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ABSTRACT

In the wake of suffrage victories, many early twentieth century Canadian women worked hard to make that equality meaningful and to extend it to all areas of women's lives. For those who predicted great changes, however, too few took their hard-earned rights further than the polling station. Most expressed their concerns and goals within the more familiar world of women's organizations. Helena Gutteridge, Laura Jamieson, Dorothy Steeves and Grace MacInnis were among the notable exceptions. While maintaining important ties with women's groups, they sought and won public office, pioneering important paths for generations of Canadian women to follow.

These political trail blazers stand out for another important reason. They chose to establish their careers and test their political rights in a socialist party -- the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation -- pledged to sexual emancipation and equal opportunities for women. They were, in short, dual rebels -- as feminists and socialists -- in a sex and class-ordered world.

Canada's third-party, socialist alternative gave these four women a very warm reception. All four emerged as
leaders within the British Columbia CCF after a relatively brief apprenticeship. But the championing of both causes was at the same time theoretically and, in practice, arduous. The CCF had difficulty living up to its promise of sexual egalitarianism. When class aspirations clashed with gender ones, the latter suffered. Nor did the majority of women within the party take the "great leap forward" which socialist theory forecasted.

Through its investigation of Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis' respective paths to political power and leadership, this thesis demonstrates that for leading women within the CCF, in particular the British Columbia CCF, the balancing of class and gender loyalties was no easy task. Personal, political and party ambitions worked against a whole-hearted campaign for sexual equality. Still, attempts to give equal amounts of attention to both allegiances were made and in Gutteridge and Jamieson's case, a relatively comfortable balance was found. Steeves and MacInnis, on the other hand, chose socialist goals over feminist ones. For these still more prominent women, balanced loyalties were unrealistic and too costly. Paradoxically, they came considerably closer than their older sisters to the power and clout which the franchise triumphs of 1917 and 1918 heralded.
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The road to female enfranchisement in Canada was long and arduous. After thirty-five years of relentless campaigning by a determined few, on May 24, 1918, women finally obtained the federal franchise. The right to political representation, however, did not bring with it unqualified equality. As late as 1928, for example, the Supreme Court ruled that "women were not qualified for the Senate and were not, therefore, legally persons". It took another year and the persistence of five Alberta women before the Privy Council overruled this decision.

Women's involvement in political parties is one expression of the degree to which the victories of 1918 and 1929 satisfied early feminist expectations and ambitions. Yet, in proportion to their numbers, the role of women in politics has been disappointing to those who predicted great changes. Between 1919 and 1975, only twenty-five women were elected to the House of Commons while only a slightly larger group of sixty-seven became provincial legislators.

In her study of Nellie McClung and female activism in the 1920s, Veronica Strong-Boag concludes that "the failure of pre-suffrage feminists to develop and clearly define attractive and satisfying models of an activist femininity"
made the future loom as tractless and obscure." This explanation, in part, illuminates women's poor political record. Maternal responsibilities, educational barriers and a host of gender-specific obstacles within the Canadian political arena further weakened their drive and ability to hold public office. The picture is not, however, one of unrelieved gloom. Twentieth-century women who desired the re-shaping of the society they saw as corrupt and unjust could opt for non-political cooperative work. The potential for reform and the spirit of sorority in a wide variety of reform bodies such as the National Council of Women of Canada, the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Federation of Women's Institutes of Canada and the Young Women's Christian Association offered women important benefits. Reform demands from women's groups in British Columbia contributed to that province's lead in social legislation.

In contrast to early expectations and promises for direct power, however, these organizations promoted the effective use of women's indirect power. Women who did seek public office after suffrage thus represent a significant and intriguing exception to the mass of their sisters who chose to work in familiar ways. In an attempt to shed light on the experiences of women who tested the reality of the
promises made during the early post-suffrage years, this thesis investigates the careers of four leading female political figures: Helena Gutteridge, Laura Jamieson, Dorothy Steeves and Grace MacInnis, whose high visibility in British Columbia's Cooperative Commonwealth Federation sets them apart from most Canadian women. It is a first step in recovering a collective portrait of female power and provides the essential groundwork for subsequent investigations into the experiences of less prominent, rank-and-file members. An analysis of their rise to power illuminates a relatively unexplored question within Canadian history: what was women's path to political office?

Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis merit assessment not only because they journeyed in unknown and frequently hostile territory for women. Their involvement in organizations which paid particular attention to women's rights and their commitment to a class-free, cooperative social order further set them apart. These political activists were, in short, dual rebels -- as gender and class advocates -- in a sex-oriented, capitalist society. They chose in fact to marry both causes. Under the larger socialist umbrella, they worked tirelessly towards fundamental social, economic and political changes which would free both women and workers alike.
Socialism, unlike mainstream and more conservative political ideologies of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, contained a systematic analysis of women's oppression. Socialist thinkers were the first to connect women's emancipation with general social advancement and more particularly with class liberation. Harmony between loyalties to sex and class, however, as a number of recent European and American studies suggest, was far simpler in theory than in practice. Within socialist parties, contradictions and conflicts between feminist and socialist goals meant the former suffered. Such subordination of women's causes was especially difficult for socialist feminists. They faced hard choices. Even for those convinced that the building of a socialist Utopia would in the long run guarantee sexual equality, the prioritizing of class loyalties was rarely a whole-hearted or comfortable decision. For some female socialists in fact such sacrifice caused considerable disappointment, disillusionment and at times despair. The right to maintain an equal balance between feminist and socialist ambitions required considerable strength.

Yet, as this thesis argues through its examination of four Canadian socialist feminists, the attempt to balance loyalties to class and sex was made. Equal attention to the twin causes had its costs. But within CCF ranks there was room to champion social and sexual liberation. Two women profiled, Helena Gutteridge and Laura Jamieson, found a
delicate balance of loyalties. The second and perhaps most challenging question this thesis addresses, therefore, is the character of the relationship between feminism and socialism.

Much of the primary research for this thesis centers around personal papers, publications and CCF documents. All four women were at one time or another elected representatives of the British Columbia CCF. Their activities and positions on social, economic and political issues are relatively well documented in collections, files and papers within British Columbia and Ottawa. The University of British Columbia's Special Collections in Vancouver has an extensive collection of primary CCF sources grouped under the Angus MacInnis Memorial Collection.

The AMMC's most valuable collection with respect to this thesis are the Dorothy Steeves Papers. These documents, which include speeches, letters, essays, articles, newspaper clippings, a diary of her daily activities during 1938 and 1939, and notes for her 1960 publication on Ernest Winch, The Compassionate Rebel, offer helpful biographical information and significant insights into her political, socialist and feminist ideology and approach. Colin Cameron's Papers, also in the AMMC, contain extensive correspondence from Steeves during the 1950s. These letters are excellent testimonies of her personal and political thought.
In contrast, Helena Gutteridge left behind no personal papers. The AMMC too has little material. The Vancouver City Archives file on Gutteridge is also relatively thin. The best available sources on this rather mysterious woman are newspaper articles about her and her own contributions to the Labour Gazette, Women's Weekly and the Federationist. Also useful are the minutes of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council during the 1910s and the papers of several Vancouver women's organizations, including the Vancouver LCW and the Vancouver WILPF. Finally, the memories of contemporaries and close friends like Hilda Kristiansen and Mary Norton are invaluable to a researcher attempting to chart Gutteridge's long career in the public arena.

Laura Jamieson's long career in public affairs is relatively well documented. She left a fairly inclusive set of papers now in the Provincial Archives of British Columbia. They contain autobiographical notes, correspondence, clippings, articles and writings which shed important light on her career, socialism and feminism. Her accounts of various women's issues and struggles, such as the suffrage and equal pay for equal work battles, are of special assistance.

The AMMC, in particular the Angus MacInnis Papers, contain significant material on MacInnis's wife, Grace. Her extensive personal papers, however, are housed in the Public
Archives of Canada. Correspondence with federal CCF officials and MPs, found both within her personal papers and within CCF/NDP Records in the PAC, is another notable resource. MacInnis’ biography of her father, J.S. Woodworth: A Man To Remember, also captures influential childhood and family experiences.

Oral histories and interviews also informed the portraits of these political rebels. Interviews with both Steeves and MacInnis are available in UBC’s Special Collections and the PABC. Interviews by the author with MacInnis as well as several of her contemporaries are now available in the Simon Fraser University Archives.8 Worthwhile guides to the world of female activism are Linda Hale’s Selected Bibliography of Manuscripts and Pamphlets Pertaining to Women Held by Archives, Libraries, Museums and Associations in British Columbia,9 and Heather Reilly and Marilyn Hindmarch’s Some Sources for Women History in the Public Archives of Canada.10 Finally, CCF publications and newspapers such as the Federationist and CCF News together with mainstream Vancouver and Victoria newspapers are welcome sources of information on these dynamic women.

An understanding of the questions raised throughout this thesis also depends on their treatment in a number of secondary sources. Until recently, most areas of historical enquiry have reflected men’s experience and endeavours.11
An increasing interest in social history and women's history, sparked by the rebirth of widespread feminism during the past two decades, has ameliorated somewhat this narrow situation. Nevertheless, a good amount of work remains to be done. For example, no Canadian historian has systematically explored women's collective choices or the existing literature on their associations. For the most part the available accounts are either amateur or fragmentary. Similarly, histories of Canadian political parties, including the CCF, have focussed largely upon their male leadership and perspectives. The activities of prominent women within these parties are very often ignored or given token attention. Finally, histories of the left in Canada have almost completely neglected the important question of class and gender harmony within socialist political circles.

The nature of the existing literature raises critical problems. Many organizational histories rely on sources and authors closely linked to the leadership elite. The result is rarely unbiased. Moreover, in concentrating on vocal and dynamic leadership, rank-and-file often remain a mystery. Too often questions also tend to reflect a desire to promote the organization and its outstanding members. The frequently superficial and rosy descriptions of club work found in yearbooks and minutes can similarly misrepresent developments. As a result, insights into the sacrifices and dilem-
mas women faced in public life are minimal. Fortunately, more scholarly studies are also available. Two noteworthy examples are Catherine Cleverdon's pathbreaking analysis of the woman suffrage movement in Canada and Veronica Strong-Boag's comprehensive account of the National Council of Women in Canada. These studies pay close attention to the ruling elite. They do, however, address fundamental questions such as the role of disunity within each movement, offering much to those interested in the "trials and tribulations" of women's groups and politically active women.

A particularly valuable collection of articles which deals specifically with British Columbia's female activists and their associations is Barbara Latham's and Cathy Kess' edited work, *In Her Own Right*. Three articles stand out: Gillian Weiss' "Women and Reform in B.C.: Some Preliminary Findings", Susan Wade's, "Helena Guttridge: Votes for Women and Trade Unions", and Mary Powell's, "A Response to the Depression: The Local Council of Women of Vancouver." Weiss' and Powell's studies argue a convincing case for the role of Vancouver's women's groups in the adoption of social welfare legislation in British Columbia. Wade's article offers a brief but useful introductory sketch of Gutteridge's activism and goals. Two additional analyses of British Columbia women deeply involved in the public arena are Linda Hale's
MA thesis, "The British Columbia Women Suffrage Movement" (UBC, 1977), and Mary Powell's MA thesis "Response to the Depression: Three Representative Women's Groups in British Columbia" (UBC, 1967). Like the articles, these works stress the significant contribution female activists made. Lastly, within the rather limited historiography of women's non-political organizations, Donald Page's "The Development of a Western Canadian Peace Movement" is especially illuminating in its assessment of the ideas and motives of the Women's international League for Peace and Freedom which Laura Jamieson helped found.

There is not a great deal written on women who chose direct political routes in their quest for social change. Rosamonde Boyd's comparative article, "Women and Politics in the United States and Canada" and Janine Brodie's "Recruitment of Canadian Women Provincial Legislators, 1950-1975" are two recent studies shedding some light on women's political record. Daisy Webster's, Growth of the NDP in B.C., 1900-1970: 81 Political Biographies (1970) and French and Stewart's biography of Macphail provide rare treatment of women activists in the CCF. Standard historical accounts of the party's growth, ideology and policy emphasize the male perspective and careers of the leadership. At the national level this inequity can in part be explained by the largely male executive and leadership core. The lack of attention paid to CCF women at the provincial level, how-
ever, is not so easily explained. Women played key roles in provincial and regional CCF decision-making, especially within British Columbia. Their omission from the history of CCF politics notwithstanding, a useful picture of the CCF's make-up and position within Canadian society is offered in a number of studies set both within the national and provincial context.20

Two important general studies of the CCF, Leo Zakuta's Protest Movement Becalmed: A Study of Change in the CCF (1964) and Ivan Avakumovic's, Socialism in Canada: A Study of the CCF/NDP in Federal Provincial Politics (1978), deserve special mention. Though very briefly, these works address directly women's status and participation in the CCF. Zakuta concludes that women were generally second choice candidates in CCF ridings, particularly in Ontario. Agnes Macphail was a notable exception.21 Avakumovic reminds his readers that the CCF, like its European socialist predecessors, favoured women's equality. Yet, with the exception of a few outstanding women the party had more success attracting youth than women.22 Neither study offers a satisfactory explanation or exploration of the party's ideological commitment to women's emancipation and equality. Nevertheless, in contrast to other major studies of the CCF, they do raise the question of women's roles and status and in so doing inadvertently identify a much neglec-
ted aspect of left wing politics in Canada: the relationship between the struggle for workers' rights and women's rights.

Though still falling short of an in-depth analysis of the marriage between socialism and feminism three recent and refreshing articles explore the championship of feminist causes within Canadian socialism. Janice Newton's, "Women and the Cotton Weekly: A Study of Women and Socialism in Canada, 1909"23 looks at attitudes towards women's issues amongst a small group of Eastern Canadian members of the SPC, while Dean Beeby's, "Women in the Ontario CCF, 1940-1950"24 and John Manley's "Women and the Left in the 1930s: The Case of the Toronto CCF Women's Joint Committee"25 examine feminist stands and advances within the Ontario CCF. Newton, Beeby's and Manley's studies are clearly exceptions to the rather pervasive historical neglect of women's experiences and opportunities within Canadian left-wing circles.

In contrast, a number of recent studies on American and European leftist parties do investigate the relationship between class and sex causes and priorities. They also challenge the assumption that traditional socialism was truly egalitarian.26 Two identities, these authors suggest, competed in the minds of socialist feminists and two sources of loyalty -- class and sex -- vied for allegiance. These
works serve as extremely useful models for this investigation of the aspirations of Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis.

Juliet Mitchell's 1971 publication, *Women's Estate* and Sheila Rowbotham's 1978 book, *Women, Resistance and Revolution*, are two comprehensive histories of modern feminism which explore the union between socialism and feminism in theory and in practice. Their special feature is their critical discussion of early socialist writings on sexual equality and their analysis of the problems revolutionary societies faced in their attempts to build truly egalitarian communities.

Throughout the secondary literature on 19th and 20th century socialist theory and practice with respect to the woman question, the notion that the socialist cause overshadowed the feminist one is strongly advanced. Yet, socialist men and women spelled out more clearly than ever before women's oppression and also promoted unprecedented attention to working-class women. Furthermore, socialism continued to offer women important political benefits. Thus for all their shortcomings socialist political parties remained attractive to women interested in gaining greater access to power and political decision-making during the first half of the twentieth century.
This dissertation investigates how four women in the British Columbia Cooperative Commonwealth Federation rose to power and viewed the connection between socialism and feminism, both theoretically and pragmatically, sheds some light on this experience and, in so doing, lays the foundation for further study into the treatment of the women question within the Canadian left. To establish the context within which Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis must be understood, it begins with a discussion of the development and scope of women's organizational life within Canada. The second chapter explores the options for women embraced by socialism and the CCF. An analysis of these feminist and socialist options and experiences sets the essential stage for the profiles of four engaging Canadian women who not only dared tread in the previously "no-woman's land" of politics but in radical political territory as well. The way in which Gutteridge and Jamieson investigated the meaning of their loyalties to class and sex ideologies are examined in chapter three. The efforts of Steeves and MacInnis are similarly assessed in chapter four.
CHAPTER ONE: FROM HOMEMAKER TO POLITICIAN:

THE EXPERIENCE OF SISTERHOOD

Citizens at last, Canadian women in the early 1920s shared with their male counterparts a mood of relief and quiet optimism. The "war to end all wars" was over. It was time to leave the ugly memories of war behind, to rebuild and to look to a promising future in which women would play an important role. The triumph of female enfranchisement and the return to peace, however, did not usher in the age of sexual emancipation and egalitarianism feminists envisioned. Post-war dislocation and the unsettling pace of social change contributed to a fear that war had "hastened the disintegration of the domestic fabric." Rather than rejoice in woman's newly-won right to a stronger social and political voice, many Canadians heralded instead her time-honoured maternal and domestic skills.

Demographic issues also inspired such Victorian "celebration of maternalism." Declining birth-rates and the overwhelming loss of young Canadian men on European battlefields could only be countered by a post-war campaign encouraging the practical and emotional benefits of a large, healthy family. A new army of specialists in child-care and family management were called in to assist couples reach this goal. Heeding their advice and consuming the latest labour-saving devices and gadgets, it was argued, would help
ensure familial success. But it was upon mothers' shoulders that the responsibility for the family's emotional stability and comfort ultimately rested. Considered the critical figure in the provision of a happy home for their husband and children, they found it difficult, at times impossible, to combat restrictive sex-typed conventions in favour of an active femininity outside the private domain.

This pervasive cult of domesticity not surprisingly strengthened in the 1930s and 1940s when world-wide economic collapse and the outbreak of another world war shattered fragile dreams of peace and a new prosperity. The uncertainty of financial survival and family stability once again reinforced traditional family structures, particularly the conventional division of labour. While economic necessity and war-time demands ironically drew increasing numbers of women into the wage-work labour force, the disquietening symbols of these trying years convinced many, perhaps most, that women, once freed of economic worries or patriotic considerations, found the home their "proper sphere". Tired and greatly disillusioned, many women gladly retreated to the security of their homes and families. For these women, as well as their weary husbands, the home, ideally if not always in practice, represented a prized refuge from the economic and political chaos or as Christopher Lasch described it: "a haven in a heartless world".
For many then the public and political world feminists had struggled so hard to open to women held minimal appeal. During the nineteen thirties, forties and fifties, in fact, only a small minority of women were attracted to public life or appeared willing to assume the responsibility of citizenship through public, organized activity. A still smaller handful entered the political arena. Within the larger female population, of course, only those financially secure generally could afford the time and means to engage in such public activity. Economic and family concerns, for example, often left working-class women unable to respond to calls for active citizenship. This discussion necessarily focuses on female exceptions amongst a largely middle-class, Anglo-Saxon female population. To understand the alternatives open to these women and the role organized women's groups played in the promotion, input and exercise of female power, four broad categories of female activity are examined including: women in "non-political" organizations, women in citizenship schools, women in female collectives within political parties, and women who chose direct political routes. Also addressed briefly are factors which either facilitated or inhibited direct political involvement. The chapter thus provides an essential backdrop to the profiles of Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis
whose activity in non-political women’s organizations and whose prominence in a non-conventional third party political alternative -- the CCF -- makes them an even rarer exception to the mass of their sisters.

The winning of suffrage in 1918 clearly did not end women’s associations. Some suffrage societies transformed themselves into bodies promoting good citizenship. A host of old and new associations also welcomed women. These women’s groups offered members important benefits. The majority of women, in fact, remained within traditional organizations which pre-dated suffrage or joined new bodies with similar make-up and ideology. Most embraced a wide variety of social, political and equal rights causes. Although not without political elements, for purposes of argument, they are referred to as "non-political."

In the post-suffrage period, as before, the weaknesses of the existing literature on women’s organizational choices means that only a limited number of conclusions can be drawn at this time. Nevertheless, the accounts which do exist supply a critical introduction into the world of cooperation of which CCF women were only one part. As most available sources focus on national federations, this discussion similarly concentrates on such groupings. Whenever possible, however, evidence of local activity, in particular
within British Columbia or Vancouver, is presented. It should also be noted that all the national organizations discussed in this chapter had local branches in British Columbia.

Industrial growth and the corresponding shift from private to public production in the nineteenth century contributed to significant changes in the relationship between the family and society. The family continued to perform important social functions; however, it was no longer the center around which the community was organized. This transformation had a dramatic impact on the roles of men and women within the family and within the larger social and economic structure. For the most part, only men emerged from their familial roles to enjoy participation in public activities. Adult women remained almost entirely within the private domain of the family.  

The opportunity to become visible, to end the isolation of private mothering and to influence the restructuring of social conditions not surprisingly attracted a significant number of Canadian women to non-political female organizations in the nineteenth century. The earliest, most convenient and frequently most accessible of these bodies were local and often sectarian. Missionary societies, especially popular during the mid-nineteenth century, exemplify such groups. With their special appeal to married and middle-
aged women, "these constituted the chief strength of organized women's associations for many years." 8

By the late nineteenth century, however, the local and sectarian nature of early female collectives increasingly gave way to a new trend of large secular-oriented federations. Evidence of institutional oppression and the general spread of "progressive" thinking amongst Canadians at that time encouraged greater attention to practical, social reform matters. Like many of their male counterparts, women club members heard a new call to action: assist those disadvantaged who cannot help themselves.

The histories of two national women's groups: the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Young Women's Christian Association, both founded in Canada during the 1870s, attest to this rather paternalistic, secularization process. While still boasting sectarian principles, their activities slowly began to reflect a serious concern with social and particularly urban problems. Their strong faith in female moral superiority further drove them to social activism. They were convinced that the increasingly corrupt public domain was in urgent need of a good woman's nurturance, skill and above all moral strength. The WCTU's expressed goals, for example, included prohibition, social purity, the formation of domestic institutions for the poor and, not unexpectedly, women's right to the vote so that
they might directly influence these issues. The YWCA also sought to influence the Dominion's moral character. To accomplish this objective its organizers paid special attention to the needs of young single women. By training girls for domestic service and by setting up urban housing cooperatives, summer camps, study sessions and recreation programs, YWCA leaders hoped to "guide their girls into a disciplined and moral womanhood".

Protestant benevolence appears to have motivated much of the good samaritanism of the WCTU and the YWCA. Overbearing paternalism frequently characterized their respective styles. Yet more important than their respective motivation and style was the immediate, if not always long-lasting, support and practical assistance the WCTU and the YWCA provided women both within and outside the Christian community. The comforting sisterhood of membership no doubt added to these benefits. Finally, these early female associations were clearly important advocates and vehicles for Victorian women eager to conquer the public domain.

The benefits of sisterhood and the opportunity to combat social and cultural deterioration through public, feminine solidarity attracted women to another nation-wide women's group founded in the late nineteenth century: the National Council of Women of Canada. Federated in 1893 under the dynamic leadership of Lady Aberdeen, wife of the
then Governor General of Canada, this association, in contrast to the WCTU and the YWCA, was expressly secular and non-partisan, on the surface at least. Its members hoped that the uniting of female reformers of all classes and religions, from all across Canada, would strengthen women's impact on social and political decision-making. They also hoped to provide Canadian women with a long-needed forum for debate. Veronica Strong-Boag made this comprehensive summation of the Council's activities:

An active member of the Canadian progressive movement, the federation considered a wide range of community problems. Many issues touched women alone but many others such as housing, immigration and public health affected all Canadians.¹¹

Like all large, broadly-based organizations, the NCWC, in its attempt to create a unified coast to coast response to feminist and social issues, confronted considerable obstacles. An umbrella to a number of national, provincial and local women's societies which differed in ideology, scope and practice, the organization often found the maintenance of unity within the movement a serious problem. Nor was adopting a forthright stance on social questions or the attraction of new members particularly smooth going. Arriving at a general consensus was not easy when politically progressive thinkers and conservative monarchists,
Eastern capitalists and Western agriculturalists, and professional women and housewives often sat at the same table. Unable to discard philosophical, commercial, and political biases, disagreement and dissatisfaction frequently divided NCWC members. Domination by a central Canadian leadership elite further alienated members and potential members, especially those west of the Great Lakes. In the post-WWI period, in fact, such disunity contributed to the Council's decline.

The inability to unite women from across Canada under a non-partisan, women's banner was especially evident in the twice aborted "Women's Party" which NCWC members tried to organize. Canadian women, like Canadian men, could not put aside long-held political, historical and regional prejudices. Nor was the Council ever able to transgress class boundaries as it had originally hoped. Only a very few from the working class considered membership and this decision was usually on an individual rather than group basis.

Despite these failings the NCWC did, for a period, establish itself as a respectable nation-wide body whose studies on women's needs and rights made heavy reading on desks of legislators. The impact of work undertaken by NCWC locals could be considerable. The Local Council of Women in Vancouver, for example, was a comparatively progressive and effective body within the federation. Unlike its parent
body, it early established networks with working-class women. During World War One LCW members sponsored two groups for working class women: the Women's Employment League in 1914 and the Minimum Wage League in 1917.

The NCWC left Canadian women another important legacy. Membership afforded critical leadership and administrative training. Learning to coordinate activities, run meetings, diplomatically solve policy impasses and above all accept responsibility for decisions which affected large numbers of people were valuable skills. Even those with experience in public affairs could benefit from membership. At NCWC meetings and gatherings they could practice management and public relations without threatening their femininity, as was the case in many male assemblies. The five members of the British Columbia Legislature in 1941, Tilly Rolston, Mrs. Paul Smith, Laura Jamieson, Dorothy Steeves and Grace MacInnis, all active members of the Local Council of Women, benefitted from the opportunity to express and test their views within this comparatively comfortable milieu. Lastly, the NCWC succeeded in what Strong-Béag aptly identified as a critical contribution to Canadian club women. It helped "female citizens relinquish the shelter of the churches and move into secular spheres".

The abandonment of sectarian support-bases, initiated by the NCWC was further exemplified in the activities of two
early twentieth-century women's organizations: the Federation of University Women of Canada and the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of Canada, federated in 1920 and 1930 respectively. Women interested in intellectual exchange and companionship bonded together in the hope that they might recapture the stimulation and community they frequently lost after graduation. Members also made time for reform and community work, especially around issues affecting women's status. Shortly before the end of World War One, for example, the Vancouver University Women's Club conducted a useful study on female offenders within the provincial criminal justice system. The FBPWC displayed its strongest interest in assisting disadvantaged women during the "Hungry Thirties".

Belonging to the FUWC or the FBPWC, as noted, offered a sorority and stimulation some members otherwise missed. As with participation in the NCWC, membership also afforded the opportunity to improve upon or learn new public affairs and leadership styles. Indeed, the encouragement and support of female leaders was an important goal. It is no coincidence that amongst the founders and leading members of the Vancouver UWC were prominent female activists: Evelyn Farris, founding member of the British Columbia UWC, became one of the first female members of the Senate and Board of Governors at the University of British Columbia; Helen
Gregory MacGill emerged as the first juvenile court judge in British Columbia. Mary Ellen Smith was elected in 1918 to her deceased husband's seat as an independent Liberal "Women's" candidate. The FBPWC similarly included women who established themselves in leading decision-making bodies. The Federation's vice-president, Pansy Pue became an alderwoman in Calgary, Alberta, convinced that "it was important that women use their influence in an active way." The rise of these women to responsible positions clearly did not rest exclusively on the experience they gained from membership in these women's organizations. But the support they received within these associations was an important ingredient in their confident challenge to restrictive norms.

The early twentieth century also saw rural women challenge restrictive norms through female solidarity. Their associations, like those in urban centres, shied away from direct political activity. Instead, they concentrated on community support services and educational reform. This approach was especially clear in the programs of the Federation of Women's Institutes, federated in Winnipeg in the winter of 1919 and best illustrated in a 1913 handbook compiled by a founding member, the British Columbia Women's Institutes. It read in part:
The aims and objectives of the Institutes are to improve the conditions of rural life, so that settlement may be permanent and prosperous in the farming community—

(a) By study of home economics, child welfare, prevention of disease, local neighbourhood needs, of industrial and social conditions and laws affecting women and their work;

(b) By making the Institutes a social and educational center and a means of welcoming new settlers;

(c) By encouragement of agriculture and other local and home industries for women. 21

On the surface, these goals reflect time-honoured patterns of female organized activity. Yet, as Alexandra Zacharia put it in her study of these institutes, "underlying these objectives can be felt the need for lonely, isolated women to band together for self-development." 22 Zacharia's observation captures the desire for sorority which, as it did in urban settings, drew women into female organizations. It also touches upon another critical characteristic of these early agrarian women's groups: the quest for greater intellectual and decision-making power for women. Education was a first step in the acquisition of such power. Armed with knowledge about the workings of the system, women could then move on. Thus, while their public agenda lacked demands for direct involvement in the judicial, legislative or political process, their hidden agenda promoted it. Some members of the Women's Institutes openly pursued this hidden agenda. Emily Murphy, founding member
of the National Federation and leading member in the British Columbia Women's Institutes, for example, became the first female magistrate in the British Empire.

Farm women, like city women, generally founded their own distinct organizations. There were some issues, however, which drew rural and urban activists together under one roof. World peace was such an issue and one popular and still surviving testimony to this cooperation was the Canadian branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Concerned with the "aggressive spirit of the capitalist economic system", particularly the international warfare it created, women banded together under leaders like Violet McNaughton of Saskatchewan, Agnes Macphail of Ontario, and Laura Jamieson of Vancouver, to "combine the idea of goodwill within a domestic framework of a cooperative society". Many members believed that peace could only be achieved within a fundamentally changed social structure and eventually worked toward the larger goal of socialism.

The dictators of the 1930s and the coming of the Second World War provided a hard lesson for these women. Although discouraged with the collapse of world peace, most WILPF members did not retire to the security of private life. McNaughton continued to play an active role in the Grain Growers Association of Saskatchewan. Macphail served as an
MP from 1921 to 1940 and Jamieson became an active member of the CCF and sat in the Provincial Legislature and on City Council on its behalf.

Non-political urban and rural women's networks, as well as joint urban-rural organizations like the WILPF, clearly offered women anxious to work within the public domain an important training ground for political activism. Such training, however, was generally a spin-off of participation not the collective's "raison d'être". There were a few citizenship groups across Canada whose purpose specifically addressed the political education of women. One notable organization which seems to have escaped the notice of British Columbia historians was the Vancouver Women's School for Citizenship.

Formed in March of 1941, largely at the insistence of an Austrian immigrant, Madame A.H. Askanasy, the VWSC presented information programs and organized study groups and lectures pertaining to citizenship at the local and national level. A CBC broadcast of February 1943 recounted the organization's birth and history. It is worth quoting in some length:
The Second World War, coming as it did on the heels of the Great Depression, brought a challenge to the women of British Columbia, especially those of us who worked for women's suffrage in this province over twenty years ago. What had we been doing with the vote for which we had struggled so valiantly and won in 1917? Couldn't women as voters have done something better than we did in dealing with the depression? If we had known a little more about Democracy couldn't we have helped better to save it by peaceful means rather than make our men fight and die to save it twice in twenty years?

These questions and others made us pause. There were women among us who said vociferously that things would remain this way so long as it was a man-made world run mainly by men. There were other women who cautioned: until women learn more about running the world than they know now they aren't likely to do a bit better at it than men are doing...women would have to know more about the actual workings of democracy—not the abstract concept alone—but the democracy right around us, in local government, and in such groups as the cooperatives and trade unions...

So our Vancouver Women's School for Citizenship was born. The success of our first lectures proved that women of Vancouver, however busy they were with war work, wanted to learn more about citizenship.26

Organizers in the VWSC attempted to offer a broad range of topics which they deemed crucial to the education and politicization of women. Panel discussion and lectures covered both political and feminist themes as indicated in the following list of lectures scheduled in the fall of
1941: "Women's Needs in the Home"; "Matriarchy -- Women's Historical Background"; "Canada's Natural Resources -- Conservation and Waste"; "Canada's Immigration Policy" and "Parliamentary Procedure: Model House of Commons". Panel participants and resource persons were recruited from government, the Legislative Assembly, industry, trade unions, and political parties. A healthy percentage of speakers came from progressive and often left-wing circles.27

Although the VWSC emphasized its "non-partisan" stance, like all non-partisan groups, political biases surfaced and made for lively, often heated debate. Women inexperienced in politics and political debate soon learned of the diversity of ideological approaches to similar problems and, likely, of the fragility of political egos.

To understand fully the impact of the VWSC on female activism in British Columbia more research is needed. One important observation, nevertheless, can be made. The VWSC's programs demonstrate a consciousness that women's impoverished political background was an important factor in their absence from the political arena. Its existence also reveals that some women were anxious to correct the imbalance through an organization geared specifically for women who lacked the tools necessary to pursue their hard-earned rights granted in 1917, 1918 and 1929.
Membership in non-political women's groups or citizenship schools was not the sole alternative open to women seeking to understand the political process and acquire the tools for political activity. Women could also learn about politics in women's auxiliaries, associations, councils or committees within political parties. Unfortunately, historians have paid little attention to these groups. As their records are, at best, fragmentary this neglect is perhaps to be expected. Despite the limited information and scholarly investigation, however, the assumption that these groups were largely subservient appendages of their parent-bodies and ineffectual in elevating women to prominent positions within parties seems generally accepted. Such an assumption might indeed explain the absence of historical research. In 1970, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, for example, reported that:

The activities of women's groups are directed predominantly to study sessions and to servicing the party staffing committee rooms, canvassing, organizing meetings, sponsoring social functions, to raise funds and performing many necessary but routine chores which should be the responsibility of a committee but not specifically allotted to women's groups. The impression gained from interviews with men and
women active in politics is that women's associations divert energies into the mechanics of running the party that could be more effectively used at other levels. Some went so far as to state that separate women's associations hinder rather than help the participation of women at policy-making levels; that they are a deterrent rather than an asset to women who wish to contribute in more significant ways.29

At first glance, the contention that within-party female associations were cogs of the larger political machinery seems valid. Relegated to positions which often resembled undervalued support staff workers in a large corporation, women in these groups frequently lacked any strong political voice. But questions about what these groups provided women with, about local variations in effectiveness and strength, and about the role they played in the adaptation from private to public activity have not been asked. Until they are investigated, current assumptions and conclusions seem premature.

A brief review of the literature on the CCF Women's Council -- a loosely knit federation of women's clubs housed within the CCF, for example, challenges the assumption that women's groups within political parties were necessarily adjuncts, performing the monotonous, but essential, behind-the-scenes work and had little impact on women's emergence as political actors in their own right. While the Council does appear to have accepted "Ways and Means" tasks
or the less popular clerical and canvassing work, fund raising and tedious organizational work by no means headed its stated goals. Included in its list of objectives were activities particularly directed towards the voicing of women's rights and the promotion of a political consciousness among women inside and outside the party. The minutes of the Provincial Executive of the British Columbia Women's Council, for instance, identified these four broad objectives:

1. To provide avenues for women and sympathizers of the movement and discuss matters of particular interest to women so we can recommend policy to the Provincial Council.
2. To stimulate women to missionary efforts on behalf of the movement especially among women who are the largest number of voters.
3. Education of socialist theory and philosophy.
4. Act as a "Ways and Means" committee auxiliary to local clubs.

As these aims suggest, the political education of women, particularly within a socialist ideological framework, was an extremely important priority for the CCF Women's Council. Supporting women's access to active political roles and raising awareness about women's rights and socialist principles was only realistic if women understood the basic political machinery and process. This really fundamental concern was perhaps best encapsulated in a Women's
Council report submitted after the National Convention in 1948. Its authors concluded: "The ultimate goal is to have women accept and be given opportunity to accept their full share of responsibility for the direction of our political life."31

The dearth of scholarly investigation into the affairs of the CCF Women's Council precludes definitive statements about the extent to which it strove to or succeeded in meeting this goal. There is some evidence to suggest that the Women's Council did contribute to the proportionately higher numbers of female delegates, organizers, leaders and members of government bodies within the CCF than those within traditional parties. Three of the four women profiled in this dissertation were active members of the CCF Women's Council.32 The component clubs certainly helped women keep abreast of current political and social policy and planning as indicated in this letter to "Women in the Clubs":
They [the CCF Women's Central Group — a member of the CCF Women's Council] have kept in touch all season, through special committees who report monthly, with what happens in the Dominion and Provincial Houses of Parliament and what our own members do and say there. A special study is being made of what goes on in the City Council and Police Courts. A Health Committee reports on health matters and what action is taken to deal with them. The School Board meetings are also covered and reported on. A Literature Convenor keeps the members posted on literature to be had at headquarters. Matters of special interest to women are dealt with.33

The impact of inner-party women's groups on women's political consciousness and access to political power, as the CCF Women's Council suggests, should not be so readily dismissed as limited or inhibitory. While the CCF Women's Council likely contained more progressive women and feminists than women's associations within conservative political circles,34 detailed enquiries into the latter might uncover new insights on their input into party policy as well as their role in the promotion of female politicians. An in-depth analysis of their role would also illuminate party attitudes towards women in politics and their commitment to sexual emancipation. Without these studies, existing ideological profiles of political parties are incomplete.

The opportunity to work in relatively familiar ways and within a generally supportive environment in non-political
organizations, citizenship groups and within-party auxiliaries or councils satisfied many female activists during the first half of the twentieth century. For a very dynamic few, however, this more socially acceptable activism was not enough. Determined to test the promises of suffrage, these women gathered their strength and sought direct membership in centres of male power and decision-making. If some kept a foot in non-political female camps, they also plunged into the largely masculine world of politics and government, setting important precedents for generations of women to follow.

Five Alberta women popularly referred to as the Famous Five for their successful campaign to have women declared persons in 1929, displayed such strong courage and commitment in their pursuit of equality for women. Convinced that women's emancipation rested on a commitment both to women's organizations as well as to larger social change within political and legislative arenas, these women dedicated themselves in both spheres of activity. Emily Murphy, prime instigator of the "Persons' Case" and first national president of the Federation of Women's Institutes, was also the first woman to hold the position of Magistrate in the British Empire. Irene Parlby, at one time president of the United Farm Women of Alberta, became a member of the Alberta Cabinet. Henrietta Muir Edwards, founding member of the
National Council of Women became a well-respected researcher into family law. In addition to her constant reform activities in groups such as the WCTU, Nellie McClung served as an Alberta MLA from 1921 to 1926. Louise McKinney, long-time WCTU organizer, was the first woman elected to a provincial legislature within the British Empire. The accomplishments of these women helped to establish an important route for women interested in higher levels of government, legislative and judicial work.

Younger female challengers to sex-typed norms who set equally important precedents for Canadian women were Canada's first woman MP, Agnes Macphail, its first female senator, Carine Wilson and its first female political party leader, Thérèse Casgrain, leader of the Quebec CCF. Macphail cautiously downplayed women's unique struggle, fearing that demands for special treatment were admissions of inferiority. With the exception of the WILPF, she shied away from female associations. Wilson and Casgrain, on the other hand, played leading roles in women's groups. They considered women's organizations to be important vehicles in women's drive for power, influence and first-class citizenship. Though differing in their overall approach to the advancement of women's causes, all three were nevertheless staunch defenders of women's rights and, like the "famous five", broke important new ground for Canadian women.35
During the first half of the twentieth century a host of sex-typed prejudices made the struggle these talented pioneers faced in their quest for a strong political voice relentless. One important explanation for the comparatively small number of women in political circles during these five decades obviously must be the exceptional strength and talent even those with connections needed to combat the deeply entrenched conservativism of this period. Constituency prejudice and a generally cold public reception to female candidates was not easily dispelled. A number of very concrete obstacles, however, also help explain the very slow and sporadic rise of women to responsible positions.

Among the more obvious obstacles to participation in politics and government were family responsibilities, limited mobility and a lack of financial resources.36 Three often forgotten, but equally critical barriers were women's limited access to higher education, their restricted access to higher echelons of the workforce and their relative absence from local decision-making bodies, all important steps in the route to political power. Most Canadian women who did make it to political office, for example, had gained access to these three stepping stones to power. Of the twenty-five women elected to the House of Commons between 1919 and 1975 and of the sixty-seven voted into provincial office during the same period, most had better than average
levels of education, were generally recruited from the higher echelons of the female workforce and frequently had experience in municipal politics or on local boards.37

Higher education appears to correlate positively with political activism and success within both male and female circles. Yet gender differences occurred as well. In contract to their male counterparts, only five percent of the ninety-two female politicians held more than a general university degree.38 Their former occupations were frequently dissimilar to those normally held by political leaders. Especially evident was the absence of business and legal expertise. While sixty-percent of male legislators reported experience in law, business or management, only seven percent of the women did.39 Information on the kinds of duties these women accepted within municipal councils and boards is scarce. Given the general tendency for women to sit on school boards, rather than on more powerful bodies, like city council, it seems reasonable to conclude that the experience women gained in local government also differed from that of the majority of their male colleagues. Lack of educational and professional expertise in critical areas of government clearly limited women's opportunities for upward mobility within the political arena. Such inexperience conceivably undermined their self-confidence and likely narrowed significantly the range of responsibilities with which they were entrusted.
The potential for upward mobility for female politicians was paradoxically undermined by another phenomenon: the token elevation of women into senior portfolios without the customary backbench apprenticeship. Five of the women voted into office between 1950 and 1975 were assigned ministerial status before serving on the backbenches. Particularly significant was their acquisition of highly visible portfolios such as those in Social Service, Consumer Affairs and Housing. The fact that these were all in traditionally feminine areas of responsibility undoubtedly contributed to this early prominence. In contrast, women were not assigned senior portfolios of Treasury, Defence, Finance or External Affairs, all identified with male power and authority. In the fiercely competitive world of politics, such deferential treatment did little to promote female credibility, mobility or success.

Obstacles to female power for women were manifest not only during their climb to governing circles. Once there attitudinal gender-specific barriers often undermined an equal voice in government. In light of these difficult conditions, women's reluctance to become political actors is not surprising. Indeed, many who did choose this path may not have been fully aware of the arduous road ahead. Once they made the plunge, however, tests of their strength, knowledge, talent and above all courage quickly opened their
eyes to the especially trying nature of political life for women. Tumultous careers, like that of Judy LaMarsh, Minister of National Health and Welfare from 1963 to 1965, so vividly captured in the title of her autobiography; Memoirs of a Bird in a Gilded Cage, suggest that political prominence for Canadian women was frequently a mixed-blessing.43

Canadian women and, in particular British Columbia women, had many alternatives to membership in the CCF. Most who desired the re-shaping of an often unjust and corrupt society opted for non-political cooperative work. The potential for reform and the spirit of sorority within these organizations offered important benefits. Membership frequently enriched members' understanding of their position in a sex-ordered society. Moreover, in a fashion resembling political movements, non-political women's associations played an important role in the promotion of needed social reform.

In contrast to early expectations and promises for direct female power, these groups perpetuated and to a considerable extent promoted the effective use of women's indirect power. Indeed, it is commonly assumed that such groups retarded women's rise to the real centers of power. While it is true that many organizational women avoided hard-nosed politics, in view of the limited understanding
historians have of the raison d'être, activities, and benefits of women's groups, this assumption seems premature. There is, moreover, some evidence to suggest otherwise.

To begin, women's associations drew women out of the private domain. They not only exposed the world to women, they exposed women to the world. Their demands for greater opportunities for women helped to create a broader consciousness of women's emerging selves, albeit rather slowly, amongst women and within a society largely content with an image of women as keepers of the hearth. Public appearances and women in responsible positions were no longer an anomaly. In short, the growth and activities of women's organizations helped to smooth the especially bumpy road for women interested in government, easing the transition from homemaker to politician.

Secondly, the non-political societies discussed throughout this chapter included a number of female politicians and promoted female political candidates. A closer look at the group dynamics within these organizations also illustrates that life in women's associations was not without its difficulties. As in mixed and strictly male organizations, power struggles, political biases and divergent visions prompted internal conflicts and disunity. These differences in turn demanded leadership skills that
went beyond the mechanics of sound organization: diplomacy, tact, persuasion and manipulation. To put it simply, through organizational work some women learned to play the political game. For women with little experience in public affairs, their growing confidence and skill were invaluable.

Finally, the failure to re-affirm a non-partisan tradition within women's organizations -- so clearly exemplified in the decline of the NCWC and in aborted attempts to organize a "Women's Party" -- convinced many women activists that non-partisan cooperation was idealistic and unrealistic. Instead, explicitly partisan cooperation was deemed essential to any campaign for major social change. Thus women's experiences in nonpolitical sororities pushed them into expressly political groups. Some accepted the philosophies and promises of the Tories and Grits, choosing to work within Canada's traditional party networks: the Conservative and Liberal Parties. Others, like Helena Gutteridge, Laura Jamieson, Dorothy Steeves and Grace MacInnis sought a new political philosophy and organization within Canada: the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.
Sectional discontent, drought and the inhumanity of the Great Depression fostered wide-ranging critique of Canada's traditional party system in the early 1930s. Angry with the inability of the country's major parties to reduce unemployment and deprivation, Canadians formed a variety of political party alternatives. Some citizens organized regional parties like L'Union nationale of Quebec and the Social Credit Party of Alberta. Focussing on local concerns and solutions, their appeal and impact, though strong provincially, was limited. Charismatic leaders criticized feeble efforts to deal with disruptive forces challenging the status quo. They offered few workable alternatives and left the established order itself unchallenged.

To many Canadians, however, changes to the established political, social, and economic structure were paramount. The chaos of the 1930s vividly demonstrated the futility of conservative thinking and the need for a nation-wide campaign against out-dated social systems. Convinced of the immorality of poverty and class privilege, their discontent
gave birth to a socialist third-party alternative: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

Historians and political scientists have paid considerable attention to the CCF's roots and socialist ideology. They have consequently shed significant light on the ideological framework within which its leading members must be understood. Their observations, however, do not paint a complete picture of the party's ideological character or appeal. Concentrating primarily on its approach to the social or class question, they have ignored its treatment of another crucial question: sexual equality. Since the strongest theoretical support for female emancipation amongst mixed organizations has traditionally come from the left, the extent to which the CCF inherited this tradition must be investigated in any serious consideration of its ideology. Moreover, as the party's attitude on women's role within society bears a direct relationship to women's mobility within the party and to the opportunity to champion feminist causes, an analysis of its position is long overdue. This chapter attempts to recover, in part, this missing link in the party's history and thereby set the framework within which Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis took their place as feminists and socialists in the British Columbia CCF. It asks, in short, what did the British Columbia CCF
offer to women seeking emancipation, equality and a more just world?

In early July, 1933, socialists and progressives from farm, labour, academic and religious circles across Canada met in Regina for the first convention of a neophyte grass-roots political movement called the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. During the long summer days which followed, this heterogeneous mix of social gospellers, reformers, radicals and revolutionaries synthesized their common ideological and economic concerns in a document they labelled the Regina Manifesto. The most outstanding features of the Regina Manifesto were its emphasis on fellowship and its direct challenge to capitalism. It read in part,

We aim to replace the present capitalist system, with its inherent injustice and inhumanity, by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated, in which economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise, and in which genuine democratic self-government, based upon economic equality will be possible.

The Manifesto also stressed the necessity for parliamentary change and democratic political action rather than violent revolution in the pursuit of a new social order. The stricter principles of "scientific socialism" were abandoned for a socialism "made in Canada" but modelled broadly on European and most particularly on British examples. Full
public ownership of property and industry, for example, was not promised. Rather, only those goods and services "necessary to the efficient functioning of the economy" would be placed under government control. Nevertheless, a revolutionary tone persisted in phrases like "the parasitic interests of the receiving classes" and the Manifesto's concluding paragraph:

No CCF government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation the full programme of social planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of a Cooperative Commonwealth.  

A large component of the radical faction of the CCF came from Canada's Pacific coast. There large numbers of British, as well as pockets of European and American, immigrants schooled in trade union and class politics joined Canadian-born radicals in a pledge to free workers from what they considered to be the stifling grip of capitalist employers. It was not a particularly homogeneous fraternity. Doctrinal differences contributed to heated, often divisive, debate. Radical miners and forest workers keen on the syndicalist strategy of the American-born Industrial Workers of the World, for example, did not always see eye to eye with dock workers espousing revisionist Marxism. Two common ideological traits, however, drew these rebels together: considerable scepticism of practical political
work within the capitalist system and a belief that the education of the working masses was the first essential step to class liberation. Their consequent articulation of a harder-line socialism and criticism of evolutionary, reformist strategy nevertheless did not give way to calls for violent or immediate revolutionary change. Unable to shake their inherited respect for parliamentary democracy, they kept within the British labour tradition. Like their brothers and sisters east of the Rocky Mountains, they rejected violent change. Still, a commitment to social revolution rather than social reform and a reluctance to compromise socialist principles at the polls distinguished many early British Columbia socialists from the majority of CCF members across Canada. This revolutionary stance was particularly evident within the founding affiliate of the British Columbia CCF, the Socialist Party of Canada. Since the freshly reorganized SPC was largely responsible for the amalgamation and merger of left-wing groups into the national CCF movement in 1935, a relatively radical approach to policy marked the early years of the British Columbia CCF.

The radical stance of many within the British Columbia CCF, however, was not left unchallenged. From the beginning, the history of this provincial party was a history of doctrinal dispute. The invariable debate between opposing factions, as Leo Zakuta put it in his study of social change
within the CCF, was over "how far" and "how fast". Convinced that a socialist state could not be realized overnight, the right-wing or moderates -- a term they preferred -- were willing to administer capitalism for some time before full socialization could be implemented. Reforms which would contribute to a more equitable distribution of wealth could not wait, they argued, for a distant Utopia. Moreover, they believed that a "far-left" image would alienate the generally conservative Canadian workers. Without their support, the party would have no base.

The left-wing, on the other hand, maintained that a genuinely socialist program required an attempt to end the present social order, not merely mend it. They called for a program of full social planning and argued that the acceptance of a mixed economy contradicted fundamental socialist principles. Determined to keep the CCF honest to its principles, particularly as outlined in the Regina Manifesto, they warned that by administering capitalism, the CCF risked becoming just another political party -- "liberals in a hurry", soon corrupted by power and capitalist ambition.

Both views had merit. In the face of wide-spread anti-communism and anti-socialism, particularly after World War Two, left-wing policy and propaganda did little to bolster the party's popularity and chances for political success. Too, as the left-wing had predicted, the forthright socia-
The aims of the Regina Manifesto were increasingly abandoned.

While these internal conflicts and ideological differences had a significant impact on the party's solidarity, success, and leadership, they did not destroy the party. With the exception of a few notable expulsions and resignations, members of both factions remained until, and frequently after, its transformation into the New Democratic Party in 1961. Equally determined to have their respective voices heard, they ultimately struggled together in the hopes of introducing changes which would lead to a better life for the average Canadian. Members of both the left and right wing repeatedly called for such key policies as the social ownership of financial institutions and major industries, health insurance, revised pension schemes, job creation, the establishment of provincial cooperatives, the abolition of company towns and unions, and a graduated income tax formula based on the ability to pay. Most could agree on these domestic needs. Agreement on foreign policy was considerably more difficult. Indeed, it was during debate over the CCF's stance on international issues and policy that the left-right split became most apparent. No agreement could be reached on Canada's role in World War Two, for instance. The discontent prompted by the National Council's decision to support the war effort drove an
ominous wedge between both camps in the British Columbia CCF.

Viewed as an imperialistic drive for power and wealth, in the early years of the CCF, war was renounced without reservation by most members. The rise of fascism in Europe contributed to a change of policy. The CCF’s National Executive and Federal representatives, with the exception of its founder and leader, J.S. Woodsworth, reversed the party’s early stance and voted to support the conscription of Canada’s resources as part of Canada’s contribution to the allied struggle. In time, they also agreed to the conscription of men. This policy reversal was a blow to many left-wingers. Pacifists in British Columbia were especially disheartened. National Council pressures soon forced the dissentors into line but not soon enough to deter embarrassing statements which contradicted officially declared policy.

Division and conflict over foreign policy was even more blatant in the early 1950s when the National Council decided to accept Canada’s participation in NATO and in the Korean Peace Keeping Forces. Left-wing members of the British Columbia CCF quickly formed a protest group which they called the Socialist Fellowship. This "party within a party" soon folded. But it survived long enough to shake the British Columbia CCF’s solidarity, threaten its image
within the province, and draw attention to what many regarded as the dominance of a select few in Ottawa.\textsuperscript{11}

The British Columbia CCF's vulnerability to doctrinal differences and conflict was not unusual. From its conception, general disharmony had cursed the North American socialist movement. Socialist organizations world-wide had similar histories of internal conflict over the best road to a classless society. As Dorothy Roberts noted in her insightful study of the British Columbia CCF, "socialist parties are especially vulnerable to doctrinal disputes since they depend for their existence on a given set of principles".\textsuperscript{12} Thus the British Columbia CCF inherited an ideological tradition which on the one hand bred confraternity and a sense of purpose while on the other painful soul-searching and struggle. The socialist campaign in British Columbia clearly demanded much of its supporters.

The CCF inherited another ideological tradition which required considerable commitment and fortitude: the promise of sexual emancipation and equal opportunities for women. Nineteenth and early twentieth century socialist thinkers from the Utopians to Marxists and Fabians incorporated the emancipation of women into their model of an egalitarian society. In doing so, they joined the fate of women and workers together. But CCF inheritors of this connection between socialism and feminism, like socialists elsewhere,
were ambivalent and hesitant recipients. Conflicts between class and gender priorities, coupled with mid-Victorian notions of women's proper sphere, mitigated against a whole-hearted challenge to sexual discrimination. Within the British Columbia CCF, sexual emancipation, though in principle equal to class liberation, in reality ranked a rather distant second. This ranking was significantly higher than that in most mixed organizations. Nonetheless, the party did not live up to its theoretical commitment to sexual egalitarianism.

The British Columbia CCF's half-hearted commitment to feminist causes was neither unique nor in light of its contradictory heritage very surprising. Mainstream socialist writings which shaped its understanding of sexual liberation were flawed. In addition, socialist parties the world over experienced significant difficulty in their attempts to blend the two goals. The CCF's response to women's issue and sexual equality must be understood within the context of its deficient theoretical heritage and socialist party trends elsewhere.

Marxist scholars provided the clearest and most popular accounts of women's emancipation within socialism during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. They were not the first to join feminism with socialism but they provided the most systematic and thorough analysis of the history and
solution to sexual oppression. Too, their works were the most widely distributed both in Europe and in North America. Such wide-spread distribution and their frequent citation on CCF reading lists as well as by party members interviewed for this thesis suggests that they were important influences on CCF views. Fabian writings on this subject were less extensive. George Bernard Shaw's, *An Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, was a notable exception. It appears to have been especially popular amongst leading CCF women and is therefore also included in the discussion which follows.16

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were not, as noted, the first to link women's emancipation to social revolution. They inherited a "Utopian" synthesis of sexual and class liberation based on cooperation and justice for all. Their more precise delineation of the social, political, and above all economic factors leading to gender oppression, however, represented a decisive break from the heavily romantic Utopian tradition. Compared to the voluminous attention they paid to class inequities, their treatment of women's subjugation was marginal. Their approach to and analysis of women's slavery within capitalism nevertheless went significantly beyond the scope and depth of other political philosophies in the nineteenth century and had a revolutionary impact on the assumptions of socialists world-wide.17
In the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts (1844) Marx placed the emancipation of women along side the general historical development in society. He borrowed Charles Fourier's theory which described women's status as an historical index of general social advancement. But by connecting women's inferior citizenship to the existence of private property and patrilineal inheritance, he took the Utopian philosopher's concept a step further. Women's subordinate position within the family and society, Marx argued, was based on the economic power of the father or husband. His economic power was in turn guaranteed through his control of private property. Thus, women's subjugation, or as Marx put it, "prostitution", to men was a reflection of the more universal subordination of the worker in capitalist society.

The key to truly human relationships was the removal of the economic dependence of women upon men and men upon the owners of production. According to Marx, this feat could only be achieved in a communist society.

Marx later submerged the problems of women into an in-depth critique of the family. In the Communist Manifesto (1848), for example, he and Engels compared the bourgeois husband to a capitalist owner. These husbands saw their childbearing wives as "mere instruments of production", their families as businesses based on "capital and private gain". The dissolution of the family under capitalism was
thus a necessary precondition to female and class liberation.

Almost four decades later, Engels again took up this theme in The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State (1884). He synthesized existing anthropological material on the family's evolution with economic determinism to "produce a coherent picture of the historical development of family institutions and the position of women".22

Accepting Lewis Morgan's provocative but erroneous conclusions in Ancient Society, Engels began his classic with the premise that prehistoric society, characterized by group marriage, collective ownership, and communal living, offered women equal status with men. Labour was divided along sex lines with men hunting and women attending community affairs. But paternity was unknown and women's procreative function won considerable prestige and control. Revolutionary economic transformations, however, steadily weakened women's matriarchal power. The development of sophisticated food production such as the domestication of animals and breeding of herds, for example, put surplus wealth into male hands.23 Production for exchange took hold and in time control over the means of production and the amalgamation of private property replaced physical reproduction as the source of power, giving strong impetus to male domination.

To maintain patriarchal control, female monogamy and patri-
lineal decent developed. Women became, in effect, another piece of man's property, his domestic slave and bought lover in monogamous marriage.  Engels called this devastating setback for women, "the world historic defeat of the female sex". He also tied it to the beginning of social division along class lines. "The first class antagonism which appears in history", he wrote, "coincides with the development of the antagonism between men and women in marriage and the first class oppression with that of the female sex by the male".

As Marx had, Engels concentrated on the destructive symbiosis of patrilineal property inheritance and male power. Lacking economic independence, women were unable to resist patriarchal rule. Their powerlessness reached its peak in capitalist society where the almost absolute dissociation of work from the home left women even further isolated and dependent on male resources. The key to liberation, therefore, clearly lay in the abolition of private property rights and the inclusion of women in public industry. Monogamous marriage would then be stripped of its economic basis and women would be free to assume socially productive roles in the wage workforce. Moreover, couples wishing to marry would have no other motive but mutual inclination.

Of course, in the wake of the industrial revolution, capitalist society had already introduced large numbers of
working class women into public industry. The opportunity for economic independence, however, was not the main drawing card or end product for that matter. Indeed, most working class women did not choose this fate freely. Poverty forced them into unskilled labour in crowded factories. Their low status there, together with exploitative profit motives and oppressive employment practices, meant that they merely exchanged one kind of dependency in the home for another kind in the factory. Too, without public childcare options, working class women were doubly trapped. Full emancipation could only occur, Engels concluded, when work was liberated from capital and institutional childcare prevailed. 28

Marx and Engels established an important theoretical commitment to women's emergence as an equal partner in a class free society. Yet, as Juliet Mitchell astutely contended in Women's Estate, the liberation of women remained a "normative ideal, an adjunct to socialist theory, not integrated into its structure". 29 They wrote far more about the common struggle of all workers, thereby discouraging special attention to women's sexual oppression. Like many of their disciples, they underplayed the fundamental problem posed by women's reproductive role. One critic, Lorenne Clark, regarded this omission as crucial to the incompleteness of their theory. She maintained,
They did not see that changed relations of reproduction were as necessary for the creation of an egalitarian society as were changed relations of production.30

Despite these shortcomings, these revolutionary thinkers, especially Engels, helped encourage recognition and delineation of how the capitalist system reinforced the exploitation of women. They stripped away nineteenth century romanticism surrounding the family and exposed its essentially economic character.31 Their promise of change under socialism appealed to women seeking an opportunity for self-development and fulfillment. The revolution Marx and Engels forecasted was expected to solve the "woman question" by introducing an era that would accord all men and women a dignified existence. Thus, although deficient in its analysis of women's special problems, their account enriched nineteenth century feminism.

August Bebel, a disciple of Marx and Engels and co-founder of Germany's Social Democratic Party, also turned to a critical examination of women's historical and contemporary status within the family. His Woman and Socialism (1879) or Frau as it was commonly called drew much of its theory from Morgan, Marx and Engels. Its unique appeal and overwhelming popularity,32 lay in its programmatic attempt to provide an account of women's oppression based not simply on the evolution of the family and private property,
but also on inequities pre-dating capitalism.

In Frau Bebel suggested that woman was a "slave before the slave existed" and that her consciousness of this subordination ran very deep. Unlike Marx and Engels, he included women's maternal function as a primary cause of women's economic dependence upon men. The liberation of women, in Bebel's view, was inseparable from the release of all human beings from exploitation and misery. But he regarded the revolution as only the beginning.

It was up to women, Bebel warned, to accept their own responsibility in the struggle to end dependence in the family and in society. Arguing that women were doubly oppressed, he foresaw not only a class fight with men against capitalism, but also a sex fight against female exploitation. Convinced that men would not usher in women's emancipation, he proposed a pessimistic but insightful analysis of women's situation. "Woman", Bebel announced, "have as little to hope from men as workmen from the middle-class".

Unlike his insights into the past, Bebel's vision of the future and his proposals for change were vague and incomplete. Although he speculated on women's life in a socialist Utopia, going considerably further than most socialists, he failed to address adequately the process of transition into the new world of equality for women. His conception of women's individual need to struggle was a
moral imperative. The strength of his work rested not, therefore, in its attempt to offer women a path to their liberation. It rested rather, in its historical and thorough approach to women's long-standing oppression and in his stubborn refusal to gloss over the awkward and somewhat embarrassing behaviors of male co-workers. Bebel was keenly aware of the contradictions within the movement and wrote:

Every socialist recognizes the dependence of the workman on the capitalist and cannot understand that others and especially capitalists themselves should fail to recognize it also; but the same socialist often does not recognize the dependence of women on men because the question touches his own dear self more or less nearly.

For socialist feminists like Ottlie Baader, also a member of the German SDP, *Frau* was sufficient to transform her life:

I read it nights through. It was my own fate and that of thousands of my sisters ... Bebel's book courageously broke with the old secretiveness.

Olive Schreiner, a socialist feminist from British Marxist circles, also appears to have found inspiration in Bebel's work. In 1911, she produced an equally biting critique of women's oppression within capitalism entitled: *Woman and Labour*. The book's special attraction to female socialists of the early twentieth century was its very vivid personal descriptions of sexual exploitation which
somehow transcended theory. In her comprehensive study of the development of modern feminism, Sheila Rowbotham suggested that Schreiner's commitment to the liberation of women was not so much a limited political decision as part of her whole life and being. When she wrote,

> It is not the women who, on hands and knees, at ten pence a day, scrubs floors of the public buildings or private dwelling that fills him with anguish for womanhood: that somewhat quadrupedal posture is for him truly feminine and does not interfere with the ideals of the mother and childbearer. But [that] the same woman by work in an office should earn a pound fifty, be able to afford a comfortable home of her own and her evenings free for study or pleasure, distresses him deeply. (sic)

...she struck receptive chords in women who shared both her desire to understand women's second-class status and her outrage. Schreiner's insight into the dynamics of sex-typed oppression within capitalist society fell short when it came to an analysis of the attitudes and behaviors of fellow socialists. Her vision of the future under socialism was only encouraging. She appears to have missed or ignored evidence of gender discrimination within socialist circles and thus did not detail plans which might facilitate the introduction and maintenance of sexual equality within a revolutionary society. Resting confident that a socialist society would automatically offer much to women, she concluded *Woman and Labour* on this optimistic note:
It is because so wide and gracious to us are the possibilities of the future; so impossible is a return to the past ... that today we are everywhere raising our strange cry -- "Labour and the training that fits us for labour!".  

Optimistic forecasts of a better future for women under socialism were also voiced within Fabian socialist circles during the early twentieth century. Fabians likewise expressed a strong challenge to social conventions which bound women to the home and inferior citizenship. Bernard Shaw's writings represented this tendency. Like Marxist writers, Shaw called women "slaves of slaves" and saw in the larger goal of socialism a path to women's emancipation. "Capitalism", Shaw exclaimed in his 1929 work, An Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, "made a slave of the man and then by paying the woman through him made her his slave ... which is the worst kind of slavery!".  

While Shaw could write in his clever, often facetious manner that "nothing blocks a woman's way into business or professional life except prejudice, superstition, snobbery, old fashioned parents", and called upon women to assume responsible positions in government, he ironically appears to have accepted the idea of the "feminine mystique". His observations about motherhood ascribe almost saintly virtues to this task. Women's "natural" monopoly on the bearing and
rearing of children (including domestic housekeeping), Shaw argued, is the most vital of all functions of mankind.\textsuperscript{43} Shaw was attempting to give well-deserved credit to women whose worth was largely neglected.\textsuperscript{44} But the tone of his praise and his insistence that women's reproductive role "gives women a power and importance that they can attain in no other profession and that men cannot attain at all"\textsuperscript{45} suggests that Shaw's feminism was maternal feminism. His attitude was characteristic of a period in which the family was revered. In many ways, he resembled Marx and Engels, who failed to probe very deeply the problems women faced in their reproductive and nurturant roles.

Whether Marxist or Fabian, the vision of women's emancipation amongst leading socialist thinkers was clearly circumscribed by a failure to acknowledge the pervasiveness of patriarchal sex-ordering and discrimination within socialist as well as capitalist circles and a refusal to adequately address the sensitive question of women's roles within the family. As a result, the steps necessary for a sexual revolution were never clearly articulated. As one writer observed, "no one designed a new family structure to facilitate female liberation. A basic social transformation was never conceptualized".\textsuperscript{46} Though visionaries ahead of their time, these socialist pioneers remained creatures of their time.
The promise of emancipation for women passed down by early socialists, though flawed, nevertheless offered new hope to radical women. One of the first opportunities to test their optimistic promises was afforded to Russian women in the wake of the 1917 revolution. Answers to their dreams of a better future were not long in coming. Thanks in large part to the courage and persistence of leading socialist feminists like Alexandra Kollantai and Inessa Armand, legislation enacted in the early 1920s ensured the essential principle of women's equality at work. It also instituted a radical transformation of the family which was intended to end a husband's domination. Divorce was made easy and as a form of renumeration for women's work during marriage, property was divided equally.

Though socialist feminists authored and lobbied for these significant changes, support for women's emancipation among leading male officials in the early post-revolution years was also available. This support, however, was not without reservation. Lenin, for instance, though repeatedly pointing to the "a priori equation" of socialism with female liberation, was uncompromising in his belief that women's causes should not hold a special place in the revolution or distract from the process of reconstruction. In Lenin's words, "all thoughts of women comrades, of the women of the working people, must be directed towards the proletarian
revolution ... for it only creates the basis for a real renovation in marriage and sex relations". 49

Lenin's insistence that the socialist campaign take precedence over the feminist one, in part stemming from a belief in the ultimately liberating climate of a new socialist society, in part because he needed all hands on the worker's deck, reflected another major concern amongst socialist leaders: the wide-spread fear that socialism required the dissolution of the traditional family. Lenin appreciated that challenges to monogamous, patriarchal family structures angered many male radicals and alienated the generally conservative worker. He astutely soft-pedalled criticisms of the "capitalist" family arguing that in time family structures would change. In the interests of proletarian and party unity, women's reproductive concerns and rights were placed on a back burner. Thus, when, in the 1930s, Stalin called for the reversal of much of the emancipatory legislation around women's home lives, he met with little effective resistance.

The tension between loyalties to class and sex which surfaced within Bolshevik circles were not unique to that party. Within European and North American socialist parties a commitment to sexual equality was far simpler in theory than in practice. Women's issues were consistently ranked second behind the more "pressing and important" goal: work-
ing class revolution and socialist reconstruction. This discriminatory treatment occurred in part because socialists believed that, as Bebel coined it, "the solution to the woman question is identical to the solution to the social question". But as events in Russia testified, there was a deeper resistance to the championing of feminism. When it came to attitudes about male and female roles and status, most radical men held firmly to time-honoured myths and stereotypes. Even enlightened leaders conscious of the hypocrisy and need for major challenges to entrenched sex-ordering remained ambivalent about the extent to which working class energy should be devoted to feminist causes. This ambivalence was particularly clear in the sceptical, often discouraging, regard for separate women's groups within the party, designed to raise feminist and political consciousness. Their enlightened words about women's rights and liberation often rang hollow.

Surrounded by such resistance and ambivalence, socialist feminists found the campaign for female emancipation extremely arduous. Those spearheading women's committees or groups were constantly reminded by their radical colleagues about the "broader" and "higher" cause of human liberation. This cause, it was contended, deserved their first and foremost attention. In short, socialist feminists were warned about the consequences of paying too much attention
to feminist issues.52 Such persistent chiding and pressure, coupled with internal division over tactics and strategy, contributed to the eventual loss of credibility, authority and in some cases, collapse of these women's groups. Without this critical source of collective support, individual campaigning for women's rights became even more difficult. In the end, many socialist feminists accepted a strategy for women's emancipation which, on the surface at least, fit within the boundaries of established party policy.

In her analysis of German socialist feminists during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Jean Quataert called women whose feminist appear to have been overshadowed by the task of social revolution or social reconstruction, reluctant feminists. According to Quataert,

... most regarded the feminist cause as a secondary concern overshadowed by the task of the class struggle and preparation for the new society. Their feminist plank incorporated only those demands compatible with the final end of proletarian revolution.53

Though on the surface seductive, Quataert's characterization is presumptuous and misleading. In general, it minimizes the important contributions these women made towards the amelioration of women's status as well as their often radical challenge to conventional lifestyles, places too great an emphasis on the strength of socialist ideology in
the apparent compromising of feminist goals and simplifies a very complex decision-making process.54

While her description of socialist feminists torn between class and sex loyalties distorts the picture, her identification of the tension and turmoil many of these women experienced is critical to an understanding of their histories. Pressures, both internal and external, to give priority to socialist aims posed a very perplexing problem for women also seeking gender equality. They confronted decisions which were clearly distinct from those faced by the majority of their male comrades and many of their middle class feminist counterparts. The dilemmas and difficult choices which the leading Bolshevik, Alexandra Kollantai, confronted shed important light on this experience.

A notorious defender of sexual freedom and dramatic alterations in family structures, throughout her career, Kollantai indefatigably tried to convince both her colleagues and international socialists across Europe and North America of the key relationship between female freedom from sex-typing and repressed sexuality to the total emergence and emancipation of women. She believed that the ultimate liberation of women would await the reconstruction of a socialist order. But she was dissatisfied with claims that sexual equality would automatically coincide with class equality or that it existed in leading socialist circles.
Recognizing contradictions between theoretical commitments and everyday practices, she felt compelled to raise questions about sexual intimacy, sex-role stereotyping and the relationship between love and work -- self fulfillment and productivity.\textsuperscript{55} She announced in 1918, for example, that old marriage forms should be abolished and replaced by a "comradely union" of two equals whose offspring, if any, would be raised with the state's help.\textsuperscript{56}

It was thus with great disillusion and hurt that she greeted the overwhelming disinterest and miscomprehension about women's concerns which pervaded post-revolutionary Russia. She understood that some conflict between the theory and practice of sexual egalitarianism was inevitable in a time of disorder and reconstruction. But she was unprepared for the pervasiveness of traditional, oppressive values surrounding women's role with the family. The eventual return to more conservative restrictive legislation during the 1930s greatly saddened this strongly idealistic rebel. One biographer has argued that her disillusionment, coupled with intense party pressures, contributed to a serious compromising of feminist principles in her senior years. According to Beatrice Farnsworth, she joined the leadership in mythmaking, publically accepting Stalinism and affirming the boast that Soviet women, liberated from bourgeois goals, had achieved the socialist goal of total equality.\textsuperscript{57}
Kollantai's general withdrawal from the party limelight and key decision-making in the 1930s and 1940s, casts some doubt on Farnsworth's conclusion. Moreover, Kollantai's personal correspondence during her last days in the public arena suggests that she remained faithful to feminist causes. Perhaps Kollantai's own words which conclude Barbara Evans Clements' more positive account of Kollantai's life and contributions—address this question best:

One must write not only for oneself. But for others. For those far-away, unknown women who will live then. Let them see that we were not heros or heroines. But we lived passionately and ardently. We believed in our goals and we pursued them. We were sometimes strong and sometimes very weak. 58

Within the European and North American socialist community, the dual and very trying commitment to both sexual and class liberation often led to a compromising or neglect of what was considered to be the less immediate goal. The theoretical principle of sexual equality was often lost in the socialist campaign for working-class power. Harmony between loyalties to class and sex was in practice extremely difficult. For most socialist men the decision was clear and relatively easy: class priorities must take precedence over sexual ones. For many socialist feminists, the paradox
arising from an allegiance to both class and sex was not easily resolved. An attempt to balance commitments and services to both required a courage and strength few could muster. Moreover, those who tried often risked isolation from key decision-making and at times expulsion. Whole-hearted socialist feminism could be a lonely option.

Although the socialist campaign frequently overshadowed the feminist one, it is important to remember that socialist women and men helped articulate more clearly than most nineteenth century reformers the nature of women's oppression. Furthermore, when contrasted with other political organizations, socialist parties continued to offer women more than empty promises about the social and political benefits of membership. These benefits included participation in traditionally male spheres of activity, a greater role in government, better conditions in the workplace, and social and economic assistance to the working-class housewife. Thus, despite reneged promises, socialist parties remained attractive to women interested in gaining greater access to power and political decision-making during the first half of the twentieth century. Canada's socialist party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, was no exception.

When Evelyn Gray of the British Columbia CCF wrote in the Federationist of October 28, 1937 that,
Some women seek public office in an effort to express women's position and needs and to improve these conditions. The radical woman understands that her problem is man's, an economic one, and that only in revolutionary change can emancipation be found...⁶⁰

She echoed a familiar socialist cry. Similarly, her article "Women", published in the Federationist earlier that year traced women's historical development and social position in a fashion closely resembling Engels and Bebel. Primitive communism, Gray wrote, allowed men and women both to share in socially productive tasks, on a footing of economic and mutual respect. Like her socialist predecessors, she blamed industrial capitalism which "forced proletarian women out of the home and into the labour force" for women's oppressed position and argued, "complete emancipation can only come with the transformation of private to social ownership of property, which will bring economic and social equality".⁶¹ Gray concluded with a comment on marriage which likewise followed the traditional socialist line. Repeating Engels words, she argued, "within a socialist society, marriage will no longer be a matter of convenience and economic necessity, but based on mutual fondness".⁶²

Gray's solution to the woman question was not unfamiliar to CCFers across Canada. Almost a year after the publication of her remarks, her statement that women's prob-
lem was the same as men's -- an economic one -- was quoted in *The People's Weekly*, the official organ of the Alberta CCF. To Gray's observation Caroline Riley added,

> It is not mainly our sex that hampers us but our sex under capitalism ... so we turn our faces resolutely across the desert of unemployed exploitation and look to a Socialist Canada when women can cooperate with men as equals for the good of all.63

Later, as chairwoman of the CCF's Women's Committee of Ontario, Riley delivered this same message to women in that province. While accepting the need for women's groups as an educational tool, she was wary of the independence a separate women's group might develop and of the impression such independence might have on a predominantly male membership. She warned,

> I think anything tending to separate women from men is a step backward ... one of our talking points has been the equal opportunity offered by our movement.64

In these messages and in CCF literature which promised full economic, political, and religious liberty regardless of sex, race or creed, the CCF fell heir to the nineteenth century socialist pledge to sexual egalitarianism.65 Within the British Columbia CCF, explicit party policy espoused the principle of women's equality with men. During its 1943
Provincial Convention, for example, British Columbia delegates adopted and forwarded to the National Council a resolution which read:

Whereas in many phases of Canadian life equality of women with men is even now not much more than a vote catching phrase; whereas the CCF is pledged to guarantee full equality to women; be it resolved that this convention suggest to the national council to take such measures as will be necessary to secure for women the same rights -- specifically the same rate of pay for the same kind of work -- as most men enjoy. 66

Although British Columbia's published provincial platforms did not expressly commit the party to an amelioration of women's inferior status, 67 there is evidence to suggest that commitment to sexual equality was more than a "vote-catching phrase". In her pioneering study of the Canadian suffrage movement, Catherine Cleverdon remarked in the late 1940s upon the CCF's practical application of sexual equality. She noted that,

Liberals and Conservatives have not failed ... to note that one source of strength within the ranks of the CCF has been the party's willingness to practice as well as preach political equality. Women in the B.C. wing of the socialist party commonly serve on committees and in important managerial posts. 68
At first glance, Cleverdon's statement is valid. The British Columbia CCF seems to have made a genuine effort to substantiate its claim that "political democracy gives each man and woman a part to play in government". When compared to the record of the major political parties in Canada, the number of female members on its executive bodies, delegates to provincial conventions, and candidates in provincial elections is impressive. During the 1938 Provincial Convention, for example, three of the ten members elected to the Executive Council were women. In the 1946 Convention almost half of the delegates were women. In the 1941 provincial election four of the eight female candidates represented the CCF. The CCF's ability to elect women in the provincial house was also respectable compared to the old-line parties. Three of the five women elected to the Provincial House in 1941 were CCF candidates.

The inclusion of women in decision-making activities was not the sole method chosen to advance the cause of women. The British Columbia CCF's attention to women's needs and rights within the larger community, particularly amongst the working class, also surpassed the efforts of Liberals and Conservatives. Resolutions and requests for nursery school cooperatives, birth control clinics, the amendment of discriminatory divorce laws, and equal pay for equal work, for example, were repeatedly proposed by men
and women within component clubs, within the Legislature, and during party conventions. Letters like that written by CCF MP Grant McNeil in 1934 spoke to the plight of working class women. He remarked:

The most nauseating hypocrisy has characterized the official position in Canada towards the question of birth control. Prudery, religious and social taboos and administrative deceit have combined to maintain a veil of secrecy over conditions which discriminate and even victimize the poverty-stricken and those without reliable information as to the use of contraceptives.

CCF activists were especially relentless in their campaign to curb the blatant exploitation of one of the largest groups of unskilled, female labour: household workers. To this end, they called for the inclusion of domestics in the Minimum Wage Act, in training programs and in unemployment insurance and worker's compensation benefits.

Living up to a theoretical commitment to sexual equality was neither straightforward nor simple. A critical examination of the documents which address women's rights and opportunities within the party suggests that while some CCF socialists sought to advance the cause of women within the movement and within the community, the realization of full sexual equality was not a dominant concern. Although the CCF in British Columbia generally provided greater
numbers of women with a political identity than had tradi-
tional parties, it led no concerted drive to develop
policies which would guarantee sexual equality nor did it
possess a very profound appreciation of the unique nature of
women's responsibilities or problems. Men's and women's
roles reflected this limitation. With the exception of a
small group of women who rose to prominence, most female
members of the British Columbia CCF were assigned the "old
business of women's organizations ... that of financial
aid". As Jessie Wendels Winch, caucus secretary of the
British Columbia CCF in the late 1940s remarked, "it was
generally assumed that women made the sandwiches and did
that sort of fund-raising".

The British Columbia CCF fell heir to an ideological
commitment to women's emancipation. In practice, like its
socialist predecessors and counterparts within Europe and
the United States, the party had difficulty living up to
this commitment. There existed right from the beginning
extreme ambivalence about the extent to which the party
should concern itself with women's rights and needs.
Conservative attitudes about family relations and sex-roles
continued to have an impact on CCF policy as on that of
their more conservative and, for that matter, more radical
rivals.
One obvious similarity with European and American socialists is the uncertain, at time disdainful, attitude the CCF displayed towards separate women's organizations. The women involved in the CCF Women's Council, for example, were generally careful not to emphasize their group's independence of thought or action. This ambivalence was especially clear in a letter addressed to "Women in the Clubs", printed in the Federationist of July 17, 1936. Its author argued that because women had traditionally been isolated in the home, women's groups were necessary for their political education. She found it necessary to conclude with a defence of the "raison d'être" of these women's clubs. Stressing women's strong commitment to the larger movement, she insisted, "this is not a separate club and does not draw women away from club membership. The women in this group will be all the more valuable to the Clubs as they are informed and interested".81

British Columbia CCFers of both sexes clearly saw the rejection of autonomous women's groups within the party as progressive. Indeed, they generally took special pride in their refusal to support separate women's groups which were in essence female auxiliaries or adjuncts to the party machinery. Harold Winch, provincial party leader and opposition head in the early 1940s, made this revealing comment:
If you had an adjunct to your organization, or a woman's organization then there was an obvious view that you were placing them in an inferior position and therefore there was the encouragement to have them all together in one organization, because it naturally followed that if you're an association and you're fund-raising to turn over money and to do things of that nature, you are a tool; you're not a partner ... there was at the same time a recognition that there were basic problems that affect women -- their status in law and their status in the home actually ... there was established within your council and within your constituency a woman's committee or chairman to specialize on women's programs and difficulties but that was within the organization and not separate and apart.82

For all this insight into the potential disadvantages and hazards of separate women's bodies and token representation, there was nevertheless strong resistance on the part of many CCFers to have women spend their time on feminist issues. Too, as noted, the majority of CCF women performed the supportive behind-the-scenes political activities. Elizabeth Kerr, a leading member of the British Columbia
party and strong advocate of women's equality within party circles, commented upon this pattern in her weekly Federa-
tionist column, "Women's View". She remarked, "By the way, I find that among men of my acquaintance I am said to carry a torch ... for women. Also the other day I heard one of them say, 'My God, how these women do stick together".83 Obviously annoyed with statements like these, Kerr went on to defend her position and that of her female colleagues. She also stressed her disappointment with the lack of attention on the part of the movement to the defeat of two female candidates in the recent Vancouver civic election. Kerr's anger and frustration revealed in the following excerpt, offers an important insight into the depth of the CCF's pledge to equality between the sexes.

We women of today ... are expected to take our place in the rough and tumble of life but to have no say in the running of things. I hate to rub it in but the defeat of Alderman Helena Gutteridge and Commissioner Susie Clark at the recent Vancouver civic elections was not regretted in the movement as I felt it should have been. The fact that the first woman on City Council should lose her seat was
more than just a loss to the CCF. It was a loss to socialists who make no distinction between sex, race, colour or creed and yet who are so prone to elect men to every office save that of social convenor or unpaid secretary. I do not mean that Helena or Susie should have been elected because they were women, but being women as good as men running, they should have been elected to represent a huge number of women voters whose particular needs they could voice. No taxation without representation is an old idea, but too new to be acceptable to a number of antiquated people.84

Practical commitment to equality was also wanting elsewhere. Ambivalence towards women's groups gave way to straightforward conservatism when it came to the sharing of family responsibilities. Early socialists' reluctance to disturb traditional family structures and women's "natural" role as wife and mother dogged their CCF successors. For example, one explanation often cited for the relatively few women in the party's decision-making bodies and for their involvement in time-honoured "feminine" activities was the difficulty for women with families to assume highly visible, time-consuming roles.85 It was far easier for women with young children to assume supportive, fundraising responsibilities. In this way family schedules remained intact. As
Hilda Kristiansen, a CCF pioneer and active member of the CCF Women's Council concluded,

... taking office has to be a continual situation ... you had to commit yourself for a year whereas putting on a dance or something ... that's just automatic ... a commitment for a week ... the planning is done in an afternoon. This is when there was free time and this is what they knew how to do. So few had time to assume a more active role.86

The fact that few female members of the CCF had time to devote themselves to hard-nosed politics suggests that socialists differed little from their Liberal and Conservative counterparts when it came to a consideration of alternative family structures and child-care arrangements. Within CCF families, sex-role stereotyping was not seriously challenged. Kristiansen admitted that during this period, she, as most of her female CCF companions, "never thought of not keeping the house clean or taking care of the children".87 Jessie Winch confirmed Kristiansen's observation. "Subconsciously", she explained, "the attitude of both men and women was that women stayed home with the children".88 Women in the CCF could be men's equals as "keepers of the hearth", but few members, it seems, were willing to entertain the idea of women becoming leaders of
the nation if this meant an abandonment of traditional family patterns.

An equally common explanation for the inequitable representation of males to females in the CCF's power hierarchy was the claim that the general public would not vote for women. Indeed Canadians had little reason to be familiar with female candidates or politicians. Female contenders in this period were an anomaly and something of a risk for a party interested in success at the polls. Nevertheless, as the victories of four capable women whose careers are addressed within this thesis testify, when placed in a reasonably strong riding and given the backing and full support of the party, women won the nod of voters, sometimes with large majorities. A variety of factors contributed to the election of these women but sex prejudice in the electorate at least could be overcome. The CCF's decision to put more time, effort and money into its male candidates appears to have been based as much, if not more so, on its own assumptions about the inferior ability and potential of most female candidates as it was on a pragmatic appraisal of their chances at the polls. Kerr's reaction to the small minority of female delegates during the 1938 Provincial Convention and to the protest of some members over the inclusion of three women on a ten member executive sums up the general sentiment and position of the "women
question" within CCF circles:

There is still a belief in the minds of many men in the movement that it is unsafe to leave the business of the movement in the hands of women, even in part... Frankly, we feel that for a movement that boasts no difference in sex, race, colour or creed, some of our Marxian Socialists are still pitifully mid-Victorian.89

Much work remains to be done before we can chart fully the nature of such mid-Victorian prejudice. This thesis begins that investigation with an examination of four outstanding female activists who tested the theory and practice of Canadian socialism. The lives and struggles of Helena Gutteridge, Laura Jamieson, Dorothy Steeves, and Grace MacInnis help illuminate the road by which the British Columbia CCF came to terms with its contradictory heritage.
In 1911, British Columbia welcomed to its shores two women, Helena Gutteridge and Laura Jamieson, who would play a significant role in the province's social and political history. Strangers to the west coast and to each other, they came from different backgrounds and for different purposes. Thirty-one year-old Gutteridge left her British homeland determined to import the spirit and methods of English suffragism to Canada's Pacific province. To this explicitly political cause, she planned to devote four years. Jamieson's, experience was radically different. A twenty-three year-old bride-to-be in 1911, her plans included raising a family with her young lawyer husband.

The childhood and youth of the two women also differed markedly. Gutteridge severed ties with her family at the tender age of fourteen, pulled herself up by her bootstraps and worked her way through school in the bustling commerce and crowds of London. Jamieson, on the other hand, was raised on a farm in the rural community of Bruce County. She matured in a supportive, close-knit family atmosphere where the "center of family life was the large kitchen stove."1

These varied backgrounds and experiences helped shape two unique individuals with different temperaments and
public styles. Gutteridge's friends and colleagues remember her as aggressive, forthright, sometimes cold, often too blunt. According to many of these same witnesses, Jamieson, although ready to speak her mind, was quiet, rather shy, and far more diplomatic and warm in approach. For all these contrasting backgrounds and public persona, the two newcomers came to share two goals which eventually caused their paths to converge: a commitment to the amelioration of women's status and a conviction that social injustice and poverty could only be eradicated in a fundamentally changed social order. Among British Columbians in the early twentieth century, these women became radicals in a double sense -- as feminists and socialists -- whose strong convictions and drive led to unusual prominence both in the world of female cooperation and in the male dominated hierarchy of the socialist movement. This chapter investigates the experiences, skills, hard choices and ideologies which influenced and reinforced such dual prominence. In so doing, it sheds light on their respective approach to feminist and socialist questions and in particular the manner in which they balanced their gender and class aspirations.

In a rare autobiographical sketch of her life and work, Gutteridge at 77 years of age made this telling observation.
Over the years I have belonged to a wide variety of organizations which campaigned for many things that are now regarded as part of "our way of life" but which, in their beginnings, were often quite radical and startling. It is natural for people to resist change yet it is a continuous process. Ideas when they are advanced may be accepted only by a few, but in time, if they are sound ideas, they come to be accepted by everyone. So it has been with a lot of things I have worked for all my life.  

Gutteridge's remarks, particularly on her efforts to challenge the status quo, were modest. The "things she worked for all her life" demanded enormous stamina and a good deal of courage. But the need for strength was not unfamiliar to this pioneer. At a very young age, Gutteridge chose a courageous route.

Helena Rose Gutteridge was born in London, England in 1880 to a large, relatively comfortable working class family. When her father decided that the education of his five sons "naturally" took precedence over that of his two daughters, she rebelled. Determined to get an education, even if the price was complete estrangement from her family, Gutteridge left home forever. Information on this period of her life is scant, but existing sources indicate that she managed to secure the education which she so boldly demanded as an adolescent. During six years at the Regent Street Polytechnique she received a sound technical training in hygiene and sanitation, complimented by a course at the
Royal Sanitary Institute in London. Shortly thereafter, the South Kensington Department of Education granted her a teaching certificate for hygiene and sanitary science. She does not appear to have put her teacher's training to any extensive use. According to an interview conducted in 1937, she worked for ten years in a London clothing store before coming to Canada. During these years she plunged into the women's movement. Gutteridge frankly declared,

... it was as a militant suffragette that I worked. I took the stump at Hyde Park Corner, took part in hundreds of parades, got thrown out of numerous meetings, waved banners in the House of Commons, anything at all to attract attention to our cause.

In 1911, after Prime Minister Asquith promised a free vote for the famous Conciliation Bill with its measure of suffrage, Gutteridge and a few of her fellow suffragettes sailed for Canada. This "self-made" woman was now ready for a new challenge. The tenacity and skills she had gained through years of emotional and financial independence, coupled with the spirit and support of sorority gleaned during her suffragette work, had groomed her for the new tasks she would face within Britain's senior dominion.

At the time of Gutteridge's arrival in the Lower Mainland, Canadian feminists were already hard at work in the Political Equality League. According to most sources,
because she found their methods slow and ineffectual, she opted instead to form her own group. Her more militant activities as a "bloomer girl" in England made this impatience understandable. But her decision to launch the British Columbia Women's Suffrage League rested on more than disagreement with PEL tactics. Her working-class interests and background, like her more radical approach to the suffrage strategy, appears to have alienated her from many of the comfortable, middle class women of the PEL. One member, Mary Norton, who eventually became Gutteridge's good friend, offered this recollection during a 1973 interview. In response to the question: "Did the PEL have many contacts with Helena Gutteridge's group or did you just go on your own?", Norton commented,

Oh no no! I had tea one day, a luncheon and I wanted to have Helena because... my natural sympathies were with her ... but I knew that they criticized her so I left her out and I often wonder what kind of friend she thought I was but it was to befriend her that I thought she'd be happier not to be [there]...our group was not exclusive but they had their limitations.  

The B.C. Women's Suffrage League wasted little time in carving out its constituency, conducting evening as well as afternoon meetings and in contrast to the PEL daring to hold sidewalk gatherings. At the center of the agitation was the fiesty British immigrant. As Chairwoman of the BCWSL,
Gutteridge barnstormed the province, speaking to political rallies, trade union assemblies, women's associations and charitable gatherings. Her basic message was always very clear: women had the fundamental right to demand and receive full citizenship. In a 1914 address during "Ladies Night" at the Conservative headquarters in Vancouver, Gutteridge thundered:

It is a very simple matter... Every reason that men advance for their having the vote applies to women. We need the vote for specific legislation but outside that we deserve it for the very reasons that have earned it for men... Some people seem to think that if a woman has the vote she will do nothing else but hang around a polling booth all the time. Men don't vote because of their ability or intellectual attainments. They vote because they are British subjects over 21 years... The tide of suffrage is coming and the idea of sweeping the ocean back with a mop won't do. We will get this legislation when the parties think it is politically expedient and if the party now has any political sense it will enfranchise the women in the next few weeks.  

In her suffrage epistles, Gutteridge was generally careful to stress that women were not out to usurp man's privileges but simply wanted their fair share in the decision-making process. In her 1914 speech to Conservative women she insisted that "this talk of men's work and women's work should be done away with." "It's just plain work and events have proven that whoever can do it
does it." But she did not always emphasize arguments based on women's fundamental human rights. Like her Canadian suffrage counterparts, she sometimes advanced maternal arguments, suggesting that the vote would help women take better care of their families and of the world at large. For example, in a talk given to the Sailor's Wives and Mothers' Red Cross Society, she argued that "women's place was in the home but that was all the more reason why she should have some say in legislation which affected the home." She concluded this address with a statement about women's greater commitment to humanity. "Men threw lives away", Gutteridge argued, "but women protected them". Such contrasting views likely stemmed from her assessment of her audience. Yet, like many female activists, during wartime, she may have been convinced that women would not have brought the world to such catastrophic ends. Women's nurturant roles might arguably foster a deeper appreciation for human life and thus a stronger commitment to world peace. Whether, in theory, Gutteridge was herself ambivalent or purposely tailoring the argument to suit the audience, in practice she refused to accept strict sex-role definitions. Convinced of her own ability to succeed in traditionally male spheres, she rejected the commonly accepted arenas of female work as shown by her bold penetration of the time-honoured male domain of trade union leadership.
After taking part in an investigation of women's wages in 1912, Gutteridge was invited to join the Tailors' Union, a member of the Trades and Labour Council of Vancouver. Her involvement in this union's activities soon led to organizational work in the TLC and participation as a delegate in their meetings and conventions. Recognizing her organizational, leadership, and speaking talents, particularly after she successfully organized the predominantly female workers of the garment and laundry industry, the TLC assigned Gutteridge greater responsibilities. Before long, she emerged as an important member of the Council's executive. During her ten years with this organization she became its "general factotum" serving as treasurer, statistician, trustee, organizer, assistant business agent, vice-chairman and secretary, the latter for four years.

Gutteridge's rapid rise to prominence within labour circles, though offering considerable personal fulfillment, unfortunately offered little financial compensation and security. Her financial status throughout her first decade in Canada remained uncertain. "She volunteered the tireless hours and energy she gave to both the suffrage and trade union movements. While meeting social and intellectual needs, such generosity hardly helped pay bills. Savings brought from Britain seem to have covered "her living expenses during her first months in Vancouver. The TLC's
offer of a small suite above the Labour Hall minimized costs thereafter. But to make ends meet, Gutteridge was forced to seek wage labour.

Gutteridge found salaried employment in a familiar sphere: the department clothing store business. Throughout most of her years with the TLC she appears to have performed secretarial work in a number of Vancouver department stores. Though underemployed, without job security and poorly paid, she welcomed this work. In addition to its monthly pay cheque, the work was relatively straightforward, leaving ample energy and time for her preferred ambition: the social and economic emancipation of women and workers. From the beginning, therefore, she appears to have placed social advancement over personal advancement, although as will be seen, at times, the two went hand in hand. It is also clear that for Gutteridge financial success was not an important consideration. Indeed, she seems to have been content with financial survival -- a feat not easily achieved during the province's leaner years.

Gutteridge's simple tastes and disdain for middle-class extravagance, coupled with the sisterhood and mutuality she experienced within the women's and union movement, made financial hardship bearable. But the challenge of survival within a predominantly male trade union movement and an
entirely male leadership was formidable. Throughout her almost ten long years with the TLC executive she was usually the only woman present at meetings. Looking back in 1957, she claimed to have been "treated courteously", despite the fact that she always said what she "had to say whether others agreed with it or not". Dorothy Steeves noted that Gutteridge "never lost an opportunity when she was speaking to put in a good boost for her beloved suffrage movement". Such assertion could not have been easy for a lone woman in a "man's world", even for one as independent and competent as Gutteridge.

Aside from satisfying her strong drive for social justice, Gutteridge's work with women and workers also gave her the professional, decision-making status her wage work activities lacked. She no doubt enjoyed the power, albeit limited, so few members of her sex experienced. Keeping peace as the chairperson during an election campaign meeting of "warring" labour and socialist factions in 1914; testifying for the Pineo Commission on workmen's compensation in 1916; chairing the first big meeting of loggers which led to the formation of the British Columbia Logger's Union in 1919; acting as a British Columbia TLC delegate to the 35th annual convention of the national TLC in Hamilton in 1919; and being the first woman delegate to the Toronto convention of the American Federation of Labour was thrilling and
immensely rewarding work for a woman dedicated to public affairs and social reform.21

One of Gutteridge's most memorable and notable contributions to the labour movement in general and to working class women in particular during her time with the TLC was the role she played in the 1916 B.C. Workmen's Compensation Commission Hearings.22 Her testimony repeatedly reminded committee members of employer and government responsibility to workers, especially to single female employees and to wives of injured or incapacitated male workers. The latter now shouldered the responsibility of the family's financial survival. During her testimony, she went beyond academic or bureaucratic studies to support her demands with personal observations. Her case drew directly on the lives of women she had organized and worked with. From inspections she undertook of workplace and home, backed by studies conducted by women's groups on the working woman's struggle, she gave first-hand evidence for the measures she advanced. Throughout her long career, Gutteridge maintained a willingness to "get her hands dirty" and view for herself the harsh realities. Such commitment spoke volumes about her character and ideological approach to social questions.

Representing Vancouver women during a national conference on women and employment in Ottawa in 1919 stands out as another rich experience for the indefatigable Gutteridge.
Having worked so closely with and hard for female labourers, it was only fitting that she present their needs and concerns to conference participants. She told delegates that working women were "an easy mark for unscrupulous employers", expressed the importance of public awareness of their special plight and stressed the immediate need to rouse union officials and members into action on behalf of their wage-working sisters, wives and daughters. She had herself, of course, repeatedly done so. As she later admitted, "I brought these questions before the unions and the men endorsed our demands. I saw to it that they did!"24

Gutteridge also brought such questions before large women's organizations. Her campaign for an improved standard of living for female wage earners, for example, incorporated women's groups. Her presence within the New Era League, Local Council of Women and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was critical to their members' education regarding their working-class sisters. In turn, the interest and assistance of "club women" proved valuable to Helena's schemes. Under the auspices of the Local Council of Women, for instance, she organized the Women's Employment League in 1914 and the Minimum Wage League in 1917, two groups offering female workers material as well as emotional support.25
Membership in the Independent Labour Party and her campaign management of the British Columbia Federation of Labour candidates in the 1917 federal election introduced Gutteridge to the politics of class struggle in British Columbia. Contact with socialists in the increasingly radical Vancouver TLC stiffened her resolve to create a new social order. In 1918 she joined and later became treasurer of a newly organized socialist group, the Federated Labour Party. An amalgamation of various left-wing bodies, under the leadership of Angus MacInnis, this party was formed for the "purpose of securing industrial legislation and the collective ownership and democratic operation of the means of production".

Nevertheless, in contrast to her early suffrage strategy, Gutteridge did not choose the "militant" route or radical stance in her quest for larger social change. Although personally unafraid of confrontation or revolutionary change, her working-class background and consequent understanding of the rank-and-file, along with her commitment to democratic principles, inspired a "sewer and water" socialism. The people's needs could not wait for the revolution. Because she chose a generally pragmatic, cautious path in politics, Gutteridge was generally considered "right-wing" by Vancouver's radical unionists. Her views and practice frequently alienated her from her
"Bolshevik" colleagues who, towards the end of the First World War, increasingly dominated the trade union movement. Tension was particularly evident when she opposed the formation of the One Big Union in 1918 and when, a year later, she bolted from a TLC executive meeting. She believed that the decision to take the TLC membership out in support with the Winnipeg General Strike was not based on a democratic referendum. She therefore refused her support.29

Internal ideological battles within the TLC clearly frustrated and discouraged its female representative. Power struggles, Gutteridge feared, were increasingly dominating TLC activities, overshadowing membership concerns and demands. Disillusioned by what she viewed as neglect of the democratic process, she decided it was time to move on to something else. In 1920, at 40 years of age, Gutteridge married a farmer30 and approximately a year later left Vancouver for the peace and quiet of a rural community in the Fraser Valley. Her decision to leave the TLC and city life may have also reflected purely personal considerations. More simply, she may have needed respite from the hard-paced city living and economic insecurity she had experienced since her fourteenth birthday. Whatever the primary impetus, like many Canadian women after the war she turned to private life.
Except for reports that her marriage ended quickly, Gutteridge's married life remains a mystery. The sources offer no explanation for the break-up, although evidence suggests that she resisted her status change from the start. Her signature on TLC minutes during the first year of her marriage, before her move to the Fraser Valley, shifted back and forth between her maiden name and married name: Mrs. Fearn. Many of her friends were apparently never told of the obscure Mrs. Fearn. Nor was she forthcoming with information to those who were notified.

It seems reasonable to assume that twenty-seven years of virtual independence made adjustment to shared decision-making and living extremely difficult, ultimately impossible. Marriage was a mistake Gutteridge obviously preferred to forget.

In contrast, Gutteridge did not seem to regret her decision to head to the Fraser Valley. She appears to have taken to poultry farming and rural living. In fact, the modest income she received from poultry sales allowed her to enjoy the tranquillity of country life for a full ten years. There is no reason to believe that she had removed herself entirely from community work. She may have indeed struck a balance between both worlds, engaging in farm work and local community activities. The 1920's were thus not a lost decade for the feisty activist. Still, the attractions
of Vancouver and a thirst for more sophisticated and effectual social action eventually drew Gutteridge back.\textsuperscript{33} In 1932 she returned to the city. Soon after, she resurfaced in the Vancouver political community, this time becoming even more visible in the city's social and political community.

When branches of the Reconstruction Party and affiliated CCF groups met together in 1933 in order to set up the Associated CCF Clubs, Gutteridge was at the forefront, acting as an executive member at large until the association's merger with the SPC in 1935.\textsuperscript{34} Once the British Columbia section of the CCF was officially constituted, she continued to serve on the executive, putting to good use the eclectic expertise she had gained in the labour and women's movements. In 1935, for instance, she worked as secretary of the CCF's Unemployment and Relief Committee as well as secretary of the Economic and Planning Commission. She became the latter's chairperson in 1936,\textsuperscript{35} remaining in this position until, and during, her election to the Vancouver City Council. In a March 1937 by-election, after three unsuccessful campaigns, she succeeded on the CCF ticket. Her victory, however, was not merely a party one. She made history once again, this time as the first woman to sit on Vancouver's City Council. The headlines of March 30th and 31st newspapers read: "CCF Nominee Wins Election: Helena Gutteridge First of Sex to Gain Honour", "Once Arrested in
London, Now City Law Giver" and "First Woman Member Applauded". 36

In addition to advancing party and gender causes, Gutteridge's achievement marked a significant personal victory. Having spent the four years since her return to Vancouver without the challenge of full-time work and more importantly without a steady income (indeed, prior to her civic triumph she was on the city's social relief roles), 37 she clearly welcomed the professional stimulation and financial independence her new position offered. Too, her election to municipal government testified to her tremendous will and drive. When last at City Hall, she had spoken as an unemployed woman demanding attention to the plight of her poverty-stricken sisters. Now, she could offer a smug smile to the alderman who, in response to her requests for assistance then, had rudely replied: "I suppose madame you could tell us how to run the city". She knew she had succeeded in making her sharp rebuttal: "I have no doubt sir that we could" a reality. 38

Civic records of Gutteridge's activities during her two years in civic office illustrate that the energy she devoted to her office and to committee work matched her previous record in the labour and women's movement. She considered municipal government central to people's well being, forever insisting that its significance should be appreciated.
"Civic administration", she later wrote, "is a thing of flesh and blood; it deals with men, women, and children in their way of life. Since the CCF must carry on on all fronts, the importance of local government must not be minimized." 39

One very tangible indication of her dedication and sense of duty is found in her attendance record for committee meetings. In 1938, for example, she was the sole alderman not to miss one meeting of the 69 committee meetings recorded. 40 While lack of familial responsibilities and an unusually healthy constitution help to explain this perfect attendance, the essential factor was Gutteridge's serious sense of duty to her constituents. One columnist acknowledged shortly after the CCF's defeat in the December of 1939 civic election,

Whatever the reason for dropping alderman Gutteridge it cannot be a failure to attend to her aldermanic duties, for during the two years she has served no council member has been more faithful or more zealous than she. 41

This zeal was especially visible in Gutteridge's fight for better housing in Vancouver. Her training in sanitation and health proved extremely useful to the Council and ultimately to the city's working class. She chaired the Council's Housing Committee, repeatedly uncovering evidence of the dreadful living conditions of the poor and unemployed. Informed by frequent personal inspections of
"shacks", she fought hard for a low-rental housing scheme, reminding her co-workers and the public that slums were not necessarily dilapidated buildings but living conditions. Gutteridge's experience in this field also helped her gain seats on related committees. She chaired, for instance, the Civic Building and Civic Planning and Parks Committee which automatically made her the city's representative on the Park's Board and the Town Planning Committee. One incident with the Park Board illustrated her conscientious attitude toward this work and her refusal to retreat to mere tokenism. When told that as Council's representative, she had no authority to interfere in the decisions of the Board, she stormed furiously out of the meeting. She made her objection abundantly clear: "If I'm no further use to this committee, I'm not going to waste further time here. I'm not here to spend a social afternoon... what's the use of me going to the meeting if I've got to sit and listen?"

Although housing policy and city planning stood out as Gutteridge's primary commitment during her term of office in civic administration, she also devoted considerable attention to other municipal concerns. She typically advocated the right of Orientals to non-discriminatory business practices, the abolition of property qualifications in municipal elections and the need for provincial and federal government to assume greater responsibility for social
welfare. Moreover, her early preoccupation with women's rights, although less intense given her many new tasks, did not wane.

Educating women about the political process and their rights as citizens became an important focus of Gutteridge's work with women during the 1930's and early 1940's. She helped organize the CCF Women's Council, often gave lectures at the Vancouver Women's School for Citizenship, and kept very active in non-political bodies such as the Local Council of Women and the WILPF. "Women", she said, "perhaps more than men are not educated enough in the problems of social justice...for we have the tools for human welfare but lack the knowledge of how to use them."44 Women, in other words, needed to learn the process of acquiring and using power. Having learned this skill during her "bloomer girl" days and subsequently, Gutteridge shared it with her sisters as often as she could. But, her ability to communicate her insights into this process, particularly to middle-class women, appears to have been circumscribed by her rather brusque manner. Though she was extremely outgoing in her social activism, her contemporaries have memories of an often abrupt, rather cold woman who seemed to withdraw from intimate personal relationships.45 On her own at such a young age, the development of a tough, somewhat icy exterior is not surprising. It is perhaps a little unfortunate,
however, that the warmth and sensitivity which inspired her dedication to public life and causes did not often reach the surface. As a role model, she remained rather inaccessible. Nevertheless, as a promoter of expanded roles and rights for women, there were few sharper, more committed advocates. Her activities on behalf of women while at City Hall certainly demonstrate this commitment. Gutteridge's work on council did in fact encompass the battle for women's rights. She frequently presented their demands and concerns, sitting on committees which dealt with their unique problems, seeking the support of women's groups when necessary and coming to their defense when her fellow members neglected or challenged their rights.

Enraged for example, when Alderman Wilson suggested the City Hall move to bar married women from employment which fell within its jurisdiction, Gutteridge, with her usual candour, wasted little time comparing the motion to similar measures adopted in Germany and Italy at that time. She also warned that a large delegation of women would attend the meeting of the committee called to examine this proposal. When Alderman Wilson retorted that "women have the greatest honour and responsibility in building happy homes" and that "it is somewhat degrading when a woman lowers herself to our standard and goes out to compete with men" she added impatiently,
Let's let all this sentimental bosh go by and get down to facts...Nobody ever objected to women scrubbing floors or bending over a washboard. This business of placing women on a pedestal is one of the oldest yarns I've heard. Men only object to women working when they start earning money...Madame Currie would never have discovered radium if women had been barred from work...As for the amount of work which would be provided if married women retired from the labour market, why it wouldn't amount to the snap of a finger. It's a very plausible red herring in this question.48

Going right to the jugular, Gutteridge went on to point out that there were Council members drawing two salaries. These members included the mayor who, as Vancouver's executive officer and as an MLA, collected double wages.49 Gutteridge won the day. While she sat on City Council, wage-earning wives did not meet with any legal opposition from municipal legislators.

The tenacious Helena was also quick to educate her colleagues when they demonstrated ignorance concerning women's needs, misrepresented their demands or displayed undue paternalism. During one discussion over a "work-for-taxes" program which allowed delinquent taxpayers to work off their debt to the city, she argued that delinquent female taxpayers, like their male counterparts, should be included in the scheme. They must accept full responsibility for their actions and Council should consider them when the city required extra help, she contended.50 Council's
patronizing dismissal of a resolution from the New Era League and the Housewives' League likewise prompted a sharp rebuttal. Her fellow aldermen appear to have regarded a resolution calling for the declaration of milk as a public utility and the creation of a marketing board for purposes of distribution as silly and naive. Gutteridge would have none of this paternalism. She quickly snapped at her colleagues that the women's organizations spearheading the proposal were neither naive nor ignorant. They did not expect City Council to establish immediately the public distribution of milk. They were only too well aware that such changes in the economic system came about very slowly. 51

This last statement exposed Gutteridge's continued impatience with the economic system she was forced to administer. Although never abandoning the pragmatism she had cultivated during her early career in the labour movement, she was increasingly convinced that a really fundamental reorganization of society was critical to a more equitable distribution of wealth and a more just social order. After a year in municipal government, she acknowledged the inadequacy of existing structures in a report to the CCF Regional Planning Committee. She concluded, "as your representative I voice my protests, and state our position at opportune moments but I am just a voice crying in the wilderness." 52
Experience and frustration with capitalist administration deepened Gutteridge's pledge to socialism and to the eradication of a system based on profit. This increasingly strong conviction was especially vivid in a 1939 article, significantly entitled: "A Socialist at City Hall", which sheds light on three essential aspects of her socialist ideology: her outright rejection of capitalist economics, her perception of class conflict, and her identification with the working class. She wrote in part,

The difficulties in carrying on civic administration under the present social system become more and more apparent every day. The need for civic administration to realize that the difficulties are very largely due to the economic developments of the capitalist system makes it imperative that representatives be elected from the ranks of the working-class already educated in respect to the difficulties and conscious of the inevitable logical sequence of increasing social responsibilities becoming the business of administration bodies. Not only is it essential that elected representation shall be conscious of the struggle going on between the "haves and the have nots" but continuous education of the general public is equally important.53

Another article written just after her defeat presents an even stronger case for socialism. Obviously disturbed by her failure to be re-elected in the December 1939 election and with the absence of any CCF person on the Council, Gutteridge began, "the pattern of thought of a lot of people
is still pre-1914." She argued further that plenty of evidence existed to demonstrate that money or lack of it was not the problem. "It is the ownership control that must be adjusted", she explained, adding, "only the ownership of wealth production means, by the people themselves, will solve the unemployment problem." An appeal to her socialist friends concluded this discourse:

So here is our work - to make a pattern of thinking that will be a mould into which the molten mass of economic and social chaos, now in the state of upheaval, may be poured and form the new social order.

Educating the populace to the need for socialism became an important priority in Gutteridge's campaign for social justice. In order to meet the immediate needs of the working-class she was willing to administer capitalism. But she insisted that when victorious at the polls, socialists be prepared to implement a fully socialist economic system. A proposed "Labour Code" issued by the CCF Economic Planning Commission while she was its chairwoman articulated this concern. The introduction began,

Any party, organization or movement, appealing to the people for a mandate to substitute a system of "PRODUCTION FOR USE" for the present system of "PRODUCTION FOR PROFIT" or which claims and uses for its battle cry the slogan "HUMAN NEEDS BEFORE PROPERTY RIGHTS" should and must, if it is to survive the
bitter onslaughts of its opponents, state clearly and emphatically, its determination to put its precepts into practice immediately upon the assumption of office, to have all the necessary information and data on hand, plus the machinery, ORGANIZED AND IN BEING, for putting into operation those planks of its platform that will ensure the loyal and undivided support of the workers in the complex productive distributive system of today.57

The inhumanity and degradation of the Depression, which Gutteridge felt and witnessed, initially as a single unemployed woman and later as a civic administrator investigating her constituency's needs, stirred in the former pragmatist a deep sense of urgency. Unless the CCF pledged itself to major systemic and institutional change right from the start, people's lives would improve only marginally, if at all. She was aware that the immediate implementation of major, revolutionary change was no easy task. Complications and conflict were bound to arise. Such potential struggle made it all the more imperative therefore, that socialists learn the process of government administration at the outset. A carefully worked out plan for socialist reconstruction was essential.

Gutteridge's growing radicalism did not reflect naive idealism or a sudden ideological shift to the left. It was consistent with her assessment of what she considered to be
the most effective, long-lasting and democratic challenge to human oppression. She was a reformist and revolutionary in one, straddling both left and right camps within the CCF. The independence of thought which fostered her youthful rebellion and subsequent political travels remained firm. Informed by considerable first hand research into the lives of the people she represented, throughout her days in the political arena she stood out as an independent unwilling to budge from her particular understanding of democracy and freedom.

This individuality and independence created an image of confidence and strength, winning for Gutteridge respect from friend and foe alike in the Vancouver community. As with most candid people, her straightforwardness was sometimes misinterpreted; and, as noted, her aggressive, at times cold countenance, not always welcomed. But her persistence won its champions, reluctant and otherwise. This hard-won respect was undoubtedly self-fulfilling, feeding the confidence to forge her own path and to remain undaunted in the face of electoral defeat.

Gutteridge's loss in the 1939 civic election did not lead to retreat. She stubbornly pledged to return to office the next year. Similarly, shortly after hearing the news of her heartbreaking loss in 1940 the press quoted her as saying,
I'm sorry for the CCF and particularly sorry for myself... but if that's what the people wanted it's quite alright with me. I'm starting in right now to campaign for next year.58

Gutteridge turned to the provincial field in 1941, but a victory in the stanchly Conservative riding of Point Grey required nothing short of a miracle. Not surprisingly, although she received a respectable count, a dramatic upset was not forthcoming.

At 61 years of age, Gutteridge finally had enough of electoral politics. In 1942, she accepted a post offered by her long-time CCF colleague, Grant McNeil and left Vancouver for a second time. This time she did not withdraw to private life. She became instead the administrator and counsellor of a Japanese internment camp at Slocan City in the British Columbia interior.59 There are no known accounts of her work during the three years she lived there. The record simply indicates that the end of World War Two brought her back to Vancouver, now officially retired from paid employment and public life. Unofficially, however, Gutteridge continued to be active in public affairs, once again choosing an alternative lifestyle to that of most women and men in their senior years.

Though no longer participating in key decision-making and policy information within the CCF, she continued to be an active member of the party and gave significant amounts
of time to the CCF Women's Council. She once again sought the sisterhood of non-political organizations, becoming chairperson and vice-president of the WILPF sometime during her last years of public life. Her most remarkable defiance of the dictates of old age, however, were the two seasons she spent employed in a fruit and vegetable cannery. Despite the cold and difficult working conditions for a woman in her early seventies, to supplement her government pension, this amazing woman deliberately chose cannery work. She had resolved to keep in touch with the women workers she had represented since her early twenties and keep in touch she did. No better testimony to her gender and class loyalties can be found.

Another rather amusing illustration of the youthful and determined spirit Gutteridge carried to her death was recalled by a friend who nursed her during the illness which eventually claimed her life on October 2, 1960. When asked by a younger woman if she wanted to join a group of elderly women for a "Sunday drive", she complained to her friend,

I don't know why she's asking me to go with all those old crocks for? I guess it's cause I can help her get them in and out [of the car]...with her rheumatism.

Gutteridge, at the time, was at least ten years older than the "old crocks" she described. On October 3, 1960, the
Vancouver Sun carried a picture of Helena Gutteridge and a headline exclaiming: "First Woman Alderman Dead: Helena Rose Gutteridge, Champion of Female Rights, Dies Here".63

An unquenchable passion for social justice, coupled with the tenacity and confidence nurtured in her youth, drew Gutteridge into two movements which strongly influenced her subsequent political career: the women's and trade union movements. The skills and experience she gained in both paved the route to political prominence in the CCF and consequently within municipal politics. From a basic knowledge of how to chair a meeting to expertise in financial matters, the organizational tools these causes taught her were extremely valuable to a young party in need of capable leaders. Gutteridge was a suitable candidate.

It is clear, however, that organizational and leadership skills only partially explain her rise to political prominence. Still more critical ingredients in her path to political power were her intimate knowledge and understanding of the working class as well as her feminist insistence that she neither wanted nor required preferential treatment and would absolutely refuse discriminatory treatment. These two points deserve some elaboration.

Gutteridge nurtured a sharp class consciousness. While she frequently mixed with the middle-class, with academics, professionals, business leaders and civil servants, she
felt most at home among workers whose language she spoke and whose special problems she not only understood but shared. Such fellowship with workers contributed to her strong insistence that class privilege and exploitation must be destroyed. More importantly, it won their respect and support. They knew she spoke from the heart and from experience. While Gutteridge had difficulty carrying the west-side vote in Vancouver, she won the constituency which to her mattered most: the working class. For an early twentieth century woman lacking broad social connections, family support, academic prestige or wealth, such grass roots support was invaluable.

Feminist aspirations and consciousness played an equally significant role in Gutteridge's political career. In fact, in a society unaccustomed to female leadership, her profound belief that men and women were equal in ability and social worth was perhaps her most valuable tool. Despite obvious obstacles facing a woman attempting to establish herself in a traditionally masculine domain she staunchly refused any special consideration or aid. Moreover, she refused to be relegated into tokenism or accept second-class status when she knew she deserved first. Harold Winch, the British Columbia CCF's party and house leader during the early forties, described Gutteridge in this fashion:
Helena was the type that would battle on the same level as a man. If there was talk, there was talk. If you wanted to swear or get rough, she could swear and get rough — that was Helena... You wouldn't dare discriminate against Helena!64

Supporters and opponents alike could not help but admire such courage.

While refusing special assistance for herself, Gutteridge did not deny women's unique disadvantages. Nor was she reluctant to bring them to public attention in an attempt to promote change. Not unlike many independent women of this period, however, she believed that it was women's responsibility to initiate change and see it through. When asked about women's role in government shortly before the 1941 election she replied, "The let George do it attitude of so many women towards government isn't helping the situation any!"65 Gutteridge was not going to let George do it. She was a political actor in her own right and demanded that she be considered such.

This determination to be treated as an equal partner frequently demanded that she be better than most of her male colleagues. For Gutteridge, the skill came fairly easy; the stamina required was viewed as another challenge which in most cases she managed to conquer. Even when it seemed that her hopes were in shambles, she appeared all the more determined to keep fighting.
There were times, however, when stifling convention, an unresponsive public and a conservative political climate wore down her ability to surmount the obstacles facing a female politician. Her inability to retain civic office or gain entry into other centers of government must have been terribly disappointing for one so dedicated to public life, especially when she saw the success of less capable men. Yet, if she did experience considerable turmoil or emotional pain, it did not defeat her. The nature of her political and personal ambitions sheds some light on this willingness to keep fighting.

The choices Gutteridge made throughout her career and the independent path she followed throughout her life rested less on a need for political power and self-aggrandizement than on a deep-seated desire for a changed world. Gutteridge, in this sense, is better described as a pioneering reformer than as an ambitious politician or revolutionary. The triumph of the democratic causes she championed was of paramount importance. Her refusal to follow the most popular route or seek affiliation with the dominant camp and her relentless determination that politicians and government listen to the people they claimed to represent reveals that power and prestige for Gutteridge were much less important than the realization of her feminist and socialist vision. Personal loss was less devastating when the larger struggle
for social change appeared to be gaining ground. Indeed, until her death she remained optimistic that "a wonderful new world" lay ahead. Thus Gutteridge was finally neither a party ideologue, doctrinaire revolutionary or "middle of the road" progressive but an independent idealist who cared more about the practical application of socialist principles and policy than their theoretical basis. She was consequently less vulnerable to the tensions between class and gender priorities which troubled other socialists. She judged issues and policies according to her own personal bias and vision, thinking less of party policy than the individual merits of the decision at hand. Unencumbered by the weight of a strict doctrine she managed to balance socialist and feminist loyalties. As Winch recollected, "Her battle for women's rights or trying to find answers to women's problems was part and parcel of the socialist movement. They went hand in hand."66 Gutteridge stands out as a socialist feminist who successfully resolved conflicts between class and gender priorities.

In her autobiographical sketch Gutteridge began, "I've been a socialist all my life."67 Although she does not add "and a feminist all my life", a careful examination of her story reveals that her identification with the women's movement and feminist causes equalled that with the class struggle. After a discussion of the early union and social-
ist movement, her focus shifted to the world of female cooperation. Her obvious pride in the changes she and her sisters achieved demonstrated her unbending belief in female solidarity and cooperation. She recalled the days when "many anti-feminists pooh-poohed the idea of women getting the vote" and remarked,

It was by sending representatives from women's organizations to the council (LCW) that we exchanged views, helped each other in our various causes, trained speakers and taught them how to organize, and acquainted them with parliamentary procedure. Through our effort we brought the plight of women workers to public attention and compelled government attention.\(^68\)

The article in fact concluded with an appeal to women:

No matter how busy they are with their families women are part of the larger community. They owe it to themselves to develop their abilities and to work for a better peaceful world. There is still a lot to be done.\(^69\)

The extent to which Gutteridge recognized or challenged sexual discrimination within the CCF can only be speculated upon since the available sources do not address this question. Her strong support for the CCF Women's Council suggests that she rejected arguments about the inappropriate-ateness of separate women's groups. It is also clear that in general when challenged on any matter pertaining to her sex she would speak her mind leaving no doubt that she stood
for complete equality. Moreover, Gutteridge's life story makes it hard to imagine her being deferential or hushed. Her militant suffragette days and union experiences had prepared her well for future confrontations. This defiant woman who told a city alderman that she could tell the honourable gentlemen how to run the city and who, a year later, did exactly that was not easily silenced. Gutteridge began her public career as a feminist and ended it as a socialist feminist. She made it abundantly clear that she was both and would not compromise one for the other.

Gutteridge's younger CCF sister, Laura Jamieson, shared this unusual ability to balance class and gender loyalties. Like Gutteridge, she stepped into the world of public activism as a feminist, soon to choose to advance women's causes under the socialist banner. The nature of her socialist and feminist aspirations, however, like her journey to political prominence, varied considerably from those of her British colleague. Still, for all their differences, as the ensuing portrait reveals, their stories contain common threads which suggest that these dual rebels belong to the same historical tapestry.

Throughout her life, Jamieson was an avid reader of both academic and literary works. Studies of the past were her greatest passion since as she put it, "there is so much to learn that can be learned through history". Her papers
are filled with copious notes drawn from her reading. She also wrote a substantial amount. Much of this writing was of an academic or journalistic nature with useful glimpses on her ideological position on social questions. Her papers also include unpublished poems, short stories, and autobiographical sketches of her youth. These too provide insights into the experiences and philosophy which influenced and guided her throughout her political career. The first few verses of a poem entitled, "Mystic", written sometime during her term as an MLA in the early forties, serves as a suitable introduction to this profile of Jamieson.

The first hepatica of spring
Found on the hill-side;
The cool grass under her bare feet
In summer;
These were her childhood joys.

Later she wrestled with metaphysics,
And pondered over philosophy
She thought she talked with God.

Life gave her happiness,
And dealt her blows
She gathered strength from both
And shared it with others.

The first verse of this autobiographical poem captures Jamieson's fond recollection of her childhood days in Bruce County, Ontario where on December 29, 1888 she was born and later christened Laura Emma Marshall. Life on the Marshall
farm was not easy. In her own words, "we lived almost a pioneer life. We had to find out for ourselves how to do things". But as she later admitted her appetite for new methods and new schemes was wetted during those early years. She developed at an early age the independence and determination she would eventually use to forge new paths.

Teaching was Jamieson's first hoped for career. Since the family had little money for secondary schooling, her sister, a nurse, offered to help. With coaching from a friendly teacher and with a good deal of perseverance, she passed the difficult high school entrance exams and was admitted to Owen Sound Collegiate. Her years at Owen Sound were fruitful. Membership on the school debating team taught her valuable speaking skills. Her conscientious attention to her studies won her a teaching certificate. Yet, as with Helena Gutteridge, teaching did not remain a part of Jamieson's life for very long. After several years in a school in Fernie, British Columbia, a new interest in social work brought her back to Ontario for university studies in philosophy.

After a stint "wrestling with metaphysics and pondering over philosophy", Jamieson completed her Bachelor of Arts. Shortly afterwards she began work as the Secretary of the Young Women's Christian Association for Western Ontario. A 'child of rural Ontario, Jamieson had developed an aware-
ness of poverty and injustice, never forgetting her mother's efforts to gather clothes for a very poor neighbour or her uncle's claim that "we farmers haven't the slightest control over the price we get for what we sell". These childhood experiences sensitized her to social inequities. It was during her years with the YWCA, however, that she really began to understand the plight of those most vulnerable to social and economic instability. A speech she heard in Muskoka, Ontario, at the beginning of her employment with the YWCA left a lasting impression. Focussing on the female workers in the garment industry, it was especially intended for YWCA board members and employees. Its author began,

You will try to provide some of the recreation which they will seek, you will try to provide some of the places they will learn to live in... you must know about how they earn their living; the condition under which they live and work; the wages they are paid. You women must know these things before you can do much to help them. Women who have the education and ability must know about the hundreds of thousands of other women in this country before they can help the latter to live a good life, a happy life to which they are entitled... These women may be much closer to you than you think.

This message hit hard. As Jamieson later described it,
Well these were tall orders. I had never looked at my own life and my duties and responsibilities like this before. I had gone to church and taught Sunday School class and sang in the church choir and thought I had done well. But a whole new set of social duties confronted me.  

Three years of social work in the cities of Western Ontario gave Jamieson plenty of opportunity to try out her new duties -- to learn at first hand of the working and living conditions facing working class women. A Christian humanitarianism was kindled, foreshadowing her eventual turn to democratic socialism. But her work for female workers was preempted and temporarily shelved in 1911 when a proposal of marriage from John Stuart Jamieson, a young lawyer recently hired by a Vancouver law firm, took her to the Pacific Coast. Soon after their arrival, the couple married. Not long after the wedding, Jamieson was appointed Juvenile Court Judge of Burnaby. In 1912, Mr. and Mrs. Jamieson moved to Burnaby, at that time, according to Jamieson, a "partly cleared, unzoned low-rent district to which the unemployed from Vancouver and New Westminster gravitated".  

Within a few years the Jamiesons started a family; Laura set to work as a full-time housewife and mother.

The responsibilities of marriage and motherhood did not keep Jamieson from an active life outside the home. Her interest in community affairs and in women in particular
drew her to Vancouver's world of female cooperation. She soon joined the University Women's Club and the Local Council of Women, becoming the former's president in 1916 and 1917. Her most memorable participation in a women's organization during the nineteen teens however was her involvement in the suffrage movement. The memories of working women trying to survive workplace exploitation and poor living conditions and her daily witnessing of the difficult lives neighbouring women faced, fed her determination to win the vote. Enfranchised women would help bring in just and equitable laws. Looking back, she wrote,

Here I found myself engaged in another struggle trying to get the vote. But echoes of the words I heard in Muskoka persisted. The campaign for women's suffrage... was based, in this province largely on the fact that the laws governing women and children were outdated and unjust and it was evident that they would not improve until women got the vote and either repealed or amended the bad old laws.

When her husband was invited to give a lecture to the Political Equality League on the laws of British Columbia, with emphasis on those affecting women, she joined him. Her contact with this group led to membership. As Gutteridge had been, she was particularly concerned with discrimination against female industrial workers. Unlike the stubborn suffragette, she chose to remain within the PEL. Jamieson
was at home in this circle of well-educated middle-class progressives. While deeply sympathetic to the working-class woman, she chose to express her concerns with women she could identify with.

As a young housewife who knew the comforts and security of a good home yet witnessed daily the misery of those who didn't, Jamieson's arguments on behalf of women's suffrage not surprisingly emphasized a desire to protect the home. During one speech she gave to members of Ward V Conservatives on October 14, 1916, she contended that "one institution which cannot crumble is woman's strong-hold -- the home."82 The vote, she further argued, would give women better control of the conditions which affected the home. Yet, greater control over the home environment was only one part of Jamieson's suffrage ambitions. The equal rights and equal opportunities the franchise promised was also central to her stance. This equality, she felt, would allow women to participate in more than charitable works and philanthropic services which she asserted "are palliative and have no permanent results."83 Instead, with the vote women could look forward to "more fruitful service to the community... [and] in some cases remove the causes of distress instead of merely relieving that distress temporarily."84 This early concern with permanent, fundamental changes rather than temporary, palliative solutions grew steadily throughout the
next two decades of her life eventually leading to her membership in a party which argued for a completely new social order: the CCF. In the meantime, she took the duties and responsibilities of full citizenship to heart, becoming very active within the Vancouver community.

After World War One, when her son and daughter were of school age, Jamieson took an active interest in the Parent-Teacher's Association and in 1925 and 1926 became its president. It was also during this post-war period that she grew interested in international affairs and peace efforts. In 1921, with Lucy Woodsworth, Helena Gutteridge and other prominent Vancouver women, she helped to organize a Vancouver branch of the WILPF. Later that year, she also joined the mixed League of Nations' Society. Both organizational roles, in addition to her continued involvement in the University Women's Club and the Local Council of Women contributed to her selection as a representative of British Columbia and Canada at the WILPF Conference in Prague, the World Education Conference in Geneva and at the International University Women's Conference in Britain, all during her tour of Europe in 1926. These experiences were rich and undoubtedly a source of self-fulfillment and confidence-building. Yet, as her poem suggests, while life gave her happiness during this period, it also "dealt her blows". One devastating blow was the sudden death of her husband in
1926. Alone, with two young adolescents to care for and support, life during the first few months after his death was grim.

Fortunately, Jamieson's high visibility in community affairs and the respect both she and her husband had earned within the Burnaby municipality opened the door to employment. Burnaby offered to her her husband's former position and in 1927 Jamieson became B.C.'s second female Juvenile Court Judge. Suddenly a working mother, dealing with the problems of the poor and unemployed in a system which offered few remedies, she could no longer rest confident that hard work and traditional middle-class answers to social injustice were satisfactory. Indeed, it was her often frustrating experience with the juvenile court system which sparked her search for a more permanent solution to injustice. That solution was socialism and the medium for action, the political arena. As she concluded, "conditions could only be remedied by political means." The immediate factor which precipitated her membership in the CCF are worth noting.

During her term as judge, Jamieson was frequently invited to speak to service clubs. Initially, her speeches avoided heated political issues. As the Depression of the 1930's dragged on, seemingly endlessly, she began to comment openly on controversial political matters. After one public
challenge to the capitalist economic system in the spring of 1938, she received a sharp letter from a Cabinet Minister who argued that judges should not express such views in public. She responded with her resignation. Shortly thereafter, as a Sun columnist expressed it, "she followed her heart into the CCF camp." Her rise to a prominent position within the party was unusually swift. Within a year, on the platform that the issue was between capitalism and a cooperative commonwealth, she waged a successful election campaign for the CCF in a Vancouver Center by-election. In May of 1939, she took her seat in the provincial legislature. There she remained for six years.

Jamieson's reputation as a fair and sensitive judge and her high visibility in the Vancouver community both as a popular lecturer and a leading figure in a number of women's organizations contributed to her rapid transition from the legal arena to the political platform. In contrast to Helena Guttridge, she had the social connections valuable to a person, crucial to a woman, aspiring political power. Of course, she too had worked hard to establish her credibility. But her familiarity with broader sectors of the society made her road into government quicker and smoother, her stay there considerably longer.

From her first days in the House, Jamieson appears to have impressed fellow MLA's favourably. About her maiden
speech, one reporter commented, "you would have thought she had been speaking in the House all her life." She talked about what she understood best -- the problems of juvenile delinquency, its prevention and cure, and the need for changes in the court and prison system. She sought political power because she desired fundamental restructuring of social welfare. It was only natural that demands for reforms pertaining to family matters, child welfare, housing, women's rights, especially those of female labourers, dominated her speeches in the provincial legislature. Support for the latter issue found an especially important place in her legislative campaign. Indeed, because electoral victory allowed greater opportunity to champion the cause of women it had been for Jamieson that much sweeter. After her second triumph in 1941, for instance, she told reporters that she "would devote her energies particularly to the help of women industrial workers." As she had after her 1939 victory, Jamieson stuck to her promise, frequently reminding the government about the plight of wage-working women. Together with her CCF sisters in the Legislature, she repeatedly requested new labour laws, improved working conditions for women, maternity support, day nurseries and birth control reform -- changes which in short would ameliorate their second class status. The government's reluctance to move on these matters at
times led Jamieson to protest: "[The CCF is] the only party to attempt to further the welfare of women".  

While concentrating on women's issues and social welfare matters, Jamieson's voice was heard on a wide range of subjects as well, including international affairs. In one speech which referred to the 1932 Imperial Economic Conference, she denounced the exploitation of naturally rich countries by foreign capital as well as the imperial government's support of private interests through armaments, including navies. On another occasion, she called Asiatic exclusionist policies racist expressions of capitalism. "It is capitalism that fosters this prejudice and hate by making groups compete for food and shelter," she said. Though supporting the CCF's decision to accept Canada's participation in the war effort, since this choice was the lesser of two evils, she was quick to defend her colleagues when they were labelled "disloyal and traitorous". In response to one member's denunciation of those against the war effort as communist, she immediately retorted that his remarks were "sadistic". Loyalty towards her fellow CCFers was also displayed during another legislative debate on foreign affairs. Rallying behind Steeves, whom one member castigated as Cassandra, Jamieson introduced her speech with a rebuttal. She suggested that such an epithet was actually a compliment because Cassandra had prophesized the fall of
Troy and fall it did. "Mrs. Steeves would be right too", she declared, "and capitalism would fall just as surely".\(^9^8\) Jamieson's legislative addresses and public speeches generally lacked the force and aggression of women like Gutteridge or Steeves for that matter. But as her rebuttal to the attack on Steeves reveals, she clearly possessed wit and assertiveness. About her particular style of delivery an observer noted, "she speaks quickly, quotes figures in reams, and had the House almost dizzy with her arguments, wagging two fingers to support them."\(^9^9\) Such assertion and drive was not sufficient ammunition, however, against the unholy Liberal/Conservative coalition of 1945. All three CCF women MLA's were toppled. Yet, Jamieson's absence from political office was not a lengthy one. Less than three years later, she went on to wage a successful battle on behalf of the CCF in the municipal field. In 1948, she became Vancouver's second alderwoman filling the void left by Helena Gutteridge's defeat in 1939.\(^1^0^0\)

On Council, Jamieson's concerns and demands resembled her predecessor's: in particular low-rental housing, a revision of the municipal franchise and public ownership of utilities. Like Gutteridge, she also paid special attention to women's issues, rallying women's organizations to her side when presenting requests to City Council. She appears to have valued their assistance considerably. Regarding
their support for the extension of the municipal franchise she noted,

Women have done a lot in asking for the extension of the franchise and have sent large delegations asking for it since I came to Council... women can accomplish a great deal in civic and national life when they are united and persistent and intelligently informed. ¹⁰¹

Jamieson's opportunity to accomplish a great deal in civic life was cut short in 1950 when she lost her bid for re-election. Nevertheless, even after her departure from municipal government, she continued to voice her concerns and ideas about women's rights to civic administrators. When, for example, Council finally pushed through a bill allowing for the discretionary dismissal of married female civic workers -- the move Gutteridge so vehemently opposed -- she took immediate action. She lobbied women's groups to this cause and wrote numerous letters to City Concil and local newspapers. These letters brought to aldermen as well as public attention a 1931 British Columbia Statute called, "The Sex Disqualification Removal Act" which stated: "no person shall be disqualified because of sex or marriage from being appointed to any judicial or civic position or from entering into and continuing to carry on any profession or vocation".¹⁰² One letter written to the editor of the Vancouver Province is worth quoting in some detail as it
offers both a concise description of the Council's actions as well as a glimpse of her approach towards such blatant gender discrimination.

City Council... decided that women employees are not adult enough to make their own decisions and so must be treated differently from men. Female employees on the permanent staff, if they marry, can be retained on a permanent basis only at the discretion of department heads, subject to the approval of the personnel director, providing however, that whenever such an employee once leaves the city's employ for personal reasons or other reasons, they should not be re-engaged on a permanent basis...

Meanwhile, no woman already married with family or without is to be taken on the permanent staff in spite of shortages of public health nurses, social workers, and others who require long, intensive training. This policy, of course, discourages girls from taking the long, expensive courses which qualify them for these jobs. It ensures a continuous shortage of trained women, a shortage which may become critical at any time.

Added to this short-sightedness there seems to have been no consideration at all of the fact that by this policy on married women workers, the City Council is constantly breaking the law. So now the City Council had added to its many activities those of censor of women's morals and law-breaker.103

With no female advocates or allies on City Council, Jamieson was unable to budge the stubborn bureaucrats.
Their decision was final and she had, for the time being at least, to concede defeat. Losses such as this, coupled with growing trends towards a re-privatization of women's lives in the early 1950's, discouraged the tireless women's advocate. But there were some successes during these years as well. These victories eased somewhat the disappointment of defeat, rekindling her enthusiasm and determination to keep fighting. One ray of hope shone in 1953 when the British Columbia legislature passed an Equal Pay for Equal Work Act, narrowing, in theory at least, the significant gap between male and female wages.

The impetus behind this pathbreaking piece of legislation had been a bill which Jamieson had herself introduced during her brief but effectual return to the Provincial House in 1952, again as the CCF member for Vancouver Center. The public's favourable response to her bill first set the wheels in motion. Almost immediately, she reported receiving "flocks" of supporting letters from women in all sorts of employment. She later wrote,

These letters showed the government that the Bill was popular. But I was a member of the Opposition, and a government seldom allows an Opposition member to get credit when the Government itself can just as well pass a similar Bill, but trimmed to suit its members and supporters. So my Bill was ruled out of order before the second reading was reached and at the next session of the Legislature, in the Fall of 1953, the
Government introduced and passed a similar Bill, but with some of the defects I had tried to avoid.  

As Jamieson's comments suggest, her eventual victory was somewhat circumscribed by the government's adoption of a significantly modified version of the legislation she read to parliament. Having studied the strengths and weaknesses of two provincial acts already in operation as well as proposed legislation in several other provinces, she had been careful to define her bill as equal pay for work of a "comparable nature", not equal pay for the "same work". She had rejected the word "same" because she had observed its abuse in Ontario. There employers were skirting the legislation by re-classifying jobs as male and female. With "male jobs" and "female jobs" categories, it was almost impossible to prove that men and women were doing the same work. Work of a comparable nature seemed a much more effective and fair categorization.  

In her original bill, Jamieson has also stressed that someone other than the complainant register the grievance with the Industrial Relations Board. A third party complaint, she believed, would prevent retributive firings. The Act finally passed a year later ignored these concerns. It was modelled instead on the Ontario Act which Jamieson considered defective. Yet, for all its deficiencies, it nevertheless established an important principle and when, almost ten years later, in 1962, the government at last
ammended the 1953 Act by substituting the words "same work" for "work of a comparable nature" and by changing the phrase "complaint by the employee herself" to "complaint of any person", Jamieson must have experienced considerable satisfaction and pride.¹⁰⁷

Jamieson's second posting in Victoria lasted only one year. Her defeat at the hands of a Socred-Tory alliance in 1953 ended her parliamentary career. At sixty-five, it was time to slow down. But like Gutteridge, Jamieson's pace did not saunter. She continued her socialist and feminist activism, speaking out against class and gender discrimination, such as the restricted civic franchise for example, staying active in the CCF Provincial Council, and maintaining committed membership within a number of local and national women's groups. Her most memorable achievement during her senior years, however, was the major role she played in the development and coordination of the New Vista Society, a housing project for people with special needs, particularly mentally disabled women. Joining her long-time CCF colleague, Ernest Winch, in the organization of this project, she put to good use the community planning skills she gleaned throughout her days in the Legislature and on City Council. The British Columbia government's eventual sponsorship of the project, its subsequent expansion, and
its existence today remain a tribute to her important work and dedication.108

Throughout her career and life, which ended in 1964 at seventy-six years of age, Jamieson demanded and worked hard for pervasive social reform. As Gutteridge had, she engaged in practical politics. Yet, she too recognized the obstacles inhibiting the implementation of widespread reform under the capitalist system. A socialist solution, she firmly believed, was society's only recourse. Social problems stemmed from unemployment which in turn grew as the result of a poorly planned, profit-based economy. This analysis of society's ills was clear in a letter to the editor of the Vancouver News Herald in June, 1939. She wrote:

As a former judge and as a socialist, I am convinced that it is sheer stupidity to expect the privately owned business, with its increasing use of machinery, can ever again employ populations. Only under a socialist-planned economy can places be found for everyone... And everyone can do much in changing our present futile and frustrated society by advocating social planning.109

The logic Jamieson saw in sound, democratic, economic planning appears to have been socialism's greatest attraction. Such planning, as well as promising full employment, encouraged cooperative living which she came to see as essential to a happier society. She cannot, however, be
described as a student of socialism. While her notes suggest that she was well-versed in socialist theory and her speeches on behalf of socialist causes could be forceful, it was a Christian humanitarianism rather than a class-conscious radicalism which inspired her turn to socialist solutions. Ideological questions and theory were not her primary concern. "A devotion to economic absolutes was not necessary", she insisted. She adopted a Fabian approach to the establishment of a new social order and sought practical alternatives to the social ills and inequities she witnessed. Social democracy would provide these answers, if not immediately, certainly in the long run. Thus, in the early 1950's Jamieson renounced the left-wing, Socialist Fellowship, led by Steeves and Cameron. At the time, Vice-President of the CCF Provincial Council, she made her anger perfectly clear. One newspaper carried this report:

Laura Jamieson, first vice-president of the CCF... blamed members of her own executive for not advancing and carrying out adopted policies of the party... It was the duty of the executive to advance all policies of the CCF adopted by proper bodies... this has not been done in the past year, she said, because the wishes.of the majority in the executive have been thwarted by some members... Without mentioning names, Mrs. Jamieson referred to the existence of a left-wing element... [she] struck out at the pacifists in the B.C. movement and advised that they should follow the lead of CCF founder, J.S. Woodsworth who bowed to the majority vote of his party
to support W.W. II, although he personally remained a pacifist to the end. The struggle for human liberation has been going on for a long time and socialists are not the only ones who have been fighting for it. 112

For Jamieson, the road to socialism would be evolutionary.

Democratic socialism also promised a solution to Jamieson's first and continued social commitment: the amelioration of women's secondary status. She remained active in non-political women's organizations including the LCW, the BPWC, the VWSC, the WILPF and the CCF Women's Council and she repeatedly requested legislation of benefit to women, especially women workers. Yet, she increasingly regarded the reforms sponsored by these female groups and the legislation introduced by government much as she had philanthropic activities two decades earlier: they were palliative but not permanent. She grew convinced that if women wanted true emancipation they would have to fight for more pervasive, fundamental social change and a system based on a whole new set of economic principles. The need for women to enjoy economic independence emerged as an important pre-requisite for sexual equality in her feminist ideology. Since economic independence could only be realized in a society with full production and full employment, it was
necessary to fight for socialism. Jamieson's 1946 political treatise on women and the CCF, *Women Dry Those Tears*, offers a penetrating look at the manner in which she incorporated her feminist ambitions into her socialist goals.

*Women Dry Those Tears* began with analysis of the impact of industrialization and capitalism on women's wage work status. Women, she claimed, were not really wanted in industry except as a supply of cheap labour. Traditional attitudes about women's nurturant function in the home were in part responsible for this position. But, she continued, it was the perceived threat to men's employment which was the most fundamental source of this discrimination and exploitation. The "too few jobs economy", according to Jamieson, was never challenged. She suggested therefore that although joining a union was a "first gesture which will dry those tears", the women of British Columbia and Canada could "dry those tears only by helping to elect a CCF government". "The inescapable fact is", she wrote, "that women workers need democratic socialism for a union can protect employees but cannot make jobs."

Reminiscent of early socialist theory, Jamieson further argued that capitalism had gone far towards destroying the family. Democratic socialism, on the other hand, by allowing all of humanity an equal share in the process and profits of production provided the basis upon which family
life was not only restored but went "forward to a better day".116 Jamieson concluded her work with a comment on Russia. In her view, it was that country's adherence to the democratic socialist principle of equality of the sexes which brought its women "so rapidly to equality with their men".117 Blinded, as were many western socialists to the contradictions between the theory and practise of sexual egalitarianism in Soviet society at that time, Jamieson accepted the teachings of her socialist ancestors and declared,

If women wish equality of opportunity in Canada, they will have to work for equal opportunity for all. In achieving it for all oppressed groups they will achieve it for themselves.118

Jamieson, like Gutteridge, subsumed the woman question into the socialist one.

But Jamieson's socialist feminism did not mirror that of the British "bloomer girl". Her concept of sexual equality -- the nature of her feminism -- varied appreciably from that of Gutteridge. As a result, the union she experienced between feminism and socialism was rather different. This distinction merits some acknowledgement.

Always resistant to outside pressures to conform, Gutteridge managed to balance both socialism and feminism because her incredibly strong will could not be dominated.
Her feminism, like her socialism, was not devoid of ambiguities and contradictions. For example, she sometimes argued that women's nurturant and humanitarian "nature" would contribute to a better, less destructive world. The choices she made in her own life and her absolute insistence that women, when rid of the serious disadvantages they often encountered at the start, were as capable in all fields of activity suggest, however, that she saw women's nurturance as acquired, not necessarily inherent. Having pulled herself up by her bootstraps, she refused to let myths and stereo-types interfere with the goals she stood by since childhood. She was herself not particularly nurturant and had proven that women could excel in traditionally "male" spheres, even one without middle-class advantages. Equality for Gutteridge meant unqualified equal status and opportunity in all areas of social, economic and political life. Her working-class roots and experiences had shaped strong egalitarian views.

Jamieson, on the other hand, had a very different conception of women's abilities and sexual egalitarianism. She constantly struggled to broaden the definition of women's sphere so that they could be accorded equal status and receive due recognition for their important contributions to society. But she never fully parted with the notion that women were inherently keepers of the hearth. Her middle
class, Christian values seem to have inspired a very gender-specific perception of power, influence and talent. Women's special abilities, she appeared to believe, lay in private and public activities which required mothering skills. She did not suggest that women be restricted to time-honoured tasks employing such skills. To the contrary, she argued for a significantly expanded use of women's abilities, including their penetration of previously closed, "masculine" arenas. Nevertheless, the equality she sought was founded on a theory of separation as well as equality. Moreover, though her papers contain strong critiques of the dynamics of patriarchy,\textsuperscript{119} she seems to have largely accepted notions about women's reproductive and nurturant talents. She failed to fully understand the implication of separate but equal roles on women's mobility and power and thus the dynamic of patriarchy itself. Instead, she sought status and power for women by exalting their nurturance. Their deep sense of humanity, she argued, was crucial to a healthy society. Her notes include this comment about Marx: "he was a child of his time".\textsuperscript{120} So too was Laura Jamieson.

Jamieson's personal challenge to conventions which restricted women's activities to the private sphere was consistent with her peculiar version of feminism. She acted out her philosophy by assuming roles which corresponded with public expressions of private housekeeping. Her experience
as a teacher, social worker, judge and politician working for social welfare reforms seems to have buttressed her conviction that women were emotionally and socially "superior" and thus better fitted for the social housekeeping of society. One straightforward indication of her acceptance of sex-typed roles was given in a remark she made on the chores within a cooperative boarding house she organized during the Second World War. "It is more difficult to find suitable work for men", she said, "[although] there is always the furnace in the winter and the lawn in the summer." Her acceptance of distinct male/female roles and of the idea that women were morally superior was also evident in a lecture delivered to the Vancouver Women's School for Citizenship. She began with "men are not women's equals in many fields" and continued.

In the field of physical activity and the industrial sector men's achievements were superior; but in the realm of nursing, social work, and care for children, women are supreme. In the creative fields of science and art men still hold sway, though women were rapidly gaining in literature. There was one field not sufficiently recognized as such; that was organizing the household, caring for the family and seeing that all members of the household lived together in harmony. In this women excel. The significance of this achievement in a world torn with strife should be proclaimed and this ability set to work in all group life. This is a man-controlled society. Men's predominant instinct was for struggle and
competition. In women the predominant instinct is maternal and humanitarian. This quality was of such supreme value that it makes women potentially superior to males. 122

Notable within Jamieson's papers are references to George Bernard Shaw whom she much admired. Her approach to the question of women's subordination to men suggests that she shared his conception of equality. In the above speech she attempted, like Shaw, to instill in women pride for their essential but underappreciated work. Her claim that women's maternal and humanitarian instinct made them superior to men differs little from Shaw's suggestion that women's reproductive and maternal role "gives them a power and importance that...men cannot attain at all." 123 As Shaw's, indeed as that of many middle class Canadian feminists of this period, Jamieson's feminism can best be described as "maternal feminism". Of course, one sharp distinction does exist between she and the great majority of her middle class sisters: she married her maternal feminism to socialism.

Maternal feminism, it can be argued, does not fundamentally challenge the dynamics of patriarchy. Jamieson's feminism was consequently more compatible with the CCF's priorities than the more radical feminism Gutteridge espoused. The CCF did not have to promote a radically changed family structure or an equal distribution of reproductive as well as productive responsibilities which a
feminist struggling for absolute equality might demand. Rather promises that a good life and success founded on cooperative principles and full employment would occur, that women would be assured an equal place in the labour force if they so desired, and that each individual would receive due recognition for his or her contributions were sufficient. The family, in her view, would emerge as a healthier, stronger unit and women as important, recognized contributors to a just and sane world.

Thus, although for very different reasons, like Helena Gutteridge, Jamieson was able to balance her feminism and socialism without the experience of serious turmoil. She never shied away from feminist issues, was proud to stand out as a woman's advocate, remained extremely active in women's groups both within the CCF and outside it and did not appear to compromise to any significant degree one set of principles for the other. Her maternal feminism did not encourage conflict or confrontation.

Yet, maternal feminism in itself cannot explain the balancing of both commitments. While facilitating a more comfortable union between class and gender ambitions, there was still considerable room for a subordination of feminist aspirations. Party pressures to prioritize the class struggle were certainly not easily ignored. What then
explains the relative balance Jamieson found between feminist and socialist goals?

One very plausible answer to this question appears to lie in Jamieson's motivation for and approach to public life and political activism. Like Gutteridge, she was finally more interested in and concerned about issues and causes than the organizations which promoted them or the personal benefits of such advocacy. Party politics like political prominence, were less important to her than individual policies which she felt would lead to the establishment of equitable resolutions. Of course, party politics were critical to the development of fair and effective policy. But she was out for the best, democratic route and left the strategizing and politicking to others who enjoyed the intrigue and "sport". She was consequently less vulnerable to the attractions of short-term political gain for herself or for the party and thus to party pressures to conform. Highly principled, it was difficult to convince her of the need to sacrifice one cause for another. In this manner, Jamieson closely resembled her British-born colleague, standing out as an independent charting what she saw as a democratic course for both women and workers alike.

When Laura Jamieson died in 1964, Vancouver newspapers carried articles which spoke of the respect she earned within the CCF and the larger Vancouver community. In one
obituary headlined: "Laura Jamieson is Dead but the Unquenchable Fire Burns On", its author reminisced, "I have seen her in the Legislature and in City Council. She was what all members of each claim to be but few are - a representative of the people". 124

A profound commitment to democratic principles and a strong thirst for social justice characterized the career of both Jamieson and Gutteridge. Their personalities varied considerably. They approached socialist and feminist questions significantly differently. The factors which contributed to their prominence within the CCF and within the provincial community were also distinct. Though struggling in the same ideological climate and facing similar gender-specific obstacles, they challenged time-honoured conventions in their own special way. Gutteridge stubbornly defied sex-role stereotyping; Jamieson chose to employ it for feminist ends. Particularly striking is the extent to which both these women translated into practice the theories and policy they argued for in public. Neither sought political power for its own sake alone. Sheila Rowbotham's observation about Olive Schreiner seems a fitting characterization of these women. Their commitment to the liberation of women and workers was not so much a political decision as part of their whole life and being. Gutteridge and Jamieson attempted to live as well as preach the spirit of coopera-
tion and equality socialists and feminists advanced, confident that in time their vision of sexual and class equality would be the norm.

The balancing of gender and class loyalties was not always as straightforward or successful as it appears to have been for Gutteridge and Jamieson. Dorothy Steeves and Grace MacInnis were unable to achieve the equilibrium their older CCF sisters found. As the following chapter reveals, the marriage between feminism and socialism which they accepted and practiced was not an equal partnership. The balancing of feminist and socialist priorities for these still more prominent CCFers was unrealistic and too costly.
When Grace MacInnis first met Gretchen Steeves, a Dutch immigrant, in 1932, she was impressed with Steeves' European "savoir-faire" and knowledge of a "great many things which didn't exist in Canada at the time". Steeves' sharp mind and strong public presence convinced MacInnis that this woman could win the respect of many. MacInnis' first impression proved correct. Upon the public platform, Steeves' keenly attuned intellect, penetrating style and broad education won considerable respect, including that of British Columbia's voters who in 1934 elected her to the provincial house. Steeves' political skill and flair proved most attractive to a young political party challenging the status quo. Francis Aldman of the Vancouver Province agreed, writing in 1936:

No other member of the legislature can match her brevity and forcefulness ... she is probably the most effective member in the present Provincial Parliament.²

Several years later, Aldman presented a similar assessment of another female MLA who likewise offered much to the
young CCF. This time Grace MacInnis received the commendation. He noted:

She is an instinctive politician, a tower of strength to the opposition ... it has been said that there is at least one opposing member who can take the wind out of their sails. Mrs. MacInnis is the equal of any and none are ever quite ready to engage in a battle of wits.3

As these observations suggest, Dorothy Gretchen Steeves and Grace Wiona MacInnis were a good match. Although of a milder disposition, and less aggressive in public approach, MacInnis possessed the very intellectual capacity, charismatic appeal, and political acumen she had so generously admired in Steeves. Equally important, she had the drive and courage necessary to exercise her talents. Indeed, like her CCF sister, once immersed in active politics she took to it "like a duck to water and never looked back".4

Colin Cameron, a close associate of both during the party's early history, once remarked to MacInnis: "You are like a guinea hen scratching around the Legislature while Gretchen Steeves is the peacock of the Legislature".5 Thriving on public controversy and debate, Steeves particularly relished the limelight. MacInnis, on the other hand, was content simply to participate in public dialogue and behind-the-scenes decision-making. Still, as this portrait
of their respective careers demonstrates through its delineation of their routes to power and its analysis of their views on socialist and feminist issues; the "peacock" and the "guinea hen" were fundamentally birds of the same feather.

The background and environment within which Steeves and MacInnis matured and the support both received helped them pursue dreams once limited to men. Childhood, youth and young adult experiences, while in many ways distinct, also contributed to common pictures including a similar approach to emancipated womanhood. Though philosophically in opposite camps within the CCF, the personal and political choices they each made throughout their careers also point to a number of similarities. These similar choices in fact largely account for their emergence as key figures in the leadership elite of the British Columbia CCF.

Dorothy Gretchen Biersteker was born on May 26, 1891, in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, the first of three children and only daughter of a Dutch physician and British School teacher. The Biersteker's enjoyed the traditions, prosperity and comforts of Dutch professionals and were thus able to offer their new daughter a secure and intellectually rich home environment. Household servants attended to the family's domestic needs, leaving ample time for cultural, recreational and above all, academic pursuits. Gretchen
took full advantage of her class privileges, developing a curious and critical intellect throughout her childhood and adolescence.\textsuperscript{6}

Like most upper middle class parents in Holland, the Bierstekers encouraged, indeed presumed, that all their children would receive post-secondary education. They made no distinction between their daughter and two sons. Gretchen thus followed the route of most wealthy and bright Dutch children, attending the classical "gymnasium" stream in high school and upon graduation, entering university. Her particular aptitude for complex analysis guided her to professional training in law and economics at the University of Leiden.\textsuperscript{7}

Gretchen's first exposure to feminism and socialism, not surprisingly, occurred during her law school days in Leiden. But with the exception of some organizational work in the women's movement, at that time, her interest in both causes was largely intellectual. Her appetite for organizational work and political activism developed, it seems, after graduation from university.

Graduation "cum laude" from the University of Leiden in 1916 paved the way to a new stage in Biersteker's young life: paid, professional employment. Shortly after receiving her law degree, she worked as a barrister for a law firm in Amsterdam. Her apprenticeship there, however, was short-
lived. A family move soon after took her to Den Haag (The Hague), Holland's capital and center of national government. But her work for a private law firm there was again brief. After only six months in the capital she was appointed to the Dutch Government's Wartime Prices and Trade Board, a position most appealing to a talented, ambitious and increasingly politically conscious young lawyer.

Employment in the civil service during the war years was indeed challenging. Gretchen's energies were nevertheless spent on more than her professional responsibilities. A growing concern with social injustice and an increasing appetite for public affairs, wetted in university, pushed Biersteker into political and social activism. She joined the Socialist Party of Holland as well as two other fast growing movements in the second decade of the twentieth century: the women's suffrage movement and the peace movement.

Her youthful enthusiasm for the socialist cause did not lead however, to an especially profound commitment to the party. As she later confessed, she was not at the time "politically-minded" and consequently not prepared to devote the time and energy whole-hearted participation demanded. When the adventure of party membership faded, so too did her zest for the work involved. She focussed greater attention on suffrage and pacifism. In fact, the Socialist Party's
endorsement of female enfranchisement influenced her decision to join party ranks. Yet, once again, her involvement in both, which was prominent enough to include public lectures, was not terribly systematic. She seemed little interested in pedestrian, but critical, routine political work. The opportunity to be on a platform and hold an audience's attention on issues she considered important held more appeal. Moreover, as with her approach to socialism, she appears to have supported these causes as an individual asserting her rights and concerns, not as a sister or fellow pacifist advancing a common, collective goal. Not until she was fully immersed in a more practical, less comfortable and less affluent world, did Biersteker seriously commit herself to the collective process of social change, to the cooperative building of a new social order.

The event most immediately responsible for Gretchen's move to an environment which was to nurture a more profound political, social and feminist consciousness, was that which altered the lives of not a few young Dutch women at the end of the Great War: marriage to a Canadian POW. The challenge of life with Rupert Steeves, a high school teacher from the vast and mysterious province of British Columbia, prompted Gretchen to give up her promising legal career and leave her birthplace and home of twenty-eight years. Unsure of what to expect, like most young war brides, she was carried on a
romantic cloud of excitement and new adventure. The adventure and challenge ahead, however, was not quite the kind the new Mrs. Steeves had anticipated. The "primitive cultural conditions" she witnessed during her endless train trek across Canadian cities, mountains, farms and wilderness disappointed the more sophisticated European. When she finally reached the coast in the winter of 1919, her enthusiasm was at best markedly circumscribed. Still more sobering was the notion that she alone was responsible for the domestic upkeep of her new Canadian home. Faced with tasks she had always counted on servants to perform and appliances like a wood stove "with no clue how you lit the damn thing", romance dissipated and reality set in with a vengeance.

Steeves' numerous letters to and from her family during her first years in Vancouver offer excellent glimpses of her difficult initiation into Canadian life. One complaint about Canadian housewives and domesticity, for example, drew this sympathetic reply from her brother Douglas:

I can really appreciate how you're having to get used to Canadian women -- still they are somewhat better than the Yanks I find! How unfortunate that you now have to do all the housework yourself -- bad luck, that's not your style.13

Another letter written to her mother shortly after her
arrival further encapsulates her dismay over the isolation and primitiveness of British Columbia culture. Particularly outstanding is the disdain and superior attitude she held towards women she viewed as slaves to a maternal and domestic identity.

After a brief but precise description of her tedious journey on the CNR, which included a stop over in Toronto "at the first civilized house I'd got to since I came to Canada ... where there were nice servants" and exposure to "real red Indians" and "cowboys" dirtier than those in Dutch movie theatres, she announced:

I shall start housekeeping without a servant but have a Japanese woman if I can a couple of times a week to clean up and earn some extra money if needs be myself to pay her. I'm not going to become a drudge like most Canadian women; they look either dowdy or flashy; there is not one simple aristocratic well dressed English women among them.14

Steeves' surviving friends and colleagues maintained that she never really lost the confidence and superior manner so clear in those early letters. But this tenacious, class-conscious "snob" of the 1920's did not remain an unhappy or reluctant resident for long. Well developed social skills which easily attracted new acquaintances and friends, a sense of humour which dismissed unsuccessful attempts at domesticity and an ability to meet and surmount new challen-
ges hastened the adaptation process. Along the way, as will be seen, she underwent considerable transformation in her personal values and social goals. But true to her vow, Steeves did not become the household drudge she despised.

Household management took up much of Steeve's first few years in Canada. Nevertheless, her daily activities were not restricted to the home. To the contrary, she maintained an unusually active role in the community and for a brief time in the wage labour force. Shortly after her arrival in Vancouver, for example, she found employment as legal advisor to the Dutch Consulate. She also "busied" herself in a number of women's organizations including the University Women's Club of Vancouver, the Vancouver Local Council of Women, and the International Women's League for Peace and Freedom, joined the League of Nations' Society, lectured on cultural and international affairs around Vancouver, and entertained left-wing theatre and study group sessions.15

The birth of her son, Hughie, approximately a year after her arrival in Canada terminated her wage work.16 She continued her active interest in voluntary cooperative bodies, however, always with an eye to greater public activity once free of early child-care responsibilities. From 1926 to 1929, for example, she served on the Point Grey Town Planning Commission,17 aware, perhaps, that such work would train her for larger community and social planning.
Steeves' relatively affluent Dutch upbringing and education made her receptive to a broader definition of women's roles. Her mother's influence and encouragement also appears to have played a critical role in her defiance of Victorian conventions restricting women's activities to the private domain. Throughout Gretchen's early activity in suffrage and politics in Holland Mrs. Biersteker supported her daughter much to her husband's consternations and disapproval. As Steeves once explained, "mother was always on my side". Nor did it end with her immigration to Canada. Biersteker repeatedly encouraged a resumption of professional work. Her first letters, while speaking with pleasure and a hint of amusement at her daughter's progress in domestic skills and "jam-making" subtly but consistently suggested that a return to the legal arena seemed somewhat more fulfilling.

Rupert Steeves' or "Steevie's" attitude towards his wife's numerous public activities during the first decade of their marriage is not well documented. Gretchen's correspondence with her family does note his expectation that she assume domestic responsibilities. The hiring of servants was beyond the means of a high school teacher. The assumption of household chores was outside a husband's role. There is no evidence to suggest, however, that Steevie disapproved of Gretchen's increasing public commitments. To the contrary,
he appears to have supported and to a certain extent shared in these activities. Both Mr. and Mrs. Steeves hosted, for instance, the left-wing study and theatre groups which frequently met in their home. Moreover, it seems likely that without his cooperation Steeves would have found the balancing of her private and public roles considerably more arduous than her papers suggest, especially during the second decade of their marriage when she plunged whole heartedly into the political arena.

The devastation of the stock market crash in 1929 shocked many progressive thinkers into action. Gretchen Steeves was among them. An initial response was to help transform the informal left-wing study group she belonged to into a more formal organization called the League for Social Reconstruction. Like similar groups forming across the country at the time, the LSR was composed of left-wing and progressive intellectuals and academics interested in a solution to the social and economic chaos of the Depression. The first meeting of the Vancouver-based group was held in the Steeves' home.

Driven to take action, during the first year, LSR members met frequently, sometimes three or four times weekly to discuss various committee work. When the CCF was formed a short while later, it was evident, as Steeves recollected years later, that "it [the CCF] was the answer". To
prepare for affiliation, in 1932, the LSR transformed itself into the Reconstruction Party. "Its platform was mildly socialist, but avoided the rigid Marxian terms of the Socialist Party". Affiliation, however, was neither immediate nor straightforward. Besides socialists and left-leaning progressives, the RP also contained "Social Creditors ... crypto-communists, four-pointers and others who flocked to the RP because it seemed like the best bet". It took a great deal of hard work, socialist education, and a weeding out process, therefore, to persuade the Socialist Party of Canada, founding member of the British Columbia CCF, of the RP's overall understanding of and commitment to socialist principles. At last, in 1933, the RP convinced the SPC and the two affiliated. Later that year, the RP further expanded its base through amalgamation with a loosely-knit group of left-wing reform clubs collectively called the CCF Clubs. Together they formed the Associated CCF Clubs of British Columbia, electing W.A. Pritchard as their first president. Finally, in 1935, almost two years after affiliation, the Associated CCF Clubs and the SPC of British Columbia merged to become the British Columbia section of the CCF, a full-fledged member of the federal party.

As key contributor to the organization of the RP and to its affiliation with the SPC, Steeves, along with two other RP colleagues, Mildred Ousterhout and Frank MacKenzie, was
invited to represent her group's interests at the first national convention in Regina in 1933. Her experience there was inspiring. From that point, there was no turning back. Soon after she launched her political career. A brief account of this trip is worthwhile.

After the exhausting 1500 mile drive to Regina in Steeves' aging car -- particularly trying since each tire went flat at various points along the rugged mountainous roads -- the party of three arrived, dusty and tired, but imbued with the fervour of witnessing history in the making. Rather awed by the theoretical and practical knowledge of many of her fellow delegates, Steeves' participation at the convention was low key or as she later described it "humble." The knowledge gained and contacts made, however, sparked a fire which continued to burn long after the convention concluded. She recalled:

The Convention was an invigorating experience for the newcomers to the movement, although it afforded a sobering insight into the complexities and difficulties which would plague the building of a socialist economy in a vast federal state of divergent traditions and problems.

The heated debates Steeves witnessed throughout the long summer days in Regina predictably left a lasting impression. Arguments, at times battles, over the most effective
strategy for social change, awakened Steeves to the complex business of policy planning and decision-making, particularly within a movement composed, on the one hand, of working class Marxists like Ernest Winch who argued for a complete break with capitalist principles and on the other, agrarian reformists like William Irvine who proposed a gradual and flexible adoption of socialist principles.²⁷ She soon realized that the CCF's passage to power, like the highway she travelled to Regina, would be rough, filled with obstructions and narrow passages. Too, it was quickly clear that a political career within the CCF would likewise be an arduous journey. But these sobering realizations, did not dampen her enthusiasm or her faith in the CCF's ability to surmount the obstacles ahead. Nor did they weaken her confidence in her own ability. Challenged to help create a strong and viable third-party alternative for British Columbia and Canada's citizens, she returned to Vancouver with Ousterhout and Mackenzie convinced, as Ousterhout remembered, "we were going to bring about great changes in our time."²⁸

Armed with the knowledge and insight she gained at the Regina Convention, Steeves did not remain "humble" for long. Almost immediately after returning from Regina she assumed organizational responsibilities in the provincial executive of the Associated CCF Clubs. Less than a year later, her obvious talents both in the legislative field and
on the platform led to her nomination in the November 1933 provincial election. Unsuccessful in this first attempt, she swallowed her disappointment vowing to try again at the next available opportunity. Such an opportunity arrived in July 1934 in a North Vancouver by-election. Almost eleven years of uninterrupted membership in the Legislative Assembly followed: in both the 1937 and 1941 provincial elections she was victorious, receiving an overwhelming majority in the latter.

Throughout Steeves' years in the Provincial House, Rupert Steeves played a relatively minor public role in her campaign efforts and political activities. He was a "good CCFer" but he preferred the challenge and politics of the educational arena, devoting most of his extra time and energy to the British Columbia Teacher's Federation. He served for several years on the BCTF executive, including the presidency. Thus, only on rare occasions did he attend events his wife was involved in. Nevertheless, Steeves' letters and papers indicate that his intellectual, emotional, and when necessary, economic, support was invaluable. His assistance with additional household and childcare responsibilities was especially welcome. Steeves reminisced, "I could have never worked in the CCF as I have, had it not been for his cooperation and patience with interference in his domestic comfort." Such cooperation and
support was not one-sided however. Steeves too considered and respected her partner's needs and choices. When he decided to return to military service mid-way through the Second World War, for example, she accepted his decision despite her deep-seated pacifism and despite the lengthy separation which followed. At other times, her cooperation and commitment to her husband went still further, taking the form of personal sacrifice. In 1952, she refused to run for a federal seat in a strong CCF riding. This decision stemmed, in part, out of loyalty to her North Vancouver constituents, but mostly out of concern for her husband's well-being. She spoke of this dilemma in a letter to her close friends, Dorothy and Colin Cameron.

I am in another dilemma now. Vancouver East has asked me to stand ... of course, Vancouver East would be a cinch, if other conditions were favourable, I should say yes, for I would rather be in the federal house. In the meantime there is Steevie to consider. He says go ahead and do what I want, but if he is still working I don't want to leave him here alone. The doctor says it might be a good thing for him to retire and of course if I had a job he could do that, but the point is that he doesn't want to as long as he can function at all --- he likes teaching, is well-loved where he is ... a light would go out if he retired before he was obliged to.31

Further correspondence both with her husband and with the Cameron's confirmed the mutual respect and devotion which
characterized the forty years of their marriage. Steeves' autobiographical notes contained this remark: "We both led very full lives and shared in each other's interests". Such partnership and respect were doubtless crucial ingredients in Steeves' indefatigable and frequently controversial political travels.

Steeves was an outspoken politician, respected and to some extent feared. As a socialist she had no tolerance for class privilege. As a strong, fiercely independent woman she also had little time for discrimination on the basis of her sex. Evidence of either in the house met with her wrath and as Bruce Hutchinson of the Vancouver Sun noted in his assessment of Steeves' maiden speech in the winter of 1935, her anger was not easily dismissed:

Mrs. Steeves dispelled the boredom which threatens the house with a flash of wit, a certain feminine charm, a penetrating satire, sharp as a razor and a burst of indignation such as we have seldom heard. Mrs. Steeves, whatever you may think of her economics, is now definitely established as a figure in provincial politics and is certainly the most formidable politician in the opposition ... she can indulge in a bitterness which indicates that hell hath no fury like a woman in politics ... what Mrs. Steeves said was a well-bred sneer at everything, a cry from the depths, for make no mistake about the sincerity of her protests, the bitterness of her hate.32

Hutchinson's overall observations of Steeves' first address
were extremely astute. His words captured not only the style and personality which was to leave a lasting impression on all who crossed her path but also the intensity of commitment which had slowly blossomed in the years previous to her entrance into politics.

Most observers of Steeves' long years in the public's eye remember her love for the platform — her passion for a stage to express her views and an audience to absorb them. Many similarly often recall the sharp voice, at times filled with venom, which could easily intimidate those she challenged. Her friends and colleagues who knew her best, however, also remember her well-planned legislative contributions, the two most outstanding being her instrumental role in the introduction of housing cooperatives and Credit Union legislation. In 1937, for example, she introduced the first Credit Union Act, inspiring Harold Winch, the CCF's Provincial Leader, to call Steeves the "Mother of Credit Unions". Nor can these contemporaries forget her fight for better employment, education, and social welfare for the working class, her battle against racial discrimination, or her ceaseless championing of women's rights. One of her favourite bills for this period in fact called for the inclusion of domestic servants, "the most exploited class of workers", in minimum wage laws. She clearly had come a long way from the uppity warbride who first greeted Canadian shores.
Steeves' charismatic style, which appealed to both intellect and emotion, in part, accounted for her ability to shift her fellow MLAs. As Kenneth Nesbitt's column, "Day in the House", reported in 1945, "there is no doubt Mrs. Steeves is a convincing speaker, so convincing that she is just about the only CCFer who can make the Coalitionists shift uneasily". The genuine humanitarian component to her socialist and feminist perspective, however, also lent breadth and substance to her addresses. She knew how to manipulate an audience but she was also sensitive to the inhumanity of poverty, the cruelty of unemployment and the injustice of sexual inequality. She used her own reactions to move her audience, if not into action, at least to attention. On one occasion, she asked, "is it right that 100 corporations should dominate the life of Canada ... [when] Canadians are in a state of physical and mental slavery through fear of poverty". On another she challenged MLAs who, by glorifying motherhood, skirted the real issues surrounding the Deserted Wives' Maintenance Act. She announced, "you can't live off halos and halos are very ghost-like when it comes to feeding children off them".

Nor were her remarks restricted to home-based ills. Steeves shared her knowledge of and concern over international issues with the government and members of the house. Well versed in international law and economics, she really
shone when addressing these matters. Yet her "radical" opinions and what to many were shocking proposals on foreign policy also roused the greatest opposition. For though Steeves could champion a fairly moderate approach on domestic issues she largely rejected compromise on international matters. As a pragmatist she could accept the need for immediate domestic reform. But to cooperate with capitalist parties on international issues and policies would be to deny fundamental socialist principles. While others increasingly compromised, she steadily abandoned the Fabian socialism which inspired her early plunge into politics. As Jessie Wendels Winch aptly concluded, "with Gretchen it was a constant radicalization of her ideas". Together with Colin Cameron, Dorothy Steeves emerged as the intellectual leadership of the British Columbia CCF's left.

Within a very conservative legislative assembly and largely conservative province, Steeves ever more radical critique not surprisingly evoked considerable resentment and anger. Conservative hostility was especially blatant in 1939, when she and Cameron lashed out at all those supporting Canada's participation in World War Two, including, by that time, the CCF itself. In a house caught in the patriotic fervour of a war to "save democracy" Steeves' claim that,
The enemies of peace are not only the aggressor nations. They are the people who will not let go of their privileges... it is folly to think that we can denounce Hitlerism and then go back to the cut-throat international competition in our own country and without world revolution... 39

met with cries of treason and headlines such as that boldly printed across the front page of the Vancouver News Herald: "Premier Pattulo Threatens To Send Report To Ottawa As A Result of Speech That Brings Cries of 'Shame' From Both Liberals and Conservatives". 40 Harold Winch, CCF House Leader recalled that both she and Cameron "came within a hairline of being charged with treason". 41

Steeves' own response to the public uproar was one of mild surprise but not regret. She wrote to her husband,

I never thought my innocent little speech would cause such an uproar and if you read the account of what I actually said in the papers you will see that it isn't so bad although the headlines try to make the most of it. 42

This stubborn woman who ended her speech with "we must have a foreign policy of our own and not follow slavishly in the path of Great Britain" 43 remained, on the surface at least, loyal to the socialist principles underlying her words. Despite the CCF's National Council's support of the Canadian war effort and the negative publicity her statements
generally invited for the CCF, she refused to retract them. She reminded those provincial and national colleagues who questioned the political wisdom of her stance about the CCF's original disavowal of the imperialistic drives fostering warfare as outlined in the Regina Manifesto.

At first glance Steeves' "treasonous" opposition to Canadian participation in World War Two makes good sense. Her socialist principles and her youthful witnessing of World War One's devastation in Europe fed a pacifism she remained loyal to throughout her life. But her bold stance in the house and her growing alliance with the left-wing of the British Columbia CCF did not solely stem from long-held pacifism or a strict adherence to socialist doctrine. Political considerations also influenced her strategy. A letter written before her speech in Victoria, reveals that Steeves was a party to the discussions about CCF policy on the war in Ottawa. Yet, while there, she did not openly challenge the decision to support the Canadian war effort. On the contrary, she appears to have agreed with the federal stance. She wrote to her husband:
Tomorrow the actual debate on the speech from the throne begins. We are put in a very awkward position by Mr. Woodsworth whose pacifism is of the religious variety and who will not compromise in a cooperation with the government in war measures or even accept that Canada is in a state of war. He will vote against the throne speech and perhaps Grant McNeil and Rowe will join him, thus causing a split. It is unfortunate but cannot be helped.

Why, then, the sudden change of heart in Victoria?

A nagging commitment to pacifism and socialist doctrine no doubt contributed to a reassessment of her position. Two additional factors, however, deserve further consideration. First, many British Columbia CCFers were unhappy with the official decision in Ottawa. Steeves' North Vancouver constituents in particular appear to have been upset with the official party stance. They regarded CCF endorsement of the war effort as a departure from the Manifesto's principles. Steeves' sensitivity to constituency concerns and her awareness of their electoral clout, therefore, likely encouraged a re-evaluation of her public position. Her comfortable majority in the following provincial election certainly suggests that her controversial speech hardly alienated her North Vancouver supporters. Second, as noted, Colin Cameron, her very dear friend and closest political ally, staunchly opposed cooperation. His opposition was not of the "religious" variety but was in line with classical
socialist analysis of profit motives underlying war. Cameron's objections and arguments probably reminded Steeves of her own initial opposition. His influence and moral support, it seems reasonable to assume, prompted and reinforced Steeves' decision to speak out against participation.

A mixture of ideological, personal and political motives thus inspired Steeves daring message to parliament. She chose to risk negative repercussions because she believed she had more to gain, for herself, for the CCF, for the socialist cause. There were many within her party, on the other hand, who regarded her statements as neither astute nor beneficial to the party and its socialist goals. Some agreed that they were indeed treasonous, if not to the country, certainly to the CCF. Grace MacInnis, one of Steeves' strongest opponents on this matter, had this not uncommon reaction:

... in my opinion Mrs. Steeves' speech added to the impression already abroad that the CCF is divided on the war issue. If this was not the case why did she not present the National Council policy which she helped form in Ottawa? ... I believe that while Mrs. Steeves' speech was pleasing to many members of the CCF, it did considerable damage to our cause both within and outside the movement.47

In the interests of party unity, Steeves refrained from further public pronouncements on the war. Her cooperation, coupled with the otherwise high level of respect she pre-
viously won from both provincial and federal members eased somewhat the tension and division which had erupted. This awkward incident, however, marked the beginning of an uneasy relationship between Steeves and those who, like Grace MacInnis, held more moderate views. It also fore-shadowed the slow death of her Fabianism which in view of the increasing doctrinal moderation of the CCF, not only alienated Steeves from her once intimate friends but slowly isolated her from key decision-makers and decision-making within the provincial and federal CCF. Her reaction to World War Two and to the debate surrounding participation unleashed a radicalism which might have otherwise lay dormant. Her opposition to compromise thus marked a significant turning point in her political career.

Steeves rejection of compromise and her increasing impatience with what she regarded as "band-aid" solutions not surprisingly strengthened after the death of her 23 year old son during World War Two. The senseless waste of war and the urgency of social change suddenly hit home. Her already strong belief that repairs to the social system were not enough was confirmed. She still rejected violent revolution and insurrection as the route to socialism but she insisted that gradualism -- the "temporary" acceptance of a mixed economy-- would prevent any full realization of socialism. Once in power, socialists would have to see to it that a
full socialist state was built. After World War Two there thus emerged an even more aggressive speaker whose patience with powerful gradualists like Grace and Angus MacInnis in British Columbia or Michael Coldwell and David Lewis in Ottawa, grew thin. Her decade long battle against reactionary social forces outside the socialist movement spread to include her idea of reactionary forces inside it.

Steeves had two critical supporters in her campaign against reformist or what she viewed as reactionary tendencies in the CCF: her marriage partner, "Steevie", and her political partner, Cameron. The former offered her the moral support and love she needed, while the latter became her ideological soulmate. A short account of their respective impact on Steeves' growing radicalism seems in order.

Rupert Steeves, as noted, did not frequently involve himself in his wife's political work. Nor was he always around when she waged her political battles. Personal and career choices of both partners meant frequent sometimes lengthy separations. Physical separation, however, did not appear to weaken their emotional bond. One especially harrowing exchange with Angus MacInnis, for example, led Steeves to write this tribute about her husband's devotion and obviously crucial backing: "I wept over the letter Steevie sent, not because of Angus' behaviour but because of Steevie's love. My God, what does anything matter when you
have that rock to hold on to."50 His support on another occasion also touched her deeply. During an informal evening with CCF leaders, "Steevie" shocked those present with a biting comment on the inferior quality of the CCF leadership which, at that time, was dominated by moderates. Steeves wrote,

They looked as stunned as if the infant Jesus had suddenly materialized to tell them off. Steevie must agree with Dorothy [Cameron] that I am too soft, when we had departed he said to me that I was too forgiving as for him, he couldn't stomach them.51

Steeves clearly treasured these moments. When events and ideological clashes seemed overpowering, her husband's love and support doubtless rebuilt her confidence to forge ahead. Rupert Steeves was not her sole or even most critical backer however. Colin Cameron, seems to have played an even stronger role in her quest to radicalize the party. Her voluminous correspondence with Cameron chronicles both the events which fed her radicalism as well as the intellectual and emotional strength Cameron seems to have given her. Her letters are frank and revealing. They expose both her sensitivity and vulnerability as well as her tenacity and anger, evidence of the respect and trust she felt towards her friend. To Cameron, she could write freely of her ideological and political concerns, knowing, it seems,
that he would grasp both her overt strategy or critique as well as her underlying optimism or disillusionment. When she made this rather facetious remark about the CCF's "Program of Action", a precursor to the Winnipeg Declaration of 1956,

The gist of it is that the CCF 'can no longer go from defeat to defeat', would collapse if we lost the next election and that we must win whatever the cost. In that truly holy cause we must forget socialism, cuddle up with the small businessman, soothe people's fears about our revolutionary character etc. Oh yes, any members who sin by deviating from CCF policy in a public place is [sic] to be disciplined.52

she knew Cameron shared both her perspective and her pain.

It is clear that both men were critical figures in Steeves often draining struggle for power. They doubtless also helped her cope with falls from power, particularly in 1945, when the Liberal-Conservative coalition ended her decade-long membership in the house. She never again sat in the Legislature, nor returned to wage work. Her subsequent attempts to win election to the House of Commons, in 1949 and 1961, went down to defeat. These losses were no less disheartening, as she had long desired a seat in the federal Parliament.53

When the doors to provincial and federal parliamentary membership appeared closed, Steeves ran for civic govern-
ment. At one point, she won a seat on the Vancouver Parks Board, but her campaigns for city hall were unsuccessful. These electoral setbacks, however, did not weaken her commitment to socialist causes or the CCF. Refusing to retire, she turned her energy and attention to internal organizational work, becoming a leading member of the British Columbia Provincial Council. She served for instance as its vice-president in 1949 and president in 1950. She also sat on the National Council and devoted considerable amounts of time and attention to the editorship of the CCF News.

Within the narrower, yet still significant, arena of internal party politics Steeves seized all opportunities to move party policy and practice in a leftward direction. To "meet the demands of the common people", the party needed forthright socialist policies. Her editorials frequently criticized doctrinal moderation while her public addresses barely hid the contempt she felt for those advancing gradualist policies. Most distressing to the CCF's right-wing, however, was the leadership she and Cameron gave to a young group of dissidents in the British Columbia CCF. Calling and modelling itself after a left-wing faction in the British Labour party, the Socialist Fellowship, this group wished to "return to the basic principles of socialism".54

The immediate factor precipitating the group's formation in 1950 was the National Council's decision to support
Canada's membership in NATO and the subsequent Canadian dispatch of "peace-keeping" troops to Korea. Yet, as Steeves had earlier warned David Lewis, the CCF's National Secretary, "this divergence in foreign policy matters did not start with the N.A.P. It arose long before and I fear it will go to an issue which may tear us apart unless we can reach some compromise." In response to Lewis' inquiry over her support of the SF, Steeves argued that her "utterances on foreign policy had been an honest attempt to evaluate it from a socialist point-of-view". She further posited,

... it is better to allow people like Colin and myself who are vitally and honestly concerned with the future of the CCF to go ahead and trust them to give leadership with the purpose of keeping this movement together, than let people drift apart because they are confused and discouraged. You are going to kill the life of the CCF if you stop discussion and the clash of ideas. I don't need to tell you that B.C. people are not the only ones who have doubts. The trouble is that B.C. is more articulate than the rest of the provinces.

Many leading moderates regarded such statements as a convenient excuse for opportunistic behavior. They identified in her domineering personality and challenge to convention decisions a personal thirst for power. In contrast however, Steeves' letters to Cameron point to a considerable
sincerity and an honest attempt to promote fundamental socialist principles which she believed had been lost right off. In defence she insisted that the movement, not she, had changed. The CCF was becoming complaisant when it needed to be stronger than ever. A letter sent to Cameron in October of 1955 clearly illustrates her deepening disillusionment. She wrote in part,

Did you hear on Saturday a week ago the play about Joe Hill, the IWW leader on CBC, Focus... it was a shattering performance. I couldn't help weeping, thinking of the sacrificial and inspiring lives of the old working class leaders compared to our present stultification and complaisance.38

Steeves' anger and frustration manifested itself publicly in biting sarcasm, and more personally caused near despair. The socialist movement she had once hoped would change things in her time appeared to be approaching collapse. In another letter to Cameron and his wife Dorothy she confessed,

I feel utterly down. The CCF has become a ghost. If we got beaten through standing for something it wouldn't be so awful, but it is because we have no principles any more. Well, this is my last election. Let the rightists have it. I'm not going to stand for executive positions any more, let them all go to hell in their own way.59
Nevertheless, Steeves did not abandon ship. About a similarly "blue" letter she wrote, "I was very silly to send you that letter which was written at a bad moment. However, as you know, it is difficult to beat me down permanently". 60

The shift from the principles of the Regina Manifesto to the vague proposals of the Winnipeg Declaration of 1956 and finally to the CCF's transformation into the New Democratic Party in 1961 left, however, a deep scar on her once unshakeable faith.

The loss of close friends and the weakening of the fellowship she had enjoyed in the early years of the CCF was equally painful. In yet another letter to the Camerons she confessed,

... but it seems strange and I admit very painful to me that my old friends to whom I have given a great deal in friendship and hospitality during the past twenty years have not even tried to reason this out with me. 61

Steeves' aggressive, cutting manner and often "superior" air clearly did not invite understanding from her former friends. Her stubborn pride masked the hurt and desolation she experienced over her increasing isolation from the core of the party to which she had devoted over forty years of her life. In addition, many could not forgive her role in the building of a potentially destruc-
tive split in the CCF. After her husband died in 1960, in fact, there were few long-time friends around to help fill the gap his absence created. She spoke of her loneliness in another letter to the Camerons written shortly after Steevie's death.

God, for the first time I feel I wouldn't really mind if I woke up dead. This isn't despair for I really can enjoy myself lots of times, but just a realization that death isn't so bad, all resentment at the idea of being snuffed is gone.62

Having lost her husband, the "rock" she so dearly cherished, and the political prominence and confraternity she always relished, the fire which burned so brightly throughout her political career faded during her last years in the public eye. It was not entirely quenched, however: Steeves' strong faith and commitment to socialism would not allow complete resignation.63 Her writings on socialism continued and she took yet another stab at elected office in 1961. She also attended the opening Convention of the NDP and while critical of the new party's priorities64 renewed her membership until her death in 1978 at 87 years of age. Thus, despite moments of disillusionment and despair, she retained, to the end, a touch of optimism that democracy and peace would some day triumph.
The slow process of intellectual discovery Steeves underwent throughout the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s deepened her commitment to socialism. It also helped her discover the working class. When she wrote in her valuable biography of Ernest Winch that,

In the minds of farmers, industrial workers and so-called white collar class it was not the state of unemployment, vanishing markets and eroded prairie lands that really counted, when the slump (Depression) overtook them ... It was the mother of a family dying because medical help did not come quickly for relief recipients ... the unwanted boys eating their hearts out in relief camps and the old men in rotten city jungles. This was the stuff which ate into peoples brains and forced them to think ...  

she wrote as a sensitive advocate of the working class. As their advocate, she worked long and hard to defend and promote their rights. Steeves' support of workers in fact, appears to have taken precedence over the cause which initially attracted her to socialism: women's rights. She did not however, abandon feminist causes. Though her attention to class inequities overshadowed her attention to sexual discrimination, her legislative contributions, public addresses and work within women's groups suggests that feminism found a significant place in her personal and public quest for a new social order. Like most feminists of this period, her feminism was not devoid of ambiguities and contradictions,
the most outstanding being her disdain for most of the women within middle-class women's organizations. But her overall support of women's rights and her overall message to women paint a feminist identity which along with her socialist one deserves recognition.

Among the more straightforward illustrations of Steeves' commitment to women's emancipation were the many bills and resolutions she forwarded in the Provincial Legislature. In cooperation with her CCF colleagues particularly Jamieson and MacInnis, and at times non-socialist female members, she consistently championed such feminist causes as access to birth control, adequate child-care support and facilities, mother's allowances, compensation for deserted wives, equal pay for equal work and fair employment practices. As these demands suggest she stressed changes especially beneficial to working-class women. Lacking in education and struggling to make ends meet, they were doubly oppressed and thus unable to mount strong resistance. Yet Steeves did not simply speak as a female socialist understandably sensitive to the needs of working class women. Numerous speeches both inside and outside the Legislature testify that she also spoke as a determined feminist insisting upon women's fundamental right to full equality. One talk to the Vancouver BPWC, for example, strongly defended women's absolute right to expanded and equal social status and roles.
Women have the same physical, mental, and spiritual desires as men and demand to be freed from the ancient taboos and superstitions being used against them. Among other things they are demanding that the supreme function of motherhood be recognized by the state and maintained throughout the duration by that institution; to undertake any kind of work according to their ability.68

Of course, women's ability to undertake "any kind of work" was not simply a matter of social recognition of their skills. Ending her speech with "I doubt whether, logically speaking, the capitalist system can give women the opportunity they desire"69 she agreed with generations of socialist feminists that the liberation of women necessitated the restructuring of society. This socialist feminist conviction was still more forcefully argued in a speech to the CCF Saanich Club almost a year later.

Headlined in the Victoria Times as "Women Would Get Hold Of Their Freedom: No Longer Wage Slaves And Slaves Of Men", Steeves followed nineteenth century socialist thinkers like Engels and Bebel, tracing women's position in primitive communism when women were "on equal terms with men", through slavedom and serfdom when women's vital role in the house-
hold was supplanted, to Christendom when women suffered an even greater degradation, "being the embodiment of sin". 70 Steeves' account of the impact of the industrial revolution was similarly derived. While bringing women back into production, capitalist economics left women with nominal rights and a still dependent status. Socialism, on the other hand, by redistributing wealth and ensuring fair and equal economic opportunities for both men and women would ensure economic independence and thus freedom from stifling dependence on men. "No longer would women's actions be governed by economic necessity." 71 It was thus crucial that women assist men solve the social question. In this manner, Steeves blended her socialist and feminist identities. She went somewhat beyond the classics on the woman question, however, with a conclusion challenging the sanctity or inherent nature of women's reproductive role. She maintained,

No longer forced into the fierce competition of the capitalist world ... they would choose the vocation they liked. Every woman was not born a mother; some preferred other pursuits to the caring of children and cooking for a husband. Those who liked the task of homemaking would care for their neighbours' children as well as their own at centers specially set aside for the purpose. Expert training would avoid the psychological maladjustment which children experience in many homes today. Housework itself would be made much easier
because everyone would be furnished with labour saving devices.72

Never particularly satisfied with the domestic role she herself assumed during her son's early childhood, Steeves' understandably emphasized a welcome escape for women whose goals did not include motherhood. She recognized the social importance and skill of child-care and household management. But she wanted a society capable of offering to women significantly broader alternatives -- a "fuller life". To "men who viewed with alarm the coming of women out of the home" she responded, "too much concentration on the home, the family and children is not a good thing ... the modern mother was not less satisfactory than the silverhair among the golden variety".73 By raising questions about women's reproductive role she moved beyond most nineteenth century socialist thinkers and twentieth century maternal feminists who were not prepared to tackle this delicate subject. She adopted, therefore, a comparatively radical perspective, believing that technical innovation and institutional childcare, in concert with the eradication of capitalism, would allow women an equal partnership in the wage workplace and in the running of society.

Attitudinal changes naturally went hand in hand with these practical steps to sexual equality. Without major ideological shifts, the introduction of socialist measures
would hardly free women from second-class citizenship. "Women of today", Steeves posited, "were not only wage slaves but in a measure slaves of men as well ... enslaved on all sides by social as well as economic conditions". Women therefore had to challenge century long myths and assumptions about the feminine mystique. "It is up to women if they want their future freedom -- that emancipation which they have not -- to make up their minds to solve the problem".

Steeves' mind, of course, had long been made up. From young adulthood to senior citizenship she individually and collectively challenged sexual stereo-types and discrimination. Her penetration of time-honoured male preserves of power, her advocacy of legislative change, and her participation in women's groups attest to her long-time gender battle. She found individual challenge to sexual injustice, however, considerably easier than cooperative feminism. Although planting both feet in a number of women's organizations, ranging from the relatively influential, Vancouver Local Council of Women to a member group of the CCF Women's Council, the Vancouver Lyceum Club, with few exceptions, she failed to develop strong intellectual or emotional ties with the middle-class women these groups housed. In short, she never felt at home in women's organizations.
Steeve's hesitant sisterhood stemmed in part from her strong identification with socialists and a party ideologically opposed to middle class or "autonomous" movements. She likely experienced external, as well as self-imposed, pressures to prioritize socialist goals which, after all, incorporated female emancipation. But it was not so much the staunch socialist as it was the intellectually superior woman, or in contemporary terms, "Queen Bee", who found wholehearted participation in the middle class women's movement difficult. The comparatively narrow, inexperienced, and maternal views of many of its representatives then, endlessly, at times understandably, frustrated and irritated the intellectually advanced, politically astute, and relatively undomestic Steeves. She was capable of considerable warmth towards working class women burdened with daily survival. She had little patience, however, with women whose class advantages, in her view, facilitated upward mobility and broader concepts of women's role and social change.

Having made her own way to the top of the ladder, Steeves was unable to recognize the discrimination which made it difficult for many middle-class women to even climb the first few rungs.\(^76\) She was unwilling to investigate either the more subtle structural barriers impedance women's rise as public and political actors in their own right or
attitudinal obstacles to consciousness raising, obstacles which she herself obviously did not entirely escape. She chose rather to patronize and dominate those who fitted her image of weak and passive femininity and in the process win their personal and political support. Such paternalism and opportunism was especially blatant in a diary she kept throughout 1938 and 1939. About three LCW meetings she noted,

... 10:30 meeting of sub-committee on taxation and constitution proceeded harmoniously and fell in with my idea, not having many of their own. Her [Mrs. Smith] views are extremely narrow and the majority of women don't know what it's all about poor dears ... the other women, of course [are] very woosey in their ideas and are anyone's meat for persuasion."

Even more distressing to Steeves were women who, although penetrating traditionally male political chambers, still refused to challenge male political thinking. Male thinking, together with capitalist ambition, she insisted, created the social and economic chaos of society. As the Vancouver Sun reported on an address she gave to a Victoria audience on the eve of World War Two,
When men have made such a mess of things she couldn't understand why her own sex didn't do some political thinking of their own instead of slavishly following masculine footsteps. 78

Beneath this forthright challenge to patriarchal thinking were serious reservations about the abilities of members of her own sex. These reservations largely precluded lasting intimate relationships with women, leading one of her female contemporaries later to suggest,

Gretchen didn't particularly like women. She wanted to deal with what seemed to her greater, more fundamental issues. There weren't many women at her intellectual level or who would be as forthright as she was. She didn't have as much in common with women as she did with men. 79

The exceptions were those women whom she saw as rejecting both capitalism and imprisoning dependencies on male power and authority. Paradoxically, her relationships with women frequently reflected the stifling expressions of male power and authority she abhorred.

It is clear that throughout her career, Steeves courageously defied sexual stereotyping and doggedly advocated major, comparatively radical, structural and attitudinal changes. She was a socialist feminist who believed in a dual battle against class and sexual discrimination and she attempted to wage both. Her commitment to the latter cam-
campaign, however, was circumscribed by an inability to identify with or relate to the majority of women she encountered. In fact, she never really lost her youthful disdain for women who lacked her sophistication, intellect, and worldly experience. As a result, her discovery of women, unlike her discovery of workers, was not terribly profound. Her loyalty to the CCF and socialist causes was thus predictably deeper than that to a movement composed of women with whom she felt few intellectual and emotional bonds. Her intellectual recognition of both a class and gender struggle was in practice flawed by a relatively shallow allegiance to cooperative feminism and a vision of emancipated womanhood which fell short of her vision of emancipated workers. The "peacock" of the British Columbia Legislature, was first and foremost a dynamic and confident spokesperson for the working class. Her feminist identity, though significant, was pale beside her socialist one. Socialism also came first for the "guinea hen" of the British Columbia legislature. Like the "peacock", she forged new paths for women, advanced women's rights and assisted feminist campaigns. But her political activities and choices, to an even greater extent perhaps, reflected a preference for socialist fellowship and goals and a flight from a really profound identification with women's groups and women's causes.

Grace Wiona MacInnis' active political life, like that
of Steeves, began during the Depression with the birth of the CCF. The motivation was, however, different. No burning desire and confidence in her ability to help create a new social order drew her into the political arena. On the contrary, she was making a second start after two highly unsatisfactory years in the teaching profession which had considerably dampened her confidence and enthusiasm. In MacInnis' case, the passion for public life and social change developed after the leap into politics, not before. Work for a newborn, left-wing party during the Depression provided her with the opportunity to discover her true character.

MacInnis' interest in socialist politics, while first finding formal expression during the Depression, was perhaps inevitable. Born on July 25, 1905, to James Shaver and Lucy Woodsworth, she spent the next twelve years of her life in North Winnipeg, a community which offered a sound education in social inequities and injustice. Her father's management of the Methodist All Peoples' Mission there awakened Grace at an early age to the difficult lives of the city's poor. She also found inspiration in the tireless assistance and support her parents gave to those who seemed otherwise forgotten. This experience did much to nurture the sense of social responsibility fundamental to the development of her socialist philosophy. As she later
remembered, her parent's work provided "the influence that really shaped my life as to the acceptance of social responsibility".81

Another set of incidents during these childhood years also profoundly affected her subsequent social outlook. These were the folding in 1916 of the Canadian Welfare League, her father's subsequent dismissal as its secretary because of his public objections to World War One, and his imprisonment in 1919 over his support of workers during the Winnipeg General Strike.82 Both incidents roused, as little else could to a loyal daughter, awareness of legal and social injustices within Canadian society.

These family crises, Woodsworth's Christian socialism which her mother Lucy closely shared, and the political model her father presented soon after the Winnipeg General Strike registered strongly on MacInnis. Yet, throughout her high school, normal school and university years, she shied away from really active political involvement. With the exception of membership to the Junior Labour League during high school, involvement on debating teams at the University of British Columbia and the University of Winnipeg,83 and occasional attendance at Sunday meetings of a small socialist study group during her year at the Sorbonne in Paris, she concentrated instead on her primary goal at the time: the successful completion of her studies. MacInnis believed
that if she divided her energies among several activities, she would excel in none. If she was to give her all, choices had to be made.

MacInnis' high expectations and single-minded determination to excel in her chosen activity made the acceptance of mediocrity or failure extremely difficult. She was thus in for a rude awakening when after her return from Paris she experienced an unsuccessful teaching stint in a Winnipeg high school. Her inexperience and inability to meet a self-imposed, unrealistically high standard of teaching pushed the young teacher to a point of near physical and emotional collapse. After two discouraging years in the teaching profession, she had had enough. It was time to rest and reconsider career alternatives. Her parents' home in Winnipeg provided a welcome refuge.

Recognizing his daughter's need for stimulation and useful work after her teaching nightmare, J.S. Woodsworth invited her to work for him, on a voluntary basis, in Ottawa in 1932. Now rested and anxious for a change, Grace accepted and left for the nation's capital. Any anxiety she might have experienced over the fact that her father and new employer was national president and parliamentary leader of the CCF quickly dissipated. Nor did the lack of monetary renumeration seem to worry her much. Her new world of politics was immediately fascinating, far more suited to her
personality and goals than the teaching of French to disinterested high school students. She believed in the party and soon began to believe in herself again. She was also aware that the salary normally paid for the voluntary services she rendered could not have replaced an invaluable political apprenticeship built into her activities there. As well, in her new environment, the socialism she had previously left undeveloped deepened and matured, igniting the drive responsible for her rise to political prominence.

When the eldest Woodsworth child finally did immerse herself in political life in 1932 then, it was with fresh enthusiasm, new found confidence and single-minded drive. Her attention to the party and cause was undivided. At first she worked for her father behind-the-scenes, beginning with the distribution of Hansard, writing pamphlets about the CCF platform and writing weekly articles for a host of left-wing publications. She gradually assumed duties and responsibilities for the entire federal CCF caucus eventually emerging as their honorary national secretary or "Joe Girl" as she modestly labelled herself. But before long, she stepped into front-line activity. According to MacInnis, her marriage to Angus MacInnis, popular MP from Vancouver South, in 1933, accounted for this rapid move into the foreground and onto the speaker's podium. Her natural talent, quick mind, and obvious compassion, however, ensured
her presence there for many years to come.

MacInnis' first opportunity to speak came during a speaking tour she and her husband of four days made to promote the CCF in 1933. Her initiation was very thorough. During an arduous whistle-stop train journey from Ottawa to the Pacific, the MacInnises greeted forty-five different audiences in as many days. Grace had not originally intended to speak. When pressed to do so by members anxious to hear the daughter of the CCF's founder and "prophet", she was "scared to death and reluctant". With Angus' encouragement, however, she ventured forth to afternoon meetings on her own and evening meetings in company with her spouse.

MacInnis found afternoon gatherings, intended for women whose household "occupation" precluded participation in the evenings, both informative and enjoyable. Participants were very responsive to social welfare issues. She found, in fact, that they seemed far more adventurous than their male relatives when discussing pensions, social security, and measures which would ease the burden of daily survival. MacInnis' recollections of this first trip, however, dwell more on the mixed evenings. Their exchange of ideas, controversy and debate finally held the greater appeal. This response foreshadowed her consistently stronger identification with mixed rather than predominantly female cooperative bodies.
Upon reaching the west coast, MacInnis' world broadened further as a result of her introduction to her husband's largely working class constituency. For Grace, these people possessed "quite a different psychology" than the middle class professionals and academics with which she had previously been involved. Although she would never abandon the humanitarian, Fabian, approach completely, her closer contact with people from the "other side of the tracks" strengthened her commitment to the class struggle and to some extent radicalized her reformist tendencies. She would proudly boast that of the electors who signed her nomination papers for the Vancouver-Kingsway riding in the 1941 provincial election "there wasn't one university graduate among the lot".

MacInnis' trip to British Columbia also marked a return to the province she had spent most of her adolescent years. Socialist friends her parents had made during their approximately four year sojourn there, such as the Winches and Oosterhouts, gladly welcomed her to Vancouver. Angus' friends and colleagues also gave her a warm welcome, initially responding to her as his wife and the daughter of J.S. Woodsworth. It was soon clear to them, however, that this determined member of the CCF deserved their respect as an individual, not simply as a relative of two prominent leaders. Thus, the contacts MacInnis needed for political support later on were easily accessible.
Since Vancouver was to be the MacInnis' headquarters for at least half of the years Angus held federal office, MacInnis wasted little time in familiarizing herself with B.C.'s policy and concerns. She soon participated in SPC decision-making and, with Angus, attended the Regina Convention as their representative. Her experience there appears to have been a rewarding one for, as Steeves graciously admitted years later, MacInnis "made a vigorous contribution to the debates". After her return from Regina, she became active in constituency executive committees, spoke to CCF clubs and women's organizations, and at times represented Vancouver on issues of special interest to her, such as the February 1939 national conference on housing held in Toronto. Before long, her organizational and speaking skills won the respect of many fellow CCFers. Persistent requests to run for office followed but she did not consent until almost a decade after she first entered the political realm. Three reasons for her hesitation stand out.

To begin with, as MacInnis has explained in several interviews since, during the 1930s, both in Ottawa and in British Columbia, she was already performing what she regarded as important and challenging work. She had no strong desire for public prominence other than that she already enjoyed. Secondly, and perhaps more crucial, she
considered her husband's career, then in full swing, more important to the CCF. Her relative youth and inexperience left her somewhat in awe of his knowledge and popularity. At the same time her election to provincial office would mean lengthy separations for them and thus a considerable reduction in the time and assistance she could offer him. This was critical. For apart from the emotional support and intellectual dialogue they shared, MacInnis had also become her husband's language and literary-style tutor.95

Forced to labour on the family farm after only four years of schooling, Angus' parliamentary speaking and writing skills were much in need of polish. With a good deal of tact and patience Grace helped her husband overcome this disadvantage. She knew that once able to articulate his "original" ideas in a more academic, educated fashion his parliamentary effectiveness would increase. In retrospect, she believed it did.96

Such assistance to her spouse, however, was not entirely selfless. Although she did sacrifice early career opportunities, she also gained much from her close work with Angus. He generously shared his ideas, his encouragement, and his political and platform experience, including his wife in all his activities and never asking or expecting her to assume a traditional "politician's wife" role. "He wanted me to become", MacInnis recalled, "a person in my own
right’. If she did show signs of deference he would respond, "for heaven’s sake, don't make a doormat out of yourself". Their simple domestic life and their decision not to have children similarly reflected the reciprocity of their support and respect for each other. This partnership lasted until his death in 1963. Nevertheless Angus' dependence on Grace and reluctance to have her leave for the provincial house, her respect for his feelings and career, and her own hesitation mitigated against an earlier drive for office.

A final explanation for her almost decade long wait to run for office can be best described in her own words.

... what played a very big part was that the Depression was very, very bad and I felt and he felt and I guess public opinion felt too that it was very wrong where there was a good salary for a woman to engage in paid activity when there were so many men that weren't getting enough to live on.

Since her husband's salary satisfactorily met their joint needs, MacInnis viewed as selfish any possible salary as an MLA. She was unable to escape the pervasive social climate which discouraged such activity for women. Besides, as she put it, "I did what I wanted to do on a voluntary basis ... it didn't make any difference to me that I didn't have the money".
By 1941, with Angus' career less demanding, the Depression abated by war-time production and many Canadian men called to European battlefields, the time was ripe for MacInnis to try for political office. The CCF, moreover, was in need of strong and competent candidates. Grace was an obvious choice. Their decision proved a good one. In the fall of 1941, she was elected to the British Columbia legislature for Vancouver-Kingsway, there joining Steeves and Jamieson. At thirty-six years of age, this youngest MLA favourably impressed her fellow members, the media and the public.

Throughout her three year term which, as with Steeves and Jamieson, ended at the hands of the notorious Liberal-Conservative coalition of 1945, MacInnis concentrated on many of the same issues addressed by her two colleagues. Her ideas on socialist economics, human rights, living conditions, especially housing and nutrition, and women's rights joined theirs echoing off the walls of the Legislature. Like her CCF sisters, MacInnis also made clear her stand on international issues; there were, however, differences of opinion between MacInnis and Steeves. Their clash over foreign policy brought to the fore different approaches to the process of political and social change, and as noted earlier, ultimately placed them on opposite wings within the CCF. In turn, their considerable influence within each camp
made them major antagonists in the battle. Needless to say, early intimacy between MacInnis and Steeves was destroyed in the process.102

MacInnis addressed in her maiden speech of January 1942 the issue which was perhaps the greatest, although not the single, source of controversy within the party and between MacInnis and Steeves: Canada's participation in international conflict. To be sure, Woodsworth's daughter, she emphasized the building of civilian morale through adequate social services, rather than military and Imperial affairs. Nonetheless, she did endorse Canada's involvement in World War Two: "the people of Canada, we feel, are fighting this war so that democracy might be born". Steeves, as we have seen, rejected this reasoning. For MacInnis, however, the decision to support the war effort came only after considerable investigation and even greater soul-searching. She often recalled subsequently that this decision was the most difficult choice she made throughout her long public life.103 The following discussion captures, in brief, considerations which precipitated her change of mind.

At the onset of World War Two, MacInnis maintained her long-held conviction that war was morally unjustified, tenaciously opposing her husband at meetings and in speeches. Evidence of fascism's mounting power in Europe, however, caused her to have second thoughts about her unbending
pacifism. She could not forget the impassioned plea for a united front against fascism made by a Spanish patriot during the 1936 British Labour Party convention nor ignore reports of Hitler's growing campaign against democratic institutions. News of the Nazi over-run of Czechoslovakia and the embargo placed on Italian oil broke the last of her resistance to the acceptance of Canadian participation in the allied struggle. Soon after the Italian crisis, she endorsed the Canadian government's policy. Her account of how knowledge of these frightening events in Europe influenced her decision to support the war effort is worth noting. In a recent interview she explained,

She [the Spanish patriot] showed how awful it was in Spain when they were trying to preserve the bit of democracy that they had achieved, that countries like our own and Britain and the U.S. would not help them at all -- this stand-aside position, you see. Well, that made me think hard ... and then I watched one country after the other being run over by the Nazis and in every case what was killed were the trade unions, and then they went on to the professional organizations and the civil liberty things and they went on to destroy all the vestiges of what had been built up over so many centuries.

This painful retreat on total pacifism was justified as the only realistic method of preserving the other principles MacInnis also held dear: democracy and equality. Once convinced of the need for Canada to do its share, she made her position clear in public appearances and writings. In part-
icular, she made the popularizing of the National Council's decision a priority, hoping thus to quieten harmful rumours about a B.C. split over the war. When her own criticism of opponents to the National Council was greeted by accusations that she herself was inviting rumours of dissension, she was quick to respond. In a letter written to the Women's Lyceum Club, a member of the CCF Women's Council, she defended her attack on anti-war speeches by Steeves. First of all she reminded them that her criticism had been private. She also outlined several reasons for her critique:

When asked what I thought of Mrs. Steeves' speech I expressed freely my belief that it was unwise for several reasons: the Provincial Legislature has little or nothing to do with the conduct of war ... in speaking as she did Mrs. Steeves gave the B.C. government a perfect alibi for avoiding its real job ... although Mrs. Steeves spoke vigorously against the war, she presented no policy of any kind for people to follow when actually involved in war as is the case at the present time ... in my opinion Mrs. Steeves' speech in itself added to the impression already abroad that the CCF is divided on the war issue. If this was not the case, why didn't she not present the National Council policy which she helped form in Ottawa? ... I believe that while Mrs. Steeves' speech was pleasing to many members of the CCF, it did considerable damage to our cause both within and outside the movement.

Another challenge by a member who suggested that the National Council's stance fell short of the teachings of its
leader elicited this response:

This is not a black and white world where we can say "this is so or that is right". It is a grey world. We can follow the teachings of those who have gone before us but we can change our own beliefs as we see them, if we are true to our own thinking in 1942. J.S. Woodsworth washes his hands of the present situation but that does not mean those who follow his principles do not change their ideas. 108

MacInnis' call for flexible thinking here as well as her arguments to the Women's Lyceum Club illuminated two significant characteristics of her political personality and socialist goals. These were her very pragmatic approach to CCF policy and her profound commitment to the survival and success of the party.

In Steeves' eyes, this pragmatism represented a fatal compromise with liberal thinking. Aware of her opponents influence on policy, she saw MacInnis' endorsement of flexibility and gradualism as a threat to the realization of principles laid down in the Regina Manifesto. In turn, for MacInnis, Steeves' position reflected an "uncritical acceptance of Marxism". 109 While with Steeves, she strongly objected to capitalist economics and values, arguing in 1939, for example, that these were responsible for "this story of human misery, degradation and waste", 110 like her father and husband, she believed that given the conservative
nature of the Canadian worker and general public, gradualism or evolutionary socialism was the only realistic route to cooperative commonwealth.\textsuperscript{111} Social-democratic countries such as those in Scandinavia were on the right track. Their pragmatic acceptance of a mixed-economy prepared their citizens for the eventual transformation from capitalism to socialism. Thus, when Steeves editorialized in 1949 that the "right-wing" was discrediting the spirit of J.S. Woodsworth through its abandonment of the basic principles of the Regina Manifesto, which was in her view, "derived from Marxist theories", MacInnis retorted that the fundamental principles of the Manifesto varied considerably from Marxist theory. In particular, she pointed out that the Manifesto's insistence on democratic action directly opposed Marxist theories advocating the overthrow of the existing society. Returning to the response she gave to critics of the CCF's war policy she argued:

He or she who would follow the spirit of J.S. Woodsworth must be ready to break with past traditions and past beliefs, no matter how firmly held; when today's conditions call for new methods and new convictions.\textsuperscript{112}

She concluded with the words her father spoke a decade earlier: "Is it not the fear of breaking old beliefs the most insidious kind of belief? Faith is a confident adven-
turing into the unknown".113

The organization of the Socialist Fellowship less than a year after this exchange enraged MacInnis. In yet another letter to the editors of the CCF News she declared, "this sort of thing is useless at any time, but at a moment of crisis when our fellow-socialists are all over the world looking for solidarity from the CCF in Canada, such irresponsibility is difficult indeed to justify".114 Citing the example of European socialists who supported the NAP and UN intervention in Korea as a necessary show of force against Soviet aggression and its threat to democracy, she ended her letter,

In the face of the courage and leadership of European socialists, the CCF in this province should have something better to offer than the complete frustration expressed by our foreign policy editorials.115

"It had gotten to the point", MacInnis admitted in considering the CCF left, "of either they survive or we do".116 To this end, she stubbornly, at times ferociously, fought.

MacInnis found a staunch ally in her husband Angus. His similar approach to the question of social change reaffirmed her own conclusion. While it is difficult to establish the independence of thought of a couple that worked so closely together, there is nevertheless no reason to suspect
that MacInnis spoke primarily for her husband and not for herself. Although he became quite ill in the 1950s and might have looked to Grace to assert his position, by that time had come into her own, wielding as much if not more influence within the British Columbia and Federal CCF.

When differences of opinion arouse, Grace did not hesitate to oppose Angus. As Hilda Kristiansen observed,

She was strong on issues. If she believed in it she would fight Angus on it ... she came to her own convictions ... and if she thought she was right she would fight it one way or the other.117

Clearly, MacInnis was no longer in Angus' or J.S. Woodsworth's shadow. In an article entitled: "The Hand That Rocks the Cradle is Going to Rule For a Change", one columnist for the Montrealer went even further, suggesting in 1948 that Grace was the true power behind the CCF throne:

... the CCF convention did, however, confirm Major Coldwell as National Leader, which was pretty much a gesture, because without detracting from the great personal capabilities of Major Coldwell, it is widely suspected that Grace, daughter of the late J.S. Woodsworth the party founder and now the wife of Angus MacInnis, CCF MP, is the real leader of that group. Certainly her voice is listened to with great respect and would be even more so if the party won its way to the East Block at Ottawa.118
This analysis might have exaggerated somewhat the strength of MacInnis' position but her correspondence with three successive National Secretaries of the CCF, David Lewis, Lorne Ingle, and Carl Hamilton, confirm that her ideas and concerns received very serious attention.119 Her advice on the promotion of the Winnipeg Declaration and her input into the negotiations leading to the transformation of the CCF into the NDP, for example, appear to have held significant weight.120 One good illustration of her influence, strategy and extremely strong identification with the movement as a whole can be found in a letter she wrote while vice-president of the B.C. CCF in April of 1957.

I am concerned with the large group having to do with the Winnipeg Declaration -- most of them being unfavourable, at least in some degree. With the federal election just around the corner it is most important to handle this matter wisely. With the combination of die-hard doctrinaires who are determined to attack the falling away from socialism by leaders of the movement and the woolly-minded perfectionists who act as perfect though unwitting tools for the former group, it will not be easy to avoid bitter and harmful debate ... I am prepared to try to get the Convention to cold storage discussion on this matter until a date nearer the 1958 Convention. I want to be prepared to make the strongest possible case (and it will be a pleasure I assure you) for the national movement in this matter.121

MacInnis's path to socialism was clearly at odds with
that of Steeves. For example, she saw the formation of the NDP, in 1961, as a positive step. Steeves, on the other, believed the CCF's original socialism had died. MacInnis' strong links with the center and support from moderates within the British Columbia section of the CCF ensured that her position triumphed. Ironically, while their ideas about the process differed significantly, their vision of the goal was remarkably similar. MacInnis' claim that in addition to economic equality "for me, the central core of socialist philosophy lies in the idea that every human being is entitled to certain rights and is expected to assume certain responsibilities" squared with Steeves' belief that the socialist ideal means more than economic rights, it also means equality of social rights. Particularly striking about these two women is the extent to which, in their strategy, in their rallying of forces to their respective side, in their indirect correspondence through the media, in short, in their tenacious battle for control, they were alike. They also shared one other characteristic, an understanding of which is critical to a complete portrait of MacInnis. Both were socialist feminists who resisted feminist sisterhood, preferring the fellowship of mixed, socialist circles. For MacInnis, like Steeves, was finally more comfortable with class liberation and its socialist advocates than women's emancipation and the feminist
champions of that cause. The reasons behind their hesitant participation in the women's movement, however, were not identical. As the following analysis reveals, MacInnis was a socialist feminist of a different character. Her view of the route to and realization of emancipated womanhood resembled that of Steeves but it was inspired by different assumptions and considerations.

Throughout her career, MacInnis emulated her older CCF sister by personally defying sex-typed conventions and publicly supporting women's rights, within the Legislature, outside it, and within women's groups. Having grown up with parents who, according to MacInnis, did not distinguish between their sons and daughters when assigning household chores, discussing social questions and encouraging career goals, she generally had little time for sexist attitudes and laws. She was taught independence at an early age particularly by her mother who in her words, "taught that there wasn't anything men could do in the world that women couldn't do if they wanted to". MacInnis expected to be treated as an equal, given no special considerations and privileges but denied no opportunities or rights. Several speeches in the Legislature reflected her strong critique of legal inequities especially those which victimized working class women. Improved working conditions, equal pay for equal work and equal employment opportunities,
unwed mother's pension, playschool cooperatives, fairer divorce laws, and the domestic workers' right to better pay as well as social security benefits were among her demands.125

Travel between Ottawa and Vancouver, in addition to her responsibilities within the CCF, left MacInnis little time for extensive participation in British Columbia women's organizations. Nevertheless, during her term in the provincial house she did join the Business and Professional Women's Club and attended and spoke at meetings of groups such as the WILPF, the VWSC, and the LCW. As well, during the 1940s, she was twice asked to represent British Columbia women, first on a sub-committee of the federal government's Post-War Reconstruction Committee in 1943, which made recommendations to the government on measures to deal with women's post-war employment and domestic problems and secondly at the International Assembly of Women in New York, in 1946, a conference which brought together over 200 women from 55 countries to discuss common goals and special problems. For MacInnis both experiences were enlightening and she came away with a greater understanding of women's situation in the war era. The former she recalled foreshadowing "the need for a lot of things",126 and about the latter she remembered the inspiring sisterhood amongst women from such vastly different worlds.127
MacInnis' personal defiance of sex-ordered norms, her legislative demands and her work with women's groups reveal clear feminist aspirations. Indeed, writings and speeches which included such statements as "[Under the CCF] women could have just as much opportunity to work as men and receive equal remuneration for equal work",¹²₈ "without economic equality there can be no true equality between men and women"¹²⁹ and "only through having full employment can women find equality"¹³₀ placed her squarely in the socialist feminist tradition. There was, however, a significant imbalance between her socialist and feminist aspirations. Unlike Steeves, she completely tied her feminist goals into her socialist ones, believing that one battle -- the socialist one -- was sufficient for a class and gender free society. MacInnis never admitted Steeves' sense of superiority over women and claimed respect for women who found it "necessary" to work in autonomous women's groups. Such an approach, however, was "less mature" and she preferred working in mixed groups.¹³¹ These statements and comment such as, "I don't think women are a sisterhood" and "ideas are mixed ones"¹³² suggest a certain sense of superiority and lead one to suspect that her willingness to engage occasionally in all-female activities and conferences reflected a desire, not unlike that of Steeves, to promote the CCF's point-of-view and to broaden her support base.¹³³
first thing any man or women needs in the line of liberation", MacInnis argued, "is to be liberated from the notion that they are just a man or just a woman. Its nice to be a women if you are a woman and a man if you are a man but there is something much better than being either and that's being a full human being."134

Underlying this insistence that men and women should be regarded as "people" struggling for the same ends was also firm conviction that sexual exploitation was just another manifestation of the larger social problem: capitalist exploitation and the values accompanying it. Her acceptance of this traditional socialist line is especially clear in an article she wrote for a German publication Gleicher entitled: "Frauen und Sozialisimus in Kanada".

After giving a brief history of the CCF, MacInnis discussed women's disadvantaged status in the workplace, poor representation in parliament, and the progress women had made in attaining greater rights, particularly in British Columbia where, she contended, suffrage had paved the way to many "progressive laws". She went on to credit the women's movement for the slow but steady amelioration of women's position in Canada yet cautioned,
We as socialists know, however, that the differential treatment is not directed at women as such but against the majority of humans, men, women, and children who could have a higher standard of living if the riches of this land would no longer be invested privately but used for the general welfare of the public. Our objective in the CCF is to convince men and women of the necessity for fundamental social changes.

MacInnis clearly blamed capitalism, not patriarchy, for women's oppression. Socialism, then, satisfied both her objectives: equality between the sexes and a classless society. The spirit of cooperation and social responsibility within a socialist society would promote equality on all fronts. In contrast to the more radical Steeves, therefore, she was unwilling to admit the possibility that a dual battle had to be waged. So strongly convinced was she that the solution to the "woman question" would be found in the solution to the social one, she directed almost all her energies within the CCF towards the class battle. Two closely related factors also appear to have reinforced her position.

The first and perhaps most significant explanation was MacInnis' very profound identification with and commitment to the CCF. Success for the party, which to her meant the emergence of a cooperative commonwealth, and, more personally, the realization of her father's dream, could only be achieved through the cooperative efforts of both men and
women. To admit discrimination and differential treatment on the basis of sex within the CCF or socialist movement would logically demand a recognition that two struggles existed. For a party already in need of unity and support, such potential division both amongst party members and within members' homes was prohibitively expensive. Moreover, the party could little afford the time, energy and funds a strong commitment to women's rights' issues required.

Nor could she personally afford to give equal amounts of attention to feminist struggles. While not possessing the same urge for political prominence and personal power Steeves displayed, she shared her challenger's desire to win the battle -- to realize her particular vision of the party's direction and future and carry on her father's important work. She thus needed personal power and set out to play the game which would win it for her. In short, the CCF was, for MacInnis, perhaps even more so than for Steeves, a major part of her life and sense of purpose. She was determined that the party would survive and was consequently prepared to pay the costs -- departure from the more radical principles it originally espoused and discrepancies between the theory and practice of equal opportunities for women. Strongly devoted to the party's growth, there remained very limited time for a cause which required
equally strong dedication: feminism. MacInnis herself often admitted that she felt she could only champion one cause at a time. If she was to give her all, choices had to be made. Rather than confront the inequities, therefore, MacInnis chose to see in the CCF's comparatively better record of female participation in decision-making and in her own strength within the party, equality of opportunity. She justified the fact that women were frequently second-choice candidates with explanations not unlike those of her male co-workers and socialist theorists of earlier decades. Lacking in experience women were not ready or able to assume the rigors of political campaigning or political office. It was unfair, moreover, to expect them to be so.

MacInnis' objections to autonomous women's groups within the CCF and to the reservation of seats for women on various councils and committees reflected other suspicions as well. The need for special women's groups within the CCF and preferential treatment would admit inferiority -- women could not make it on their own as people. Such affirmative action, she insisted, would place women in power who were there on a "decorative basis". For all this awareness of many women's political ignorance, she nonetheless refused to lend her support to within-party women's groups aimed at the education and politicization of inexperienced women. The CCF campaign required a cohesive, united effort
and could little afford autonomous women's groups with potentially divisive critiques.

MacInnis' attitude toward the family offers a final explanation for her apparent unwillingness to recognize socialists' vulnerability to sexual stereotyping and discrimination. Her socialism developed as a result of the sense of social responsibility her parents encouraged and lived. Using her own family as a model, she became convinced that the "family was the seedbed of citizenship." Believing in its crucial role in the search for a better world, she was thus reluctant to critique its sex-ordered and imbalanced power hierarchies. Moreover, if socialism guaranteed the liberation of the family through its promotion of cooperative values and shared wealth, to admit gender inequities both within individual CCF families and with the larger CCF family would be to question the family's potential within a cooperative commonwealth. It was therefore far easier to concentrate on a goal which blended with her concept of the ideal family: the eradication of its materialist, class-based status. Too, while MacInnis promoted women's ability to succeed in time-honoured male domains, she could not entirely escape prevailing attitudes about women's critical role in the child-rearing process. She agreed that men could and should share in this activity. But she feared the ramifications and chaos of major
changes to family structures, radical life-style alternatives and institutional child-care. The entry of large numbers of women into the political arena, though theoretically appealing, in practice threatened family stability, child-welfare and responsible citizenship.

MacInnis' claim that the "body politic should ideally consist of a working partnership between men and women", while liberating in intent, was in practice wanting. She refused to investigate the gaps between the theory and practice of sexual equality within the CCF. She largely rejected autonomous women's groups designed to facilitate women's assumption of equal partnership. She viewed the nuclear family and women's role in the child-rearing process through fairly conventional eyes. Her approach to the woman question did not match her approach to the social one. She prioritized the class struggle. The clarity of her feminist vision subsequently suffered.

In their strategies and attempts to steer the party in a direction each considered to be the most appropriate and in their approach to the "woman question", the "peacock" and the "guinea hen" were clearly two-of-a-kind. Talented and tenacious, they helped engineer important gains for both workers and women. Their discovery of workers, however, was considerably more profound than that of women. The emancipated womanhood of their dreams was not quite within reach.
After years of relentless campaigning, on May 24, 1918, Canadian women won the federal franchise. Contemporary provincial governments, with the exception of Quebec, also bowed to suffrage demands. Over half a century after Confederation, the majority of Canadians were at last equipped with a tool to express their concerns about the country's social, economic, and political life. Official political equality between the sexes was not, however, absolute. Another decade passed before women were declared "persons" and thus eligible for the highest levels of legislative and political office. Thanks in large part to the persistence of five Alberta women, as Canada approached the calamitous decade of the 1930s, its female residents were finally, in principle at least, considered first-class citizens.

In the wake of suffrage victories, many Canadian women worked hard to make that equality meaningful and to extend it to all areas of women's lives. For those who predicted great changes, however, too few took their hard-earned rights further than the polling station. Women wanting and able to help re-shape a society they saw as corrupt and unjust largely preferred the more familiar world of non-political cooperative work. The potential for reform and the benefits of sorority available in numerous women's col-
lectives such as the National Council of Women of Canada and the Federation of Women's Institutes of Canada satisfied, it appears, the majority of post-suffrage activists. For most the world of direct political decision-making remained elusive.

Yet, the potential for reform and preferences for the more comfortable and socially acceptable spheres of female activism within female societies only partially explain women's disappointing showing within the political arena. A host of gender specific obstacles including women's limited access to higher education, restricted openings to higher echelons of the workforce, limited mobility and financial resources, inexperience in local decision-making, unsatisfactory child-care alternatives and a predictable variety of attitudinal barriers further weakened their drive and ability to seize and hold on to direct political power. In light of these considerable barriers, women's sporadic and slow rise to political prominence hardly seems surprising.

For a dynamic and determined few, however, these obstacles were surmountable. Dissatisfied with the circumscribed role non-political women's organizations could play in the affairs of government and social change, attracted to the power and influence available within political parties and legislative bodies and determined to test the promises of suffrage, these women stubbornly defied patriarchal con-
ventions and practical limitations to take their rightful place in the running of Canadian society. Four British Columbia feminists, Helena Gutteridge, Laura Jamieson, Dorothy Steeves and Grace MacInnis were amongst these courageous pioneers. In fact, they more than tested their right to political equality, they exercised it to the fullest.

Unlike many Canadian women and many Canadian men for that matter, these pathbreakers did possess advantages which eased the transition from responsible citizen to political actor. Supportive families and friends, for example, were important factors in their journeys to political prominence. For Jamieson, Steeves, and MacInnis, intellectual, emotional and financial backing from family members contributed to the acquisition of important academic prerequisites for political work and to the bold pursuit of dreams men once monopolized. Gutteridge was an exception. Estranged from her biological family at a very young age, she pursued her ambitions in spite and perhaps in some measure to spite them. But the support she found in feminist sisterhood and later in the trade union movement doubtless also built the courage to forge ahead.

Also beneficial to their respective routes to political leadership were the training and work experiences these women sought and obtained in fields conducive to the assumption of legislative responsibilities. Gutteridge, for
instance, was trained in sanitation, hygiene and labour relations, Jamieson in social work, community planning and law, Steeves in law, economics and town planning and MacInnis in organizational politics, housing and related community affairs. Jamieson and MacInnis had the additional good fortune of having highly visible and respected relatives. While both earned their right to govern through hard work and abundant skill, the prominence of their spouses, and in MacInnis' case, father as well, opened the door to public office.

Not to be forgotten advantages were the sharp minds and broad knowledge all four women possessed. Though clearly not essential for public office, such intelligence no doubt facilitated entry into the previously exclusive, male political arena.

Finally, these female politicians received a critical, if indirect, push from women's organizations. With the exception of MacInnis, who later spent some time in women's associations and programs, they began their public activities in women's groups and eventually emerged as leading figures within several. There they learned public affairs' skills and were afforded important opportunities to practice leadership and decision-making. Such training and group support, in addition to academic and professional experiences, prepared them well for future public activities.
Perhaps of an even greater impact was the frustration felt over the very limited power and control women's groups had in the post-suffrage years. Their determination that political answers were the only realistic routes to social change likely reflected futile experiences with non-political solutions.

But the path to political office and acclaim for these women, as Helena Gutteridge's career most acutely testifies, reflected more than social, educational, professional or intellectual advantages. Their respective political triumphs also point to a special blend of personality characteristics including an incredibly strong will and sense of self, a single-minded, almost self-righteous determination to realize goals, a willingness to sacrifice personal comfort for these ambitions, a rather uncanny ability to turn adversity into an advantage, and a feminist insistence that they were a match for any man, indeed some would argue superior. For women in a society clinging desperately to sex-ordered, Victorian values, such fortitude and tenacity was essential. Without it, it seems unlikely that the considerable advantages and talent they possessed would have been sufficient ammunition against the powerful obstacles which held the bulk of Canadian women in check.

One final explanation for Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis' successful route to public office and poli-
tical prominence deserves consideration. They chose to establish their career and test their political rights within a socialist party pledged to sexual egalitarianism and equal opportunities for women. Indeed, Canada's third-party, socialist alternative, the CCF, gave these women a very warm reception and the opportunity to exercise political clout after an unusually brief apprenticeship. Recognition of their determination, drawing power, political acumen and talent to a significant degree influenced such strong and swift acceptance. Still the party's comparatively greater receptivity to female leadership and stronger sensitivity to equal rights issues seems to have paved a smoother road to political office, particularly for women as outspoken and independent as these.

The CCF's, in particular the British Columbia CCF's, theoretical and practical commitments to sexual equality and a brighter future for women were not without contradiction and conflict. However, the experience of individual women like Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis reflected important steps forward for recently enfranchised Canadian women, enhancing the party's egalitarian image. Champions of women's causes had greater opportunity to voice feminist concerns, while the needs of working class women -- wage labourers and homemakers -- were also addressed. Despite these comparatively significant strides towards a new equal-
ity for women, the majority of women within the party unfortunately did not take the "great leap forward" socialist theory promised. When it came to the implementation of egalitarian principles, in fact, the CCF bore some resemblance to the mainstream parties and a very close likeness to socialist parties world-wide where the redress of sex inequality was given only half-hearted attention. Ardent supporters of gender as well as class aspirations were often forced to keep a vigilant watch for discriminatory treatment of women and women's issues. They often found themselves personally shouldering much of the responsibility for the advancement of gender goals. What then explains such flawed liberation and how did such ambivalent and contradictory commitment to women's rights affect socialist feminists within the party such as Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis?

One important explanation must be found in the CCF's contradictory theoretical heritage. While incorporating a long-overdue analysis of gender oppression in their theory for social change and forecasting sexual freedom within a new socialist order, early socialist thinkers spent substantially more time discussing the dynamics of and resolutions to class discrimination within capitalist society. Their treatment of sexual exploitation and emancipation was in comparison marginal, replete with inconsistencies.
cularly significant to their deficient analysis of women's oppression were two defects: the failure to raise questions about the impact of women's reproductive functions, which together with exploitative production practices, entrenched second-class citizenship, and the absence of a well-developed and precise delineation of measures necessary for changed gender relations. The commitment to gender liberation handed down to socialist parties was at best, a tenuous one, leaving considerable room for contradictory practices. In short, the marriage between socialism and feminism passed on to the CCF was troubled from the start.

Another important clue to the CCF's rather weak commitment to full sexual equality was the inability of most members, reformer and radical alike, to escape mid-Victorian prejudice about women's "proper sphere". Through promoting women's rise to responsible public roles and equal opportunities in the workplace, if such advancement meant radical alterations to traditional family structures, most balked. Consequently, the majority of the female CCFers remained within traditional "feminine" spheres, assuming the more tedious organizational, fund-raising and house-keeping responsibilities. Indeed, as one leading member of the CCF Women's Council complained:
There is still a belief in the minds of many men that it is unsafe to leave the business of the movement in the hands of women, even in part. Frankly, we feel that for a movement that boasts no differences in sex, race, colour or creed, some of our Marxian socialists are still pitifully mid-Victorian.

Within the British Columbia CCF traditional gender roles remained, for the most part, sacrosanct.

A third factor underlying the party's hesitant and defective pledge to sexual equality was the fear that too much attention to women's causes was divisive, requiring time and energy better spent on the "human" struggle. Moreover, the possibility of the growth of a strong feminist sub-group worried leaders already concerned with party unity and aware of the rather pervasive conservatism within rank-and-file homes. They thus discouraged the formation of autonomous women's groups designed to raise political awareness and feminist consciousness amongst women. CCF women did organize information sharing groups but were generally careful to stress their membership within and loyalty to the class struggle.

Lastly, many CCFers rather naively believed that the introduction of a cooperative society based on full employment and a sharing of wealth would automatically usher in gender equality. Concentration on the campaign to create such a society was thus more pressing.
In brief, the party within which Gutteridge, Jamieson, Steeves and MacInnis established successful and influential careers did not always practice the sexual equality it preached. Though offering substantially more to women seeking political power, advocating important changes to the lives of working-class women and attempting to draw more women to its ranks, theoretical flaws, party politics and priorities, and Victorian conservatism, contributed to the prioritizing of class allegiances and a subordination of women's causes. Full sexual equality within and outside the CCF remained a promise of the future. Thus we come to the second important question raised earlier. How did the women profiled within this thesis handle such inequitous treatment of feminist goals and how did the prioritizing of class ambitions affect their respective campaigns for a gender and class free society?

Not surprisingly, their responses varied. By insisting upon an equal voice for themselves, challenging blatant discrimination, and championing improved and equitable legislation for women, on the surface, all four appeared anxious to keep the party honest to its principles. When it came to the question of party loyalty and the compromising of gender aspirations for class gains, however, clear attitudinal and behavioural difference surfaced.
Gutteridge and Jamieson, as we have seen, managed to steer clear of pressures towards the prioritizing of socialism, insisting upon a relatively equal championing of both causes. The extent to which they directly confronted colleagues about the party's secondary treatment of women's rights, or indeed recognized the discrepancies is unclear. But throughout their career with the British Columbia CCF and days in public office, they maintained strong and lasting links with the women's movement, gave important leadership and direction to women's organizations, and continued to wage strong battles for women's rights within and outside political spheres. Their independent approach to political issues and political life, coupled with their relative indifference to political games or power for personal gain reinforced their ability to resist organizational pulls. They were willing participants in cooperative teamwork, but unwilling players if team victory meant a compromising of goals they strongly believed in, whatever the issue, whatever the cost. They placed their personal convictions before party loyalty.

Neither woman, of course, completely escaped time-honoured conventions about women's status and roles. Nor were their feminist goals completely free of contradiction. Vulnerable to sexual stereotyping, Jamieson for example, used and seems to have accepted, separate but equal argu-
ments to advance feminist causes. Still, their loyalty to and identification with women and women's special concerns matched those to and with workers and class interests. Moreover, they were deeply committed to the democratic process, even when the political forecast for socialism, looked bleak. Such ideological equilibrium, idealism, and integrity, while costly to their personal political advancement and to the acquisition of really powerful roles within the CCF, contributed to the balancing of feminist and socialist aspirations, a rare occurrence in a world of political compromise and trade-offs.

Steeves and MacInnis, on the other hand, did not challenge the CCF's flawed commitment to sexual liberation. Deeply identified with the political organization they devoted tireless energy and time to, attracted to power and influence for personal as well as political reasons, and members of the top decision-making elite of the party, they faced comparatively stronger internal and external pressures to accept party strategy and priorities, irrespective of the potential impact on feminist advances. To put it simply, they strove for a really powerful voice within the movement they considered to be the key to the establishment of a just and equitable social order. To achieve such prominence, however, a price had to be paid: a watered-down, at times muffled, feminist critique. Yet, there were other factors
which influenced a prioritizing of socialist goals, setting them even further apart from Gutteridge and Jamieson. Although equally strong advocates of legislative change aimed at the amelioration of women's wage workplace and home lives, both in their own way felt somewhat superior and intolerant towards other women, especially middle-class women. Their somewhat disdainful attitude toward middle-class women either lacking their political acumen and intellectual ability or satisfied with female cooperative work and their preference for socialist confraternity and "mixed" solidarity increased their vulnerability to "male" priorities and the acceptance of the subjugation of women's causes. It might be argued that their identification with "masculine" ideas and circles freed them from the personal conflict they might have experienced when forced to compromise feminist ambitions. Particularly noteworthy when contrasting the careers of these two women with those of Gutteridge and Jamieson is the fact that by choosing to follow party footsteps, play the game and accept party priorities, they came considerably closer than their older CCF sisters to the equality and political clout the suffrage victories of the war years prematurely heralded for women.

Within the British Columbia CCF there was clearly room for a balancing of class and gender loyalties. The likelihood of a rocky union between socialism and feminism,
however, was also there. For those interested in top-level power and influence within the party, the odds of such disharmony were extremely high. CCFers, like their socialist ancestors and contemporaries, failed to probe the dynamics of patriarchal as well as capitalist relations, delineate precise guideline for the implementation of a gender free and egalitarian society and thus left the door to hesitant and contradictory emancipation for women wide open. Only the most ardent and independent socialist feminist attempted to close it to half-hearted attention and re-open it to full and equal championing of women and worker's rights. But within the socio-political climate of early to mid-twentieth century Canada this was no easy task. Socialist organizations while in so many ways ahead of the times also succumbed to the tenor of the times. The CCF was clearly no exception. Thus, allies and supporters of whole-hearted socialist feminism were often hard to come by.
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