

Help for Farm Homes: the Campaign to End Housework Drudgery in Rural Saskatchewan in the 1920s

Marilyn Barber

Volume 9, Number 1 (28), juin 1985

Women, Technology and Medicine in Canada

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/800203ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/800203ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

CSTHA/AHSTC

ISSN

0829-2507 (print)

1918-7750 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Barber, M. (1985). Help for Farm Homes: the Campaign to End Housework
Drudgery in Rural Saskatchewan in the 1920s. *Scientia Canadensis*, 9(1), 3–26.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/800203ar>

HELP FOR FARM HOMES:
 THE CAMPAIGN TO END HOUSEWORK DRUDGERY
 IN RURAL SASKATCHEWAN IN THE 1920s

Marilyn Barber*

Farm women must reduce the drudgery of their work. In the 1920s, countrywomen repeatedly heard this exhortation at farm women's meetings and read the same compelling message in the women's sections of farm periodicals. Drawing strength from both the women's movement and the farm movement, countrywomen leaders argued that conditions for women in the farm home vitally affected the quality of rural life. With a consciousness of gender differences derived from the women's movement, they sought to place women's work in the farm home on a basis of equality with men's work in the fields and the barn. With a class consciousness derived from the organized farm movement, they wanted to make farm homes as efficient and attractive as city homes. Leaders of the farm women's movement across Canada cooperated in the endeavour to improve the farm home, but regional differences affected the direction and progress of their work. The Saskatchewan campaign shows how farm women activists tried to reduce housework drudgery in one of the most rural of Canadian provinces.¹

A Saskatchewan farmer's wife who needed more help than could be provided by her own family traditionally employed a hired girl. The hired help might be a stranger employed in a formal way but frequently she was a neighbour's daughter who came at times of special need during the busy harvest season or when a new baby was expected. By the 1920s the use of labour-saving devices increasingly achieved prominence as an alternative method of reducing the burden of farm housework. The Saskatchewan farm women's crusade to eliminate household drudgery hence raises central questions regarding the relation between the employment of hired help and the introduction of labour-saving technology into prairie homes.

The connections between the use of domestic technology and the employment of domestic servants need to be considered in the rural as well as the urban context. Studies of household work, which are primarily American, concentrate on urban centres. In the words of Judith McGaw in a review essay on 'Women and the History of American Technology,' 'white, middle-class, urban, northeastern women figure prominently in the literature.'² Focusing on the period of most obvious change between 1870 and 1930, these studies examine the role of feminists, women's organizations, manufacturers, advertisers and architects in

*Department of History, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

promoting changes in domestic technology. Writers agree that in the early twentieth century the use of labour-saving technology in urban homes increased and the employment of domestic servants decreased. They do not all agree on whether a cause and effect relationship can be drawn between the two developments.

The decline in the employment of domestic servants is generally attributed not to the development of new household technology but to the emergence of other employment opportunities for women. Charles Thrall, writing on 'The Conservative Use of Modern Household Technology,' discounts the popular notion that modern appliances played a major role in the reduction in the number of household servants. Instead, he claims that the availability of cheap labour was the major factor influencing the employment of household help. If there are few other employment opportunities, household help will be available and employed regardless of how much or how little modern household equipment the employers have.³ Susan Strasser in *Never Done* similarly concludes that the decline in the relative number of domestic servants occurred because single women chose other employment opportunities, such as factory work, not because employers believed that domestic technology enabled them to dispense with their maids.⁴ Historians who have examined the movement to professionalize housework point out that domestic science was intended not to eliminate the need for maids but rather to attract more young women to a career as domestic servants.⁵ Nevertheless, although new domestic technology is not viewed as the major reason for the decline in domestic service, it is seen as a contributing factor. Ruth Schwartz Cowan in her recent book, *More Work for Mother*, concludes that 'many people purchased appliances precisely so that they could dispense with servants.'⁶ In her articles she develops more fully the role of advertising in transforming the servantless household of the 1920s from an economic necessity to a virtue.⁷ Her work underlines the need to consider carefully possible changes in attitude over time and the reasons for those changes.

Whether the availability of servants affected the acceptance of new technology is also an issue for debate. In the American and British literature, two questions which are not exactly the same have been asked. First, did the existence of servants impede acceptance of new technology--that is, if people were able to employ servants were they reluctant to purchase new equipment or uninterested in more efficient methods of work? Second, did the decline in domestic servants lead to greater use of household technology; did people take a more active interest in technology because the lack of servants forced them to look for other alternatives? These two questions need to be linked. If the employment of servants actively impeded the acceptance of domestic technology, then the lack of servants becomes a necessary prerequisite to the increased use of labour-saving techniques. If the employment of servants was not a direct impediment to the use of technology, a scarcity of servants can still be an important stimulus to the progress of domestic technology, but not a necessary prerequisite.

Historians agree that the increasing scarcity of servants in the twentieth century stimulated interest in domestic technology.

Less attention is given to whether a lack of servants was a necessary prerequisite to bringing modern technology into the household and those writers who do consider the question are not in accord. Caroline Davidson, writing on housework in the British Isles, asserts that the existence of servants did not retard the progress of domestic technology, that if technology was not an immediate success the reason was the expense, not the existence of servants.⁸ By contrast, Donald Sutherland and David Katzman, who have written on domestic service in the United States, argue that middle-class households turned to household technology only because servants became scarce. Katzman uses a comparison between North and South as evidence for his case, claiming that in the southern states where there were more cheap domestic servants, households waited the longest to adopt the new technology.⁹ The American literature thus generally established a dichotomy between the employment of domestic help and the acquisition of domestic technology with the decline of servants influencing the increased use of technology.

Rural western Canada experienced a continual scarcity of female farm help in the early twentieth century. Alternative opportunities for women, as well as the preponderance of men in western settlement, explain the scarcity. Neither farm daughters nor recently-arrived immigrant women wanted to work in the country when opportunities beckoned in the cities. Even if obtained, domestic help could not be retained on the prairies where bachelor homesteaders quickly wooed eligible single women. If the lack of hired help stimulated acceptance of labour-saving technology, Saskatchewan farm women certainly had reason for interest in technological assistance.

The difficulties of acquiring labour-saving technology in rural Saskatchewan offset the need for assistance. Saskatchewan farm women could not obtain electricity or running water in their homes as easily as could urban women or even women in rural Ontario. While Ontario Hydro conducted an energetic rural electrification program in the 1920s, Saskatchewan rural electrification did not occur until the 1950s. In Saskatchewan, only one percent of farmers received electricity from transmission lines before the passage of the Rural Electrification Act in 1949.¹⁰ In addition, the harsh prairie winters impeded the installation of functioning year-round water systems. As a result, Saskatchewan farm women had ready access to the ideas but not the facilities of modern technology.

Concerned by the lack of assistance for hardworking Saskatchewan farm women, who had to cope with outdoor chores as well as housework, countrywomen leaders worked to increase the supply of female farm help at the same time as they promoted domestic technology. They saw no conflict between the employment of farm help and the use of labour-saving devices. The two were partners in the campaign to eliminate drudgery from farm homes. They portrayed technological improvements as complementing and attracting household help; in situations where hired help could not be procured, technology could serve as an uncomplaining substitute available twenty-four hours each day. The success or failure of their efforts depended on the response of

Saskatchewan farm families who with a limited amount of disposable income felt a greater need to make choices and exercised caution in spending money on any means of reducing the burden of housework.

The women's section of the organized farmers championed the movement to end housework drudgery in rural Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan led the way among western provinces in giving formal membership to women in the farmers' organization. The Women's Grain Growers' Association, begun in 1913 and officially recognized at the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' convention in 1914, gave the women equal membership with the men in the SGGA but also separate membership in their own women's section.¹¹ The same structure continued in 1926 when with the merger of the SGGA and the Farmers' Union, the WGGGA was replaced by the Women's Section of the United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section). Saskatchewan farm women wanted dual status because they believed that although farm women and men had common interests which they must work together to promote, the women also had separate interests because of the sexual division of labour on the farm and the distinct role of women in the family and the community. The farm home like the city home was considered to be woman's sphere, so housework problems concerned women, not men.

Violet McNaughton, the primary initiator and first president of the WGGGA, provided dynamic leadership for Saskatchewan farm women throughout the 1920s. Emigrating from southern England in 1909 at the age of thirty to join her father and brother at Harris, Saskatchewan, Violet Jackson six months later married John McNaughton, a Glasgow-born homesteader active in the SGGA. A former school teacher, Violet McNaughton brought to her activities a strong faith in the power of education, a belief in cooperation and superb organizing abilities. A feminist and active supporter of woman suffrage, she worked for equality for women in the economic as well as the political sphere. Unable to have children after a serious illness early in her marriage, McNaughton turned her considerable energies to promoting the interests of Saskatchewan farm women. Described in a 1926 article in *Maclean's* as 'a radical and an insurgent' and by Francis Marion Beynon as 'far too radical for the things that interest you to interest the great majority of the women,'¹² Violet McNaughton held many offices in the Grain Growers' Association and represented the association at provincial, inter-provincial and national meetings of government, farm and women's groups. In 1925, she became editor of the women's section of the *Western Producer* which position she hoped to use to educate farm women. With her enthusiasm, McNaughton played a major role in promoting ideas and developing policy.¹³

Another Saskatchewan farm women's association, the Homemakers' Clubs, shared the WGGGA interest in improving the farm home, but not its concern for direct economic and political action by farmers. The provincial government and the University of Saskatchewan Extension Division sponsored the Homemakers' Clubs which began in 1910 modelled upon the Ontario Women's Institutes. With the motto 'For Home and Country,' the Saskatchewan Homemakers' Clubs stressed the skills of homemaking and child care and

reinforced the campaign to reduce domestic drudgery. Abby DeLury, Director of the Homemakers' Clubs at the University of Saskatchewan, maintained good relations with the WGGGA. Therefore, in Saskatchewan, the two organizations coexisted harmoniously, although, in both Manitoba and Alberta, leaders of the United Farm Women initially viewed the rival Women's Institutes with bitterness as agents subsidized by the provincial government to combat the organized farmers' movement.

Farm periodicals reinforced the educational activities of the women's associations. All contained women's sections which linked women's interests directly although not solely to the home. Most important was the *Grain Growers' Guide*, begun in 1908 as the organ of the grain growers' associations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Francis Marion Beynon, Mary McCallum and Amy Roe, successive women's editors at the *Grain Growers' Guide*, although based in Winnipeg, attended meetings and reported events in Saskatchewan. Other farm periodicals, also published in Winnipeg, such as the *Farmer's Advocate* and the *Nor-West Farmer*, provided a forum for communication among farm women in the three prairie provinces. In 1923 the SGGGA established *The Progressive*, which soon changed its name to the *Western Producer*, as a distinctly Saskatchewan paper intended primarily to promote SGGGA pool interests.¹⁴ Through the pages of farm periodicals, Saskatchewan farm women not only received information and instruction from their own leaders but also shared in a broader communication of ideas which helped to shape the Saskatchewan campaign against drudgery.

The farm women's movement in Saskatchewan was cast in an Anglo-Saxon mold. Not only was the leadership drawn from among women of British origin but those leaders consciously or unconsciously seemed to define their constituency as other women of British origin. The farm periodicals, written in English, circulated primarily in English-speaking homes. While there is no adequate information on WGGGA membership, the association's reports tend to portray the 'Non-English' or 'New Canadians' as a group requiring social service work or assistance in Canadianization rather than as participating members in a cooperative enterprise.¹⁵

Saskatchewan farm women leaders knew that the reluctance to spend money on the farm home constituted a major obstacle to either the hiring of help or the acquisition of labour-saving devices. They realized the economic constraints affecting far families, but believed that impediments to action existed as much in the mind as in the pocketbook. Because of their belief in the power of education, they blamed ignorance and indifference for the continuance of much of the farm wife's drudgery. In Violet McNaughton's opinion, 'too many women take this drudgery as a matter of course and do not use their initiative to plan for even slight improvements.'¹⁶ Farm women reformers emphasized that housework could be made more efficient and the wife's labour reduced in many ways which required thought and planning but very little expenditure of money.

Feminists such as McNaughton challenged the allocation of economic priorities which gave the barn precedence over the house.

They did not query the sexual division of labour on the farm but did oppose the subordination of women's sphere. They argued that the greatest economic problem was not the absolute lack of money but rather the reluctance to attribute proper economic value to women's labour. Again and again, they lectured farm women that their labour was a commodity with real value and that it was not true economy to save everything except themselves. Farm women activists concerned with the economic status of the married woman drew the philosophical basis of their argument at least in part from leading European feminists.¹⁷ They knew that educating Saskatchewan farm women to change their way of thinking and behaving would not be easy. After fifteen years of practical study of farm conditions, Violet McNaughton wrote:

Henry Ford has written a book centering around the text; "Hard Labor is for machines -- not men", and proved it too. Women need much education to realize this truth because we women have never recognised that domestic labor is a commodity and has a real value.... Even in this age of emancipation when as single women we make a success of life in our various occupations, we are apt to again take on with our marriage vows many of our old ideas.¹⁸

Countrywomen leaders told farm women that they must conserve time and energy so that they could use their talents for the benefit of their family, their community and country and themselves. By reducing housework drudgery, a farm wife could shift her efforts to production for the market and increase the family's cash income by the sale of poultry and dairy products. McNaughton portrayed the New Farm Woman as a Pool Woman who would be an active shareholder in the poultry pool and any other possible form of commodity marketing. In order to attend to her work efficiently, the New Farm Woman must have a modern farm home. Increased economic productivity helped to justify the expenditure of money on the farm home but was not the only reason for attacking burdensome housework. In addition, farm women reformers placed great stress on the need for leisure by which they did not mean idleness or frivolous self indulgence. In part, women needed more time to be better mothers, to devote to homemaking rather than simply housekeeping. As a member of the WGGGA executive explained, Home Economics 'is an attempt to place an economic value on the work of the women (sic) in the home, to enable her to utilize her time in such a way as to leave her leisure to be a real Homemaker.'¹⁹ A farm woman's responsibility extended beyond her own family. She needed time to take part in community activities, to work for community betterment and to educate herself to be an informed citizen and exercise her franchise wisely. In McNaughton's view, a farm woman also had an important responsibility to herself and should use leisure to develop her better self so that she might 'live a life' as well as earn a living.²⁰ The motivation for promoting reform may have been partly to keep women on the farm, but it was definitely not to confine them narrowly to the home sphere.

WGGA leaders sought to educate farm women both in the employment of hired help and in the acquisition of labour-saving devices. They responded to the shortage of domestics in Saskatchewan by efforts to increase the supply of female farm help as well as by the promotion of domestic technology. The employment of hired help possessed certain distinct advantages. On isolated Saskatchewan farms, another woman could give companionship and perform services, such as the care of small children, which machine technology could not offer. If employed on a temporary basis when most needed, as during the busy season or when a baby was expected, hired help also seemed less expensive than the permanent acquisition of many labour-saving devices.

Like other Canadian women's organizations, WGGA turned to immigration as a solution to the domestic help problem. With the end of the Great War, WGGA leaders lobbied both the federal and the provincial governments to increase the recruitment of immigrant domestics for prairie homes. At the national level, Violet McNaughton, as head of the WGGA immigration committee, represented the interests of Saskatchewan farm women on the Canadian Council for the Immigration of Women for Household Service, an association formed to advise the federal government. Through meetings of the CCIW, McNaughton joined with other women from across the country in recommending procedures to encourage female immigration and also gathered ideas which influenced Saskatchewan activities. Because the Saskatchewan government supervised placement within the province and cooperated with the federal government in recruitment, the WGGA also pressured the provincial government to procure more female farm help. The Saskatchewan Liberal government did act more quickly than most provincial governments in spending money on the recruitment of female domestics. In the early 1920s, Saskatchewan was the first province to offer an assisted passage scheme for domestic servants, sharing with the federal government the cost of the woman appointed to select British women for Saskatchewan farm homes. In addition, Saskatchewan along with Ontario led the way in accepting the 1923 Empire Settlement Act which provided passage assistance to British houseworkers. How much responsibility for the government's actions should be attributed to the organized farm women is less clear. The WGGA claimed credit for the appointment of a very capable supervisor of women's employment in the provincial labour bureau. An internal government memorandum draws ministerial attention to the women's claim but neither substantiates nor refutes it.²¹ The provincial government had its own reasons for encouraging female immigration: the government wanted to ensure that bachelor homesteaders obtained wives and formed a stable family unit on the Saskatchewan prairie. Whatever the reason for recruiting immigrant domestics, the government procured only a limited number for Saskatchewan farm homes during the early 1920s.²²

Complaints common to domestic service were even more pronounced against employment in rural areas. The long working day of the domestic seemed even longer and more arduous in a farm home where women had the responsibility for outside chores and lacked equipment to aid them. The low wages characteristic of service reached their lowest level in rural districts where families had little disposable income. Promises of treatment as a

member of the family did not compensate for the disadvantages. As one young woman who had been employed in two farm homes exclaimed:

Heaven save us from being "made one of the family!" It is most disagreeable, even if the family habits are polite ones. The condescension, the rudeness, the impertinence generally defined as "making her one of the family" is unnecessary to the female farm employee.²³

Realizing the difficulty of attracting even immigrant women to farm housework, WGGGA leaders endeavoured to improve the conditions of work. At the same time as they relied on the prestige, resources and administrative machinery of government to increase the number of domestic servants brought to Saskatchewan, they sought to educate their own membership in order to make employment in farm homes more attractive. The women leading the movement to improve rural living conditions argued that technological advances were essential in order to enable the farm to compete with the city in attracting help. Even before the war, farm periodicals reported that employment agents could not induce girls to go to the country because of the lack of modern conveniences in farmhouses. Readers of the *Nor-West Farmer* in 1910 learned that:

In city households there is as a rule much more attention paid to having everything convenient for the women to work with. This is one of the reasons why it is so much easier to secure domestic help in town than in the country.... We have no doubt that if one hundred servant girls who had worked in both kinds of homes were questioned, at least ninety-five of them could tell of ways in which the country home could and should be more nearly modelled after the average city home, to the benefit of the farmer's wife.²⁴

Home economics professionals called upon their expert knowledge to reinforce conclusions drawn from the practical experience of placement agents. Edith Charlton Salisbury, Professor of Household Science, Manitoba Agricultural College, and editor of *The Homemaker's Corner* in the *Nor-West Farmer* urged western farm women to 'get the business of home-making on a more business-like basis':

It must be because our ideas of what we should expect from a helper are too indefinite, our knowledge of the work that we want done impracticable or insufficient, our methods in general too unsystematic that there is so much difficulty in getting and keeping help in the farm home.²⁵

In the 1920s, the increased mechanization of urban homes made the introduction of technological improvements into farm homes all the more important.

From the growing domestic science movement of the early twentieth century, farm women reformers drew two models for modernizing housework and making farm employment more attractive: the professional model and the business model. Professional status implied training, an achievement of a certified level of proficiency, and higher wages which gave recognition to the training. In the emphasis on greater regulation, the professional model merged with the business model. Industry was stealing women from housework, so advocates of domestic service reform stole from the factory system the idea of the scientific organization of the work process and the regulation of the hours of work.

'Standardization' emerged as the code word encapsulating all proposed reforms to make domestic service more professional, more business-like, more scientific, more efficient -- in sum, more attractive to young women. Advocating higher wages and shorter hours for female farm help was not intended to mean that employers should pay more and receive less. Standardization was inextricably linked to an application of the principles of domestic science. Through systematic work processes, good management and the use of proper tools, the work could be done more efficiently in less time. Farm homes would enter the modern era of technological progress.

The idea of standardization had roots reaching back to the nineteenth century, but drew fresh vitality from the reform environment of the war and reconstruction years. In the United States, Christine Frederick popularized the concept of standardized housework in her books, *The New Housekeeping, Efficiency Studies in Home Management* (1916), *Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home* (1920) and in her writings in the *Ladies' Home Journal*. Applying Frederick Taylor's factory efficiency studies to housework, she explained that efficiency meant 'not expensive equipment or impractical theories, but simple principles of work which enable you and every homemaker to do her household tasks in the best way, with least effort and greatest success.'²⁶ Both maid and employer would do better work more quickly with standardized operations, conditions and schedules which saved time and motion. Since the final goal was not solely the increased efficiency of the worker, but 'her increased material and mental success,' the employer must also ensure that the employee received a 'fair deal' in working conditions and an 'efficiency reward' in the form of bonus wages or time off.²⁷ Similar ideas of standardized housework were widely discussed in Canada and welcomed by those who sought a solution to 'the servant problem.'²⁸

The WGGGA and the farm press both advocated the standardization of domestic service as the panacea which would overcome resistance to farm housework. From the Canadian Council on the Immigration of Women, Violet McNaughton brought to WGGGA meetings reports of the committee on the standardization of housework, of which she was a member, which had carefully studied the question of standardization, drawing information from labour bureaus and household science schools, not only in Canada and the United States, but also in France, Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, Persia and Japan.²⁹ As she told the

1919 annual convention of the WGGGA:

I think there is great educational work to be done by our members in the matter of helping to raise the standard of housekeeping, the status of domestic help. This seems the only solution of the help problem.... Until there is some standard of efficiency, a certain amount of training demanded, and, in consequence, a social position equal to other branches of industry, girls will prefer offices - and who can blame them?³⁰

Ideas of standardization appealed to feminists because they strengthened demands that greater value be placed on women's work. In the rural west, interest in developing a wage scale suited to professional status reinforced feminist demands that the woman working in the house should be as well paid as the man working in the fields, the equivalent of equal pay for work of equal value although the terminology was not used. Before the war, Francis Marion Beynon, editor of The Country Homemakers section of the *Grain Growers' Guide* wrote:

The trouble is that housework is not a profession and the majority turn to it without either inclination or training, but because they have never been trained to do anything else. There is no inducement for them to make themselves proficient because the wages are so low and advancements so rare and so small that the girl who goes into domestic service sees no future before her.

What we will have to do is to give the girl who helps us with the housework as high wages as we pay to the man who helps in the field. We will have to give her definite hours of work and pay her for over-time.³¹

Beynon's successor at the *Guide*, Mary McCallum, attributed the reluctance to assign proper value to women's work as much to farm women as to farm men. She tried to teach farm women that a higher wage for the hired help was justified because the expenditure enabled the farm woman to conserve her energy and her health:

Many farm women would rather work their fingers to the bone than to pay the same wage to a hired girl that is paid to a hired man. I think I understand that perfectly and it seems to me very natural that they should feel that way at first thought. Many of them are only just emerging, if they are that, from the early days of pioneer hardship, when every cent had to be counted. They have had almost no money of their own to spend upon themselves and it seems to them outrageous to pay a girl from twenty to sixty dollars a month for the work which they did for nothing. But the question is whether it is not better to pay even that for hired help

when one has it to pay, than to break down in health and leave one's little ones to the mercy of strangers.³²

McCallum agreed with Violet McNaughton that 'it is necessary for farm women to be educated as to the relationship between the farm housekeeper and her hired help.'³³ Farm women worked too hard themselves so they expected their help to act like human machines. McCallum used her position at the *Guide* to try to convince farm women to treat their help in a more considerate fashion:

There is in a large majority of cases something far from kindly co-operative work between the farmer's wife and her servant. Farm women are so accustomed to working 16 hours out of the 24 that they fail to see why other women about the house should prefer to live a more ordered life.³⁴

To achieve reforms, WGGa leaders did not rely solely on the business model of standardization, but also appealed to cooperative principles fundamental to the women's movement and the grain growers' movement. The WGGa executive pointed out to the members that:

The girls are sisters and should be treated as companions. If they are not fit for companions they are not fit to be left with the children. Many of these girls will come from the old country and will require to be dealt with sympathetically until they learn the customs of the new country.³⁵

The appeal for cooperation did not seem to be based on a belief in absolute social equality but rather was predicated on procuring the right type of help for farm homes. Farm women had an even greater stake than urban women in raising the status of domestic service; the young women who came as hired help often stayed as daughters or neighbours. As McNaughton explained:

I want to attract a type of girl who can rank socially with clerks, etc. To raise the whole status of domestic help. This is probably of more vital interest to farm women than any other class, as the girls will marry their sons etc.³⁶

For adherents of the grain growers' movement which made cooperation its main business principle, there was nothing inconsistent in appealing simultaneously to the spirit of cooperation and the methods of business practice.

Reformers obviously believed that farm women understood the benefits to be obtained from hiring help. They defined the main obstacle to be overcome as the scarcity of available help resulting from low wages and hard conditions of work on the farm. Although accurate information on the employment of female farm

help cannot be obtained, neither the efforts to increase supply through government encouragement of immigration nor the attempts to educate farm women to apply ideas of standardization seem to have greatly changed the employment situation.³⁷ Alternative opportunities in urban areas continued to attract both farm daughters and immigrant women. The principles of standardization often did not suit the unspecialized work conditions of the home, and farm families remained reluctant to spend money on hiring help which decreased the wife's work load but did not significantly increase productivity. While continuing to promote domestic technology as a way of attracting hired help, farm women leaders increasingly directed their campaign at the farm wife who had to work without the aid of hired help.

Because of the conviction that every farm home could and should benefit from domestic technology, farm women activists devoted considerable time and energy to investigating, explaining and advocating a wide range of labour-saving techniques. The example of commercial services in urban areas raised interest in the possibility of combatting farm drudgery by moving more of women's work outside the home. WGGGA conventions in the war and immediate post-war years repeatedly passed resolutions in favour of the establishment of cooperative or community laundries and bakeries. Cooperative bakeries would remove a hot, time-consuming task from the farm home and place rural women on a more equal basis with urban women. McNaughton argued that the modern farm woman must quit baking bread:

For what is the sense of say 200 women in each municipality performing 200 individual tasks in summer time, making 200 homes exceedingly uncomfortable with 200 fires in order to bake 2000 loaves when in one well-equipped municipal bakery one or two persons can perform the task with but a fraction of that labor. Look in at the next bake-shop and calculate how much individual labor women put into baking an amount of bread equal to the baker's single batch.³⁸

Cooperative laundries received even more attention. The wash was the most hated chore, especially on farms without running water in the house or a power washing machine. Centralized laundries attached to an existing power source offered one means of overcoming the lack of municipal services in rural Saskatchewan. In 1917 the WGGGA asked the Cooperative Elevator Companies to consider using the power from elevators for laundries; in succeeding years they recommended that the laundries be connected to creameries so that the family wash could be delivered along with the farm cream.³⁹

WGGGA reports do not reveal that the exact source of the association's interest in cooperative laundries and bakeries. The original knowledge of these cooperative services does not seem to have been extensive. Zoa Haight, Convenor of the Household Economics Committee, reported in 1920 that it had been difficult to procure much satisfactory information on cooperative laundries as there were none in the province.⁴⁰ By 1921, she had secured evidence about the case of the Chatsfield, Minnesota, cooperative

laundry, established in association with a cooperative creamery, where the average cost for each family was one dollar per week for washing and ironing.⁴¹ The WGGGA believed that the Chatsfield example showed that cooperative laundries could work; they were not an impractical utopian ideal. Moreover, the concept of community services seemed to conform exactly to the cooperative philosophy of the grain growers' movement. Indeed, the idea even received a favourable reception in wider circles. At a 1918 conference which brought together representatives of Saskatchewan women's organizations and the Saskatchewan government to discuss means of relieving the shortage of household help for farm homes, it was agreed that for any permanent solution 'it would be necessary, by gradual process, to standardize the hours, wages and working conditions and relieve the farm homes of such work as washing, ironing, baking, buttermaking, etc. by the establishment of community laundries, bakeries, creameries etc.'⁴²

In spite of the WGGGA interest, not even one cooperative laundry was established in Saskatchewan. 'Would the farm women make use of rural community laundries and bakeries?' was made a suggested topic for discussion at meetings of WGGGA locals, but no information is given in the reports regarding the response of the membership.⁴³ In the later 1920s, at least one writer suggested that cooperative laundries might be decidedly impractical in Saskatchewan because distances between neighbours were so great.⁴⁴ The size of farms definitely created communication problems in rural Saskatchewan, and although cars and trucks were effectively shortening the distance to the nearest community in the 1920s, winter travel remained difficult. In addition, practical economic problems undoubtedly impeded the establishment of cooperative laundries and bakeries. Cooperative laundries and bakeries required cash contributions for a service which could be provided at home without the expenditure of money. The recommendations always came from the women's section of the SGGGA and there was no indication of possible economic arrangements or of the response by the male membership which controlled the major financial resources. Perhaps the will to put the idea into practice also was not sufficiently strong. The farmers' cooperative philosophy incorporated an intense conservative belief in the individual home as the basis of rural society; cooperative laundries might seem a greater departure from the self-sufficient family home than cooperative purchasing and marketing.

The campaign to eliminate household drudgery focused primarily on the application of labour-saving techniques in the private home. Most farmers in Saskatchewan owned their own home although the size and structure of the dwelling varied greatly. Many farm wives, like Violet McNaughton, began married life in a one or two room 'shack,' and then graduated to a more commodious, better constructed, house.⁴⁵ Farm women activists recognized that economic conditions, shaped by both individual circumstances and the general state of the farm economy, inevitably affected the ability to make improvements to the farm house. Nevertheless, they did not accept lack of money as an excuse for inefficient farm homes.

'The best labor-saver, after all, is brains' practically formed a slogan for women leading the campaign to promote domestic technology in rural Saskatchewan.⁴⁶ Applying the principles of domestic science did not necessarily mean buying expensive and complicated equipment. Ida MacNeal, President of the WGGA, explained that:

Conveniences in the kitchen where mother spends most of her time do not always mean expense we found and may only entail a few hours of someone's time which could not be spent to better advantage.⁴⁷

Domestic science meant proper household management. It meant systematizing the work to ensure that it was done in the most efficient manner possible with the least expenditure of energy. Rooms, and especially the kitchen, should be laid out so that steps were not constantly wasted. Too often the design of Saskatchewan farm kitchens would horrify a home economics expert:

Even such conveniences as might be are not always in. Not infrequently the roller-towel is on the opposite side of the room from the wash-basin, the pantry on the far side of the kitchen from the dining room, and the kitchen range in the wood shed, perhaps on still another side.⁴⁸

Equipment should be made to fit the woman who used it, and the woman in the home could do much to better herself if she used long-handled dust pans, high kitchen stools and kept coal scuttles and fireless cookers at a level which did not require bending and lifting. To aid women, recommended heights for tables, sinks, ironing boards and laundry tubs were correlated to the height of the woman who would be using the equipment.⁴⁹ The WGGA home economics committee also investigated and promoted a number of inexpensive devices which would contribute to convenience and better health. Preeminent among these was the fly-trap.

Scientific methods were important, but not sufficient. Labour-saving technology which required the expenditure of money was also essential. No farm home could be considered efficient without the installation of a water system to eliminate the heavy carrying of pails of water in and out of the house, but piping, pumps and cisterns cost money. The primary labour-saving device desired by all farm wives was a power washing machine, but washing machines and gasoline engines cost money. Farm women activists, acutely aware of the reluctance to spend money on the farm home, challenged directly the allocation of priorities in the farm economy. They chorused, 'Too long the yard has looked like a machinery shower and the house is all run on woman power.'⁵⁰

Leaders of the WGGA and writers in farm periodicals unanimously agreed that the barn was better equipped than the house but they allocated blame for the situation to the wife as much as to the husband. According to an article in the *Nor-West Farmer*:

It is not always easy to decide where the fault lies when the farm home is not as adequately equipped as the barn; when the farmer's wife is making a slave of herself and drudgery of her work because of insufficient appliances. Sometimes the fault rightfully belongs to the farmer, and almost as often it can be laid on his wife's shoulders.⁵¹

The same opinion was expressed in the Countrywoman column of the *Grain Growers' Guide* which attributed lack of equipment in the home to the wife's false economy:

The farm woman, herself, is often to blame for much of this as her husband is. A farmer may be conservative in taking up new things, but if he is, his wife is even more so. She holds back, believing in so doing that she is saving money when she is really wearing herself unnecessarily. Manufacturers find it more difficult to introduce labour-savers into farm homes than to sell implements to farmers.⁵²

McNaughton also implied that some farm wives were hesitant to try new machinery. When she toured Saskatchewan for the WGGA, giving lectures in which she urged the buying of all possible labour-savers, she found that:

Much to my surprise, I got more response from the men than from the women. Often a middle-aged man would say that he wanted to buy power machinery or some other improvement for the house but his wife would not agree to "change her ways."⁵³

As convenor of the WGGA Home Economics Committee, Zoa Haight concurred with McNaughton's conclusions, claiming that 'much labor would be saved if women would use more machinery but many were afraid of engines.'⁵⁴

If farm women and farm men could be educated to the importance of modernizing farm houses, there was much that could be done to overcome the lack of municipal services. Electricity, the symbol of technological progress, featured prominently in the campaign to improve the standards of rural life. The gap in convenience and comfort between middle-class urban homes and rural homes created before World War I by electric lighting systems was magnified in the 1920s when an array of appliances powered by electricity became cheaper, more reliable and more commonly used in city houses.

Although Saskatchewan did not acquire a rural electrification system until after World War II, farm women were told that they did not have to be deprived of the benefits of 'my servant, electricity.' Initially, the WGGA home economics committee promoted the gasoline engine as an alternative source of power replacing hand power. One small engine would soon pay for itself in greater efficiency by running the washing machine, the churn, the cream separator and other equipment. The next stage was to

use the gasoline engine, or energy produced by a windmill, to operate a farm electric plant. Proclaiming that 'electric light on the farm is no longer a luxury,' the United Grain Growers advertised an electric plant designed to 'bring to the farm home all the benefits of city electric lighting' (see illustration). According to the UGG catalogue, with the batteries charged once a week by a gasoline engine, the plant furnished sufficient current not only for electric lights but also for the operation of modern conveniences such as washing machines, electric irons, fans, vacuum cleaners, toasters, sewing machines, churns and cream separators.⁵⁵ The domestic electric plant was not a perfect substitute for a rural electrification system; it produced a less efficient 30 volt direct current for which appliances had to be specially adapted. The expense of an electric plant constituted an even greater problem, and it was only with the greater prosperity of the latter 1920s that farm women activists began to devote more attention to actual electrification of Saskatchewan farm homes.⁵⁶

Lack of access to municipal water and sewage systems constituted the other major technological deprivation of farm homes in the twentieth century. The ability to run water from a tap and to expel sewage down a drain had not acquired quite the same symbolic mystique which advertisers attached to electricity, although the ideal bathroom of the 1920s did exude both luxury and cleanliness.⁵⁷ Yet without a water system, the carrying of water and slops rated as the heaviest chore which the farm wife faced every day. Having concluded as a result of personal experience that 'the most outstanding form of drudgery in farm homes is the handling of water,' McNaughton, as women's editor of the *Western Producer*, began 'The Running Water Club' to publicize the water question. She explained that shortly after her marriage, she had a serious operation which left her an invalid for almost five years:

During those years I suffered so much from carrying those pails of water which are a part of the burden of a country woman that it burned into my mind this water question very deeply. I met so many women afterwards who were suffering from the effects of this same hard work that I have never been able to get away entirely from this question.⁵⁸

Water systems could be installed in farm homes at much less expense than electricity, so through the 'Running Water Club' McNaughton hoped to collect and circulate advice which would lead to action.

'The Running Water Club' stressed that every farm home from the shack on the homestead to the permanent house on an improved farm should enjoy the benefits of a water system. The arrangements could be modified to suit physical circumstances and financial budgets. For the homestead, the recommendation was an inexpensive gravity system for soft water, operative in the busy summer season but drained in the winter to prevent freezing. At the other end of the scale, a more elaborate system for the improved farm made permanent provision for hard drinking water piped from the well in addition to soft wash water

captured from the roof and stored in a cistern. Hot water was easily obtained by connecting the range boiler to the system. Sufficient, although not high, pressure at the taps was secured from a gravity system, which required placing a gravity tank above all outlets, either in the attic, an upstairs closet or, if necessary to prevent freezing, a kitchen cupboard. Alternatively, those with more money could install a pneumatic system which used air pressure to pump water from a tank in the cellar. The pneumatic system produced stronger pressure at the taps but as a consequence was more wasteful of water as well as more expensive. Anxious to prove that the saving of labour need not cost much money, the leaders of the running water campaign always emphasized the less expensive gravity system.⁵⁹

In the promotion of domestic technology, as in the recruitment of domestic servants, the organized farm women of Saskatchewan enlisted the assistance of the provincial government. They wanted to use the resources of government to extend their educational campaign and to provide a better base of scientific knowledge. In 1927, at the request of the Women's Section of the United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section), a conference was held between representatives of Saskatchewan women's organizations and members of the government to consider the question of home economics. The conference agreed to set up two committees, one to confer with the government regarding the apportionment of funds to enable the Home Economics Extension Department of the University of Saskatchewan to conduct more comprehensive educational work, and the other to consult with university officials engaged in relevant scientific research.

The special research committee, chaired by Violet McNaughton, investigated the wider uses of electricity and labour-saving devices but gave particular attention to the water question. In the spring of 1928, soil and engineering experts from the university conducted a survey of selected farm houses to ascertain what types of waste disposal would be successful in particular soil conditions. Again, McNaughton emphasized that:

The whole idea back of this scheme is confined to work which can be done with some expenditure of labor and very little expenditure of money. In other words, it was not intended for the benefit of people with plenty of money to build new houses, because such can get all this help from their architects and other sources; it is to help conditions better for those who are likely to live in their present homes for quite a few years longer.⁶⁰

The survey aided in the development of ideas and the drawing of simple plans which were then publicized not only at meetings of the Women's Section, UFC, but also through practical demonstrations at various fairs and by an exhibit installed in the machinery car of the university extension department which toured the province.⁶¹

McNaughton regarded major companies as potential allies in the publicity campaign. Noting that large American firms had

a research and publicity department 'concerned entirely with selling the idea of whatever article they may be marketing,' she wrote to Winnipeg to ask if the Maytag company maintained a similar department which could provide literature useful in selling the idea of machinery such as power washing machines. Similarly, she asked Eaton's Mail Order Advertising Department whether the exhibit of sink, hot water front and tank, costing only \$35 complete, which was being displayed at the fairs and in the machinery car, could be photographed and advertised in Eaton's catalogue. Unfortunately, the suggestion arrived too late to be considered for the Spring and Summer 1929 Catalogue, although the T. Eaton Company expressed considerable interest in the idea.⁶²

Education constituted the guiding principle of the campaign to eliminate drudgery from Saskatchewan farm homes. Through education, farm women leaders hoped to introduce into farm homes technological improvements which would both attract hired help and benefit the farm wife doing all her own work. Reformers believed that farm women could change their standard of living if they had the knowledge and the will to do so, but they found progress to be slow. Even obtaining information on the state of technology in Saskatchewan farm homes proved difficult. In 1923 the WGGGA executive encountered problems persuading members to return a questionnaire surveying rural home conditions. Based on a similar Manitoba survey, the questionnaire was intended to provide 'proof for the contention that rural families are not able to maintain a standard of living which provides the comforts demanded by the average urban family.'⁶³ Although little information exists on the actual use of labour-saving technology by farm wives, the 1923 survey does show that many farm homes lacked even simple conveniences.⁶⁴ Farm women leaders expressed frustration at the continued resistance which their reform efforts encountered. In McNaughton's words, 'it is such uphill work trying to encourage women to adopt Home Engineering as at least a subject of study.'⁶⁵ She attributed the uphill work not to the lack of money but to the 'inherent conservatism of women.'⁶⁶ With her faith in the power of education, McNaughton did not perceive that lack of money undoubtedly created much of the apparent conservatism. While farm leaders promoted both hired help and domestic technology as a means of reducing drudgery, many farm wives obviously believed that they could afford neither.

The countrywomen's campaign to modernize Saskatchewan farm homes formed part of a broader crusade to create a better rural society, but also drew its particular inspiration from national and international woman's movement. Farm women activists did not challenge the separate spheres philosophy but addressed other women through the women's pages of farm periodicals and through farm women's organizations. They saw that Saskatchewan farm women were caught in a double bind. Because they lacked municipal water and electric systems, they required hired help more than city women; for the same reason they found attracting help to be more difficult. At the same time as WGGGA leaders pressured the government to increase the supply of household workers, they emphasized the importance of standardizing housework. Applying scientific technology in the house

became the main solution to farm drudgery because it would both attract more household workers and aid women not able to have hired help. Countrywomen leaders believed that many of the ideas of standardization were as applicable to rural homes as to urban homes, to poorer homes as to richer homes. To overcome the remaining significant technological gap between rural and urban conditions, they proposed cooperative enterprises to remove some work from the home and promoted domestic water and power systems to lighten labour in the home. By cooperative and individual enterprise, they sought to end housework drudgery in rural Saskatchewan.

NOTES

1. In 1921, 71% of the population lived in rural areas in Saskatchewan, as compared to 62% in Alberta, 57% in Manitoba, and 52% in British Columbia. By contrast, in Ontario and Quebec the majority of the population lived in urban centres in 1921. Calculated from *Census of Canada, 1921, Vol I, 345*. The census defines urban areas as incorporated areas.
2. *Signs* 7:4 (Summer 1982), 813. In this essay McGaw provides a good synopsis of the American literature on technology and domestic work.
3. *Technology and Culture* 23 (1982), 175-94.
4. *Never Done* (New York, 1982), Chap. 9, 'Mistress and Maid,' 162-79.
5. For a Canadian example see Diana Pedersen, "'The Scientific Training of Mothers,'": The Campaign for Domestic Science in Ontario Schools, 1890-1913,' in Richard A. Jarrell and Arnold E. Roos, eds., *Critical Issues in the History of Canadian Science, Technology and Medicine* (Thornhill, 1983), 178-94.
6. *More Work for Mother* (New York, 1983), 99.
7. 'The "Industrial Revolution" in the Home: Household Technology and Social Change in the 20th Century,' *Technology and Culture* 17 (January 1976), 1-23, and 'Two Washes in the Morning and a Bridge Party at Night: The American Housewife between the Wars,' *Women's Studies* 3 (1976), 147-72.
8. Caroline Davidson, *A Woman's Work is Never Done* (London, 1983), 173-6.
9. David Katzman, *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* (New York, 1978); Daniel Sutherland, *Americans and Their Servants: Domestic Service in the United States from 1800 to 1900* (Baton Rouge, 1981).
10. J. H. Richards and R. I. Fung, *Atlas of Saskatchewan, 1969*, 23-6. See also Clinton White, *Power for a Province* (Regina, 1976).

11. R. Marchildon, 'Women's Auxiliary of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers,' (MA Thesis, University of Victoria, 1979), Chaps. 1-2, provides an account of the organization of the WGGGA.
12. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E92, WGGGA(1), Beynon to McNaughton, 15 January 1914.
13. Myrtle Hayes Wright, 'Mothering the Prairie,' *Maclean's Magazine* (1 April 1926); Sheilagh Steer, 'The Beliefs of Violet McNaughton: Adult Educator 1909-1929,' (Master of Continuing Education Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1979).
14. *The Progressive*, 11 Sept. 1924.
15. S. M. Lipset, *Agrarian Socialism* (Berkeley, 1950), 48, states that 'dwelling together, settlers from non-English-speaking countries have not participated as much in rural community organizations as have English-speaking farmers. There is considerable prejudice against non-Anglo-Saxon groups, especially those from central and eastern Europe.'
16. *Western Producer*, 21 October 1926.
17. SAS. McNaughton Papers, D54, Irene Parlby to McNaughton, 12 September 1925.
18. *Ibid.*, E26, 'Economy of Labor in the Home' by Violet McNaughton, Harris.
19. SAS, B2, United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section), XVI, 19, Report of Proceedings at First Annual Convention of the Women's Section, UFC, 1928.
20. *Western Producer*, 14 October 1926, 9; 17 January 1929, 16; 7 March 1929, 16. See also Sheilagh Steer, *op. cit.*, Chap. 3.
21. SAS, Dunning Papers, X-11-0, Labour, 1919-22, Memo for Dunning, 27 July 1920. See James Struthers, *No Fault of Their Own* (Toronto, 1983), for information regarding the creation and development of the Employment Service.
22. Saskatchewan obtained approximately 100 to 300 British houseworkers per year for both urban and rural homes. In the latter 1920s, the railways also brought houseworkers from the 'non-preferred' countries of central Europe. The statistics are based on information in government correspondence. Unfortunately, the *Annual Report of the Immigration Department* does not correlate occupation and provincial destination.
23. *Farmer's Advocate and Home Journal*, The Ingle Nook, 27 March 1918.
24. *Nor-West Farmer*, 20 May 1910.

25. *Nor-West Farmer*, 21 September 1914.
26. *The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management* (New York, 1916), 21-2.
27. *Ibid.*, 154.
28. The extent of Christine Frederick's influence in Canada has not yet been determined. One example of the Canadian publication of her ideas is the article 'What's Being Done to Put the Home on a Business Basis' in *Everywoman's World*, March 1914. In addition, Canadian women read American magazines. In the 1920s, the Canadian circulation of the *Ladies' Home Journal* was more than double that of the *Canadian Home Journal*. See Mary Vipond, 'The Image of Women in Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s' in S. Trofimenkoff and A. Prentice, eds., *The Neglected Majority* (Toronto, 1977), 180-1.
29. *Grain Growers' Guide* (GGG), 'The Countrywoman,' 20 October 1920.
30. *Ibid.*, 26 February 1919.
31. *Ibid.*, 4 June 1913.
32. *Ibid.*, 4 July 1917.
33. SAS, McNaughton Papers, Mary P. McCallum, Editor, Women's Dept., GGG, to Mrs John McNaughtan sic, 10 April 1918.
34. *Ibid.*, 17 April 1918.
35. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E93, WGGGA, Minutes of Executive Meeting, 28 July 1916.
36. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E27, Immigration General, McNaughton, President Interprovincial Council Farm Women, to Mrs Jean Robson, 30 April 1919.
37. Published census information provides separate occupational statistics for Regina but does not distinguish between rural areas and other urban centres in 1911 and 1921. The ratio of female servants per Saskatchewan household was 35 per 1000 (1/28) in 1911, 32 per 1000 (1/30.9) in 1921, and 50 per 1000 (1/19.9) in 1931. The 1931 statistic cannot be assumed to be an accurate indication of employment trends in the 1920s. Ten percent of Saskatchewan domestics were employed in Regina in 1911, 7% in 1921, and 10% in 1931.
38. *Western Producer*, 30 July 1925.
39. SAS, G35 Pamphlets, WGGGA Year Books, 1917-22, and B2, Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, III, Women's Section, Convention Reports.

40. SAS, B2. Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, III Women's Section, I Minutes, Meeting of Board of Directors, 27 July 1920.
41. *Ibid.*, WGGA, Seventh Annual Convention, Feb. 1921; Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work for Mother* (New York, 1983), 115, explains the operation of the Chatsfield laundry which employed a staff of nine persons.
42. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E29, Immigration: Saskatchewan Government, Report of Conference, Regina, 18 June 1918.
43. SAS, G35 Pamphlets, WGGA Year Books, 1917, 1921, 1922.
44. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E26, Home Economics, 'What the Farm Woman can contribute to Home Economics,' by Mrs T. L. Guild.
45. Myrtle Hayes Wright, 'Mothering the Prairie,' *MacLean's Magazine* (1 April 1926). McNaughton's first home as a bride was a one-room sod house.
46. Quoted from Report of Home Economics Convenor, WGGA Annual Convention, 1921, SAS, B2, SGGGA, III Women's Section, I Minutes.
47. *Western Producer*, 6 November 1924.
48. GGG, The Country Homemakers, 1 May 1918.
49. *Western Producer*, 13 November 1924.
50. *Western Producer*, 9 July 1925.
51. *Nor-West Farmer*, 20 November 1912.
52. GGG, August 1925.
53. *Western Producer*, 16 April 1925.
54. SAS, B2, SGGGA, III Women's Section, I Minutes, Report of Seventh Annual Convention, February 1921.
55. SAS, AG12, Dept. of Agriculture, II Catalogues, Group B, 89, United Grain Growers Catalogue 1918, 80; 1919, 44.
56. In 1919 the UGG charged over \$500 for the least expensive electric plant with engine. *Ibid.*, 1919, 44.
57. See Susan Strasser, 'Fetch a Pail of Water,' *Never Done*, Chap. 5, for American examples.
58. *Western Producer*, 23 September 1926; SAS, B2 United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section), XVI, 19, Report of Proceedings at First Annual Convention of the Women's Section, UFC, 13 June 1928.

59. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E26, Home Economics, 'Running Water on the Farm,' and 'Home Engineering and Report of Water Supply and Water Disposal Survey.'
60. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E26, Home Economics, McNaughton to Mr James McGregor, Idaleen, Sask., 2 May 1928.
61. *Ibid.*, McNaughton to T. Eaton Co., Winnipeg, 4 December 1928; B2, United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan Section, XVI, 19, Report of Proceedings at First Annual Convention of the Women's Section, 13 June 1928.
62. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E26, Home Economics, McNaughton to The Maytag Company, Winnipeg, 4 December 1928, 31 December 1928; McNaughton to Mail Order Advertising Dept., T. Eaton Co., Winnipeg, 4 December 1928; T. Eaton Co., to McNaughton, 10 December 1928.
63. *The Progressive*, 15 November 1923, 'Rural Survey Extended,' SAS, B2, SGGG, III, 6, Housing, 1923 Survey of Rural Homes. The file contains only 18 completed questionnaires. Other returns do not seem to have been preserved.
64. *Western Producer*, 6 November 1924, 11, 'Mainly for Women.'
65. SAS, McNaughton Papers, E26, McNaughton to Mrs E. Neilsen, Loreburn, Saskatchewan, 4 December 1928.
66. *Ibid.*, McNaughton to Mrs Agnes Coe, Plunkett, Saskatchewan, 24 July 1928.