

of the CCF and future NDP leader, and at least one after-dinner speaker at union banquets was a CCF-NDP.

Finally, *The Eaton Drive* is a celebration of the CCL, and to a lesser extent the CCF, in their efforts to represent the working people of our country.

But whether one agrees or not with Sufrin's political views, it is her uncritical attitude of the CCL's role in the campaign to unionize Eaton's and the poverty of her analysis concerning women's place in this campaign and in the labour movement which weaken what might have been an incisive insider's view of this important moment in labour history.

Nancy Guberman
Université du Québec à Montréal

Notes

1. See Nancy Guberman "Working, Mothering and militancy: Women in the CNTU" in *Union Sisters*, Women's Press, 1983; Debbie Field "The Dilemma Facing Women's Committees" in *ibid.*

Family Time and Industrial Time. The Relationship between the Family and Work in a New England Industrial Community. Tamara K. Hareven. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. Pp. 474.*

Tamara Hareven's investigation into the work patterns and family lives of the predominantly French Canadian workers at the Amoskeag Mills in Manchester, New Hampshire, is fascinating to read, generally well written and represents a major advance in our knowledge of how families interacted and functioned within the institutions of industrial capitalism. Not only does one learn the very detailed specifics of family kinship networks within the Amoskeag Mills, but Hareven is not shy about delineating the generalities of change in family functioning and individual

life courses between the early twentieth century and the present. This is a major work and an important contribution to both family history and labour history and to building a bridge between the two. It has already raised much discussion and been widely and divergently reviewed. In this review I shall focus on two major issues of interest to Canadians and women - the portrayal of Quebec society and the french canadian family; and the work of married women, French Canadians in particular. Two problems are evident in her treatment of these topics. They extend, I think, to other aspects of the book as well.

Hareven tends to present broad generalizations on a topic, then subsequently either nuance, condition or contradict them, often using different data. Thus, Quebec society is portrayed initially as a traditional, largely rural society, peopled by "traditional rural families," by implication typified by the "stem family" structure found by Horace Miner in his study of St. Denis done in 1939. Migration to Manchester, Hareven argues, "shifted the economic base of the family from landholding to industrial work" and disrupted "therefore, the basic territorial continuity and the interlocking of generations within the family life style." This stem family structure was not found among the french canadian families of Manchester.(p. 117) Had Hareven read a little more widely consulting perhaps the work of Leon Gérin, undertaken in just the period she is studying, or more recent analyses by historians Normand Séguin or Gérard Bouchard these oversimplifications might have been avoided. Both Quebec society and the Quebecois family were clearly more complex than suggested. Neither territorial continuity nor the stem family were important features of nineteenth and early twentieth century rural families. There is little doubt about the poverty and depleted farms characteristic of rural life in Quebec in this period. All rural families were not, however, landholders. Furthermore, many of those who were, were accustomed to supplementing agricultural in-

come and subsistence with wage labour -usually away from the family in lumber camps. The rhythms of such work were clearly different from those of a factory system like that of Amoskeag. Yet the transition from "landholding to industrial work" and the acculturation to the demands of industrial capital had clearly already begun for many. Indeed, Bruno Ramirez has shown that while the majority of males in textile work in New England had previously worked as farmers or farm labourers, fully 35 per cent of female French Canadian textile workers had worked either in textile mills, in manufacturing or in some branch of the textile trades, prior to emigration.¹

Having presented this simplified picture of Quebec society, Hareven subsequently nuances it, conceding the importance of migration as "an essential component of the family cycle in Quebec" (p. 117) and admitting that "even immigrants from rural communities in Quebec had been exposed to industrial time schedules, through the employment of other family members. Thus it is unrealistic to refer to rural communities in an industrialized country as "pre-industrial." (p.123) Furthermore, with some surprises one learns in a later chapter that Hareven had sampled three Quebec communities -the "communities of origin for many of Manchester's French Canadians." There they found that in 1871 70 per cent of households were nuclear, without boarders, compared to the 50 per cent found in urban Manchester. (p.165). Despite the earlier period, it might have been useful to use this data earlier in the book, and perhaps describe it at more length to better illustrate the society some of the immigrants were leaving. Furthermore, if the community of origin of Manchester's French Canadian immigrants was indeed known, could we not have been told more about the geographical sources of chain migration? This would surely have been of interest even to non-Canadian historians and readers.

This tendency to generalize, then nuance or contradict is apparent too in the way that Hareven deals with the work of married women. In a chapter on the meaning of work we are told that in Manchester millwork was not a transitional phase in a woman's life but a career. Women dropped out for childrearing, then returned later. As employment tightened in the 1920's this "flexibility disappeared; women found it necessary to return to work as soon as they were able after childbirth." (pp.77-8) Nowhere is this change documented or figures on the percentage of the female workforce that was married over the period given. Indeed, in the chapter on Family Work Strategies, it is argued that women's work "encompassed only one segment of life" and "often stopped with marriage or shortly thereafter." Details from her sample of the 1900 census show that 12.6% of married women living with their husbands worked. This participation rate is certainly high in comparison with the United States as a whole (5.6%). It is nearly double that of New Hampshire and certainly higher than urban areas in Quebec. It is the result, she suggests, of the "attractiveness of the textile industry to both married and single women," and of the fact that working class first generation immigrants had not yet absorbed "the middle and upper class ideology that censored the work of wives and mothers outside the home." (p.202) The "foreign born" were most likely to have wives at work. Unfortunately she does not break down the work of wives by specific ethnic background. Nor does she show the relationship between the work of wives and daughters and the family head's job or income. This is surprising. Elsewhere Hareven and colleagues have suggested that higher employment rates among first generation immigrant women are "more consistent with an economic than a cultural" explanation.² At least one of her own interviewees stated she worked because "we weren't able to make it with one salary," (*Amoskeag*, p. 70).

Continuing the ideological or cultural explanation, Hareven argues that by the "second genera-

tion the American values of domesticity had become dominant." Domesticity and the avoidance of labour outside the home by married women are thus presented as specifically American values that emerged in the middle class. My work on French Canadian families in Montreal between the 1860's and 1880's suggests that work outside the home for married women was not a working class French Canadian practise. Those who did report jobs were largely in the sewing trades where work could be done at home.³ Frances Early has found that among French Canadian women in Lowell, Massachusetts in 1870 almost all married women were "keeping house."⁴ Similarly, Judith McGaw found that in the 1880's in Berkshire County, "French Canadian wives were the least likely to report an occupation."⁵

These admittedly scattered findings suggest at least the possibility of a different interpretation in which nineteenth century French Canadian families in the United States and Canada avoided wage labour by wives unless it was absolutely necessary. Only in the twentieth century did immigrants to New England compromise these values, change them, either because of greater economic need, or because of a desire to raise their standard of living. Or perhaps the Amoskeag Mills because of their sheer size, the fact that the company kept a reserve labour list of workers who could be drawn on for short periods coupled with relatively high female wages, offered a special opportunity to married women in need of additional family income. The fact that they could work for short periods, continue their skill development, then return to domestic obligations, may have made factory employment more acceptable. She argues that her interviews show that in "working class families, wives' work outside the home was still viewed as an important contribution, even an integral aspect of the family's economy." (p.202) Yet these interviews were done in the 1970's when married women's work was widely accepted in the United States. In the book

we are given no indication of the period interviewees are describing. The explanation by one woman that "we wanted a car like anybody else," suggests a practise deriving from much later than the 1900 sample, perhaps even after the 20's or 30's. It hints at a possible shift over the period from what Joan Scott and Louise Tilly have called the family wage economy to the family consumer economy.

Hareven argues that the wage labour of children was not a substitute for mother's employment. (p.216) Yet her figures show that it was only in under 4 per cent of all households that husband, wife and others, presumably mostly children were at work, while in 31 per cent only husbands and other members were working. The data on kin linkages within the mill do not shed more light on this issue as relationships were only established by linkages with marriage records, not birth records. The whole discussion could have been sharpened by indicating the percentage of wives of different ethnic origins with children old enough to work who actually did so in 1900 and by examining and discussing in more detail the careers of those married working women falling into their work based sample.

Ethnicity and gender, economic need and traditional practises clearly interacted in a complex manner to determine people's behaviour. Hareven has been criticised by others for not dealing adequately with wage differentials based on ethnicity and gender.⁶ Ethnicity and gender interacted in another way which Hareven hardly mentions and which highlights what seems to me to be a second problem with the book. Hareven deals much more successfully with major changes in family behaviour between the early twentieth century and the present than with changes in the period she is studying. Thus for the years between 1900 and 1930's we see change in some aspects of family's and people's power within the plant, some of the relationship between kin and permanence in the mill. We do not, however, get an idea of the changing rela-

tionship between "family time" or family labour commitment and a decaying industry that would help us better understand either structural or ideological changes. Hareven mentions three major changes in the nature of the workforce over the period. The proportion of French Canadians increased dramatically from 34 per cent in 1912 to 60 per cent in 1928. The workforce became more female - from 37 per cent to 49 per cent, and it aged as the proportion of 15 to 19 year olds decreased. (Pp.228-32) These figures suggest transformations in the family economy of workers and French Canadians in particular that are not addressed. The conclusion that "family behaviour did not modernize at the same pace as workers' conduct in the factory" seems particularly questionable since family labour commitment is dealt with largely in the chapter based on 1900 data. The nature of her data imposes this problem to some extent, as the census sample, the work histories and the interviews often cover different periods. The interviews might have been more explicitly integrated with other data by identifying them with specific generations of immigrants in the way Meg Luxton has done in her *Not a Labour of Love*.

In two more technical ways there are problems with the book that seem unnecessary. Some of the tables are not clear to me and some of the footnotes appear to be inaccurate or obscure. Thus Table I breaks down the workforce by sex and ethnicity, but gives no indication of whether it is for the entire period or a specific date. It would have been relevant here to provide information on the age of workers as well. Table 5.6 examines "generations in each cluster working in the mill at the same time" and has one category for "none." I have been unable to conceptualize what this means, and had similar problems with the preceding table. Figures 8.4 and 8.5 look different but have exactly the same title. Footnotes are difficult to follow as pages are given only for direct quotes. On page 17 Fernand Harvey is cited as discussing French Canadian textile workers "driven out of mills in the eastern

townships in Quebec by cheap labour imported by mill owners from Northern Quebec." The only similar reference I have been able to find in his book is to the families brought from the Saguenay to work in the textile mills of Hochelaga, Montreal. Footnote 10 in chapter 5 (p.105) is either misplaced or incorrect. It follows a sentence arguing that in Quebec "opportunities and obligations of children were ranked in relation to inheritance practises." The footnote, however, refers the reader to where definitions and descriptions of traditional kinship systems can be found.

The book raises exciting and important questions which it only partially resolves. At times Hareven seems to be tilting at dead dragons, albeit ones that she has played a major role in laying to rest - in particular the idea that industrialization destroyed the "traditional" extended family replacing it with a more fitting nuclear one. In her desire, correctly, to show the opposite, she may have overemphasized both the strength and quality of kin ties and underemphasized the negative impact of industrial work on family relations, family time and basic survival. *Family Time and Industrial Time*, for instance, seems to portray a more positive picture of the strengths and co-operation basic to family life than do the interviews published in her earlier book *Amoskeag*.

The technical problems, the contradictions and aspects of the analysis could have been eliminated with a final and careful re-editing. They mar what is nevertheless a major work that questions the existing boundaries of labour and family history, and that will be of interest to people in a variety of disciplines and the general public. Such brave, wide ranging books are easier to criticize than to write.

Bettina Bradbury
McGill University