HAVEN OR HEARTACHE?

IMMIGRANT WOMEN AND THE HOUSEHOLD

Charlene Gannagé
University of Toronto

Au point de vue théorique cet article procure une importante rectification à la fausse polarité des deux positions suivantes: soit que la position de la femme au foyer est à la base de son oppression sexuelle, ou soit que la famille est essentielle à la survie et à la solidarité de la classe ouvrière. En se basant sur d'intenses entrevues avec des ouvrières immigrantes d'une manufacture de Toronto, cet article se concentre sur les aspects complexes et contradictoires de leurs expériences familiales. Il examine en détail la double journée de travail et démontre les façons dont les immigrantes sont à la fois dépendantes de la famille mais oppressées par leur position dans la famille.

At the theoretical level, this paper provides an important corrective to the false polarity of two positions: (a) that women's position in the household is the locus of their gender oppression; and (b) that the family is essential to working-class survival and solidarity. Drawing on in-depth interviews with immigrant women workers in a Toronto garment factory, the paper focuses on the complex and contradictory aspects of their family experiences. It examines women's double day of labor in detail, and demonstrates the ways in which immigrant women are both reliant on and oppressed by their position within the household.

Certain debates concerning the gender division of labor have focused on women's role in the household in order to understand women's oppression (Benston 1969; Fox, ed. 1980; Luxton 1980; Mitchell 1971; Morton 1972; Seccombe 1974). Most of the theoretical literature has emphasized the political economy of domestic labor, especially women's unpaid labor, in reproducing labor power. Given the decrease, in recent years, in the number of women who are full-time housewives, a major criticism of the domestic labor debate has been its failure to examine the double day of labor for women who work outside the home (Coulson, Magas, and Wainwright 1975; Rowntree and Rowntree 1970). On the other hand, several social historians have argued that the family has been necessary to working-class survival and solidarity, especially during the transition to industrial capitalism (Curtis 1980; Humphries 1977). Recently, black feminists have claimed that black women's family experiences provide a cultural haven

against racism, thereby functioning very differently from white women's experiences of the family (Caulfield 1984). This paper argues that such a polarity of positions is false. The article focuses on the complex and contradictory aspects of immigrant women's family experiences, both in providing important material resources to ease their wage labor, and as the locus of their gender oppression. It examines women's double day of labor in depth and shows how immigrant women both rely on and are oppressed by their position within the household (see Note 1).

To capture the rich texture of the lives of women workers, especially the complexity of their social relationships, this paper draws on in-depth interviews of women workers in a garment shop. While survey techniques represent one research option, the case study method facilitates an understanding of working-class life from the perspective of an "insider." Wax (1971) emphasizes the social aspect of the insider's view based on shared meanings. By studying one workplace, I was able to obtain intricately detailed "inside information." In addition, by focusing on the totality of women's experiences, in-depth interviews helped clarify the variety of ways women factory workers manage their double workday.

The use of human biography has become an increasingly widespread technique in the social sciences. For C. Wright Mills (1969), the cornerstone of sociology is the intersection of biography, history, and social structure. Sheridan and Salaff describe the life history tradition as a method that "blends history and biography in order to explore the effects of social structures on people and to portray the ways in which people themselves create culture" (1984:1). Certain social psychologists refer to "the science of human biography" as a framework for understanding the development of personality (Seve 1975). Recently, feminist historical researchers have emphasized oral traditions in an attempt to explore dimensions of women's lives that are obscured or hidden by traditional archival methods (Bornat 1978; McCrindle and Rowbotham, eds. 1979).

The use of in-depth interviews helps to document the finely-meshed reality of everyday life, including the contradictions, changes, and elements of struggle involved in the intersection of human biography with social structure. It portrays women as subjects whose real, practical activity is devoted to finding ways to cope with everyday life. For these reasons, the presentation of data in this paper emphasizes the content of what is expressed, rather than how many times it is said or how many people have said it.

This paper is based on research conducted from January 1980 to January 1982. The subject is a unionized cloak shop, Edna Manufacturing, located in the Toronto garment district. It is a conventional shop where skilled tailors, who are primarily male,

make the whole garment. The shop has been in continuous operation since the late 1930s. At the time of this study, Edna Manufacturing employed less than fifty workers, a third of whom were women. These women were primarily segregated in the lower-skilled and/or lower-paid sectors of the factory as finishers and non-craft workers.

Unlike the male operators in the shop, who were mostly Polish Jews, the women were ethnically heterogeneous. Some were Jewish women from Eastern Europe who came to Canada around 1930. Others were Eastern-European women who immigrated immediately after World War II. The rest of the women at Edna Manufacturing came to Canada between the late 1950s and early 1960s, including women from Greece, the Ukraine, several Italians, and a few women of British descent. Only two of the women interviewed were Canadian-born.

I interviewed both women who were working in the shop and women who had retired. Two women retired during the course of this two-year research project. Tremendous variation existed in the ages of the women in the study. The youngest was forty-one years old, and the oldest was seventy-five. Because of the demographic characteristics of the employees of Edna Manufacturing, and also because I was collecting oral histories, I was able to document the entire range of the women's life experiences.

Interviews were conducted in homes and were tape recorded (see Note 2). To ensure confidentiality, all names, including the name of the shop, have been fictionalized. Verbatim accounts are used to present the material. English was the second language of the majority of my subjects. I have tried to convey their authentic life experiences with only minor editorial corrections in grammar and syntax, and I have not attempted to unravel stated contradictions in their perceptions (see Note 3).

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA

Initially, questions concerning migrant labor were not central to my research. As the research proceeded, it became clear that these questions were important considerations that needed to be taken into account to provide a holistic picture of the women's lives.

Some women in the study immigrated to Canada to escape harsh economic climates in their home countries. Sheila Glaber was twenty-five years old and single when she immigrated from Austria in 1930. Her father was a financier and land owner who faced a bleak future following the decline in his investments after World War I:

Sheila Glaber: We were at that time . . . well off. Because we had money in the bank, we had land. . . . we were [lending] money . . . My father gave money for interest. But then we had nothing. We were left with just a piece of land.

Underdeveloped and war-ravaged Austria offered little opportunity for employment:

Sheila Glaber: There was no work. We lived in the suburbs of the city. The city had no factories, and the country just had a little land that we worked on. We didn't actually work it, but the farmers worked and they gave us half of the corn or whatever there was. Times were very bad. . . . There was no way to make a cent or a dollar. The situation was very poor.

Canada offered the possibility of a better life:

Sheila Glaber: I knew that it was a different country, and sooner or later I would get ahead better than there.

When Sheila Glaber settled in Winnipeg, she found herself in the beginnings of a depression which was to last until World War II. Desperate and lonely, she looked for work:

Sheila Glaber: When I came to Winnipeg, I didn't have anybody. I just came and I rented a room. I had a few dollars and looked for a job, and everybody was pitying me. "You need a job? You are a lonely girl? You have no one?" And they took me in and kept me for a week or two. They didn't have any work. Not because they didn't want me, but there was no work until 1939.

Ruth Domanski worked in Russia as a bookkeeper and planned to become a judge. After several unsuccessful attempts to find honest work, she finally landed a job when she agreed to fiddle the books for the manager of a cooperative farm. She fled the country in fear of future reprisals under Stalin. Following the tragic death of her husband and a lucky escape from the ship *Exodus*, she arrived in Canada, a single mother who proudly refused to go on welfare. She didn't want to be a burden on her relatives who were also struggling to make ends meet:

Ruth Domanski: When I came over here I didn't have money. I didn't want to be a burden on my sister because they couldn't make a living themselves. It was still too hard. I didn't know the language and I had a baby on my arms. My husband was killed in Germany when the baby was born. I had to think fast to make a living on my own. I went into the needle trade. I was stuck with it. I couldn't go to school. It's not that I'm pleased with the needle trade. It's not what I'm raised and educated for. But I have no choice. I'm still with it, and I'm here now.

With the financial help of the Landsmen Society, to which Ruth's sister's husband belonged, her sister sponsored Ruth's immigration to Canada. The Landsmen Society was instrumental in helping Ruth to make contact with the union and eventually get a job. Family and ethnic ties provided the support system and the social network necessary for many new immigrants to link up with the union movement, to find employment, and to make friends and share in cultural activities. For Jewish immigrants, the Landsmen Society met this same need:

Ruth Domanski: They were born there in Poland, but after the war they came over here. They kept together and they worked together. They entertained together. They eat together. They were company.

Some women found companionship and support by participating in union activities and politics. During the thirties in Winnipeg, Sheila Glaber was an executive member of the union and sympathetic toward members of the Communist party:

Sheila Glaber: They were smart people. Some of them were educated people. They knew the history of Russia. They knew what socialism was and what Russia was before. Sometimes I sympathized with them. Because I was also a poor girl. I was starving for a day's work. I was in that atmosphere. The atmosphere was working-class. So how could I think of anything else? All workers were like that.

When Sheila moved to Toronto, she found that the union office was located in the same neighborhood where the majority of garment workers lived. The workers lived close to the factories and walked to work. Community relationships outside the factory helped strengthen the cultural bonds between workers:

Sheila Glaber: A lot of Jewish people live in that area. People were poor. They didn't drive cars. They had more limited life in every respect. At that time, you went out in the street, you met somebody. You invited them in for tea or you had a walk with them. You went to have a coffee somewheres, so that was a treat already. It was all together.

Friendship networks extended beyond the factory walls to encompass the whole industry. Besides living in the same communities, groups of Jewish workers knew each other in the old country. Their common past provided them with the support they needed to feel at home in a new country.

After World War II, Canada took in displaced persons from Europe. Because of their life experience, many were anti-Communists. Some worked in the needle trade alongside old-timers who were sympathetic to socialism and communism during the 1930s.

Donna Jakubenaite explained the circumstances that led to her emigration from Eastern Europe:

Donna Jakubenaite: It was very bad. So many people was killed by Russia. So many was in the jails. The war started. I left the country [in Eastern Europe] and I came to Germany. And then, I came to Canada. Because we got nowhere to turn, we were scared of Russia very much. We can't go nowhere because the Balkan countries were occupied by Russia.

Donna was single and thirty-three years old when she was sponsored by her employer to come to Canada as a domestic. Her first job left her close to nervous collapse:

Donna Jakubenaite: I got very sick because I'm not used to work as a domestic. I was always scared I'm not doing right because I don't know the English language. I was always scared, would I wake up in time. I run myself down so much. I lost so much weight. The doctor said, "Then you can't work as a domestic because you [will] collapse completely."

When Donna was younger, her sister had taught her how to sew. She looked for work in the Winnipeg garment industry:

Donna Jakubenaite: I know sewing a little bit from my home. From my older sister. [She] was a tailor. She was sewing ladies' dresses, and I used to work [a] little bit with her.

To her pleasure, Donna discovered a large Lithuanian community on a visit to Toronto. She decided to leave Winnipeg and gave notice to her employer:

Donna Jakubenaite: I decided to come to Toronto. I went to the lady who was looking after us and I gave her notice because I wanted to leave Winnipeg. Oh, she was crying. She say, "Never get such a worker, [as] good [as] you are." I was very fast, and she tried to talk me out of going. But just her family [spoke my language]. Almost all my people were here. My friends were here. That's why I decided to come to Toronto.

In a Toronto garment factory, Donna experienced discrimination because of her status as a displaced person. The foreman returned her work and asked her to do it over again:

Donna Jakubenaite: One old man, the foreman, was on our section. He was very old and was very nasty. He was hating D.P.'s. He was hating newcomers. He had lots of problems. I wanted to quit there because it was too much. Oh my nerves! He give back [my] linings. He say it was not right.

Donna complained to her employer when the same foreman continued to give her small amounts of work compared to the huge

bundles given to old-timers. After work, she socialized with friends in her language community, met a man who owned a factory, and went to work for him. Shortly thereafter, she married him.

Single immigrant women were anxious to marry and settle down in their adopted country.

Sheila Glaber: I was anxious to get married. Girls are smarter now. But at that time you didn't want to stay alone and I wasn't young anymore.

Sheila married a man who had previously been married at least three times. He was cruel to her and she had to support him financially. Two years later, she divorced him.

SETTLING DOWN AND LOOKING FOR A COMMUNITY

Many women who immigrated to Toronto in the late fifties and early sixties moved with their husbands and children. Their motivation stemmed from a hope for a better life for their children. Theresa Green moved from one English-speaking country to another in search of better opportunities:

Theresa Green: I felt I was looking for something better for my children—more opportunities for them.

Like so many other immigrant women, Theresa found life in a new country alienating. Even though she could speak English, the workplace culture was far from friendly:

Theresa Green: This is something strange for me because I can honestly say I don't like working in Canada. I know I have to work, and I make the best of it. But in my home country, and even in other countries where I have lived, I worked with Australians, and Jewish people and Polish people. But we seemed to be more friendly, somehow. Actually, at home we would save a little bit off our pay and go out to dinner and the theater. But here, I feel that there is nobody I can really talk to. It's not right, somehow.

A workmate who immigrated from England was equally disappointed. She attributed her alienation to the poor working conditions and fly-by-night operations characteristic of the Canadian garment industry. Unable to settle down, she returned to England, where workers were in demand, and were treated better:

Carol Lenski: I got sort of disgusted with the employment. Everyplace you worked in, the place would close down. Either the employer couldn't get a loan, or else he was old. So I went back to England. Because working conditions were better even though the wages were not. You had cafeterias, the places were more

organized, cleaner. I think that they needed workers so badly that they tried to tempt you to come and work in the place. And they would give you free tea at break. It wasn't too long after the war so they really needed workers.

Most of the Italian women immigrants were sponsored by extended families already settled in Toronto. Isolated by their inability to speak English, they found job hunting an excruciating task, as Maria Lebella explained. She relied on her older son to help navigate the unfamiliar streets:

Maria Lebella: I don't know where to go. I look in the newspaper. I say to my oldest son, "You come with me. I don't know whether to take a streetcar. [I don't know] where is that place."

Most of the women interviewed did not have previous experience working in factories, although they sewed clothes in their homes for their families. Maria Lebella's mother first taught her how to sew:

Maria Lebella: I learn by my mother. Not because she do it for business, but for her own family. She teach me.

Maria had worked for wages as a finisher in her home in northern Italy. She preferred factory work because at the factory, she was free of family responsibilities. At home, she often had to work late into the night because household duties interrupted her wage work during the day:

Maria Lebella: I think it is better in the shop. You are free. You don't have to do [housework]. [At home, you] have to prepare [the kids] to go to school. [In the factory], you go and you are free from the family. [At home], have to stop the work to prepare [the meals]. And go with the kids to school. You can't leave little kids alone in the streets. I was working more in the night than the day. Because you lose a lot of time.

In Italy, Rosa Lorenzo had worked as an operator in her husband's custom-tailoring shop. She used a machine, sewing men's pants. When she came to Canada, she could not find work as an operator because most employers insisted on "Canadian experience." As a woman, she found it impossible to hold a job that was traditionally defined as men's work. Instead, she worked as a button sewer, earning less than $4,000.00 a year:

Rosa Lorenzo: I like to [be] operator, but I tell you when you go to another shop, everybody wants experience. Nobody wants to give time to learn.

Grace Campisi was born in Sicily, where women did not work outside the home. Unaccustomed to factory work, she moved from factory to factory looking for suitable conditions for a working

mother. The most difficult problem she faced was the guilt of leaving her children every morning:

Grace Campisi: Change a lot of factory because before I don't like very good to work. I tell you the truth, because I never work before I come here. When I come here, everything so changed. I don't like leaving my kids. I don't know how much I cry. I never leave my kids before.

Women's work in the shop was poorly paid, involved longer lay-offs, was repetitious, and required less creativity compared to the craftsmanship which characterized the men's work. Although the women's work was less individualized and more interdependent, language barriers between groups of women made it difficult for them to develop a common, collective sense of working conditions. For the men and some of the Jewish women, union and work-related activities were synonymous with their ethnic network. Other women were isolated from each other because they did not have a common language. As outsiders in the world of work, most of the women sought meaningful relationships in their families and through ethnic-related activities outside of work. In the factory, some women gravitated toward workers in their own language groups. For example, Donna Jakubenaite formed a friendship with a Lithuanian worker in her husband's factory:

Donna Jakubenaite: Yes, I got one friend. We was working together. But she lives now in Vancouver. She is my very close friend and we was just at her daughter's wedding a couple of weeks ago. . . . When we got our own factory . . . she was working with us. . . . I got mostly my friends from the time I come to Canada. I got a few of his [her husband's] friends from the old country too. But most is from . . . when I came to Canada in 1948. I got a couple of friends from the old country here.

Friendships grew from common experiences as new immigrants. Ruth Domanski, who came to Canada from Russia, still keeps in touch with the workers she met in her first factory job:

Ruth Domanski: Everybody has their own crowd. When I first started working, it was my first job, my first friends, my first acquaintances. We got together with each other or we're having company. Mind you, we're still seeing each other. People I worked with thirty-one years ago. If I have a party, let's say my daughter got married and I had a shower for her, I invited all the girls I worked with. They married off their children, they invited me to their wedding. With the old-timers, I'm in touch.

Sometimes ethnic ties, family ties, and workplace experiences intersected. Grace Campisi shares confidences with her daughter's mother-in-law, who helped find her a new job:

Grace Campisi: Sometimes, you want to spend the time, you talk about the family. Sometimes you got a problem, you talk. Feel little bit bad. When you talk, you feel a little bit better.

The family provided a haven for these women to maintain their cultural identity during the transition from their countries of origin to Canada. The family was the one place they could use their own language. A feeling of solidarity with others who shared a common language was important, as Evelyn Thompson, an immigrant and a former staff member of the union, explained:

Evelyn Thompson: I think immediately there's a sense of more intimate feeling because you both came from the same background. The women can relate to you in the language, particularly on sensitive and personal topics as sexuality or their family life.

Jointly preparing recipes learned in their home countries afforded the opportunity to escape the silence and talk freely:

Grace Campisi: Talk, make coffee, eat, cook together.

While the weekends were saved for domestic chores, they were also occasions for family get-togethers. Preparing big meals was both an act of love and a way of maintaining ethnic traditions:

Donna Jakubenaite: They like my food. They like my cabbage rolls. They like my perogies. They right away phone, "Grandma when you make cabbage and perogie? We want it" (she laughs). It makes me happy.

Family celebrations, especially weddings, were a focal point. The women showed me albums of their children's weddings. Though finances were a problem, and despite the fact that this was traditionally the responsibility of the bride's mother, Maria Lebella made an effort to provide a wedding celebration for her son:

Maria Lebella: He finish [college] in May. He get married in June. That's it. He was not with a job. I say "Wait to get married. Find a job before." She finished with college. They decided to get married. I say I am not going to make a party. I haven't got money. And both say, "We don't need a party. We don't want a party." After they can't change their mind [about marrying], I make a party. There was a hundred people, but I pay for all the party.

The freedom to learn English was a luxury. Most women were hamstrung by inadequate child-care facilities, a double day of labor, and lack of economic resources. Ruth Domanski describes the intolerable double bind she faced when she tried to break out of her isolation:

Ruth Domanski: I went three hours to night school. I sneaked out. My landlady screamed at me. She said that if I'll do it again, she'll take the children away from me. She'll call the welfare, because I've neglected them. She didn't want to look after them. . . . So I stopped going to school. I didn't know [that] you had to have a baby-sitter and pay. That's to me something new. . . . I couldn't understand it. To me, it was the way I was raised. . . . In other words, help others. I'd been a landlady. I had women and children in my house. [If] she wanted to go out, I'll look after the children, I didn't have any pay. Go ahead, by all means, I don't mind. [Canada] is a country, everything you have to pay. I didn't know that.

THE STRUGGLE TO MAKE ENDS MEET

Although they came to Canada in search of a better life, the women in this study sought jobs outside the household because they faced economic hardships. Shortly after arriving in Canada, Ruth Domanski married and lived on a farm. She moved in with her husband and her husband's brother. When the latter began to make sexual advances toward her, she left the farm. To keep peace between the two brothers, she never told her husband. She never remarried, and as a single parent, she eventually took a second job in a bakery to supplement her low wages as a finisher:

Ruth Domanski: This was after I came back from the farm. And I couldn't support two of them. So I left one with my sister. The oldest and the little one, I took to nursery school. And I managed. Mind you, I did odd jobs. I cleaned flats and I cleaned toilets to make an extra fifty cents or a dollar. It was hard on me. But we survived. . . . When my daughter wanted to come back, I had to do something about it. I had to look for another job. I didn't want to go to the government for help. The baby was only two years old. My daughter was nine years old. I was a citizen already. Everybody used to say "Why don't you go on welfare, they will help you." I said, "No. I'm strong. I have two hands. I'll manage. It's not forever. We'll go down for help." That's why I look for another job. I started working on two jobs.

Carol Lenski moved to Canada from Calcutta, where she had married an American serviceman. After settling in the United States for a short time, she left him. She needed a job, and a friend who lived in the same rooming house told her about a job sewing buttons in a clothing factory:

Carol Lenski: I had to work. It was a necessity because once I left my husband, I had to support myself. One of the immediate problems was to get a job as fast as I could. It didn't really matter what kind of a job as long as I could have enough money to support myself.

Carol looked upon her first job in the needle trade as temporary. Like so many young women, she expected to remarry and leave her job. Thirty years later, she still found herself in the same industry:

Carol Lenski: I just thought it would be temporary. As most people always think, if you've been married once, you'll remarry. I often thought about going to school at night, but because of being physically tired when you come home, you just didn't have that ambition or energy to go to school. I would have liked to [have] gone to university. I [have] always been very interested in anthropology and zoology.

Sheila Glaber did not have children. She worked prior to her second marriage, and wanted to continue working. Her husband also worked in the needle trade as an operator. The combination of her husband's poor health and the pressures of the piecework system made it difficult for the couple to live solely on her husband's salary:

Sheila Glaber: I told him, what am I going to do at home? Waste time. I'm used to work. I was well. I was strong. What will I do—watch the house? I have no family. He thought that we have something to live on, I shouldn't work anymore. But I wanted to work. I could make money. We could retire—the two of us. I saw that he wasn't too well of a man.

Maria Lebella went out to work because she was having difficulty making ends meet on her husband's take-home pay of seventy dollars a week while he was taking English lessons:

Maria Lebella: I say to my husband, "I want to buy a house. I don't want to live like that seventy dollars a week." The husband [does] not see what's the problem in the house. He not go shopping, he not look [to see that] the kids need the shoes.

Women workers at Edna Manufacturing were pioneers compared to an earlier generation of women who did not work outside the household. Their own mothers had worked full-time at home, raising children and maintaining the household:

Sheila Glaber: . . . we had a lot of kids. There was too much work for a woman at home [to work outside of the home]. With me, I came here, I encountered a different style of life. I lived like they were living here. . . . Sure it was easier, because I had right away a sink with water, a gas stove. Now, I have an electric stove. They had a wooden stove. They had to carry in the wood. Make the fire. Bake the bread. They had a lot of work, and they had a lot of children.

Ruth Domanski: My mother was a homemaker. Period. I wasn't. That's a different life. My mother had a good life. My father

gave her a good living. Raised us very nicely. There were six children. That's what she was trained for, and involved in. My generation was a little different. My children are still different. They have more education than I do. They have university. I don't.

Theresa Green reported that when she entered the labor force, her work load increased. In addition to her domestic labor, she put in a full workday at the factory (see Note 4):

Theresa Green: You weren't just sitting home and taking care of your children, and planning your meals. You were going out to work, and taking care of the children and tending to meals. I think a woman has two jobs, always. A job outside and a job at home. Women are having it a little bit easier now . . . women who had families. I think their husbands help them more. But at the same time, it was a done thing. You didn't think about it. I was tired. You knew these things had to be done, and you took it into your [stride].

Some women attributed their double day of labor to the peculiarities of their European background. The fact that their husbands did not help with the housework or child care was a tradition handed down for generations:

Grace Campisi: My people don't like to do like this because my people used to something different. I used to do the same in Italy. The lady stay home, clean the house, and make everything so good at home. When the husband come, she got everything ready to eat, he eat. Maybe he dress nice and go some place. And the lady stay [home] to clean, to look at the kids. That's it. I can't say anything because this is the style . . . my style, anyway (she laughs). I cannot say, "You wash the dishes." No. He doesn't know [how to] cook, he never cook. When I come home, I cook, he eat.

Sheila Glaber: I did [the housework], mainly. He didn't like it too much. Sometimes, I was angry. But men are not [supposed to do housework], especially European men. Canadian [men] are more modern, they help out their wives, I think. He used to help me. Sure, he used to go down, fix things on the machine. Like on Sunday—fix for me . . . sew up things. He used to do the driving. He was a good man. Some men dry the dishes. I didn't want him to dry. I didn't want him around—the kitchen is too small. And cleaning, I used to do mostly myself . . . weekends. I got up Sunday morning. Laundry, I did Friday night once in two weeks.

These women did not realize that their workmates from both Canada and Great Britain also performed a double work load:

Jane Mathewson: When he used to get home, I never talked to him. You know what I mean? He had his own troubles. [I did] not [want] to have an argument. He'd take the paper and he'd read it, and he'd put on the football or the baseball. That was his job, and I went ahead and done my work.

Theresa Green: There was a time when a man would come home from work and sit . . . and put his feet up, and that was him. A woman would come home from work, and she would have to start all over again. Getting this and that done, and plan for the next day, and plan for the week.

THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP

Unlike the marginal nature of their work in the factory, in the private sphere of the household women workers exercised their creativity and, in a limited sense, power over their immediate surroundings. As we will see, these women reported that they regulated the pace of their domestic labor. While I was in their homes, they proudly shared their meals with me; told me about the successes of their children and/or grandchildren; showed me the layout and design of their homes, their needlework, and the beauty of their gardens; and, as already mentioned, showed me their children's wedding albums. However, the power they exercised in the household was curtailed by the complex interplay of economic hardship and the authoritarian relationships that they had learned within their family settings.

Grace Campisi's marriage was an economic relationship which gave her hope that she could escape the poverty of her father's household. She was one of eight daughters in a family where her widowed father was the sole breadwinner. She married at the age of fifteen, knowing full well that her father could not provide her with the traditional dowry to start married life. For her, marriage was an economic necessity:

Grace Campisi: I didn't have a mother. My father couldn't look after all the kids. . . . I said my father can't give me anything. I don't have nothing when I married. . . . Nobody make me nothing. My mother died. My father got to work for all the kids. Got to give all the money just to eat. I say OK, I take my husband, marriage, that's it. . . . That's why I marry very young.

For a number of women who immigrated from Europe, patriarchal customs dominated matrimonial traditions. Women reported that their marriages were arranged by either a professional matchmaker, or by male relatives who brought prospective husbands to the parents' home for approval. The father of Mary Kastanys altered her birth certificate, hoping that a younger age would make her more appealing to the man he would eventually approve.

Courtship or dating were unheard of prior to marriage, and once married, a woman learned to love her husband "a little bit everyday" (Mary Kastanys). Economic necessity and traditional marriage customs left these women with few romantic choices. I asked Grace Campisi whether she like her husband when she was first married:

Grace Campisi: First time, no. But after I see [him] everyday. I didn't know my husband before. When I see the first time, I don't like very much; but after, everything change.

This is not to say that companionship, love, and respect were not important aspects in the marriages of women at Edna Manufacturing. What was striking about the women I interviewed was their strong sense of solidarity and loyalty toward their husbands:

Sheila Glaber: I repeated it a dozen times already. That was my happiest time of my life. Getting up in the morning. Having breakfast together. Drive to work. Park the car there. He used to go to his factory, and I go to my factory. And then I used to come out and wait for him, or he wait for me near the car. And we went home, and we had supper, and we shared, and that was my happiest life. Not now. Now I am alone and lonely, and I don't feel too good. And I think what I am to do today and tomorrow, to fill up my day. [This] age is not nice. It's the poorest part of your life. If you are together, and you feel well, perhaps it's good. But if you are alone, it's a very pitiful life.

For Emma Ross, this solidarity was based on a feeling of a common past, the memory of the European life.

Emma Ross: Oh, ya. . . . From the same country. We talk a lot about the past which we don't have now . . . about European time. We are from the same part of the country. We was married there, so we liked everything there. So everything [is] in our memory.

However, companionship was not confined to the marriage relationship. Some women preferred the companionship of other women:

Carol Lenski: You're just as happy to get that companionship from women, because there's no sexual need at all.

Some women, such as Theresa Green and Carol Lenski, did not subscribe to traditional notions of women's economic and emotional dependence. They found it difficult to fight against an ideology that defined women's proper place as an extension of a man. As women who insisted on being considered equal partners, they were not readily accepted:

Theresa Green: They've told me I'm independent. I said, "Isn't that good?" They said, "No, it can become a fault," and this makes sense in a way. I never saw it as a fault, but I've been told that. I guess the people who have told me [this] are the type that think you should cling to a man and depend on him. I feel it's no good living alone. Everybody needs somebody. That I agree with, but at the same time, I've been fending for myself and my family for [so many] years now, that I think it would be very difficult to knuckle down. . . . not too many people would put up with my [way of life]. You get used to your own way of life. I've been going with somebody for a couple of years, and I find myself taking over responsibilities. This person saw that I was capable, and let me take over. I resented this.

Carol Lenski: Mostly, when people see you alone and you're a woman, they always think that you hate men. You get this all the time. They think that you don't like men because you're on your own, you're not married, and you haven't got a steady boyfriend. Mostly it's men who think like this. It's not true at all. It's because men are so egotistical that they can't accept it, that you don't want to go with them, so that they say there's something wrong with you. If you're intelligent, they don't want to go with you because you're a threat. It's all the way things have worked out over the centuries where men have been led to believe this, and it will take a long time to change their attitude. Even women think like that . . . that's the man's place, that he's got more intelligence.

Wages in the garment industry made it difficult for the majority of women to be economically independent. For this reason, marriages were affected by economic considerations.

Carol Lenski: . . . most of the jobs . . . allocated to women in the past in this industry, you could not make enough money to support yourself. That's why women who were married or new immigrants who were living at home with their parents were coming into it.

The inability of single women to support themselves financially made them more anxious to marry. In some cases, when their choice of a husband did not work out, they decided to leave. According to both Carol Lenski and Ruth Domanski, this decision was financially hard:

Carol Lenski: Many a time I thought I really would have been better off staying with him materially, because we were going to build a home. He was a man who worked hard and was very good to me. So materially, I would have been better off than I am now.

Ruth Domanski: I didn't have enough money. I wasn't enough with the children, which I give my life for them. I love them dearly. I neglected my own [life] because of them. . . . I didn't

have a social life. To support the children, no one gave me any help. I did it all [on] my own. Hard work.

Even after Jane Mathewson married, the decision to not have children was not completely within her control. This decision was dominated by economic questions, the inability to combine family responsibilities with work, and her husband's disinterest in children.

Jane Mathewson: We didn't have time. A job meant more to me than anything else, because if you didn't work, you didn't have a meal. Then it was too late. I never thought about it. I was going on thirty then. . . . we were still working when I got home, and do the work and go to bed, and get up and go in the morning. That's all we thought of.

Although it is difficult to say which of these factors was primary in her decision not to have children, Jane missed the caring and nurturing aspect of motherhood. She cared for twelve cats and a dog. On her bedroom dresser sat a life-sized doll dressed in children's clothing.

Many women told me that they rarely left the house without being accompanied by their husbands. A night out with women friends, or leisure activity independent of their husbands, was unheard of:

Sheila Glaber: I hardly know anybody because I had no time. I always run to work and come back. I had to do my work and look after the house.

Donna Jakubenaite: Now, the young women when they are married are going by themselves to cocktail bars. They're meeting girls and go somewhere else. We never used to do that. If we go, we go with our husbands. I never go to dance by myself. If my husband can't go, I can't go. But now, it's completely different. That's why it cause so many divorces, and cause so many arguments. Women don't have any responsibilities. That's very bad. And they don't have any respect for each other now.

Women's isolation in the home and reliance on their husbands was an extension of their lack of economic resources. Some women who did not drive or who could not afford cars depended on their husbands for rides. Unlike in the 1930s, when workers lived in the same neighborhood as the factories and their union offices, today's workers live in suburbs far from the city center, and must travel long distances to work.

To arrive home at a reasonable hour by catching a connecting bus to the suburb of Mississauga, Rosa Lorenzo left work immediately at four o'clock. Mary Kastanys commuted daily with her husband from their home near Lake Simcoe, about eighty kilometers

north of Toronto. Lack of mobility prevented women from holding union positions, attending meetings, or enjoying leisure activities outside their homes. Staying after work for union meetings or coming back downtown for evening meetings were not realistic possibilities. Also, the ever-present fear of being out alone at night reinforced women's isolation in the home.

THE DOUBLE DAY

Women's work in the household was different from their work in the factory. For the most part, their labor in the home was not directly supervised, but was self-regulated activity that could be carried out at a pace determined by the individual. Carol Lenski provided insights into this aspect of domestic labor:

Carol Lenski: There's a big difference [between] sewing in your home and sewing in the shop, . . . as far as the method. When you're at home, you do things slowly. You take your time. When I'm at home and I sew in a zipper in a skirt, I baste it first into the garment, whereas in the shop you haven't got time to do that. So it does require a different technique.

After a particularly hard day in the factory, some women reported that they let their housework "slide" one day, only to catch up the next day:

Rosa Lorenzo: I feel tired. Too much work sometime. If I can't do everything today, do it tomorrow, a little bit. When do I relax? At night when I am sleeping.

Carol Lenski: . . . I let things slide. . . . You're too tired when you come home to really do anything. Besides, you really need the rest, apart from anything else.

Jane Mathewson worked late into the night and on weekends doing chores. Grace Campisi tried to get as much housework as possible done on the weekends so that she was prepared for the following week when she returned to work. Many women that I interviewed sacrificed their leisure time on weekends and evenings to maintain their households:

Grace Campisi: I spend my weekend a little bit to clean, to wash, to press everything, to clean the backyard, the front. Somebody tell me, "You want to come to the cottage this weekend?" I say, "No." She say, "Why?" I say, "Because I am so busy [at] home." I want to make everything so clean [at] home. Saturday, my daughter, she come. She got a small baby she leave at my house on Saturday. She's a hairdresser. She work Saturday, so I do everything when the baby come home. She make me so busy. I cook. Sometime she bring the baby Friday night. . . . Come the night, I

am so tired—my legs—I can't work anymore because I work all the day. Sunday the same. I want to provide everything because Monday, start again to go to work. I don't want to leave everything. I want to fix everything. I kill myself sometimes. When come night, I go to sleep. Maybe when I die, I relax. When I die, I finish everything.

Maria Lebella's household routine was scheduled around the needs of her husband, who worked the midnight shift at a bakery. He was on a different "time clock" from the rest of the household. He ate meals and slept at different times, and was not available for child care because of his work schedule. His shift work created a double routine for Maria, cooking and washing up for both her children's and her husband's meals.

Maria Lebella: Yeah, it's very hard. I think it's more hard for him. No eat. Can't sleep, he's too nervous. It is not a normal thing. Eat different time. In the day, the phone ring. Some people knock on the door. Kids on the street [make] too much [noise]. Can't sleep [in the] daytime.

Shift work was disruptive to family life. Maria's brother-in-law never saw his children because he worked the four o'clock-to-midnight shift. His children were growing up without him:

Maria Lebella: . . . my brother-in-law, he work in the same place and he start four o'clock in the evening. He say it's hard, too, because he can't see the kids in the evening. And all week he not see the kids because when he came, the kids asleep. And when the kids [are] home, he sleep.

Ruth Domanski explained her daily and weekly schedule in caring for her children and reproducing her own labor power. She was very dependent on the labor of her children, who shared the burden of domestic responsibilities:

Ruth Domanski: I used to take off a couple of hours to do shopping. Washing was done on Sunday. Saturday, I worked only ten hours. Sundays, I worked twelve hours. The rest of the week was sixteen hours. In those different hours, I did everything. Put the menu on. Bought the food. I did the washing. The children did the ironing. And the cleaning. . . . All at night. All on two days of the week, Saturdays and Sundays. That's why I say I give up my own life—my social life. All was in that time. Saturdays and Sundays, those couple of hours for the whole week, even if I worked sixteen hours a day. My daughter helped me a lot. Everyday work, she did after school. She came home, she saw dinner is prepared. We had wieners and beans, and hamburgers and potatoes. I always prepared food the night before, and I leave a note, what's for supper. She used to come home and do it.

Volunteer work was another aspect of women's work that I encountered. Sheila Glaber, who did not have children, contributed a great deal of money and labor to Pioneer Women, a volunteer organization devoted to raising funds for the state of Israel. After World War II, Sheila sponsored several refugees to Canada. They lived in her home as boarders. Their rent supplemented her family income. Sheila's home became an economic resource which eventually paid for itself:

Sheila Glaber: Now, can't get a house because you can't pay it. That time, low interest, low down payment. You took a chance. You worked on the house yourself. But now, you have no chance. You buy a house, it's 100,000 dollars. You have to pay a high interest. You can't keep the house. And there isn't a style of renting out. . . . You live alone, which wasn't [the style] years ago. I lived in one room and I rented the rest of the rooms in order to pay [for] the house. Otherwise, I couldn't get ahead. [This] generation doesn't know that.

The labor of taking on boarders was primarily Sheila's responsibility. She performed an additional set of domestic responsibilities to her double day of labor:

Sheila Glaber: I had to clean the steps and the toilet, and around the house and the grass. Look after the lawn, look after the snow in the wintertime. Looked that the kitchen should be cleaned. If you neglect a house, the roomers don't respect the house, but if they see it's clean, they respect it more.

Ruth Domanski also took on boarders, but when her child grew into an attractive woman, she decided that strange and sometimes alcoholic men in her home posed a threat to her daughter's well-being.

CHILD CARE

Domestic labor not only involved daily maintenance of the household—that is, cooking, cleaning, shopping, laundry, gardening, sewing, painting—but also included reproduction of the next generation of workers. Women at Edna Manufacturing not only left their jobs to have children; they were also, for the most part, responsible for their children's care after they were born:

Donna Jakubenaite: Most[ly] I was [rearing the children] . . . because I know my husband was busy with the business. I didn't want to put [child care] on his shoulders. I never complain. Weeknights when [my son] was sick, I always was with him. 'Cause my husband got lots of responsibility. Designing is not an easy job. I didn't want to disturb him. House bills, mortgages . . . everything was my responsibility.

Theresa Green: I was responsible for the children. Every which way, I always was. Financially, when he was working and we were both together, he was good that way. But as regards anything else, he wasn't a responsible man. He left everything to me. I was used to it. It was good training for me when I was left on my own.

Aside from the financial burden, the care of children made a difference in terms of the way women structured their day. Women with children reported that they had to systematize their routine to meet the needs of their family:

Theresa Green: I think it's just the usual when any mother works. You get up and you have your breakfast together. And you're rushing out to work and the children go to school. And you come back, and you're cooking supper and tidying up, and maybe preparing something for the following night. Doing your laundry at night. With a family, you have to do it. It's not like being on my own and working, and I can wash when I feel like it. You have to have a routine. It's just the usual.

Donna Jakubenaite: You must have schedule. When to feed baby. When to put [the baby] to nap. When to wash the diapers. It was different from before—you make yourself schedule. When to make the formula.

Women with children stretched their day, getting up earlier in the morning and working late into the night to make preparations for taking their children to the baby-sitter. Child care was not simply a matter of dropping off their children at the baby-sitter's on the way to work. Mothers prepared their children by feeding them, bathing them, dressing them, and bundling them up before transporting them to a pre-arranged child-care facility. They prepared the food or formula [breast feeding was difficult], washed the diapers, provided clean clothes, and often provided a change of clothes so that the child's needs were met while the mother was working at the factory. Rosa Lorenzo reluctantly recalled the arduous daily routine of taking care of her baby:

Rosa Lorenzo: It makes me sick because too much work when you got a baby. I was up at five o'clock. Shower the baby, bring it to the baby-sitter. I don't want to remember . . . after I go to work at the night he want to come back. I go to pick up, make supper, wash the clothes for him.

Donna Jakubenaite was fortunate because her baby slept through the night after his eleven o'clock feeding. Interrupted sleep and sleepless nights to feed babies created a very tired worker in the morning.

Donna Jakubenaite: I wake up six o'clock. Formula, I always make in the evening and put in bottles in the fridge. And when I wake up six o'clock, wash myself and make coffee . . . for husband. . . . Then baby wakes up. Wash him with wet cloth. Change him. Put everything in a carriage and I take to my girlfriend's house. Then we go to . . . work. [Her] mother looks after the two babies. I make formula. I give everything, food, diapers, everything what [she] needs 'til I come home. On the way back home, I pick up my baby. Make supper . . . my husband helps lots in the kitchen. He loves cooking. . . . I feed the baby, and after that, we play little bit with the baby. And then I give him [a] bath. Prepare him for bed. After that, wash diapers. Ironing. I put him seven o'clock or six o'clock in bed. He wakes up eleven o'clock. I give him last feeding, and he sleeps 'til next morning.

Troubles did not end at the baby-sitter's doorstep. The greatest hardship for these working mothers was leaving their children in the morning. While working, their thoughts were continually focused on their children's welfare (see Note 5):

Donna Jakubenaite: It is hard when women got baby. It is hard to go to work and look after baby. Because you're always worrying. You're working, but you're worrying about your baby. You're never relaxed. Always, you're thinking how he is, and is he OK. . . .

Grace Campisi: You don't know how much I cry when I leave my daughter. Especially this one, because she grew up very skinny. Too skinny. She don't want to eat nothing. She give me so many troubles. . . . When she was a baby, she cry. I don't know [why]. She don't feel sick. I'm so scared to leave with somebody else. But have to go to work. I cry . . . all the day. I never leave my kids before I come to Canada—never. So not too easy for [me]. When I go to take a bus, my daughter come to me. She cry. I cry. My sister-in-law come too, she take my daughter. I go, I cry so much.

Rosa Lorenzo: I worry [when] I leave the baby. I can't explain, because you don't [trust] . . . the lady. You worry because the baby can't talk. I think you feel better when you leave [with] the family. You trust better.

The worry increased when the children became ill. Usually, it was the mother who left work to care for the children.

Donna Jakubenaite: Oh God. I sit there the whole time, sit in hospital. I didn't go [to] work. I was sitting right at [his] bedside. Just at nights, they throw me out. . . . I nearly die myself. It was so bad. I was crazy, I was crying all days. Listen, if I lose him, I go too.

Theresa Green: I had been up all night with him. It wasn't anything serious, but we did think at the time it was appendi-

citis. They took him into the hospital in the early morning, and they only took him in a day. I wasn't able to go to work. So I just phoned and explained to them. When he was home, I stayed home a day or two just to make sure he was alright. When I'm working, I'm conscientious. I like to do a good job and all that, but when it comes to a family crisis, I don't think about work. My family comes first.

The fact that women left work when their children were ill was not simply an indication of domination by their husbands. As Joan Merton, a union organizer pointed out, a woman's decision to stay home may involve economic considerations stemming from her lower wages:

Joan Merton: Why would a family that is struggling to survive at their combined income level, have a husband stay at home and lose twice as much money as she would, staying home?

Making arrangements for child care was the mother's responsibility. She usually found another woman—a member of her immediate or extended family, a neighbor, or a friend—to look after her children. If they could afford it, women hired baby-sitters. Ruth Domanski was one of the few women who placed her child in nursery school. Ruth could not leave work early enough to pick up her baby before the child-care facility closed. She relied on the maintenance workers to watch her child after closing time:

Ruth Domanski: They were very good about it. They kept the children even [when] they closed up already. The women who used to clean . . . used to wait for mothers to come to pick up the children.

If they were unable to afford full-time baby-sitters, some mothers asked neighbors to be watchful in case of emergencies.

Ruth's daughter looked after her younger brother (see Note 6). Ruth took the time to discipline her children, and to teach her daughter how to look after herself and her brother.

Ruth Domanski: They both helped. The little one just followed orders. You tell him, he does it. The older one, just see that everything should be in order, I shouldn't be upset. My concern was how they do at school, and not to get into trouble. Have their meals on time, and go to bed on time. Everything went smoothly. . . . They didn't sit in the house if I wasn't there. They went playing before bedtime. I constantly remind them to behave, they shouldn't get into a fight. Do your homework. Have your meals. Go out for a little bit outside. Play. When the time comes, go to bed.

Because some women relied on other women to care for their children, the bonds that arose between them, especially mothers and daughters, were very strong. Many women lived close to their mothers and/or had daily or weekly contact by telephone and in person. Donna Jakubenaite described her relationship with her stepdaughter:

Donna Jakubenaite: 'Til now, we are very close. Anything she needs or something bothers her, she always calls me. Nobody else, just me. We used to be very, very happy. Go [to] picnics and we have so much fun. I teach her to speak my language so nice, nobody thinks she born here.

Mary Kastanys simply did not have the resources to hire a baby-sitter or to leave her children with her family. She was very poor when she and her husband immigrated to Canada from Greece. Her husband found a job at a car wash, and she stayed home to look after her newborn son and young daughter. After four years of living in poverty, she had to take a job. She bought a television and told her son to watch it, and not to leave the house. Her daughter came home at lunchtime to feed her brother and cared for him after school. But Mary's son was not completely alone, because she asked the elderly woman living upstairs to rescue her son if she ever saw a fire. Mary was filled with grief at having to leave her son:

Mary Kastanys: I am very, very poor. No money, no nothing, because I come to Canada and [it costs] $350.00. I work at Mr. Jacob's. Every day, cry. I do not say nothing to my husband, because maybe my husband say to me, stop the job. . . . I know I don't have money. Not enough when my husband working because [he] cleans truck for car wash. I say I'm all right, OK. I don't say nothing because I cry every day.

Even if their children were in school, mothers reported that they were available for emergencies. On professional development days, when her nine-year-old son did not attend school because teachers were in training sessions, Rosa Lorenzo brought her son to the factory:

Rosa Lorenzo: I don't feel good 'cause I don't like to leave him alone. You never know [when] something wrong with these kids. Some days, I take him to the shop with me. The boss says it's OK. Here, [give] him some paper [for drawing].

Her son didn't like this arrangement because he quickly grew bored and lonely without his friends. Rosa said that she would like the union to help her and other mothers to get day-care facilities, but that it had never occurred to her that the union could help in this matter.

Why did women at Edna Manufacturing endure the hardships of a double day? In most cases, economic necessity drove them into the work world. For those with children, the possibility of educating their children so that they would have better lives than their parents was the heart and soul of their struggle.

Emma Ross: I cannot give them money. That's all I was dreaming in my life. I dream to have educated children because I don't have [a] chance.

Anna Martino: Want him to do something really good, something really important. Don't want him to go to work in the shops, like I do, or his father. Very hard work in the shops. Always, you see bosses around you. I would like he go to school, even university, or college. To be something better than me and my husband, 'cause we come from Italy, we have got no school. You got to go in the shop, but the children grow here. They have more chance to go to school, to learn whatever they like. I don't force him to [be] what he have to be, but I force him to go to school. To be better in the future.

Martha Newmann: I just explained to you that the Italian people, they're hard workers. They didn't want their children should go to the shop. Why should I want my child should go to the shop, and I came in 1930? And I went through [endured] the shop while she had the opportunity to be educated and to be somebody. That's why I worked (see Note 7).

Here, the children have a chance to have education without paying. In Europe poor children couldn't go higher than public school. If they wanted to go to high school, you had to be rich. So why would I want my child to go to the factory if she was born here, and she had a chance to be educated?

NO TIME FOR LEISURE

Some women coped with their double day of labor by giving up most of their leisure time to maintain a household (see Note 8). Rosa Lorenzo said that she relaxed at the end of the day when she was sleeping, and Grace Campisi suggested that she would relax in her grave. Donna Jakubenaite spent her spare time driving her son to hockey games. Her leisure time involved family entertainment, not time away from the family:

Donna Jakubenaite: We often go out. We go to picnics. Take a few holidays. We go to Wasaga Beach. And we start to enjoy [my son's] running, his talking.

When he was seven years, after his sickness, he started playing hockey, and I took him to every lesson, to every hockey, 'til he was sixteen years old. I took him. Even when I had guests [at]

home, I excuse myself. I said, "My boy must have game and I must take him there." I enjoy watching. Mostly the people say, "That's your boy, [that] was goalie that stops all the pucks?" I said, "Yes, that's my boy."

Ruth Domanski explained how she had to sacrifice her social life to work two shifts and provide for her family. This left her no time for personal enjoyment:

Ruth Domanski: I haven't got time to think about myself. Don't forget, seven years of my time went to work two shifts. That's when I was younger. When I got older, I didn't care about company. All I know, I have my children. They come here every Saturday for supper. Occasionally, we would talk on the phone. My granddaughter gets on the phone very often. Talks to me. I go to my sister. I am away from the social life. I just adjusted my life, and I am content the way I adjusted it. I get up at five o'clock in the morning. Quarter to six, I leave the house. I get home around five o'clock, I have my supper. I clean up. I rest. I have to get up at five o'clock in the morning again. So, there is no time to run around and come [home at] eleven, twelve o'clock, and go to bed. Then, I am fully awake; I don't want to sleep. If you had to get up in the morning and go back to work . . . in the middle of the week, forget about it. I can't have company.

RELIGION AND THE GENDER DIVISION OF LABOR

Varying forms of religious sentiments existed in the factory. Anna Martino opened her interview by summing up her life as "my job, my family, and my religion." Grace Campisi lamented that she did not have time to go to church on Sundays because she had so much work to do at home. Sheila Glaber said she was not orthodox because she had to go out on Saturdays to perform domestic chores. Although she was at one time sympathetic to members of the Communist party, she now found comfort in Zionism. Ruth Domanski observed the Jewish holy days out of respect for her parents, but not because she really "believed in it." Emma Ross went to church every Sunday during the winter, but in the summer, she lapsed. Toward the end of her interview, she talked at great length about her admiration for John F. Kennedy and the fact that he understood Europeans and stood up to the Russians in the Cuban missile crisis. Most importantly, he was a Catholic like herself. Theresa Green was a practicing Catholic, but later distanced herself from the Catholic Church's views on birth control, which she said were not practical. Carol Lenski had renounced her Catholicism as too "far-fetched," in favor of a belief in reincarnation. Rosa Lorenzo looked forward to going to church on Sundays because this made her feel good.

For some women, religion played a significant role in determining a morality about the gender division of labor, especially

in prescribing the nature of women's relationships to their families:

Anna Martino: [Religion] means a lot to me. I can go every day to church, but you don't have the chance if you work. On Sunday, I like to go to church. If you go to church . . . such beautiful words about God and Christ. . . . To be a good person. To stay more close with relatives and friends.

Donna Jakubenaite: I am person who believes in a God, and don't do bad things. I believe [there is] something more in the world than money. That's what religion means to me . . . not just money can make you happy. I am happy when I go to the church. I talk with the church. Like teach the children, [don't] do something bad, or steal, or rob somebody. I believe in my husband. I believe in my children. That [is] what I think is my religion.

Maria Lebella offered a more critical perspective on religion, which she compared to a business enterprise:

Maria Lebella: I not go to church every Sunday. That got nothing to do . . . [with what] I . . . believe in. Religion is business. Because one push the other. Say, "mine the best," and hate the other. Why, for one God, [are there] so many religions? And even the priest hate the other. If it [is] the same God, why [not have] just one religion? The other [religions are] almost the same, [except for] little things. One is against the other. Because [the church] wants more people to [go to] war, and [the church] got business.

THE PERSONAL IS POLITICAL

How did these women fight back? For the most part, women at Edna Manufacturing tended to develop personal solutions to counter the ideology of the gender division of labor that existed in their households. Theresa Green divorced her husband because he didn't take his "responsibilities" seriously. Carol Lenski developed a personal life-style suited to being single:

Carol Lenski: I don't think I'm the marrying kind. . . . there are certain women who are not domesticated. I hate housework. I don't like cooking. I don't like any of the things associated with women who want to get married. I just wanted my freedom to do what I wanted. I come and go as I please. Eat when I want, sleep when I want. Go out when I want. In a marriage, you can't do that. You have to think of the welfare of the person you're married to. Maybe that even goes back to my childhood in a boarding school, where you were so confined and restricted.

Although they did not define themselves as feminists, both Theresa Green and Carol Lenski were conscious of women's issues

and their rights as women workers. However, they did not have a collective strategy for fighting for their rights in the workplace. Ruth Domanski and Martha Newmann were old-time trade-union activists. Their collective experiences were mediated by alliances with male workers, and sometimes with their employer. They rejected any possibility of women combining to fight for their rights. They did not consider women to have needs that were different from the needs of male workers.

Grace Campisi's life was characterized by quiet fatalism. She did not see the possibility of challenging the gender division of labor in the household:

Grace Campisi: You think I like doing everything? I am so tired. I feel real terrible. What am I supposed to do? I got to work, that's all.

Maria Lebella stood out as woman worker who demonstrated genuine leadership potential. Born in southern Italy and married to a trade-union militant, she moved with her husband to a northern industrial city where left-wing politics were widespread. Her concept of an alternative society stemmed from her experience in Italy, where her consciousness was first strengthened through her opposition to rich land owners and fascism. She developed a sense of dignity from earning a wage:

Maria Lebella: I am a worker. I'm not the boss. I am not with Davis [the Conservative party premier of the province of Ontario]. In Italy, the rich stay with the rich and the poor stay with the poor. I remember before the war, my God, I want to kill all the rich. Sorry, I say like that. Because at that time, they want to kill you. It's terrible. I remember the rich people get all the land. That's why the South, it's very, very [backward]. Even [when] Mussolini was alive. And you ask me why I am with the worker. I remember how it was. After that, people run away [to] Canada, America. Everybody was living a terrible life. I have to work all year to give to [the land owners]. If I not produce how much he say, next year he going to charge [me]. The people run away if they can, and nobody work anymore that land.

She keeps in touch with current events in her home country, and remains open-minded by reading books:

Maria Lebella: I read a lot of books. What happened before the war. What happened after the war. If you, day by day, know what's going on, you read, your mind change. I read the newspaper. I listen to the news from Italy.

More importantly, she is one of the few women in the factory who has made friends with women from other ethnic backgrounds. Her friendships are not confined solely to her own language group.

Maria Lebella: Where I was working, we was real friends. We understand each other. We are close friends because we like each other. One is Greek, the other is Italian. We have something in common. We work[ed] at the same table. We are five girls. And we still phone each other, and talk and meet.

Maria Lebella was successful in winning her husband's approval of her right to work. As a result, she now has a different relationship to the economy of her household because she is no longer dependent on her husband's wage. A new interdependence characterizes her relationship with her husband:

Maria Lebella: My husband say, "You never work before. We can live." I say, "What do you mean"? He make just a little. We going to live OK, yeah, for food but we need other things, clothes, and this and that. I say, "I don't want to stay home. I want to go look for job."

Other married women in the factory struggled against their husbands' attitudes, whether they were challenging traditional notions of their children's sexuality or encouraging their sons to "help" their wives with housework. In their struggle for economic independence and the right to work, these women waged a battle that was shared with all other women in the factory. Rosa Lorenzo explained the economic considerations that drove her out to work, and her husband's attitudes that attempted to hold her back:

Rosa Lorenzo: Because when the men come, he wants everything so nice at home. When the wife is working, he waits for the supper. He wait for the clean. That's why he not so happy. He say "I need a little money, but I don't like you go to work" I say, "I make more money if I go to work." I won because we need.

Sheila Glaber valued her life as a worker, despite its so-called marginality and unimportance, and the effort it required in balancing her double day:

Sheila Glaber: I did enjoy my work. I like to go in. And to be busy. And produce. And to make money. And be free with my dollar. I come home, and I attended whatever I had. I was well. I was strong. I was younger. I like it. I made a living. I liked the people. I liked the place. What would I do at home? It's nice to stay [at home] a day or two; then you get restless.

The women at Edna Manufacturing shared a sense of self-respect and identity, linked to their work and control of their wages. Donna Jakubenaite explains:

Donna Jakubenaite: I like work. Somehow, I feel useful. I enjoy working. When you are sick, I missed work. My husband used to come home and find me crying. He say, "Why you crying"? I say, "I

want to go to work." I miss the people. If you missed your pay or something, you feel something is short, is not right. You have your own [money], you enjoy that, and you enjoy helping your husband. You feel you belong to the world. You work, you make progress.

FACING RETIREMENT

After the children had grown and immediate family responsibilities had ended, grandmothers eased the burden of their daughter's and/or daughter-in-law's double day; a luxury that, as migrant workers, they had not enjoyed because necessity forced them to leave their own mothers in their home country.

Ruth Domanski was always available as a baby-sitter for her grandchildren. In turn, her daughter sat by her bedside when Ruth was ill:

Ruth Domanski: We talk about it a lot of times. She says, "Ma, I don't want to impose on you. You raised your family, and now it's my turn." I said, "No. Give me my pleasure. Whenever you need me, call me for help. You're sick, I'll be right there—a built-in baby-sitter. Time, I'll make for you." She deserves it. I'll never forget what she's done. She needs help, I [am] right there. Even now, I was sick, she was sitting right there. She was everyday in the hospital.

Donna Jakubenaite looked forward to retiring from the factory after thirty years in the garment industry. As soon as she retired, her daughter-in-law, who lived next door, went out to work and Donna took over the household tasks in her daughter-in-law's house as well as in her own.

Donna Jakubenaite: They [were] even struggling with the mortgages, with the taxes, but I let her go to work. I watch baby without a cent. Baby was looked [after], and fed. I even looked after her house, washed her clothes when she started work.

Forty-nine-year-old Maria Lebella planned to retire early (i.e., within the next year) to care for her grandchild while her daughter-in-law continued to work. Mary Kastanys suggested to her son that he have five children so that she could look after them.

Taking care of grandchildren was truly a "labor of love" that the older women looked forward to in their retirement, because they didn't have the time to enjoy their own children when they were working. Donna Jakubenaite explained:

Donna Jakubenaite: I have no time to enjoy with my own child. Always busy. Always rushing. (Pointing to her grandson) I enjoy [being] with him. I love him. It was hard to go [to work]. I was

brokenhearted to leave [my son] with somebody. You can't enjoy. When you come after work, you make supper, rushing. Then you bathe him. Time to put to bed. You've got no time to enjoy with your own children. But with grandchildren—everything!

Grace Campisi could not retire early. She needed to work to support the remaining family in the household. She had a nine-year-old daughter at home, and was unable to quit work to care for her older daughter's child:

Grace Campisi: I don't feel very good when she go to work, and she leave the baby. I don't like very much, but what can I say? She say, "You stay home, you can watch my daughter." I can't stay home. I need the money, too.

In the factory, male workers brought gifts to the bookkeeper to thank her for special favors in connection with the wage payment system. Gifts consisted of produce from summer gardens and baked goods made by their wives in the winter. While certain women workers received favors from the employer, such as purchasing cloth at a cheaper price, the majority of women workers did not receive the same generous favors as the men received. This may be symptomatic of their low status in the factory. Among co-workers, reciprocity involved taking the role of the other. Within the family, women showed their appreciation in the exchange of kindnesses and not in the exchange of gifts or money (e.g., Ruth Domanski offered to babysit for her daughter because the latter was so helpful in helping to raise her brother while Ruth held down two jobs. In addition, Jane Mathewson took care of her dying husband because she did not want to put him in a home for the aged. She felt that he would have done the same thing for her if she had been in a similar situation. Now a widow, Jane continues to live in the house she and her husband shared for so many years).

Whether in the workplace or in the family, gestures of solidarity are common, and are different from the exchange of gifts. The exchange of gifts is reserved for special occasions like birthdays and holidays. On the other hand, the exchange of money on special occasions is considered to be an exchange between relatives who are not close. In the case of boarders, money might change hands for rent. If boarders were not able to pay in money, they would perform some service for the household based on their skills.

Reciprocity not only involves empathy and putting oneself in the place of the other, but also a hierarchy of levels of exchange based on the nature of the relationship, abilities, and needs. The nature of reciprocity changed as workers migrated to the new world and adapted to a new way of life. In this way, old forms of reciprocal exchanges were combined with new styles (e.g., Ruth Domanski's description of her relationship with her

landlady was a lesson in New World customs, where money is exchanged for babysitting, a practice unfamiliar to her Old World thinking). Clearly, lack of familiarity with patterns of reciprocity in the New World can add to the culture shock of migrant workers.

Caring for the elderly and dying was a common experience for older women in the factory. Jane Mathewson nursed her sick and aging husband. She described her daily routine, which centered around the care of her husband before and after she worked in the factory all day:

Jane Mathewson: Double the work. I had to nurse him but I didn't mind. I was used to it. Take him to the washroom half the time. Get his breakfast. Almost feed him. Wash his clothes. Sometimes, he'd dirty his clothes and I'd just keep on washing. That is one thing I never refused, because if I were sick, he'd look after me. I was only sick once, when I had the operation on my ear. Then he didn't stay home. I say, "You go to work, forget about me. I'll look after myself." I used to prepare his meals and have everything ready. I'd give him his breakfast because he couldn't do much. He'd sleep all day, nearly. Then, by the time I got home, I was ready to look after him again. See, a lot of people won't do that. They'd put him in a nursing home. I wouldn't do it, because if he could look after me, I could look after him. I can do two jobs at that time. I was younger and I was stronger.

The isolation of caring for her sick husband was a hardship for Donna Jakubenaite. When I first met her, she had just retired from the factory and was very excited about spending her retirement with her husband and family. Shortly thereafter, her husband had a stroke which left him speechless and partially paralyzed. I visited her during this bleak period of her life:

Donna Jakubenaite: Very hard the last five months, the worst in my whole life. I must do everything. He's wetting bed at night. And when he make his movements, I must clean him. He don't let me move nowhere. Nobody can help you. I got some help for a few weeks from [a] homemaker—used to come for half a day. Let me go shopping, help with the housework. Now, it's over. I'm on my own. It's very hard for me. Everybody working. Everybody got their own troubles. Like my daughter is very sick with cancer. She can't move. My son working all the time. My daughter-in-law working. Then, she got her sister who's sick very much with kidney disease. No, everybody got troubles.

Donna was not able to escape even for a few hours of relaxation. The shock of seeing her once strong and vital husband helpless and dependent drove her further into depression:

Donna Jakubenaite: I must do everything by myself. That's why my nerves are so bad. Why I'm crying so much. Because I am like

slavery now. I don't have one hour by myself to go somewhere to meet my friends. These last five months, I am completely isolated from everybody. I'm happy someone comes here a couple of hours. I enjoy the company, little bit talk. Something different. But to see him every day, like that. Your heart is broken. The man is completely different. You remember him before you see now. He was strong. He was happy. He was everything. Now he's unhappy, and I'm unhappy. At least if he could talk, you can talk. But now he can't talk. You're sitting all day and all night, not even one word said.

Ruth Domanski, on the other hand, had been very lucky. She decided to retire following a successful cancer operation and filled her days by reading books, sewing costumes for her grandchildren, playing rummage with her neighbors, and participating in the activities of both her neighborhood retirement club and the union retirees' club. Since her one hundred-dollar monthly pension from her union did not cover her expenses, she sold her house and lived in an apartment. I asked her how she was enjoying her retirement:

Ruth Domanski: Very pleasant. I don't miss the factory. Because I worked very hard for thirty-one years. I haven't even got time to think that I'm retired. My time flies so fast. My time is fulfilled, and I feel very good about it. I hope I'll go on that way.

Sheila Glaber, who had immigrated to Canada from Austria, was having trouble making ends meet with her various pensions. She received a government pension of around four hundred dollars per month, a meager widow's pension of twenty dollars a month from her husband's union, and another pension of one hundred dollars a month from her own union's pension fund:

Sheila Glaber: I can't live on that. I'll tell you why . . . to keep an apartment. To drive a car. To give a lot to charity. I give all over. . . . And to help my sister in Israel, I need a lot of money. Not that I eat a lot or buy a lot of clothes for myself. I'm not a youngster, I'm a woman. What I need is clean and decent. So I need a lot of money. I had my teeth fixed—cost me a fortune.

CONCLUSIONS

Even though women's position in the family mediates their wage labor, immigrant women are closer to the family because of the material and social resources that the family provides as a social institution. For example, a number of women reported that they were first taught to sew by other family members. Most women I interviewed continued to sew clothing for their children and themselves in the household, even though they spent their whole

day sewing in the factory. Extended-family networks were helpful in sponsoring families for immigration to Canada. Once they immigrated, women relied on these same networks, as well as on ethnic networks, to find jobs. One woman was actually employed in her husband's shop. Grandmothers and older daughters took on the additional responsibility of child care. The sick and elderly were often cared for by family members. Clearly, women in a family provided valuable services, both for each other and for other household members, where the state and the society at large did not provide these services.

In addition to spending what would normally be considered a full day at the factory, women at Edna Manufacturing also worked in their households—that is, they worked a double day. The working day was not divided into eight hours of work, followed by eight hours of leisure and eight hours of sleep. This latter division of time is a sex-blind conception of the "average" working day because, as we have seen, "women's work is never done." My study points to the need to view domestic labor as a continuous process that operates *alongside* women's working day in the formal work force (in this case, a factory); *and not* as a discrete labor process that follows time spent in the formal work force. In this study, women's domestic labor operated intermittently with their work outside the home—whether this meant shopping during lunch hours, arranging child care on the way to and from work, answering the telephone if an emergency arose at school, or leaving work early to care for sick children. The women reported that they were always worried about their children while they were working. There was no question of going to work and turning one's mind away from family responsibilities. While they performed tedious, boring, and sometimes mindless tasks at work, their minds were constantly in touch with the needs of their families. They planned their next meals, amended family budgets in anticipation of lay-offs, and discussed family concerns with other women workers. Because their working days never ended, domestic and factory experiences were dialectically intertwined. As this paper has shown, if the women's liberation movement is to have an impact on the everyday life of immigrant women workers, the profound complexities and contradictory aspects of their double day of labor must be properly addressed.

NOTES

1. This paper is based on research for my doctoral dissertation at the University of Toronto in Toronto, Canada, titled, "Dividing Women and Men: The Role of the Company, the Union and the Family in the Canadian Garment Factory." I am grateful to the following people for their critical comments on earlier versions of this paper: Lisa Gilad, Chris Huxley, Deirdre Meintel, Kathryn Molohon, Cheryl Mounsey, Miguel Murmis, Janet Salaff, Jim Turk, and the Labour Studies

Research Group in Toronto. I would also like to thank Dany Lacombe and Simon LaFlamme for translating the abstract. Of course, final responsibility for the paper is mine.

2. I am grateful to Richard Lochead of the Public Archives of Canada, and to Barry Wellman of the Sociology Research Committee of the University of Toronto for providing me with tapes for this study.

3. Interviews for this paper were conducted on the following dates: Grace Campisi, July 8, 1980; July 4, 1981. Ruth Domanski, July 2, 1980; October 21, 1981. Sheila Glaber, November 4, 1980; October 25, 1981. Theresa Green, December 14, 1981. Donna Jakubenaite, August 4, 1980; November 27, 1981. Mary Kastanys, December 10, 1981. Maria Lebella, July 20, 1980. Carol Lenski, July 30, 1980; November 11, 1981. Rosa Lorenzo, July 21, 1980; October 21, 1981. Anna Martino, July 3, 1980. Jane Mathewson, October 30, 1980; November 6, 1981. Joan Merton, January 4, 1982. Martha Newmann, August 11, 1980. Emma Ross, July 16, 1980. Evelyn Thompson, November 17, 1981.

4. Meissner et al.'s (1975) time-budget study in the Vancouver, British Columbia area corroborates the findings of my study. The Vancouver researchers found that women sought their own solutions to their double work load by working both part-time and less overtime. Thus, they worked an average of more than one hour per day less than their husbands. They also reduced their domestic workday to half that of housewives without employment, while intensifying their domestic labor at other times and on weekends. When these women entered the work force, their total weekly work load increased by eighteen hours compared to the work load of their husbands. Husbands' weekly work loads increased by six minutes in couples with no child under ten years of age, and by one hour in couples with a child under ten.

5. Harris (1983) argues that the guilt women felt about having their children at home while they worked made it difficult for them to participate in campaigns for child-care facilities; these struggles at the workplace reminded them of the so-called "neglect" of their children.

6. This arrangement seemed to be more prevalent if the oldest child was a daughter. Women whose oldest child was a son tended to make other arrangements.

7. Martha Newmann is Jewish. In this quote, she is comparing her life-style to that of more recent Italian immigrants.

8. Meissner found that compared to women, men's work and leisure time remained unaffected by mounting household

requirements: "In an estimate for an entire week the overall effect of being a woman is a loss of three and one half hours of leisure time, when controlling for the effects of wife's employment and child under ten. The effects of the wife's job (when controlling for the influence of the young child) are a reduction of thirteen and one half hours in women's leisure time, and no change at all in their husbands'. After controlling for the effects of the wife's job, men's reduction in leisure hours due to a child under ten is nearly half that of their wives' loss of six hours." (1977:170)

REFERENCES CITED

Benston, Margaret
1969 Political Economy of Women's Liberation. Monthly Review 21(4):13-27.

Bornat, Joanna
1978 Home and Work: A New Context for Trade Union History. Radical America 12(5):53-69.

Caulfield, Mina Davis
1984 Imperialism, the Family and Cultures of Resistance. *In* Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Men and Women. A. M. Jaggar and P. Rothenberg, eds. pp. 374-379. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Coulson, Margaret, Branka Magas, and Hilary Wainwright
1975 The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism—A Critique. New Left Review 89(January-February):59-71.

Curtis, Bruce
1980 Capital, The Stage and the Origins of the Working Class Household. *In* Hidden in the Household. Bonnie Fox, ed. pp. 100-134. Toronto, Ontario: The Women's Press.

Fox, Bonnie, ed.
1980 Hidden in the Household. Toronto, Ontario: The Women's Press.

Harris, Lorelei
1983 Industrialization, Women, and Working Class Politics in the West of Ireland. Capital and Class 19(Spring):100-117.

Humphries, Jane
1977 Class Struggle and the Persistence of the Working Class Family. Cambridge Journal of Economics 1(3):25-41.

Luxton, Meg
1980 More Than a Labour of Love. Toronto, Ontario: The Women's Press.

McCrindle, Jean, and Sheila Rowbotham, eds.
1979 Dutiful Daughters. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Meissner, Martin
1977 Sexual Division of Labour and Inequality: Labour and Leisure. *In* Women in Canada. Second Edition. M. Stephenson, ed. pp. 160-180. Don Mills, Ontario: General Publishing.

Meissner, Martin, Elizabeth W. Humphreys, Scott M. Meis, and William J. Scheu
1975 No Exit for Wives: Sexual Division of Labour and the Cumulation of Household Demands. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 12(4):424-439.

Mills, C. Wright
1969 Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mitchell, Juliet
1971 Woman's Estate. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books.

Morton, Peggy
1972 Women's Work is Never Done. *In* Women Unite! An Anthology of the Canadian Women's Movement. Canadian Women's Educational Press, ed. pp. 46-68. Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Women's Educational Press.

Rowntree M., and J. Rowntree
1970 More on the Political Economy of Women's Liberation. Monthly Review 21(8):26-32.

Seccombe, Wally
1974 Housework Under Capitalism. New Left Review 83(January-February):3-24.

Seve, Lucien
1975 Marxism and the Theory of Human Personality. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Sheridan, Mary, and Janet W. Salaff, eds.
1984 Lives: Chinese Working Women. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Wax, Rosalie
1971 Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.