complexity as men. In times of unemployment or fear of unemployment domestic labour was seen as most appropriate for women; but even in times of high labour demand, the threat of competition from women was to be avoided by the temporary nature of any non-traditional jobs for which women were trained or by the concentration of women in "feminized" work processes.

The extraordinary demand for female labour during the war generated a rhetoric of egalitarianism that made it look as if the sexual division of labour had been significantly modified in the direction of greater equality. In actuality, the rhetoric hid the fact that those changes were more apparent than real and were designed to be temporary. If the rhetoric of sexual equality had had any substance at all, one would have expected women's wartime gains to be consolidated in post-war plans. What occurred, however, was a use of the planning apparatus to confine women to traditional occupations more reminiscent of the pre-war period.

NOTES

We should like to thank Helen Lenskyj for editing the final version of this paper.

1. See *Business Week*, 21 June 1982, 137.
2. There were no sharp lines of demarcation separating these training programs. Indeed, there was always some overlap.
3. See Veronica Strong-Boag, *The Parliament of Women-. The National Council of Canada, 1893-1929* (Ottawa, 1976).
4. *Labour Gazette* (May, 1939), 469-72. Home Service Training Schools were started in the late summer of 1937. During the first year all provinces but Prince Edward Island participated in the program and twenty schools were in operation. PAC, Rc 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. I, "Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Programme - Home Service Training Schools - Report by the

Youth Training Branch of the Dominion Department of Labour," n.d., presents situation as at November 30, 1938, hereafter cited as "Home Service Training Schools Report," 1938; "Training for Household Employment - Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Programme," Department of Labour, Ottawa, May, 1940, hereafter cited as "May 1940 Training for Household Employment."

5. The 1913 Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education mentioned specifically the National Council of Women, the Women's Institutes of Ontario, and the St. Jean Baptiste Federation of Montreal as "active in seeking for the inclusion of provision for the training of girls for housekeeping and home-making in the elementary and secondary schools." Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, *Report of the Commissioners* (Ottawa, 1913), Part n, 364-78; Part iv, 1991-3. See also Strong-Boag, *Parliament of Women*.
6. Its other strong recommendation had been to educate country girls to an appreciation for rural domestic economy as a means of keeping young women on the land. PAC, RG 27, Acc. No. 70/382, Box 75, "Final Report of the Women's Employment Committee to the Chairman and Members of the National Employment Commission," 10 December 1937.
7. *Ibid.*
8. The long-term trend toward women comprising an increasing proportion of the counted labour force continued in Canada during the depression despite the economic hard times. The number of women employed rose from 490,150 in 1921 to 665,859 in 1931 and an estimated 744,000 in 1937. Their percentage of the total labour force also grew, from 15.4 in 1921 to 17 in 1931 and 19 in 1941. "Wartime History of Employment of Women and Day Care of Children," completed before 24 August 1950, Part 1, 1-5, PAC, Rc 35, Series 7, Vol. 20, file 19.
9. L.M. Grayson and Michael Bliss, eds., *The Wretched of Canada* (Toronto, 1971), vi.
10. The 1913 Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education (p. 376) had also argued that training and certification in housekeeping would increase remuneration for and remove social stigma from domestic servants.
11. "Home Service Training Schools Report," 1938; "May 1940 Training for Household Employment."
12. "Home Service Training Schools Report," 1938.
13. With respect to wage level, experience was more significant than training. For example, one live-in maid with three months' Home Service training was earning \$12 a month, another \$16 a month, while two with two years' experience were earning \$20 a month and another, with four years', \$25. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-14-5, vol. I, "Kitchener Household Employment Study Group Report," 26 March 1940; "Findings of Preston Study Group," n.d.
14. Sara Diamond, "You Can't Scare Me ... I'm Stickin' to the

- Union: Union Women in British Columbia during the Great Depression," *Kinesis* (June, 1979), 16-17; Provincial Archives of British Columbia, Add. Mss 215, Vol. viii, YWCA, Victoria Branch, Minutes of Board of Directors' Meetings, 14 December 1934, 11 January, 22 February 1935, 17 April 1936.
15. *Labour Gazette* (February, 1939), 167; "Findings of the Preston Group."
 16. "Home Service Training Schools Report," 1938.
 17. "Youth Training in Canada in 1938."
 18. "Home Service Training Schools Report," 1938.
 19. "May 1940 Training for Household Employment." In 1944, when there was talk of creating a similar institution on a larger scale for the post-war world, R.F. Thompson, Director of Training in the federal Department of Labour, anticipated that low demand from prospective trainees would be a problem because it had been difficult even during the depression "to obtain [a] sufficient number of applications to keep our two dozen schools filled." PAC, RG, 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1, R.F. Thompson to Isobel Robson, the Local Council of Women, Winnipeg, 18 November 1944.
 20. *Labour Gazette* (January, 1942), 34.
 21. *Labour Gazette* (April, 1941), 427; "War Development of the Training Programme," n.d., presumed from internal evidence to be ca. mid-1943, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
 22. Such agreements were made with all provinces except Prince Edward Island, which lacked both training facilities and war industry. P.E.I. applicants were accommodated in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.
 23. *Labour Gazette* (January, 1941), 17.
 24. Men who came within the age group liable to be called for compulsory military service (initially single men between twenty and twenty-six years of age) were not admitted unless they had medical rejection slips, and during 1942 ineligibility was extended to male farm and rural workers without special permits from National Selective Service. "Progress Statement in Training Programme, April 1st to December 31st, 1941," PAC, RG, 27, Vol. 725, file 12-2-1; "War Development of the Training Programme."
 25. *Labour Gazette* (May, 1941), 571.
 26. *Labour Gazette* (April, 1941), 427.
 27. R.F. Thompson to Minister of Labour, 3 November 1941, re Progress Report of the War Emergency Training Programme, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 725, file 12-2-1.
 28. As early as April 1940, the decision of the Ontario government to close the Dominion-Provincial Home Service Training Schools in its province provoked a series of letters in protest from various women's associations. Ontario Archives, RG 3, Mitchell Hepburn Papers, General Correspondence, Public 1940, "Youth Training Movement"; 1941, "Labour Department."
 29. Thompson to Minister of Labour, 3 November 1941.
 30. "Progress Statement on Training Programme, April 1st to December 31st, 1941."
 31. *Ibid.*
 32. "War Development of the Training Programme."
 33. Frederick Edwards, "Night-and-Day School," *Maclean's*, 1 May 1942, 16-17, 22-4.
 34. See Ruth Roach Pierson, "'Jill Canuck': CWAC of All Trades but No 'Pistol Packing Momma,'" *Historical Papers*, (1978), 106-33; "Canadian Women and Canadian Mobilization During the Second World War," *Revue Internationale d'histoire militaire*, special issue prepared by the Canadian Commission of the International Commission of Military History (1982), 181-207.
 35. Edwards, "Night-and-Day School," 16.
 36. *Labour Gazette* (April, 1942), 405-6.
 37. *Labour Gazette* (December, 1942), 1427-33.
 38. *Labour Gazette* (September, 1941), 1103; (March, 1942), 299; "Training of Women Under War Emergency Training Programme," n.d., ca. mid-1943, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
 39. We are using "skill" and "skilled" in the traditional sense. The whole question of the nature and definition of "skilled" work is a complex one worthy of study. See, for example, Mercedes Steedman, "Sex and Skill in the Canadian Needle Trades 1890-1940," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, Ottawa, 11 June 1982.
 40. Speech reported in *Labour Gazette* (April, 1942), 414.
 41. *Labour Gazette* (January, 1941), 15.
 42. For similar practice in Britain during World War 1, see Gail Braybon, *Women Workers in the First World War: The British Experience* (London, 1981), 51-65.
 43. Leslie Roberts, "Fire Power," *Maclean's*, 15 May 1942, 13-14.
 44. Thelma LeCocq, "Woman Power," *Maclean's*, 15 June 1942, 11.
 45. The "powered fuselage conveyor assembly line," where all of the work was done by women, provided one illustration of this "fitting jobs to women." "There, and on the engine balcony, air driven wrenches and screw drivers, light weight electric drills and rivet squeezers are the rule. Special supports are used to hold jigs and assemblies, the weight of which would cut down the efficiency of women workers if they had to hold them as men did." "Women Workers -A Problem," *Canadian Aviation* (November, 1943), 78, 80.
 46. R. Eric Crawford, "Ingenuity Pays Big Dividends Noorduyn Factory Men Find: Method Improvement Study Results in Many Clever Machines and Factory Ideas," *Canadian Aviation* (January, 1943), 39-43, 80.
 47. *Labour Gazette* (November, 1942), 1292.
 48. Edwards, "Night-and-Day School," 22.
 49. Mary Oliver, "A Wartime Schoolroom," *Canadian Business*

- (January, 1944), 69, 90. The instruction took place outside the War Emergency Training Program as any courses of less than two weeks were regarded as training on the job. "War Development of the Training Programme"; Gladys Ross, interview with Helen Lenskyj, Toronto, 25 August 1983.
50. Roberts, "Fire Power," 13-14. Roberts noted that men whose ethnic backgrounds would have been an obstacle to their admission to the ranks of skilled labour before the war also benefited from the wartime revolution in vocational training.
 51. LeCocq, "Woman Power," 10-11, 40; Lotta Dempsey, "Women in War Plants," *Mayfair* (May, 1943), 93.
 52. "Women Workers - A Problem," 78-80.
 53. LeCocq, "Woman Power," 10-11, 40.
 54. If she had directly replaced a man who had entered military service, her chances for holding on to that job at war's end were limited by other factors as well, a main one being the Reinstatement in Civil Employment Act of 1942, which guaranteed veterans their jobs back after discharge. See Department of Labour, "'Dismiss' but . . . what of a job?" October, 1944, copy at PAC, RG 27, Acc. No. 71/98, Vol. 1, file 22-5-1.
 55. F.H. Sexton, Director of Technical Education, Department of Education, Nova Scotia, to T.D.A. Purves, Deputy Minister of Labour, Nova Scotia, 30 April 1943, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, file 6-24-1, vol. I.
 56. Routine Letter #141, R.F. Thompson, Director of Training, Department of Labour, to all Regional Directors, 7 January 1943, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1. As the end of war came into sight, the emphasis in training shifted more and more in the direction of rehabilitation and post-war planning. By Order-in-Council PC 1976 of 21 March 1944, the very name "Wartime Emergency Training Program" was scrapped for one more appropriate to the post-war peacetime world: "Canadian Vocational Training." *Report of the Department of Labour for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1943* (Ottawa, 1943), 29; *Report of the Department of Labour for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1945* (Ottawa, 1945), 56.
 57. "Wartime History of Employment of Women and Day-Care Children," Part 1, 81.
 58. See, for example, L.C. Marsh and O.J. Firestone, "Will There Be Jobs?" *Canadian Affairs*, 1, 18 (1 October 1944).
 59. See, for example, Department of Labour, *DISMISS but ... what of a JOB?* (Ottawa, 1945). An October 1944 draft of this pamphlet can be found at PAC, RG 27, Acc. 71/98, Vol. 1, file 22-5-1.
 60. Anne Fromer, "Post-War Employment Field Graphed by Weir Report," *Saturday Night*, 22 April 1944, 6.
 61. See Pierson, "Jill Canuck." Also Routine Letter #141, R.F. Thompson to Regional Directors, 7 January 1943.
 62. Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, VI: *Post-War Problems of Women - Final Report of the Sub-Committee*, 30 November 1943 (Ottawa, 1944). See also Gail Cuthbert Brandt, "'Pigeon-holed and Forgotten': The Work of the Sub-Committee on the Post-War Problems of Women, 1943," *Social History/Histoire Sociale*, 15, 29 (May, 1982), 239-59.
 63. "Post-War Working Intentions of Civilians as Indicated by Answers Given on D. L. R. 57-58 Forms Completed by 29,845 People in Canada," PAC, RG 27, Acc. No. 70/450, Box 14, file 208.
 64. Janet R. Keith, "Situations Wanted: Female," *Canadian Business* (November, 1944), 74.
 65. "Women To-Morrow," address by Captain Olive Ruth Russell to the University Women's Club, Dalhousie University, Halifax, 15 March 1944, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1. At the time of this address, Russell was one of two personnel selection counsellors (army examiners) with the Canadian Women's Army Corps.
 66. The government sub-committee also advocated a nursery school program that, because of its short hours (9 a.m. to noon), would have been a benefit only to the full-time mother and no help at all to the gainfully employed mother, struggling under the double burden of wage work and child care. In 1944 the sole woman on the Economic Advisory Board of the province of Quebec, Renee G. (Mme. Henri) Vautelet, produced a similar report on the post-war problems of Quebec women. It, too, bristled with unresolved tension between granting that women needed to seek employment outside the home and proposing policies that would "reduce industry's economic reasons for employing women in preference to men."
- The change in provincial government in August 1944 had terminated the work of Quebec's Economic Advisory Board, and Vautelet's report might never have seen the light of day had it not been translated into English under the title *Post War Problems and Employment of Women in the Province of Quebec* and published by the Montreal Local Council of Women in August 1945. Copy at PAC, MG 30, c 175, Vol. 1, file #5.
67. Wartime Information Board, *Looking Ahead: Our Next Job*, Canadian Post-War Affairs: Discussion Manual No. 3 (Ottawa, 1945), 11. Similarly, Marsh made adult women fit into his social security scheme principally as wives dependent for benefits on "the husband as the chief wage-earner." Leonard Marsh, *Report on Social Security for Canada 1945*, with a new Introduction by the author and a Preface by Michael Bliss (Toronto, 1975), 195-232.
 68. See Ruth Pierson, "Women's Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Canadian Labour Force in WWII," *Historical Papers* (1976), 141-74; revised version in *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*, ed. by Susan Mann Trofim-enkoff and Alison Prentice (Toronto, 1977), 125-45.
 69. *Report of the Department of Labour for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1945*, 56.
 70. The one minor exception to all this equality of status and opportunity that Dr. Russell acknowledged was the unavailability of out-of-work benefits to the married female veteran whose husband was deemed capable of maintaining her. Olive Ruth Russell, "Re-

habilitation of Persons from the Armed Forces with Special Reference to Ex-Service Women," address to the Business and Professional Women's Club, Ottawa, 13 March 1945, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1.

71. *DISMISS but ... what of a JOB?*, 29.
72. Olive Ruth Russell, "Rehabilitation of Women of the Armed Services," 19 February 1945, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1.
73. War Emergency Training Agreement, Schedule "K" (1944-45), *Rehabilitation Training*, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 725, file 12-2-1. In rural areas local Canadian Legion branches provided the initial interviewing service.
74. *DISMISS but ... what of a JOB?*, 28-9.
75. Appendix "Y" to Canadian Vocational Training War Emergency Training Agreement, Schedule "K" (1945-1946), copy at PAC, RG 27, Vol. 742, file 12-14-7-I.
76. Department of Veterans' Affairs, *Back To Civil Life*, 2nd rev. ed. (Ottawa, 1944).
77. *Ibid.*, 14.
78. A short story in a post-war issue of *Maclean's* took as subject the problem of what a veteran (male understood) was to do when he returned to find his peacetime job held by a "girl" "stubborn as well as beautiful." The story's proposed solution - "Marry her" - was meant only semi-facetiously. Ron Broom, "Marry the Girl!" *Maclean's*, 1 October 1945, 16-17, 22, 25-6, 28.
79. *Back To Civil Life*, 24.
80. Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, to A.D.P. Heeney, Clerk of the Privy Council, 10 November 1945, PAC, RG 27, Acc. No. 71/98, Vol. 2, file 22-5-6-7.
81. The Dominion Civil Service Circular Letter 1945-17, dated 17 November 1945, called for renewed enforcement of the pre-war discriminatory policy, which stated that: "Any female employee in the public service shall, upon the occasion of her marriage, be required to resign her position." Quoted by E.L.M. Burns, Director General of Rehabilitation [drafted by Dr. Olive Ruth Russell], to W.S. Woods, Deputy Minister, 3 December 1945, Veterans' Affairs, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1.
82. *Towards Equality for Women* (Ottawa, 1979), 5.
83. Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance Branch of the Department of Labour, Employment Circular, 17 May 1945, PAC, RG 27, Acc. No. 71/328, Vol. 2, file 90; Minutes of Conference of Supervisors of Women's Training, Canadian Vocational Training, Ottawa, 11, 12, 13 February 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1A.
84. 23rd Report on National Selective Service Operations, February, 1945, PAC, RG 27, Acc. No. 71/328, Box 3.
85. In a letter dated 10 April 1944, R.F. Thompson, Director of Training, Department of Labour, asked Mrs. E.D. Hardy, president of the National Council of Women, to contact women's organizations, particularly the National Council of the YWCA, for "suggestions for various types of training which would afford reasonable assurance for employment" for women in the post-war period. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
86. See, for example, "Will Maids Come Back?," *Chatelaine* (June, 1944), 21-2; Katharine Kent, "Crisis in the Kitchen," *Maclean's*, 15 October 1945, 10, 62.
87. Memo of March, 1945, to Mary Eadie, Supervisor, Women's Division, Employment and Selective Service Office, Toronto Branch, from Ombra Dill, Supervisor, Household Assistants, attached to letter of 15 March 1945, to Mrs. Rex Eaton, Assoc. Director, Selective Service, from Mary Eadie, for G.S. Collins, Mgr., Employment and Selective Service Office, Toronto Branch, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1A.
88. Questioned on the problem of too many women in the labour force, Minister of Labour Humphrey Mitchell announced that women "have preferred - and I think this is a pretty sound conclusion to arrive at - to return to home-keeping." House of Commons, *Debates*, 1945, 2371. See M. Theresa Nash, "Images of Women in National Film Board of Canada Films During World War II and the Post-War Years (1939 to 1949)" (Ph.D., McGill University, 1982).
89. Russell, "Women To-Morrow," emphasis in original.
90. "Since woman's full right to work has been taken for granted in the war emergency and she has been able to prove her efficiency, is it not natural to assume that in the employment market after the war her claim to the right to employment should be based on her merits rather than her sex." *Ibid.*
91. Russell, "Rehabilitation of Women of the Armed Services" emphasis in original.
92. Whyard, "Dr. Russell - Rehabilitation," for *Saturday Night*, draft, 19 June 1945, copy at PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1.
93. R.F. Thompson to Miss Isobel Robson, Winnipeg, 18 November 1944, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1.
94. R.F. Thompson, to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour, 20 March 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 1523, file x5-12, part 1.
95. Rehabilitation Information Committee, Minutes of I I July 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 3575, file 11-8-9-9, vol. 1; Edith C. Scott, Lieut., Rehabilitation, Naval Service, Department of National Defence, to Marion M. Graham, Superintendent of Women's Training, CVT, 20 August 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 11; A.C.P. Clayton, Group Captain, for Chief of the Air Staff, Air Service, Dept. of National Defence, to Training Branch, Dept. of Labour, 20 August 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1; Marion M. Graham to Bertha G. Oxner, Director of Women's Work, University of Saskatchewan, 6 September 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1.
96. Olive Ruth Russell to Mr. J. Andrew, Rehabilitation Information Committee, Wartime Information Board, 9 July 1945, PAC,

242 MODERN CANADA 1930-1980's

- w 31, K 13, Vol. 1; Fraudena Eaton to A. MacNamara, 18 February 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1A.
97. Olive Ruth Russell to Marion Graham, 5 September 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1. See also address given to the Winnipeg Local Council of Women by Dr. Olive Ruth Russell, February, 1946, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1.
98. *Labour Gazette* (February, 1946), 196. The opening of such a school in the Maritime Provinces was not felt to be warranted. Routine Letter #388, R.F. Thompson to all Regional Directors, 3 April 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
99. Mary D. Slater, Superintendent of Women's Rehabilitation, Dept. of Veterans' Affairs, to Marion Graham, 13 November 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1.
100. Press releases "Homemaking" and "Homemaking Course" prepared for opening of the Homemaking and Family Living Course for ex-servicewomen in Toronto, 18 February 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vols. 1, 1A.
101. Olive Ruth Russell to Miss Bernice Coffey, Women's Editor, *Saturday Night*, 24 July 1945, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1. Also PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-5-5, vol. 1, Lieut. Edith C. Scott to Marion M. Graham, 20 August 1945: "Having the homes of ex-service people well managed by capable trained housewives will help greatly both in the re-establishment of the returning generation and in restoring a stable peace-time society."
102. A. MacNamara to Mrs. Rex [Fraudena] Eaton, 14 February 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1A. Eaton to MacNamara, 18 February 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1A.
103. A.H. Brown to A. MacNamara, 2 March 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1A.
104. *Labour Gazette* (April, 1945), 523.
105. Forwarded with a covering letter to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, 2 August 1945, by Mrs. G.D. Finlayson, Corresponding Secretary, National Council of Women of Canada, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-2, vol. 1A.
106. Quoted in a letter of 25 February 1946 to Marion Graham from Mrs. C.D. Rouillard, Chairman, Public Affairs Committee, National Council of the YWCA, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1.
107. *Labour Gazette* (February, 1946), 195.
108. Marion Graham to Chief, Legislation Branch, Dept. of Labour, attention Miss Mackintosh, 20 February 1945, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
109. According to one review of rates as advertised in local newspapers throughout Canada, for general housework, live-in monthly wages were \$25 in Nova Scotia, \$40 in Vancouver and Quebec City, \$40 to \$60 in Toronto, \$35 in Regina and Saskatoon. The prevailing rate for day workers in Toronto was 50 cents an hour with carfare and lunch. See the untitled report attached to Fraudena Eaton's note of 15 January 1946, that the "review was made on a date within the month commencing December 7th, 1945." PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1.
110. Canadian Vocational Training Programme, Appendix B, For Women Veterans, Dept. of Labour, April, 1947, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
111. See Ruth Pierson, "Home-Aide': A Solution to Women's Unemployment After World War II," *Atlantis*, 2, 2 (Spring, 1977), 85-96.
112. R.F. Thompson to A. MacNamara, 11 January 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1. Routine Letter #346, Marion M. Graham to all Regional Directors, November, 1945; also the follow-up memo of 1 December 1945 to all Superintendents of Women's Training in CWT Regional Offices, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1.
113. Women's Rehabilitation Annual Report, 1946-1947, draft prepared by Dr. Olive Ruth Russell, PAC, MG 31, K 13, Vol. 1.
114. Walter S. Woods, *Rehabilitation (A Combined Operation)* (Ottawa, 1953), 256-7.
115. Mrs. Rex Eaton's speech to a Regional Rehabilitation Training Conference in Vancouver, March, 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 748, file 12-15-5, vol. 1K.
116. Mary D. Slater to Marion Graham, 15 April 1946, re: Visit of Superintendent to Vancouver District, 9-18 March 1946, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
117. Canadian Vocational Training Programme, Appendix B, For Women Veterans, Dept. of Labour, April, 1947, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 744, file 12-14-16-12, vol. 1.
118. See Pierson, "Women's Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women." There is evidence that unemployed women, some of them displaced from insurable jobs in the offices and plants of war production, were denied Unemployment Insurance benefits if they refused to take jobs as domestics. See House of Commons, *Debates*, Stanley Knowles, 14 July 1947, 5636. Attention was brought to this debate by Nash, "Images of Women."
119. Marion M. Graham to Chief, Legislation Branch, attention Miss Mackintosh, 20 February 1946.