

Women's Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Canadian Labour Force in World War II

Ruth Pierson

Volume 11, numéro 1, 1976
Québec 1976

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030808ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/030808ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)

1712-9109 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Pierson, R. (1976). Women's Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Canadian Labour Force in World War II. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, 11(1), 141–173. <https://doi.org/10.7202/030808ar>

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada, 1976

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

RUTH PIERSON
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Women's Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Canadian Labour Force in World War II

It is often assumed that the employment of women in the labour force during World War II greatly advanced the emancipation of women, at least in the sense of women's struggle to achieve equal status with men in Canadian society.¹ Building on that assumption, feminists have lamented the ease with which many of the gains were lost at the war's end. One famous account, concerned with United States society but considered to have relevance for Canadian society as well, postulated the propagation of a "feminine mystique" to account for the post-war reverses suffered by women's struggle for equality.² I should like to argue that both the assumption of great gains made by women during World War II and the bewilderment over the post-war reversals rest on an inadequate examination of the context of women's wartime employment and an inaccurate assessment of the degree to which attitudes towards women's proper role in society changed during the war. My basic proposition is that Canada's war effort, rather than any consideration of women's right to work, determined the recruitment of women into the labour force. The recruitment of women was part of a large-scale intervention by Government into the labour market to control allocation of labour for effective prosecution of the war.

My first point is that National Selective Service and the federal Department of Labour, in their wartime mobilization of the work force, regarded women as constituting a large labour reserve, arranged in layers of employability, to be dipped into more and more deeply as the labour pool dried up: recruiting first young "girls" and single women and then married women without children for full-time employment, next women encumbered with home responsibilities for part-time employment, and finally women with children for full-time employment. Starting with the most mobile, National Selective Service pulled in these layers successively as the war effort intensified. In their public pronouncements, government officials stated a reluctance to draw upon those layers of the female labour reserve, the mobilization of which would be most disruptive of the traditional family system.

Secondly, the government recruiting agencies viewed their task as service to Canada's war effort. Accordingly, the paramount appeal of recruitment campaigns was to patriotic duty and the necessity to make sacrifices for the nation at war. Not women's right to work, but women's obligation to work in war time was the major theme.

Thirdly, accommodations to the particular needs of working women were made within the context of the war effort. These were generally introduced as temporary measures, to remain in effect only so long as the nation was at war.

I

Canada entered the Second World War with the effects of the Great Depression still in force. There were approximately 900,000 registered unemployed (Canada's work force at this time was approximately 3.8 million strong). In the following two years this reserve of unemployed persons largely met the increased demands for manpower created by military recruitment and the step-up of production stimulated by the war. By 1942 the slack in the labour market had been taken up. With war industry geared for full production and the Armed Forces continuing to withdraw large numbers of male workers from the labour force, the situation had changed from one of labour surplus and unemployment to one of labour shortage. "To meet the pressure of war needs attention, therefore, became focussed on the reserve of potential women workers who had not yet been drawn into employment."³

By thirteen orders-in-council, the National Selective Service programme was established in March 1942 under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour.⁴ Prime Minister Mackenzie King, in his March 24, 1942 address to Parliament on the National Selective Service, declared that "recruitment of women for employment was 'the most important single feature of the program.'"⁵ He went on to outline a ten-point plan for drawing women into industry.⁶

In May 1942 a division of National Selective Service was created to deal with employment of women and with services related to women's employment. Mrs. Rex (Fraudena) Eaton of Vancouver was appointed Assistant Director of National Selective Service in charge of the Women's Division. In December 1942 her title changed to Associate Director. Mrs. Eaton sat on the Administrative and Advisory Boards of N.S.S. and was immediately responsible to the Director of National Selective Service, a position held by Elliott M. Little until November 19, 1942, and thereafter by Deputy Minister of Labour Arthur MacNamara.

My first contention is that women were regarded as constituting a large labour reserve on which Canadian industry could draw to meet the special labour demands created by the war emergency. One of the first steps of National Selective Service regarding the recruitment of women into the work force was to assess the size of the top layer of this labour reserve: that consisting of young single women. "It was decided to conduct a compulsory registration of *younger* women in order to ascertain more definitely what resources of woman power were available."⁷

Under authority of order-in-council P.C. 1445, which directed the Minister of Labour "to establish and maintain an inventory of employable persons" in Canada,⁸ Humphrey Mitchell on September 8, 1942, ordered the registration of

all female persons aged twenty to twenty-four (i.e., born in the years 1918 to 1922 inclusive), with the exception of members of religious orders, hospital patients, prison inmates, and women currently in insurable employment.⁹ The registration was held during the week of September 14 through September 19, 1942.¹⁰ In urban areas women reported to the local Employment and Selective Service Office; in rural areas, to the nearest post office.¹¹

Although women were required to register whether married or unmarried, it is clear that the main objective of this initial inventory of Canada's womanpower was to determine the size of the labour reserve made up of young single women so as to enable their effective mobilization. One major reason why the age group twenty to twenty-four was chosen was that: "Single women would compose a higher percentage of the total than would be found in older age groups."¹²

On August 20, 1942, Mrs. Eaton convoked a conference in Ottawa of executive representatives of twenty-one national women's organizations so that she could enlist their cooperation and support for National Selective Service and the September Registration of Canadian Women. She explained that the registration of Canadian women aged twenty to twenty-four

will show us exactly how many single women we have available to meet the increasing shortage of workers in our war industries. Then we will have a pool of single workers from which to draw when an employer asks for additional staff, and single women can be supplied immediately.¹³

At this time, the policy was not merely to mobilize single women, but to render unnecessary the employment of married women with children. Mrs. Eaton stated emphatically: "We shall not urge married women with children to go into industry." Married women up until then had been allowed to drift into employment in war industries because, she was reported to have explained, "no known reservoir of single workers existed." It was hoped that the September 1942 registration of Canadian women would enable National Selective Service "to direct single women into essential war industries rather than to have employers building up huge staffs of married women with children."¹⁴

On December 15, 1942, A. Chapman of the Research and Statistics Branch of the Department of Labour submitted a report on the "Female Labour Supply Situation." Working with the results of the September 1942 Women's Registration, follow-up interviews carried out by local Employment and Selective Services Offices, and detailed analyses by local offices of the relation of unfilled vacancies to unplaced applicants, he concluded:

Study of the available information regarding the supply of and demand for female labour clearly indicates the existence of a large reserve of female labour throughout the country.¹⁵

Beyond "the overall surplus of female labour," the figures more particularly indicated "that the bulk of the readily available surplus of female labour is con-

centrated in those areas where war industry is least developed." Even allowing for variation of response to the Registration in different parts of the country, Chapman insisted that the figures "do emphasize the tremendous reservoir of female labour in areas such as the Maritimes and the Prairies where development of war industry has been slight."¹⁶

National Selective Service (Women's Division) attached considerable significance to the fact that:

There were 22,655 young single women without home responsibilities in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, who were willing to work full-time either at home or in another area.¹⁷

The information disclosed by the Registration and follow-up interviews led to the adoption of a programme for transferring young unmarried women workers, the most mobile segment of the female labour force, from areas of surplus to areas of short labour supply.

In May 1942 a survey of the anticipated demand for female labour "showed that at least 75,000 additional women would be required in war industries before the end of the year."¹⁸ The Registration itself acted as a stimulus to young women to fill out applications for employment.¹⁹ In addition, N.S.S. launched a nation-wide publicity campaign, using radio and the press, to urge upon women "the need to engage in some phase of the war effort."²⁰ Newspaper publishers and magazine editors agreed to give space in their publications to pictures of women working on machines, of women war workers in their special work uniforms, and to stories of accomplishments by individual women. Papers published news releases on National Selective Service and the problems it was facing. CBC presented over the national network "a series of dramatic plays, written expressly for National Selective Service around the theme of women war workers."²¹ The publicity campaign paid off. "By January 1943, the additional 75,000 women required for war industries had been recruited." It was calculated that by June 1943, 158,000 women had joined the industrial war effort since the beginning of 1942, bringing the total number of women engaged directly and indirectly in war industries to 255,000. During the same period, several thousand women had volunteered for service in the Women's Divisions of the various branches of the Armed Forces.²² The "readily available surplus of female labour"²³ had evaporated.

The September 1942 National Selective Service (Civilian) Regulations²⁴ provided the basis for controlling Canada's labour power during the war. They established schedules of labour priorities, to be revised periodically, which classified industries and firms under one of four categories: A) very high labour priority; B) high labour priority; C) low labour priority; D) no labour priority. Employment advertising was brought under the control of N.S.S.: no employer could advertise for employees except by arrangement with a National Selective

Service Officer. No employer could interview or hire a person for a job who did not possess a N.S.S. permit to seek and accept employment. A seven days' notice of separation was required of an employer to fire and of an employee to quit. After January 1943 all persons between 16 and 65 years of age (excluding full-time students, housewives and clergy) were required to register for work at local Employment and Selective Services Offices if not gainfully employed for seven consecutive days.²⁵ National Selective Service controlled the issuance of permits to seek or enter employment "in a given community, industry, occupation or establishment" within Canada²⁶ and, after October 29, 1942, the issuance of "Labour Exit Permits" to seek or accept employment in the United States.²⁷ Through these measures, National Selective Service was able to supervise the movement of labour between establishments and to direct persons "to employment in the order of importance to the war effort"²⁸ and to the maintenance of essential civilian services within Canada.

Women registering at local Employment and Selective Service Offices for full-time employment were directed in the first instance to fill vacancies in establishments that had been given an "A" or "B" labour priority rating. But by the summer of 1943 serious labour shortages had developed in areas of the service sector long dependent on female labour. Women were leaving low-paid service jobs for more lucrative employment in war industries. Hospitals, restaurants, hotels, laundries and dry cleaning establishments were clamouring for help. Women were needed as ward aides in hospitals, as waitresses and kitchen help in restaurants, as chamber maids and waitresses in hotels, and for various subordinate positions in laundries and dry cleaning establishments.²⁹ The labour pool of single women available for full-time employment was exhausted. "It became necessary to appeal to housewives and those groups who would not ordinarily appear in the labour market."³⁰ N.S.S. (Women's Division) decided to launch a campaign to recruit women with home responsibilities for part-time work.

The N.S.S. (Civilian) Regulations of September 1942 exempted from government control "part-time subsidiary employment which is not [a person's] principal means of livelihood."³¹ Employers did not have to seek prior N.S.S. approval to advertise for part-time help or keep a record of their part-time employees. Nor did persons seeking part-time subsidiary work have to register with a N.S.S. local office. Therefore, the Women's Division of N.S.S. in their campaigns to recruit housewives for part-time work needed the voluntary co-operation of employers as well as of women seeking part-time employment not exceeding twenty-four hours.

That use of part-time workers would become necessary was foreseen as early as November 1942.³² Supervisors of the Women's Division of local Employment and Selective Service Offices were instructed to begin persuading employers to make plans for employing women on a part-time basis. At first employers generally resisted the idea. In a memorandum dated May 7, 1943, Mary Eadie, Women's Division Supervisor, Toronto, reported that, although

some had "undertaken to use it with success . . . the employer as a whole 'will not be bothered' . . . with part-time help."³³ Employers cited higher costs stemming from additional clerical work, rearrangement of schedules, increased pay roll work, need for increased supervision, and a feared rise in absenteeism and turnover as reasons for their opposition. But when firms in production of non-essentials, such as candy, tobacco, soft drinks and luxury items, were informed that N.S.S. would make no effort to send them "full-time workers while essential services and war industries were short of labour"³⁴ and when by the spring of 1943 even establishments providing essential civilian services were suffering an acute labour shortage, many employers began to show a greater willingness to employ women part time.

The first campaign for part-time women workers was mounted in Toronto from July 12 to July 26, 1943. To prepare for it, Toronto Selective Service first sought the cooperation of employers. "Several conferences were called" with employers in hospitals, restaurants, hotels, laundries and dry cleaning establishments "to discuss the possibility of [their] using part-time" women workers.³⁵ On May 22, 1943, Mary Eadie reported to Mrs. Eaton that "the Ontario Restaurant Association, the Laundry and Dry Cleaning Association of Toronto and the Hospital Association of Toronto will co-operate with us because they are in such dire straits for help these days."³⁶ When employers had placed with the Toronto Selective Service Office a sufficient number of orders for part-time workers (approximately 1500), the publicity campaign could be launched.

Meanwhile Toronto Selective Service also sought and won for the campaign the sponsorship and collaboration of the Local Council of Women.³⁷ According to Mrs. Eaton, it was "with great courage" that Mrs. Norman C. Stephens, President of the Toronto Council of Women, "offered to promote a publicity campaign inviting Toronto women to accept part-time work in these occupations which no one will claim to be glamorous or highly paid."³⁸

Not only employers in essential civilian services, for which the campaign was principally designed, but employers in some war industries decided to experiment with part-time workers. The appeal was "particularly directed to housewives."³⁹ At the same time "no women with important home responsibilities were unduly urged to register." Furthermore "no appeal was made for women to work part-time in addition to a full-time job." However, "many women without children and with few home responsibilities consented, under pressure of the campaign, to accept full-time work."⁴⁰

In her report of July 28, 1943, to the National Selective Service Advisory Board, Mrs. Eaton was enthusiastic over the results of the campaign. Two thousand, two hundred and sixty-seven women had responded to the call. Of these 1518 had been placed in essential services, 643 in part-time, and 875 in full-time positions. Another 599 had accepted part-time employment in war industries. The remainder (150) were yet to be placed. For Mrs. Eaton, "the success of the

campaign offered some assurance that there is still a pool of women ready and willing to fill a breach when emergencies arise."⁴¹

The Toronto campaign for part-time women workers served as a model for similar campaigns in other cities throughout Canada. N.S.S. Circular No. 270-1, dated August 18, 1943, and sent to all local Employment and Selective Service Offices, outlined the main purpose and features of the campaign. It was to relieve labour shortages in "essential services such as hospitals, restaurants, hotel, laundries and dry cleaning establishments." It was directed at "a new type of recruit," namely "the housewife or others *who will do a Part-time Paid Job* for six days per week, perhaps only four hours per day, or perhaps three full days each week." Not only was the campaign to be directed at housewives, the work they were being asked to do was seen as an extension of housework outside the home, as is clear from the circular's statement: "It is possible for many women to streamline their housekeeping at home to do the housekeeping in the community for standard wages." Local offices were first to secure the willingness of employers to provide definite orders for part-time workers, then to secure the sponsorship "of an organization of women who have the high confidence of the community." The Local Council of Women was specifically recommended. The publicity campaign would engage the combined efforts of the employers, the sponsors, and the staff of the local E. and S.S. Office. The expenses of the campaign were to be borne by the benefitting employers and the Dominion Government on a fifty-fifty cost sharing basis. Women of the sponsoring organization could help in the local office with registration of applicants, but all referrals to jobs would remain the responsibility of the local E. and S.S. Office staff.⁴²

The President of the National Council of Women, Mrs. Edgar Hardy, agreed to endorse these campaigns. A letter signed on August 31, 1943, by A. MacNamara and Mrs. Rex Eaton, was sent to all Local Councils of Women enlisting their support of the campaigns for part-time women workers. Explaining the necessity for the campaigns, the letter stated: "There is no reserve of men in Canada today. In fact there is little reserve of either men or women."⁴³

Working in close co-operation with the Local Council of Women, National Selective Service launched special recruiting campaigns for part-time women workers in the fall of 1943 in Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina, Brandon, Ottawa, Moncton, and Halifax. The drives sought part-time workers for jobs in the essential services already mentioned, but also in some centres, such as Edmonton, for jobs in the garment industry. In some places, such as Brandon and Edmonton, the part-time campaign was combined with a campaign for full-time women workers. In Ottawa, the campaign aimed exclusively at encouraging women who were formerly employees of the civil service, but who were now married, to return to part-time or full-time work to alleviate the serious shortage of workers in war departments of government.⁴⁴

Although for as long as possible only full-time women workers were sought for war industries, by the end of 1943 and throughout 1944 women were hired

for certain war jobs on a part-time basis. In some areas "housewives shifts" came into existence, so named because they were made up primarily or entirely of "housewives who could work only in the evenings" from 6:00 or 7:00 to 10:00 or 11:00 p.m.⁴⁵

Even before the conclusion of the part-time campaign in Toronto on July 26, 1943, National Selective Service was alerted to the existence of an acute labour shortage in war industries in the Toronto area. An estimated 3,500 women were urgently needed to fill full-time high-priority jobs in war industry.⁴⁶ The urgency of the need precluded its being filled by transferring women workers from other parts of Canada.⁴⁷ Toronto Selective Service met with representatives of the media to discuss how "publicity could be used to impress women with the importance of employment in war industries." Members of the War Council of the Artists' Guild proposed that N.S.S. seek "to recruit women for employment in war industries for full time work for a period of not less than three months." At meetings on July 23 and 26 with representatives of management from Massey-Harris, Victory Aircraft, Goodyear, Small Arms, General Engineering, and York Arsenal, Toronto Selective Service sold these employers on the idea of launching a campaign to recruit full-time women war workers for a three-month period of service. As Mrs. Eaton reported to the National Selective Service Advisory Board on July 28, 1943, although they felt their need to be for long-term full-time workers, the employers recognized certain advantages to the special appeal for three-month service: 1) it would give the media "a new publicity angle to emphasize the needs of war industries for more workers"; 2) it might very well recruit many women who, once employed, would remain in employment; and 3) it would counteract "the fear of being frozen to the job" which was seen as deterring many women from accepting "employment full time in essential industry".⁴⁸

The key note of the campaign was "three months' service,"⁴⁹ but attention was also given to the need in general for women workers in war plants to do full-time service on any one of three shifts. Although the call went out to all women, special appeal was made to housewives, with reference to the counselling service for mothers and the attempt to place women in war plants near their homes.⁵⁰ Radio publicity on the need of women in war industry began early in August. Originally set to open on August 18, the full-fledged three-months' service campaign in the end got underway on August 30 and ran to September 11. During the first week a "war industrial show" was put on at the T. Eaton Company Auditorium. In booths set up by twelve industries, "girls" from war plants demonstrated the operations which they carried out "in their ordinary work at the plant" and "a fashion show was given in which the girls wore their plant uniforms."⁵¹ In her final account of the results of the Toronto Campaign for Women in War Industries of August 30 to September 11, 1943, Mrs. Eaton reported that 4,330 women had been referred to war industries, 300 women had applied for part-time war work but had not yet been placed, and 168 applicants were awaiting referral until day nursery care for their children had been arranged.⁵²

WOMEN'S EMANCIPATION . . .

N.S.S. continued to launch recruitment campaigns for full-time women workers as labour demands dictated. In early October 1943 an intensive campaign was mounted in Peterborough for 550 new women workers for full-time jobs in textile factories and other high priority manufacturing firms.⁵³ Similarly in November 1943 special drives to recruit female textile workers for full-time jobs were carried out in the textile centres of Hamilton, Welland, St. Catharines, and Dunville.⁵⁴

In late September 1943, N.S.S. Regional and Local Officers in Montreal began planning a massive recruitment campaign to alleviate the area's recorded labour shortage of 19,000 women. But on November 2, 1943, a meeting of Montreal employers with Léonard Préfontaine, N.S.S. Regional Superintendent for Quebec, decided to postpone indefinitely the large-scale general campaign. As opposition to women's employment still persisted in Quebec, feeling was that the public would be more receptive to a series of short, small, separate drives specifically for "hotels, laundries, hospitals, textiles, etc."⁵⁵

In general the urgency for special recruitment campaigns let up in December 1943.⁵⁶ During the first months of 1944 "there was a slow but noticeable reduction in war industry."⁵⁷ The number of women in the labour force actually declined by 10,000 to 15,000 in the first three months of the year. Although the end of the war was in sight, N.S.S. was concerned that there be no slackening of the war effort until victory was secured. There was concern above all that women would begin to leave war industry in greater numbers than the slight slow-down in production warranted.⁵⁸ Married women might be wanting to return to their homes "and a less strenuous life"; single women might be wanting to secure post-war jobs. "Publicity was released through all channels asking . . . women [to] remain steadily on their jobs throughout the year." N.S.S. instructed the Supervisors of the Women's Divisions of local Employment and Selective Service Offices to try to persuade all women asking for separation notices to stay on their jobs. To the reluctant they should suggest a few weeks' holiday; or offer transfer to a more convenient shift or, finally to "a part-time job in essential work near their homes." The efforts of N.S.S. met with the desired results: "there was no general exodus [of women] from war industries and essential services."⁵⁹

Then in June 1944 came a new emergency. The invasion of France made necessary a last large-scale special campaign to recruit women for war industry. The Department of Munitions and Supply informed N.S.S. that shell and ammunition plants in Ontario and Quebec were going to have to operate at peak production in order to meet the needs of the Armed Forces on the newly opened European front. An estimated 10,000 additional women workers were required.

The campaign, which used the services of a commercial advertising agency, E.W. Reynolds Company, Ltd., of Toronto, was organized by the Public Relations Office of the Department of Labour⁶⁰ and "promoted co-operatively by the plants concerned"⁶¹ with every assistance from National Selective Service.

Local E. and S.S. Offices near the shell and ammunition plants in Ontario and Quebec, such as Ajax, Pickering, Small Arms, Toronto, Massey-Harris, Weston and Woodstock, Moffats, and Bouchard, Montreal, "redoubled their efforts to persuade women to accept jobs" in these war industries.⁶²

In co-operation with recruiting agents of the shell and ammunition plants of Ontario and Quebec, National Selective Service resumed the transfer of women from Sydney, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Calgary, Regina, and Winnipeg to central Canada. Some 350 Alberta women, many of whom were school teachers, were persuaded to give up their summer vacations and take jobs at Ajax and Pickering, on the agreement they would be back in Alberta for school opening, October 2.⁶³

In addition to the wartime recruitment of women into industries and services, there was also recruitment of women into agriculture "to fill some of the gaps in farm man power with female labour."⁶⁴ In all provinces farmers' wives and daughters took over farm work in the absence of male relatives and farm workers who had left the land to join the Armed Forces or work in industry. In two provinces, however, special programmes were organized to recruit farm labour on the basis of the Dominion-Provincial Farm Labour Agreement, entered into by Ontario in 1941 and by British Columbia in 1943. The Ontario Farm Service Force divided female farm labour volunteers into three brigades: 1) the Farmerette Brigade for sixteen-year-old and older female students and teachers during their summer holidays; 2) the Women's Land Brigade for housewives and business and professional women on a day to day basis; and 3) the Farm Girls' Brigade especially for farm women up to twenty-six years of age to lend a hand where and when necessary. The work was hard, usually nine to ten hours per day, and the wage rate low, 25 cents per hour. In 1943, "12,793 girls in addition to a considerable number of teachers" were enrolled in the Farmerette Brigade; approximately 4,200 women in the Women's Land Brigade; and about 1000 in the Farm Girls' Brigade. After its creation, National Selective Service helped to publicize the appeals for Farm Labour Service.⁶⁵

II

As is perhaps already apparent, Labour Department officials, National Selective Service officers, and Farm Service officials, charged with the recruitment of women into the labour force during World War II, viewed their task as service to the war effort. Accordingly, in their recruitment campaigns, they appealed first and foremost to patriotic duty and the necessity to make sacrifices for the nation in war time.

This key note was struck in the National Selective Service General Report on the Employment of Women of November 1, 1943. Next to determining the size of the existing labour reserve of women, the N.S.S.'s main task was "to outline to all Canadian women the part they would be expected to play in the anticipated expansion of all war demands."⁶⁶ It was the job of National Selective Service to

convince women “that it was their duty to go to work” and to persuade women “that work in war industries offered the most direct contribution which could be made to the prosecution of the war, apart from enlistment in the Armed Forces.”⁶⁷ The overalls and bandana of the woman war worker “became a symbol of services.”⁶⁸ The “vigorous publicity campaigns” of the Ontario Farm Labour Service laid “considerable stress on patriotic service.”⁶⁹

“There must be not let up in the supply of vital arms and equipment — no let up in food production — no let up in essential services” stated the letter sent by the Director of National Selective Service and Mrs. Eaton to the Local Councils of Women enlisting their help for the fall 1943 campaigns to recruit women workers. The letter went on to make the following two suggestions:

Arrange for an inspirational address in which the prestige and importance of any work essential to the war or to the home front is stressed, as well as a tribute to women now so employed.

Stress the need of women for the armed services but point out essential employment as an opportunity for women not of military age to serve with equal effect.⁷⁰

The N.S.S. Circular of August 18, 1943, sent to all E. and S.S. Offices, outlining the Campaign for Part-time Women Workers in hospitals, laundries, dry cleaning establishments, restaurants and hotels, opened with this ringing declaration: “During the last three years in the spirit of service and adventure women have entered the war plants and the war factories.” The same circular ended on this hortatory note: “The health and wellbeing of the Canadian people must be maintained while they participate in the March to Victory. The civilian essential services in the community are of vital importance.”⁷¹ A September 29, 1943 meeting of N.S.S. officials with personnel officers of various Peterborough firms agreed that the city’s October 1943 drive for women workers had to “supply the patriotic appeal to young people to come out from stores for full time factory work and for older women to come forward for part time storework.”⁷²

“Roll Up Your Sleeves for VICTORY!” was the headline of the December 1943 design, prepared by the Information Division of the Dominion Department of Labour, for a full-page newspaper advertisement to recruit women for war industry. In the centre of the ad was a drawing of a woman, shoulders squared, rolling up her sleeves. Behind her, a montage of photographs of women working, one a taxi driver, another a nurse, and the rest on production lines in war industry. The caption read:

The women of Canada are doing a magnificent job . . . in the Munitions factories, making the tools of war, in the nursing services . . . in the women’s active service units, on the land, and in many other essential industries. But the tempo of war is increasing, and will continue to increase until Victory is won. We need more and more women to take full or part time war work . . . Even if you can only spare an hour or two a day, you will be making an important contribution to the war effort.⁷³

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1976 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

In May 1944, when it was feared that women were wearying of war work and might be leaving the labour force altogether or changing to jobs promising more of a future, Mrs. Eaton drafted a letter to be circulated among the local E. and S.S. Offices. It contained this directive:

Try to change the attitude of mind represented in the words: "I want to get a post-war job" or "I am tired of making munitions." We need to remind ourselves and others that the war has yet to be won and completed. It is too early to express other ideas. Service and sacrifice are yet the key words.⁷⁴

Finally, in the massive campaign of July 1944 to recruit women to meet the sudden critical demands for labour in the Ontario shell and ammunition plants, the slogan was: "Women! Back Them Up — To Bring Them Back." This slogan appeared on advertisements placed in the major newspapers, reprints of which were delivered to thousands of homes in the neighbourhoods of the war plants, and on posters attached to the front and back of street cars, displayed in store windows, outside movie theatres and in theatre lobbies. The press release prepared by E.W. Reynolds & Company, Ltd., Toronto, for Moffats Ltd., manufacturer of ammunition boxes for the 25-Pounder gun, quoted this appeal from one of the company's officers:

Only by the single and married women coming forward and offering their help will it be possible to get these ammunition boxes out in the required time and thus keep faith with the boys at the front.⁷⁵

The call to patriotism, to sacrifice for the nation at war, to loyalty and service to the troops fighting overseas — that appeal dominated the recruitment of women workers from beginning to end.

At the same time Labour Department and N.S.S. officials were not unaware that many women were in the labour force, or applying to enter it, out of economic rather than patriotic motives. In a March 5, 1943 memorandum to Mrs. Eaton, Renée Morin of the Montreal N.S.S. reported on her recent conversation with a personnel officer for the Dominion Rubber Company. Mlle. Isabelle Groleau, who interviewed prospective workers for the plant, had stated that:

Most of the married women with children who seek work in our factory are in need of money to help their family. Those who are working merely to buy luxuries have not the courage to stick to their work. Very few have in mind a contribution to the war effort.⁷⁶

On March 30, 1943, the Women's Division of the Toronto E. and S.S. Office ran a questionnaire on married female applicants over thirty-five years of age. In communicating the results to Mrs. Eaton, Mr. B.G. Sullivan, Ontario Regional Superintendent for N.S.S., singled out the responses to Question No. 5 as "the most interesting highlight." The fifth question had asked: "What is the prime object in your securing employment?" Of the women questioned, 9% had indi-

cated patriotic motives, 59% "desire to supplement family income," and 32% "personal needs."⁷⁷ A May 11, 1943 memorandum brought to Mrs. Eaton's attention that that month's issue of *Relations* carried an article by Germaine Bernier entitled "Encore ce Travail Féminin." It gave results from a 1942 investigation carried out by the Quebec Jocistes into the working experience of 700 of its gainfully employed female members. Among the results was the statistic that 31.4% of the women had given "as their reason for working economic necessity — no other source of revenue."⁷⁸ Although the representativeness of these studies is not established, it would appear that some discrepancy existed between the official emphasis on patriotism and the actual motivation of women workers.

Not all reports, however, to N.S.S. on the motivation of female workers cast doubt on their patriotism. On April 30, 1943, the Director of Technical Education of Nova Scotia sent this account of the motivation of women workers in a munitions plant in his province: "Their general attitude showed that they felt their effort was directly connected with war activity and based on a keen feeling of patriotism."⁷⁹

Actually advertisements for women workers recognized economic incentives, as at least of secondary importance. The caption on the December 1943 "Roll Up Your Sleeves for Victory" ad ended: "By taking up some form of war work you will not only be showing your patriotism in a practical way, but you will also be adding to the family income."⁸⁰ Above or below the slogan "Back Them Up — To Bring Them Back" the advertisements in the July 1944 drive for women workers spoke of: "Opportunity for Women in Modern War Plant . . . [for] doing an important job and at the same time making that extra money which you can use to plan your future."⁸¹ Nonetheless, patriotic service to the war effort was the main motif of campaigns to recruit women workers.

III

From the start of attempts to bring increasing numbers of women into the labour force, it was realized that accommodation would have to be made to the particular needs of working women, especially married women and women with young children. By and large, however, such accommodation was made in the context of the war emergency and regarded as having rationale only for the war's duration.

One accommodation, in the way of an economic incentive to married women, was the July 1942 amendment to the Income War Tax Act with respect to the income of married couples. Under the tax law in force up to July 1942, a married woman, whose husband also received an income, could earn up to but not more than \$750 without her husband's losing the right to claim the full married status exemption. The 1942 revision of the tax law as it affected married couples granted the husband whose wife was working the full married status ex-

emption “regardless of how large his wife’s earned income might be.”⁸² The “special concession” was regarded as a “wartime provision.”⁸³ This amendment to the Income Tax Act was designed “to keep married women from quitting employment”⁸⁴ and to “encourage the entry of married women into gainful employment.”⁸⁵ Up through 1946, the husband paid no tax on any income up to \$1,200, regardless of his wife’s earnings. The wife paid tax on income exceeding \$660.⁸⁶

Then in September 1946, by Act of Parliament, the Income Tax Regulations were again amended with respect to married couples where the wife was working. The amendment to the Income Tax Act, effective January 1, 1947, repealed the wartime provision which granted the husband whose wife was working the full married status exemption regardless of the size of her income. As of January 1, 1947, once a wife’s income exceeded \$250, the married status exemption of her husband would be reduced by the amount of her income in excess of \$250. Many married working women figured that the tax change would have a serious effect on their actual contribution to the family income after taxes. Many employers of married women feared the change would have a drastic effect on their skilled female labour force. Representations poured in to the federal Departments of Labour, Finance and National Revenue. Officials in these Departments tended to think that the negative reaction was based on ignorance and misunderstanding. However, the Minister of Finance felt that an official statement by himself, or “a widespread programme of publicity might attract unnecessary attention to the subject.”⁸⁷ Instead he prepared an explanatory memorandum which pointed out that the changes in the Income Tax Act also included an increase in the full married status exemption from \$1200 to \$1500 and a general reduction in tax rates. Further it sought to clarify the actual effect of the tax changes on the combined income of husband and wife; a table demonstrating the effect on combined incomes at various levels was appended.⁸⁸ This memorandum was then sent to all Regional and Local Offices of the National Employment Service, with extra copies for distribution.⁸⁹

Nonetheless, representations kept pouring in. The married female employee continued to calculate the effect her earnings in excess of \$250 would have on reducing her husband’s exemption and thus her actual contribution to the household income. Fruitpacking and canning firms complained that many of their most skilled female packers and sorters were quitting work once their earnings reached \$250.⁹⁰ Textile firms complained that they were losing many of their most experienced power sewing machine operators, silk cutters, winders, and carders.⁹¹ Similarly business offices reported losing experienced stenographer-typists;⁹² hospitals, married nurses;⁹³ school boards, married women teachers;⁹⁴ department stores, married female employees.⁹⁵ The Deputy Minister of Labour, Arthur MacNamara, denied that, “in so far as the Labour Department [was] concerned, ” the intention of the tax change had been “to drive married women out of employment,” and certainly not “out of nursing, teaching and any other line of employment where their services are so seriously needed.”⁹⁶ But as the

spokesman for the Primary Textiles Institute in Toronto, reasoned: since the 1942 revision, which conceded full married status exemption to the husband irrespective of the wife's earnings, had been designed to draw married women into industry, its cancellation would have the opposite effect.⁹⁷ Nonetheless the official position of the Federal Government, as expressed in the memorandum prepared by the Minister of Finance in November 1946, was that the tax concession granted married working women in 1942 had been a war measure, "justified only by the extreme state of emergency which then existed."⁹⁸

Perhaps the major accommodation to the particular needs of working women arranged during the war was the establishment of child care facilities in Ontario and Quebec on the basis of the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement. But this accommodation too was made in the context of the war emergency and viewed to have a *raison d'être* only so long as the war emergency lasted.

In 1942, when it was realized that the Canadian economy would have to draw more extensively on women's labour than heretofore, it was also recognized that there might well be need to provide child care facilities for working mothers. The Prime Minister's address to Parliament on March 24, 1942, explaining the necessity and plan for the National Selective Service and outlining a ten-point programme for bringing women into industry, had contained as its sixth point: "The provision of nurseries and other means of caring for children."⁹⁹

Although the Women's Division of National Selective Service did not begin in 1942 to campaign for the employment of mothers, women with pre-school and school-age children had been in the labour force before the outbreak of war and had continued to enter it as production quickened.¹⁰⁰ As Mrs. Eaton wrote in June 1942, "without any urging on the part of Government, married women, usually on the basis of need of further income, have already gone into industry and are doing a good job."¹⁰¹ The mothers among these married women had had, of necessity, to make their own arrangements for the care of their children, with the help of relatives and neighbours.¹⁰² "But these unorganized arrangements" — here was government's and industry's material interest in day care in a time of labour shortage — "do not always work out so well and break down for days and weeks at a time."¹⁰³ The number of existing private nurseries, run by churches and other charitable organizations, was inadequate. In 1942, in Ontario, especially in the Greater Toronto area, public pressure for government provision of nurseries and after-school supervision of children increased. There was mounting concern over "latch-key" children and the possible connection between working mothers and the rising rate of juvenile delinquency.¹⁰⁴ Asked to supply the Minister of Labour with ideas on child care for his upcoming meeting with Ontario and Quebec Ministers, Mrs. Eaton referred to the rising concern for the welfare of children of working mothers as the main argument why government now had to step in:

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1976 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

Consistent and well-founded reports lead one to believe that children are neglected — thus becoming unhappy, undernourished and delinquent. Such a situation must be accepted as a responsibility of government in these days, when it has become a burden too heavy for private agencies.¹⁰⁵

Before the end of April 1942, the Director of N.S.S. was in contact with the Government of Ontario concerning “the setting-up of nurseries in co-operation with the provinces as needed.”¹⁰⁶ In May Mrs. Eaton conferred with the Minister and Deputy Minister of Public Welfare in Ontario and with the Minister of Health and Social Welfare in Quebec.¹⁰⁷ Experts in the field of child care, such as George F. Davidson, Executive Director of the Canadian Welfare Council,¹⁰⁸ and Dr. W.E. Blatz, Director of the Institute of Child Study of the University of Toronto,¹⁰⁹ were consulted.

On the basis of these preliminary talks and consultations, a draft for a Dominion-Provincial agreement on child care was drawn up. On June 16, 1942, the federal Minister of Labour called a conference in Ottawa to discuss the proposed agreement with the Minister and Deputy Minister of Public Welfare of Ontario and the Minister of Health and Social Welfare of Quebec. After clause by clause consideration of the draft agreement, it was approved.¹¹⁰

Then on July 20, 1942, through Order-in-Council P.C. 6242, the Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Dominion Government, was authorized to enter into agreements with any of the provinces to establish facilities for the care of children of mothers employed in war industries, in accordance with the draft agreement. A copy of the agreement and a letter inviting participation in the plan were sent to every province. The two most industrialized provinces signed that summer: Ontario on July 29, 1942; Quebec on August 3.¹¹¹ The only other province to sign was Alberta, in September 1943.¹¹² But the Alberta Provincial Advisory Committee on Day Nurseries, set up to assess the need in that province, voted on April 26, 1944, that there was none,¹¹³ despite considerable pressure from groups in Edmonton and Calgary for the establishment of day nurseries in those two cities.¹¹⁴

In the meantime, the administrative machinery was set up to implement the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement in the only two provinces which would make use of it, Ontario and Quebec. The Agreement itself provided that capital and operating costs were to be shared on a 50-50 basis between the Dominion and the Province.¹¹⁵ The initiative for establishing particular day nurseries rested with the Provinces.¹¹⁶ Ontario and Quebec each created a Provincial Advisory Committee on Day Nurseries, and local committees in urban centres, to determine where need existed. Provincial directors were appointed, and in Toronto, a director for the city.¹¹⁷ At the federal level, Miss Margaret Grier was appointed in October 1942 Assistant Associate Director of N.S.S., under Mrs. Eaton, to have charge of the administration of the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement.¹¹⁸ Local Employment and Selective Service Offices assumed the responsibility of interviewing ap-

plicants on need for child care, determining the eligibility of their children for day care, making referrals to operating child care facilities, and keeping records of the numbers of applicants and referrals.¹¹⁹

The Dominion-Provincial child care programme was slow in getting off the ground. In fact, the first day nursery to open, at 95 Bellevue Avenue in Toronto on October 6, 1942, was initially a provincial project and was only later brought under the terms of the Dominion-Provincial Agreement.¹²⁰ A second day nursery in Ontario, actually the first under the Agreement, was opened in Brantford on January 4, 1943. February brought the opening of Ontario's third, fourth and fifth day nursery units in St. Catharines, Oshawa, and Toronto; March, the sixth and seventh, also in Toronto.¹²¹ To accommodate the increasing numbers of married women entering the labour force in the spring and summer of 1943, six more day nurseries were opened in Ontario between April and September.¹²²

In addition to day nursery care for children two to six years old, the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement also provided for: foster home care for children under two; and school supervision, outside of school hours, for children between the ages of six and sixteen. The latter included supervision of school-age children during vacation periods as well as provision of a hot noon meal and supervision before and after school during the regular school term. A special sub-category of the school care programme was developed, called Junior Day Care, which provided for the kindergarten child after the conclusion of the regular school session.¹²³

By September 1945, there were twenty-eight day nurseries in operation in Ontario, 19 in Toronto, 3 in Hamilton, 2 in Brantford, and one each in St. Catharines, Oshawa, Galt, and Sarnia, accommodating altogether approximately 900 children. In addition there were 44 school units, 39 of which were located in the Greater Toronto area; of the remaining five, Hamilton had two, and Windsor, Oshawa, and Sarnia each had one. The Wartime Day Care Programme for School Children accommodated approximately 2,500 children.¹²⁴

The child care programme was even slower getting off the ground in Quebec, and never developed there to the extent it did in Ontario. The first wartime day nursery in Quebec was opened on March 1, 1943, in Montreal. In 1943 five others were opened in Montreal, four on May 1, and one on October 1. As the latter closed on December 31, 1944, there were in September 1945 only five wartime day nurseries operating in Quebec, all in Montreal, and accommodating on the average only between 115 and 120 children.¹²⁵ There was no development in Quebec of the day care programme for school-age children.¹²⁶

From the outset, the federal agencies involved viewed the establishment of child care facilities for working mothers as a war emergency measure designed "to secure the labour of women with young children" for "war industry."¹²⁷ In May 1942, the Minister of Labour gave his approval to six principles which Labour Department and N.S.S. officials, among them Mrs. Eaton, had drawn

up with reference to Government aid for day nurseries. The sixth stated: "That any such service should be strictly limited to provision for the children of women employees in war industries."¹²⁸

The actual Dominion-Provincial Day Nurseries Agreement departed somewhat from the original intention to confine eligibility to pre-school children of mothers working in war industries.¹²⁹ The preamble clearly specified that the child care facilities which the Dominion and Provincial Governments would undertake to establish were intended for the young children of mothers working in war industries. But Clause 10 provided for the care of school-age children outside of school hours. And Clause 11 provided that up to 25% of the capacity of any project could be opened to the children of working mothers employed in other than war industrial occupations. Furthermore Clause 1 (d) gave a broad definition to "war industries."¹³⁰ In practice, however, only firms with an A or B labour priority rating were considered to be "war industries."¹³¹ The federal government's position was that child care was "normally the *responsibility* of the Province, in cooperation with its local groups." Only the additional burden on the provinces "caused by war conditions" justified the federal government's assuming a share of that responsibility. Therefore the programme should "relate *chiefly* to war industries."¹³²

In the course of 1943 strong objection was voiced to Clause 11 of the Day Nurseries Agreement which set a quota of 25% of a project's capacity for children of mothers not employed in essential industry. Most vociferous in their criticism were the Toronto Welfare Council and the Toronto Board of Education. C.H.R. Fuller, Business Administrator and Secretary-Treasurer of the Toronto Board of Education, made representation in a letter to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, on February 5, 1943; R. Alan Sampson, Chairman of the Toronto Board of Education, wrote directly to Prime Minister Mackenzie King on May 6, 1943.¹³³ They asked that a most liberal interpretation be put on the definition of "war work" as "anything essential to the community at war" so that the children of all working mothers would be eligible. Application of the quota, they pointed out, put the school principals administering the school day care programme in the difficult position of having to refuse some children while accepting others. Limiting eligibility primarily to the children of mothers employed in firms with an A or B labour priority rating, discriminated against mothers working in other firms. This was unfair, they argued, as all working mothers were contributing indirectly, if not directly, to the war effort. In many cases, the woman doing the "non-essential" job was freeing a man or another woman for work in war industry. The children of all working mothers should be made eligible for the government-funded day care services.

On June 10, 1943, Mrs. Eaton chaired a meeting in Ottawa of N.S.S., Labour Department and Quebec and Ontario officials to assess the Wartime Day Nurseries programme a year after the draft agreement was first approved. First on the agenda was criticism of Clause 11. The meeting agreed that "the ratio of 75 and 25 for mothers employed in war industry" should continue and that the

interpretation of "war industry" as firms with A and B labour priority rating should still hold. Labour Minister Humphrey Mitchell gave his approval to this decision.¹³⁴ "If the Agreement is extended to include the children of all mothers who work, there is a further case that could be made out quite logically for the children of the woman who is ill or who is doing essential voluntary work," Mrs. Eaton had written to N.S.S. Director Arthur MacNamara on May 19, 1943.¹³⁵

But objection to Clause 11 persisted. Newspaper editorials took up the criticism:

We are now into the fifth year of war. For at least three years the pressure has been heavy to get more women into industry. In the last year Government agencies have urged women with children to fill the gaps so that the nation's economy could continue to function.

If mothers are to follow the advice of those agencies, then surely this division of children of working mothers into two classes is beyond common reason.¹³⁶

So editorialized *The Globe and Mail* on October 28, 1943. "It is a sort of crusade taken up by the papers, churches and women's organizations to get the children admitted regardless of any other consideration," Mrs. Eaton observed in a memorandum to N.S.S. Director MacNamara on December 1, 1943.¹³⁷

Under this mounting pressure the Ontario Minister of Public Welfare "gave way publicly" in November 1943 and N.S.S. officials began to reassess their stand.¹³⁸ Mary Eadie, Women's Division Supervisor of the Toronto local office, was asked to estimate the consequences in increased enrollments if the Day Nurseries Agreement were extended "to cover the children of all employed mothers."¹³⁹ By December 1, 1943, Mrs. Eaton had concluded that: "It is now apparent the 25 percent [Clause] does not altogether suffice."¹⁴⁰ Negotiations with Ontario and Quebec to revise Clause 11 were begun. Finally by order-in-council, on April 6, 1944, for Ontario, and on May 18, 1944, for Quebec, authority was granted to amend Clause 11 to extend the Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement to include children of all working mothers. Nonetheless the amendment stipulated that "children of mothers working in war industry shall have priority at all times in admission" to any child care facility established under the Agreement.¹⁴¹

That the Dominion-Provincial Day Nurseries Agreement was construed as a war-time emergency measure, however, is underscored by the relative swiftness of the programme's discontinuance. On August 23, 1945, J.A. Paquette, Quebec's Minister of Health and Social Welfare, wrote to Labour Minister Humphrey Mitchell in Ottawa that he, Paquette, planned to close the day nurseries in Quebec on the first of October of that year. His argument read:

Article 23 of the Agreement, signed by the Federal Government and the Province of Quebec on the 3rd of August 1942, provides that the Agreement shall continue in force for the duration of the war.

Now that the war is over, I would be inclined to close these Day Nurseries immediately, but I feel that a month's notice to the parents would only be fair.¹⁴²

Paquette's letter was referred to W.S. Boyd of National Registration. In Boyd's opinion, it could be contended on two grounds that Canada was still legally in a state of war: 1) a final peace treaty had not been signed and delivered; 2) neither His Majesty nor the Governor in Council had issued a proclamation that the war had ended (as Section 2 of the War Measures Act required).¹⁴³ Nonetheless on September 1, 1945, Humphrey Mitchell wrote to Paquette that he accepted Paquette's judgment and that Paquette, "as chief administrator of the scheme," had the right to close the nurseries when he chose and "upon such notice as is deemed advisable."¹⁴⁴

The closing of the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries in Quebec was set for October 15, 1945. In mid-September day nursery staffs were sent a letter from the Deputy Minister of Health and Social Welfare that their services would no longer be required after October 15th.¹⁴⁵

Margaret Grier, N.S.S. Assistant Associate Director in charge of Day Nurseries, received appeals to keep open the five Montreal day nurseries from the Montreal Council of Social Agencies,¹⁴⁶ from officials of the Welfare Federation and the Federation of Catholic Charities, and from the Montreal Association of Protestant Women Teachers.¹⁴⁷ As early as April 20, 1945, mothers of children attending the first wartime day nursery established in Montreal had drawn up a letter urging the Government to continue the Day Nurseries after the close of the war.¹⁴⁸ In October these same mothers gathered signatures on a petition to be sent to Dr. G.L. LaPierre, Director of Wartime Day Nurseries for the Province of Quebec, protesting against their closing.¹⁴⁹ In both letter and petition, a major reason the mothers gave for requesting continuance of the programme was that the mothers who placed their children in the nurseries were compelled to work, because of death of husband, separation from husband, war injuries or sickness of the husband, or inadequate wages earned by the husband. Further the mothers argued that, compelled as they were to work outside the home, they could do so, thanks to the day nurseries, relieved of anxiety over the well-being of their children. In fact, their children were receiving better care in the day nurseries than they would have under any other circumstances: better health care, training, and diet. The day nurseries were actually helping the mothers keep their families together.

These appeals were of no avail. The Quebec Government's position remained firm: the Dominion-Provincial Day Nurseries programme had been a war measure; the war was now over, and therefore the Agreement was no longer in force.

The situation was quite different in Ontario where many more wartime child care facilities had been established and there was correspondingly greater

pressure to keep them open after the close of the war. It was the federal government which took the initiative in opening discussions to end the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement in Ontario.

On September 11, 1945, Fraudena Eaton reported to Arthur MacNamara that applications for day care in Toronto had "increased rather than diminished during the past two months." She was having Miss Grier investigate "this seemingly unreasonable situation."¹⁵⁰ On October 31, 1945, the Wartime Day Nursery and School Day Care Centre in Oshawa were closed due to decreasing enrollment.¹⁵¹ But elsewhere in Ontario, especially in the Greater Toronto area, where 19 day nurseries and 39 day care centres for school children were in operation, reports from local employment offices showed in November "a continuing high demand for day care of children of working mothers."¹⁵²

Mrs. Eaton's response to this information was to give a gentle nudge to Mr. MacNamara with the suggestion that:

The time will come fairly shortly when the employment of mothers will not necessarily be related to production for war purposes or for highly essential civilian goods. It brings the matter of providing day care for children back to the point where it may be reasonably looked upon as a responsibility of the Provincial Government.¹⁵³

Mr. MacNamara took the hint and instructed Mrs. Eaton to draft a letter to the appropriate Minister in Ontario inviting discussion of a date to be fixed for terminating the Agreement on Day Care of Children.¹⁵⁴ In his letter of November 22, 1945, to the Deputy Minister of Public Welfare in Ontario, Mr. MacNamara wrote:

You understand that the financing of these and similar plans by the Dominion Government has been done as a war measure and our Treasury Board naturally takes the position "now that the war is over why do you need money?"¹⁵⁵

He suggested as the date of termination of the Agreement "the end of the Dominion Government fiscal year or soon thereafter."¹⁵⁶

Investigations indicated that of the mothers using the child care facilities in Toronto, 50% were working full time out of economic need: some were widows without, or with very small, pensions; others were deserted and unmarried mothers; still others had husbands who were unemployed or ill or earning inadequate wages. In 5% of the cases husbands had been "apprehended because of conduct." Thirty percent of the mothers were working full time to help husbands pay off debts, purchase homes, or get re-established in business. Fifteen percent were working part time to supplement family incomes.¹⁵⁷

Hope was growing in Ontario that, after the Dominion Government pulled out of the Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement, the Provincial Government might

pick up the whole tab. Margaret Grier informed Arthur MacNamara on February 15, 1946, that Deputy Minister of Public Welfare B.W. Heise himself had told her "he now had every hope that the Province would continue to maintain the day nurseries."¹⁵⁸ In early February deputations went to Toronto City Hall, the Board of Education, and the Provincial Departments of Education and Public Welfare to press for the continuation of day care in Ontario. At an early February meeting 300 interested persons in Toronto founded a National Nursery School Association "with the object of pressing for nursery school care in all Provinces and the maintenance of the standards set up in the Wartime Day Nurseries."¹⁵⁹

Meanwhile four months had elapsed since the Dominion Government first approached the Ontario Government proposing a date for the termination of Federal participation in the Day Nursery project. On February 18, 1946, Mrs. Eaton wrote to Mr. MacNamara suggesting that, as Ontario might continue the operation of day nurseries, provincial authorities were in no hurry to see Federal funds cut off. Now, however, the time for the cutoff had come, she argued, as:

No suggestion could be made now or even four months ago, that the employment of those women whose children are in day care centres is essential for work of national importance.¹⁶⁰

This argument was taken up by Federal Labour Minister Humphrey Mitchell in his letter of February 26, 1946, to W.A. Goodfellow, Ontario Minister of Public Welfare. "As you know," Mr. Mitchell wrote, "the Dominion share in financing this project was undertaken as *a war measure* for the reason that women whose children were in day care centres were engaged in *work of national importance*." Implying that the gainfully employed mothers of Ontario were no longer engaged in work of national importance, the Federal Minister of Labour communicated his Department's decision that it was necessary to set April 1st as the termination date for Dominion participation.¹⁶¹

Now a three-way passing of the buck began. W.A. Goodfellow's response to Humphrey Mitchell came in a letter of March 7, 1946. He informed the federal minister that enabling legislation was before the Ontario legislature to make day nurseries a municipal concern, with the provincial government sharing costs. The termination of federal contributions coming on April 1st together with the planned transfer of day nurseries from the Department of Public Welfare to municipalities, threatened to disrupt the running of existing child care facilities to the end of the school year. In view of that, the Ontario minister requested the federal minister to consider extension of the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement to June 30, 1946.¹⁶²

Humphrey Mitchell approved the extension to June 30th of the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement, although this information got lost in the shuffle of intradepartmental memoranda and was not communicated to the Ontario Minister of Public Welfare until April 2, 1946.¹⁶³ In the interim,

first and second reading had been given in the Ontario Legislature to Bill 124 authorizing municipalities to "provide for the establishment of day nurseries for the care and feeding of young children" and the provincial government to contribute one-half of the costs of their operation and maintenance. The bill passed third reading on April 4th and was enacted into law as The Day Nurseries Act, 1946.¹⁶⁴ Each municipality in which one or more wartime day nurseries had been operating was notified of the new legislation. The day care programme for school-age children was to be dropped altogether.

On May 17, 1946, the Ontario Minister of Public Welfare wrote the Federal Minister of Labour with a new request. Some of the municipalities had indicated that, as their budgets for 1946 had already been passed, they had no budgetary provision enabling them to assume fifty percent of the costs of keeping day nurseries in operation for the remaining six months of 1946. Therefore, W.A. Goodfellow was submitting for Humphrey Mitchell's consideration the following proposition:

For those municipalities which indicate a desire to have the [day nursery] programme continued and which are prepared to assume the administrative responsibilities from July 1, would you consider continuing the 50 percent net cost of operation until December 31, 1946?¹⁶⁵

On the same day Mrs. G.D. Kirkpatrick, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Welfare Council of Greater Toronto, forwarded to Humphrey Mitchell the Board's resolution not only that the Dominion Government continue to contribute 50% of the funding for Ontario's day nurseries through December 31, 1946, but also that the Provincial and Dominion Governments continue their support of the day care for school-age children.¹⁶⁶ A second letter from Mrs. Kirkpatrick to Humphrey Mitchell on May 29, 1946, reiterated the concern of the Toronto Welfare Council's Board of Directors that the day care programme for school-age children not be eliminated.¹⁶⁷ Toronto, the city in which most of Ontario's wartime nurseries and day care centres for school children were located, was one of the municipalities whose 1946 budgets made no provision for assuming even the day nursery costs.

On May 21, 1946, Humphrey Mitchell wrote to Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Health and Welfare. According to Mitchell's assessment of the situation, the current pressure on the Federal Government was the result of "the Ontario Government's endeavouring to arrange for municipalities to pay the fifty percent heretofore paid by the Dominion Government and the municipalities are objecting."¹⁶⁸

Claxton responded on June 7. He and his Deputy Minister could "see no reason why the Dominion Government should continue in peace-time to share in the costs of a program, the interest in which is apparently centred almost entirely within one province, and indeed largely within one large city in that province." Claxton had learned from his deputy that Hamilton had agreed to absorb the

municipal share of the day nursery costs in its 1946 budget. In Claxton's opinion, if Hamilton could do that, "even after the municipal tax rate has been struck and the budget set for the year," certainly other cities, such as Toronto and London, should have been able to do likewise.¹⁶⁹

On June 12, 1946, Humphrey Mitchell communicated to W.A. Goodfellow the Dominion Government's decision not to grant Ontario a further extension.¹⁷⁰ On June 30, 1946, the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement with Ontario came to an end. The day care programme for school children ended in Ontario on that date. By the end of November 1946, nine out of the 28 day nurseries were closed.¹⁷¹ To what extent the remaining 21 survived will require further research.

IV

The post-war abrogation of government-supported day nurseries in Quebec and day care for school children in Ontario, the post-war reduction of government support to day nurseries in Ontario, as well as the post-war cancellation of the tax concessions to employed married women, were all in keeping with the official attitudes towards working women which prevailed during the war itself. As labour shortages developed in 1942, women were regarded as a large labour reserve that Canadian industry could draw on in the war emergency. But women's place was in the home, and so initial recruitment was directed at young unmarried women and then married women without children. To meet increased labour shortages in 1943, recruitment had to dip more deeply into the female labour reserve, down to women with home responsibilities, even to mothers of young children. In deference to "majority opinion" which tended "to favour mothers remaining in the home, rather than working, where at all possible," N.S.S. and Labour Department officials appealed to the fact of abnormal times, of war conditions, to justify their having to encourage mothers with young children "to accept industrial employment, as an aid to our national effort."¹⁷² Even after the establishment of child care facilities in Ontario and Quebec, the Federal Department of Labour insisted that its policy was "to put emphasis on single or married women without children accepting employment in the first instance."¹⁷³ As only war service justified a mother's leaving home for the public work place, the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries Agreement was intended to provide day care primarily for the children of mothers working in war industries. According to Mrs. Eaton in April 1946, the Women's Division of N.S.S. had "found that women with children were unwisely deciding to look for employment," and had therefore in October 1943 advised the Counselling Service of local Employment and Selective Service offices "to hold back from employment those who would seem to be neglecting their home and family."¹⁷⁴

In so far as there was opposition to the employment of women in industry, as there strongly was from certain quarters in Quebec,¹⁷⁵ the Women's Division of National Selective Service did not respond with arguments of women's equal

right to work, but instead invoked the necessity of sacrifice for the nation at war and stressed the temporary nature of that sacrifice. In so far as women accepted jobs previously held only by men, they were generally regarded as replacing men temporarily. The large-scale part-time employment of women was obviously a temporary arrangement. The very increase in numbers of women in the labour force, from approximately 638,000 in 1939 to an estimated 1,077,000 by October 1, 1944,¹⁷⁶ was regarded as a temporary phenomenon. Therefore, it is not surprising that, faced with problems of women's unemployment and economic dislocation in the postwar period, the Women's Division of National Selective Service sought solutions in the return of married women to the home and the channelling of young unmarried women into those occupations in which women's services had been long accepted and were greatly needed: domestic service, nursing and teaching.

NOTES

*I owe the idea for this paper to Shirley Goundrey who audited the course I offered during winter semester 1975 on the history of feminism. At the Public Archives of Canada last summer, I received gracious assistance from archivist John Smart, to whom I am truly grateful. For valuable help with revising the first draft, I should like to thank my colleagues Charles Pye in the Economics Department and Ralph Pastore, James Tague, and Stuart Pierson in the History Department of Memorial University.

¹Barry Broadfoot, *Six War Years 1939-1945: Memories of Canadians at Home and Abroad* (Toronto, 1974), p. 353. Work is beginning to be done on the relation of women's wartime employment to the long-term trends in women's participation in the labour force. See Hugh and Pat Armstrong, "The Segregated Participation of Women in the Canadian Labour Force, 1941-1971," *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 12, no. 4 (Part 1), November 1975, pp. 370-384; Paul Phillips, "Women in the Manitoba Labour Market: A Study of the Changing Economic Role (or 'plus ça change, plus la même')," Paper given at the Western Canadian Studies Conference, University of Calgary, February 27-28, 1976; and, for the First World War, Ceta Ramkhalawansingh, "Women during the Great War," in *Women at Work: Ontario 1850-1930* (Toronto, 1974) pp. 261-307.

²Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York, 1963). For the impact of *The Feminine Mystique* on Canadian society, see the *Report of the Royal Commission on The Status of Women in Canada* (Ottawa, 1970), p. 2.

³Chapter on "Employment of Women and Day-Care of Children" (completed sometime before August 24, 1950), in the "History of the Wartime Activities of the Department of Labour," Part 1, pp. 5-6, Public Archives of Canada (PAC), Records of Unemployment Insurance Commission, RG 35, Series 7, Vol. 20, File 10. Hereafter cited as "Wartime History of Employment of Women . . ." or "Wartime History of . . . Day Care of Children."

⁴"The Development of the National Selective Service (Civilian) Organization in World War II to December 31, 1945," n.d., p. 7, PAC, RG 35, Series 7, Vol. 19, File 2; "History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," n.d., p. 5, PAC, RG 35, Series 7, Vol. 19, File 3.

⁵"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 6.

⁶PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

⁷Emphasis mine. "Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 15.

⁸"History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," p. 6.

⁹Government Notice, September 8, 1942, Registration of Women, Order, Department of Labour/National Selective Service, PAC, Records of the Department of Labour, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1. By Order-in-Council P.C. 1955 (March 13, 1942), every employer subject to the Unemployment Insurance Act (August 7, 1940) was required to register all persons in his employ on forms provided by the Unemployment Insurance Commission. "History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," p. 6.

¹⁰Registration was extended for those who had not been able to register during the prescribed period.

¹¹From the creation of National Selective Service in March 1942, the Minister of Labour and the Director of National Selective Service had found it necessary to draw upon the personnel and premises of the local offices of the National Employment Service of the Unemployment Insurance Commission for implementation of National Selective Service policies. By the terms of Order-in-Council P.C. 7994, dated September 4, 1942, the intimate association between the Unemployment Insurance Commission and National Selective Service was regularized for the duration of the war. The personnel and premises of the local Employment and Claims Offices of U.I.C. were placed at the disposal of the Minister of Labour for administration and enforcement of National Selective Service Regulations; and Employment Service an Unemployment Insurance Branch of the Department of Labour was created with an Unemployment Insurance Commissioner as its Head (and in December 1942 this Director of Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance, Allan M. Mitchell, was put in charge of the Labour Supply Division of National Selective Service); local Employment and Claims Offices became Employment and Selective Service Offices and their managers became National Selective Service Officers. To handle the increased work load, the original 97 local offices of the National Employment Service had increased to 226 local Employment and Selective Service Offices by November 1, 1943. With respect to women's employment, separate Women's Divisions were set up within local Employment and Selective Service Offices in all larger urban centres. The supervisors of those Women's Divisions of local E. & S.S. offices were, in all but two or three instances, women, and their staff, female. A Women's Division supervisor was responsible in the first instance to her local Employment and Selective Service office manager, but frequently in direct communication with Mrs. Eaton, Associate Director of N.S.S. (Women's Division), and the staff of her Ottawa office. See "History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," pp. 5-15; "The Development of the N.S.S. (Civilian) Organization in WWII," p. 11. Also the General Report on National Selective Service — Employment of Women, November 1, 1943, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2; and "Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 13.

¹²"Wartime History of Women . . .," p. 16.

¹³"Listing of Women Starts September 14, Says Mrs. Eaton," *The Globe and Mail*, August 21, 1942, p. 12; "Mrs. Rex Eaton Announces Registration of Canadian Women," PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

¹⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁵A. Chapman, "Female Labour Supply Situation," December 15, 1942, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

¹⁶*Ibid.*

¹⁷"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 19.

¹⁸General Report on National Selective Service — Employment of Women, November 1, 1943.

¹⁹A. Chapman, "Female Labour Supply Situation," December 15, 1942.

²⁰General Report on National Selective Service — Employment of Women, November 1, 1943.

²¹"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 8.

WOMEN'S EMANCIPATION . . .

²²General Report on N.S.S. — Employment of Women, November 1, 1943.

²³A. Chapman's phraseology.

²⁴Embodied in Order-in-Council P.C. 7595, August 26, 1942, effective September 1, 1942 (*The Canada Gazette*, Vol. LXXVI, No. 94, August 28, 1942, pp. 1-4); and consolidated and extended by Order-in-Council P.C. 246, January 19, 1943. "The Development of the N.S.S. (Civilian) Organization in WWII," pp. 8-9, 12; "History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," pp. 9-12, 18-19.

²⁵"The Development of the N.S.S. (Civilian) Organization in WWII," p. 12.

²⁶"History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," p. 10.

²⁷Order-in-Council P.C. 9011, passed on October 1, 1942, put into effect October 20, 1942, and known as the "Labour Exit Permit Order". "History of the National Employment Service 1939-1945," p. 16.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁹Letter of May 18, 1943, from Mary Eadie, Supervisor, Women's Division, E. & S.S. Office, Toronto, to Mrs. Norman C. Stephens, President, Local Council of Women, Toronto. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

³⁰General Report on N.S.S. — Employment of Women, November 1, 1943.

³¹"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," Appendix, Part 1. On May 12, 1943, in N.S.S. Circular No. 234, Allan M. Mitchell, Director of Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance, clarified the definition of part-time subsidiary work. Henceforward, employment was not to be "regarded as part-time subsidiary employment unless (it was) in addition to a regular full-time occupation or, unless, in the case of a person who (was not in) full-time regular employment, it (was) outside normal working hours," defined as between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. "In the case of housewives, employment (would be) regarded as part-time subsidiary employment if it (did) not exceed twenty-four hours in any week" inside or outside normal working hours.

³²"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 20.

³³Memorandum of May 7, 1943, from Mary Eadie, Supervisor, Women's Division, Toronto, to Mr. B.G. Sullivan, Ontario N.S.S. Regional Superintendent. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

³⁴"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 20.

³⁵Report on Recruitment of Part-Time Workers — Toronto, by Mrs. Rex Eaton to the National Selective Service Advisory Board, July 28, 1943. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

³⁶Letter of May 22, 1943, from Marg Eadie to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

³⁷The National Council of Women of Canada is a federation of women's organizations, organized nationally, provincially and locally. For its early history, see Veronica Strong-Boag, *The Parliament of Women: The National Council of Women of Canada, 1893-1929* (Ottawa, 1976).

³⁸Letter of September 8, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton to Mrs. H.L. Stewart of the Local Council of Women, Halifax. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

³⁹Report on Recruitment of Part-Time Workers — Toronto, by Mrs. Rex Eaton to the National Selective Service Advisory Board, July 28, 1943.

⁴⁰"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," p. 22.

⁴¹Report on Recruitment of Part-Time Workers — Toronto, by Mrs. Rex Eaton to the N.S.S. Advisory Board, July 28, 1943.

⁴²N.S.S. Circular No. 270-1, August 18, 1943, Employment of Women — Campaign for Part-time Women Workers. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

⁴³Draft letter of August 31, 1943, signed by Mr. A. MacNamara and Mrs. Rex Eaton, to be sent to Local Councils of Women. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1976 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

⁴⁴“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 23.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁴⁶Draft Letter of August 31, 1943, signed by Mr. A. MacNamara and Mrs. Rex Eaton, to be sent to Local Councils of Women.

⁴⁷“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 24.

⁴⁸Mrs. Rex Eaton’s Report to the National Selective Service Advisory Board on Recruitment of Women for Work in War Industries, July 28, 1943. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

⁴⁹Letter of August 16, 1943, from B.G. Sullivan, Ontario Regional Superintendent, to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

⁵⁰Minutes of July 26, 1943, Toronto, meeting of N.S.S. with local Employers about the Campaign for War Plants. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

⁵¹Letter of September 1, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara, with copy to Humphrey Mitchell. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

⁵²Memo. of September 22, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

⁵³Letter of October 13, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mme. Florence F. Martel, N.S.S. Montreal. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

⁵⁴“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 23.

⁵⁵Minutes of Employers’ Committee Meeting held on November 2, 1943, in Mr. Léonard Préfontaine’s office, re. Recruiting Campaign for Women War Workers. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 1508, File No. 40-5-1.

⁵⁶Letter of December 2, 1943, from V.C. Phelan, Director of Information, Information Division, Department of Labour, to Mr. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 615, File No. 17-5-11, vol. 1.

⁵⁷“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 25.

⁵⁸Memo. of May 8, 1944, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 3.

⁵⁹“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 25.

⁶⁰Letter of August 8, 1944, from Gordon Anderson, Public Relations Officer, Department of Labour, to Mr. Arthur MacNamara, Deputy Minister, Department of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 615, File No. 17-5-11, vol. 1.

⁶¹“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 26.

⁶²*Ibid.*

⁶³Memo. of July 25, 1944, from Mrs. Kate Lyons, Supervisor of Women’s Work, Edmonton, to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 3.

⁶⁴N.S.S. Report on “Wartime Employment of Women in Canadian Agriculture,” April 17, 1944. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 985, File No. 7.

⁶⁵*Ibid.*

⁶⁶General Report on N.S.S. — Employment of Women, November 1, 1943.

⁶⁷“Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .,” p. 8.

⁶⁸“Comments re Wartime Programme,” p. 5, Preface to “Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .”

⁶⁹N.S.S. Report on “Wartime Employment of Women in Canadian Agriculture,” April 17, 1944.

⁷⁰Draft letter of August 31, 1943, signed by Mr. A. MacNamara and Mrs. Rex Eaton, to be sent to Local Councils of Women.

⁷¹N.S.S. Circular No. 270-1, August 18, 1943, Employment of Women — Campaign for Part-time Women Workers.

⁷²Minutes of Meeting at N.S.S. Offices, Peterborough, September 29, 1943. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 2.

⁷³December 1943 Design for Full-Page Newspaper Ad. to Recruit Women for War

WOMEN'S EMANCIPATION . . .

Industry. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 615, File No. 17-5-11, vol. 1.

⁷⁴Memo. of May 9, 1944, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara, with Suggested Draft Circular re Tightening of N.S.S. Regulations for Women. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 3.

⁷⁵Moffats "Help Wanted" Campaign Breaking July 20, 1944. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 615, File No. 17-5-11, vol. 1.

⁷⁶Memo. of March 5, 1943, from Renée Morin, N.S.S. Montreal, to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

⁷⁷Letter of April 8, 1943, from B.G. Sullivan, Ontario Regional Superintendent, N.S.S., to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1. Unfortunately Sullivan's report of the questionnaire results does not give the number of women questioned.

⁷⁸Memo. of May 11, 1943, from Percy A. Robert, Montreal, to Mrs. Eaton and Mr. Goulet. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

⁷⁹Memo. of April 30, 1943, from Dr. F.H. Sexton, Director of Technical Education, Department of Education, Technical Education Branch, Province of Nova Scotia. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

⁸⁰December 1943 Design for Full-Page Newspaper Ad. to Recruit Women for War Industry.

⁸¹PAC, RG 27, Vol. 615, File No. 17-5-11, vol. 1.

⁸²"The Income Tax Change Applying to Married Employees in 1947," n.d. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁸³Letter of November 7, 1946, from A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour, to Mr. Fraser Elliott, Deputy Minister of National Revenue. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁸⁴"Income Tax Change Benefits Employed Married Women/ Aims to Keep Wives from Quitting Posts," *The Globe and Mail*, July 16, 1942, p. 1.

⁸⁵Explanation received from the Minister of Finance, J.L. Ilsley, by Douglas Hallam, Secretary of the Primary Textiles Institute, Toronto, and conveyed in his letter of November 4, 1946, to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, and in his letter of November 13, 1946, to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁸⁶Full-page advertisement "To the Man and Wife Who are *Both* Working," *London Free Press*, December 26, 1946, promoted through the Employer Relations Division of the Unemployment Insurance Commission Office, London, Ontario, and sponsored by the London Chamber of Commerce. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁸⁷Letter of November 27, 1946, from J.L. Ilsley, Minister of Finance, to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁸⁸"The Income Tax Change Applying to Married Employees in 1947," n.d.

⁸⁹Memo. of November 30, 1946, from A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour, to S.H. McLaren, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Unemployment Insurance Commission. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁰Minutes of the January 24, 1947 Meeting of the Vernon Local Employment Committee, a copy of which was sent to officials in the Departments of Labour and National Revenue. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹¹J.R. Moodie Company, Hamilton. Information conveyed in memo. of April 17, 1947, from Margaret McIrvine, Acting Regional Employment Adviser, U.I.C., Toronto, to B.G. Sullivan, Ontario Regional Superintendent. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹²Memo. of December 31, 1946, from George G. Greene, Private Secretary, Department of Labour, to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹³Memo. of January 30, 1947, from W.L. Forrester, Manager, Local Employment

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1976 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

Office, Prince George, B.C., to William Horrobin, Pacific Regional Employment Officer. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁴School Board of Charlotte County, New Brunswick. Information communicated in a telegram of November 7, 1946, from A.N. McLean, Saint John, New Brunswick, to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁵T. Eaton Company, Ltd., Toronto, reported that 453 married women had left their employ since January 1, 1947. Information in a letter of April 26, 1947, from G.W. Ritchie, Chairman, Ontario Regional Advisory Board (Department of Labour), to A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁶Letter of February 12, 1947, from A. MacNamara to F. Smelts, Chairman, Pacific Regional Advisory Board, Department of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁷Letter of November 13, 1946, to A. MacNamara, from Douglas Hallam, Secretary, Primary Textiles Institute, Toronto. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁸"The Income Tax Change Applying to Married Employees in 1947," n.d. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 606, File No. 6-24-11.

⁹⁹Ten Points Enumerated in the Prime Minister's Speech of March 24, 1942, with a View to Bringing Women into Industry. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 1.

¹⁰⁰"According to the 1931 Census, there were 128,132 married women, including those divorced or widowed, who were gainfully occupied. Less than half that number were married women living with their husbands. In 1941, the single women who were working outside their own homes numbered about 688,000, and the others, 166,000." See letter of September 23, 1943, from the Chief, Legislation Branch, Department of Labour, Ottawa, to Miss Marion Royce, Secretary for Young Adult Membership, World's Young Christian Association, Washington, D.C. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vol. 2.

¹⁰¹Memo. of June 13, 1942, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. George Greene, Private Secretary to the Minister of Labour, Ottawa. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹⁰²Report on Day Care of Children, July 1, 1943. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹⁰³Mrs. Eaton's memo. of June 13, 1942, to Mr. George Greene.

¹⁰⁴"Need for Day Nurseries," Editorial, *The Globe and Mail*, July 16, 1942, p. 6.

¹⁰⁵Mrs. Eaton's memo. of June 13, 1942, to Mr. George Greene.

¹⁰⁶Letter of April 30, 1942, from E.M. Little, Director of N.S.S., to G.S. Tattle, Deputy Minister, Department of Public Welfare, Ontario. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 1.

¹⁰⁷Letter of May 14, 1942, from Faudena Eaton to E.M. Little, Director of N.S.S. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹⁰⁸Letter of April 28, 1942, from George F. Davidson, Executive Director, The Canadian Welfare Council, to Mr. E. M. Little, Director, N.S.S. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹⁰⁹Memo. of April 30, 1942, to E.M. Little, Director of N.S.S., and R.F. Thompson, Supervisor of Training, Training Branch, Department of Labour, subject: Conference with Dr. W.E. Blatz, Director of the Institute of Child Study of the University of Toronto. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹¹⁰Report on "Day Care of Children," July 1, 1943, no authorship specified. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹¹¹Letter of March 17, 1943, from Miss Margaret Grier, Assistant Associate Director N.S.S., to H.F. Caloren, Assistant Director of Administrative Services, Department of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹¹²Memo. of November 10, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. V.C. Phelan, Director of Information, Information Division, Department of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

WOMEN'S EMANCIPATION . . .

¹¹³Letter of April 27, 1944, from Mrs. E.C. (Marjorie) Pardee, N.S.S. Representative of N.S.S. on the Albertan Provincial Advisory Committee on Day Nurseries, to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-9.

¹¹⁴PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-9.

¹¹⁵Memo. of May 27, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. George Greene, Private Secretary to the Minister of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1. Mothers were charged fees under the Agreement. For day nursery care, mothers in Ontario paid 35c per day for the first child, 15c for additional children; in Quebec, the fee scale was 35c per day for the first child, 20c for additional children. Where both parents were working, the fee was 50c per child in both provinces. For day care of school children, mothers in Ontario were charged 25c per day for the first child, 10c for additional children. No school projects were established in Quebec.

¹¹⁶Memo. of February 8, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹¹⁷Letter of March 17, 1943, from Miss Margaret Grier, to H.F. Caloren, Assistant Director of Administrative Services, Department of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹¹⁸“Wartime History of . . . Day Care of Children,” p. 3, PAC, RG 35, Series 7, Vol. 20, File 10; Memo. of February 8, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹¹⁹Memo. of June 16, 1943, from Mrs. Eaton to Mr. Eric Strangroom in response to request for information on Day Nurseries for the Minister of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1; N.S.S. Circular No. 291, October 15, 1943, on Women Workers — Day Care of Children, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vol. 2.

¹²⁰Memo. of March 4, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vol. 1. The Bellevue Avenue Nursery served not only as a child care facility but also as a demonstration and training centre.

¹²¹July 1943 Monthly Summary of Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries, Ontario. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 1

¹²²September 1943 Monthly Summary of Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries, Ontario. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 1.

¹²³Memo. of November 10, 1944, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. V.C. Phelan. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹²⁴Survey of the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nursery Programme in Ontario submitted on October 29, 1945 to Mr. B. Beaumont, Director of Child Welfare, Department of Public Welfare, Ontario, by Miss Dorothy A. Millichamp, Organizing Secretary, Wartime Day Nurseries, Dept. of Public Welfare, Ontario. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 3.

¹²⁵Report of the Quebec Ministry of Health on the Dominion-Provincial Wartime Day Nurseries, November 15, 1946. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-5-2, vol. 2.

¹²⁶Memo. of July 7, 1945, from Margaret Grier, to Miss Norris. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹²⁷Letter of April 30, 1942, from E.M. Little, Director of N.S.S., to G.S. Tattle, Deputy Minister, Department of Public Welfare, Ontario. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 1.

¹²⁸Memo. of May 22, 1942, on Proposals for Day Nurseries for Mothers Working in War Industry, for file in Deputy Minister's Office, Department of Labour. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹²⁹Memo. of June 13, 1942, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. E.M. Little, Director, N.S.S. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹³⁰“Wartime History of . . . Day Care of Children,” Appendix, Part 2.

“‘war industry’ means any industry or concern engaged in the manufacture, assembly, pro-

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1976 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

cessing, transportation or handling of arms, ammunition, implements of war, naval, military or air stores, or any articles deemed capable of being converted thereto, or made useful in the production thereof intended for the use of His Majesty's naval, military or air forces or for the use of the forces of any of His Majesty's allies in the present war, including supplies, materials, equipment, ships, aircraft, automotive vehicles, goods, stores and articles or commodities of every kind which, in the opinion of the Minister (of Labour), would be essential for the needs of the Government of Canada, of the aforesaid forces or of the community in war and anything which in the opinion of the Minister, is or is likely to be necessary for or in connection with the production, storage or supply of any such articles aforesaid.'

¹³¹N.S.S. Circular No. 291, October 15, 1943, on Women Workers — Day Care of Children.

¹³²Report on "Day Care of Children," July 1, 1943.

¹³³PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vol. 1.

¹³⁴Minutes of the June 10, 1943 Conference on the Day Care of Children, Confederation Building, Ottawa. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹³⁵Memo. of May 19, 1943, from Mrs. Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vol. 1; Vol. 1508, File No. 40-5-6.

¹³⁶"An Inequitable Division," Editorial, *The Globe and Mail*, October 28, 1943, p. 6.

¹³⁷Memo. of December 1, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vol. 3.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*

¹³⁹Memo. of November 22, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 1508, File No. 40-5-6.

¹⁴⁰Memo. of December 1, 1943, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. A. MacNamara.

¹⁴¹Order-in-Council P.C. 2503, April 6, 1944; and Order-in-Council P.C. 3733, May 18, 1944, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 610, File No. 6-52-2, vols. 4-5.

¹⁴²PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁴³Memo. of August 30, 1945, from W.S. Boyd, National Registration, Department of Labour, Ottawa, to Mrs. Rex Eaton. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁴⁴PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁴⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁴⁶Letter of September 20, 1945, from Miss Gwyneth Howell, Assistant Executive Director, Montreal Council of Social Agencies, to Miss Margaret Grier. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-5-2, vol. 2.

¹⁴⁷*Ibid.*, Letter of October 3, 1945, from Renée Morin, N.S.S. Welfare Officer, to Miss M. Grier.

¹⁴⁸PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁴⁹See above note 147.

¹⁵⁰Memo. of September 11, 1945, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. Arthur MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁵¹*Ibid.*, Letter of October 22, 1945, from B.W. Heise, Deputy Minister, Department of Public Welfare, Ontario, to Mrs. Rex Eaton; letter of October 29, 1945, from A. MacNamara to Mr. B.W. Heise.

¹⁵²*Ibid.*, Memo. of November 8, 1945, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, to Mr. Arthur MacNamara.

¹⁵³*Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴*Ibid.*, Memo. of November 9, 1945, from A. MacNamara, to Mrs. Rex Eaton.

¹⁵⁵*Ibid.*, Letter of November 22, 1945, from A. MacNamara to Mr. B.W. Heise, Deputy Minister, Department of Public Welfare, Ontario.

WOMEN'S EMANCIPATION . . .

¹⁵⁶*Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷Letter of December 17, 1945, from Mary Eadie, Supervisor, Women's Division, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Toronto, to Miss Margaret Grier, Assistant Associate Director, N.S.S., Ottawa. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 3.

¹⁵⁸Memo. of February 15, 1946, from Margaret Grier to Mr. Arthur MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁵⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰*Ibid.*, Letter of February 18, 1946, from Fraudena Eaton, Vancouver, to Mr. A. MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

¹⁶¹*Ibid.*, Letter of February 26, 1946, from Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, Ottawa, to W.A. Goodfellow, Minister of Public Welfare, Province of Ontario. Emphasis mine.

¹⁶²*Ibid.*, Letter of March 7, 1946, from W.A. Goodfellow, Minister of Public Welfare, Ontario, to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

¹⁶³*Ibid.*, Letter of April 2, 1946, from Humphrey Mitchell, to W.A. Goodfellow.

¹⁶⁴*Ibid.*, Bill No. 124, An Act respecting Day Nurseries, 1946.

¹⁶⁵Letter of May 17, 1946, from W.A. Goodfellow, Minister of Public Welfare, Ontario, to Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, Ottawa, PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 3.

¹⁶⁶*Ibid.*, Letter of May 17, 1946, from Mrs. G.D. (Beatrice H.) Kirkpatrick, Chairman, Board of Directors, United Welfare Chest, A Federation of Greater Toronto Social Services, Welfare Council Department, to Humphrey Mitchell.

¹⁶⁷*Ibid.*, Letter of May 29, 1946, from Mrs. G.D. (Beatrice H.) Kirkpatrick to Humphrey Mitchell.

¹⁶⁸*Ibid.*, Letter of May 21, 1946, from Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour, Ottawa, to Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa.

¹⁶⁹*Ibid.*, Letter of June 7, 1946, from Brooke Claxton to Humphrey Mitchell.

¹⁷⁰*Ibid.*, Letter of June 12, 1946, from Humphrey Mitchell, to W.A. Goodfellow, Minister of Public Welfare, Ontario.

¹⁷¹Memo. of November 28, 1946, from J.C. McK. to Mr. MacNamara. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 611, File No. 6-52-6-1, vol. 4.

¹⁷²Report on "Day Care of Children," July 1, 1943. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 1.

¹⁷³*Ibid.*

¹⁷⁴Letter of April 4, 1946, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, Associate Director, to Miss R.M. Grier, Assistant Associate Director, National Employment Service, Ottawa. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 609, File No. 6-52-1, vol. 2.

¹⁷⁵Marie T. Wadden, "Newspaper Response to Female War Employment: *The Globe and Mail* and *Le Devoir* May-October 1942," History Honours Dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland, May 1976.

¹⁷⁶"Wartime History of Employment of Women . . .," pp. 80-81. In February 1944, Mrs. Eaton estimated the number of women in the labour force at approximately 600,000 in 1939, rising to 1,200,000 by early 1944. Letter of February 2, 1944, from Mrs. Rex Eaton, Associate Director N.S.S., to Mrs. J.E.M. Bruce, Convenor, Trades and Professions Committee, Local Council of Women, Victoria, B.C. PAC, RG 27, Vol. 605, File No. 6-24-1, vol. 3.

