

## THE POLITICS OF WOMEN'S EDUCATION: ESTABLISHING HOME ECONOMICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 1914-1949

*Lee Stewart*

In the nineteenth century, feminists who promoted the admission of women to universities were divided on the issue of the content of their education. The "separatists" favoured a modified curriculum aimed at preparing women for their life's work as teachers, nurses, and mothers. The "uncompromising" were adamant that "separate never means equal" and would not be satisfied until women were admitted to the same courses as the men.<sup>1</sup> Although the "uncompromising" strategies were victorious in the nineteenth century, the appearance of the so-called "female faculties" in the twentieth century is evidence that women's higher education had been re-examined. But did these female faculties represent a victory for feminist politics? Was instruction in programmes such as home economics and nursing an attempt by the academy to accommodate the needs, interests, and wishes of women? In the context of the nineteenth-century debate between the separatist and the uncompromising feminists, were these female faculties able to raise the status of women's professions, or did they simply reaffirm the social expectations of women?

Most Canadian universities incorporated home economics courses into degree programmes by 1920. At first glance, this concession to women's presence on campus may be assumed to be one of the spoils of victory, like women's suffrage, that followed in the wake of the first wave of feminism and the First World War. But despite a campaign begun by organized women in British Columbia even before the provincial university opened its doors in 1915, women had to wait until 1942 for home economics to be established at the University of British Columbia. This paper examines the long process of establishing home economics at U.B.C. and finds, notwithstanding feminist politics, that far from being an attempt to accommodate women, this programme ensured that the university could better accommodate men.

In 1914 a public exchange of opinions between two prominent feminists regarding the place of home economics at the proposed University of British Columbia echoed the debate between the "uncompromising" and the "separatists" half a century before. Evlyn Farris, graduate in philosophy and classical studies from Acadia University, founder and former President of the University Women's Club in Vancouver, and successful candidate for the UBC senate, held definite views about domestic science courses at the university. Farris believed that the tendency to introduce practical training for women imperilled their intellectual development and endangered the value of philosophical learning. In short, Farris upheld the benefits of a liberal arts education in a world that she thought increasingly substituted "practice for principles." She was reluctant to attribute professional status to homemaking, but conceded that if it

was a profession then women could enter professional schools for training after receiving a bachelor's degree. Alternately, she suggested, domestic science courses were better offered in schools entirely distinct from the university. Farris clearly meant to dissociate women's education from the prevailing acceptance of the sexual division of labour and the assumption that women's interests were overwhelmingly domestic. It is likely, too, that Farris wanted to preserve the emphasis on equal education, meaning the same education for men and women, at the university.<sup>2</sup>

Alice Ravenhill, a member of the Vancouver Local Council of Women who had pioneered domestic science instruction in England, argued that home economics was, indeed, a valid course of study at the university because it was based on a large group of sciences—biology, chemistry, physics, mechanics, economics—as well as psychology, physiology, and hygiene. Moreover, the need for further research in the field of home economics justified its inclusion as a university subject. But the central theme of Ravenhill's defence was the need for women's education to enable them to combat such social problems as infant mortality and the spread of communicable diseases. Ravenhill charged that Canadian arts graduates were ill-trained for their roles as mothers and that instruction in "the right care of human life" deserved the same recognition at the university as the care of plant and animal life encompassed by the study of agriculture.<sup>3</sup>

The clear winner in this debate on women's education appeared to be Ravenhill. Farris' arguments had less appeal to the majority of women who did not have a university education. For many, her opinions represented an elitist attitude toward education, whereas Ravenhill expressed the views of the maternal feminists who believed that home economics provided solutions to the nation's social problems and represented a practical choice of study for women. With the support of women's organizations, the home economics movement gained momentum in B.C. and the objections of Farris, and women who held similar opinions, were heard less. In fact, no other single issue since women's suffrage commanded such sustained and energetic support from women in British Columbia as the movement to establish a department of home economics at U.B.C. For over twenty-five years, organized women campaigned to implement this course of study aimed at professionalizing female domesticity.

However, Farris, not Ravenhill, had been elected to the U.B.C. senate. In fact, Farris served alternately on the U.B.C. senate and the board of governors from 1913 to 1942. Although the records do not reveal the measure of Farris' aversion, indifference, or even assent to proposals for home economics courses at U.B.C., it remains a curious coincidence that the movement for home economics met finally with success within six months of Farris' retirement from the board of governors. Farris may have been a powerful behind-the-scenes ally in the university's passive resistance to the home economics campaign that lasted for a quarter of a century.

Before World War I, Alice Ravenhill, in British Columbia, and Adelaide Hoodless, who originated the Canadian home economics movement in Ontario, advocated women's education for their domestic roles at a time when maternal feminism was both credible and effective because it emerged from a well-defined women's culture formed in the late nineteenth century. The women's movement in this period was strengthened by separate female institutions that mobilized women and gained political leverage in the larger society.<sup>4</sup> Thus suffragists developed a successful strategy, based on the strength of women's separate sphere, but designed to extend women's political influence and participation beyond the domestic sphere. The home economics supporters adopted the same strategies in an attempt to promote "the science of the home" and overcome a male bias in education.<sup>5</sup>

Schools and universities that established home economics departments before, during, or immediately following World War I more likely responded to the maternal feminist demands for this new instruction. Home economics was often seen as complementary to instruction in agricultural training for men in an era when men and women claimed separate but equal spheres in the work of nation building.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the emphasis on the scientific principles of household science encouraged women to venture into scientific studies as an extension of a legitimate (socially approved) interest, rather than as a deviation from the interests usually expected of their sex. The feminist aims of the home economics movement showed great promise while a separate female sphere prevailed.

In this climate, women had every reason to be hopeful that home economics would be available shortly after the opening of the provincial university in 1916. The proposed building plans for U.B.C. in 1913-1914, which provided that a domestic science building would be one of the first constructed, indicated the university's tacit approval of this course of study.<sup>7</sup> Home economics courses were established at other Canadian universities in this era, and in light of U.B.C. President Wesbrook's avowed convictions about the nation's need for experts in domestic science, it seemed likely that U.B.C. would follow suit.<sup>8</sup>

The senate first recommended to the board of governors in April 1919 that the university establish a school of home economics with a bachelor's degree in household science. This proposal urged an early appointment of a dean to arrange for staff and equipment for lectures to begin in the 1920-1921 session.<sup>9</sup> The response of the board was "sympathetic" to the senate's request and promised to consider it when the university was in a better financial position.<sup>10</sup> Taken aback by this postponement the senate sent a strong recommendation to the board of governors that "they put forth every effort to have a faculty of home economics opened in 1920."<sup>11</sup>

Again the board deferred this undertaking. The following spring the senate committee on home economics interviewed the board members to urge immediate action to establish a home economics course. They emphasized that without it, women would have to leave the province to take this training; that women

wanted to take this training to fit them for their duties in the home and community and not with a view to remunerative employment; and that the majority of homemakers would prefer a home economics course to any other.<sup>12</sup> The board reiterated that in the present condition of finances it was impossible to establish a faculty of domestic science.<sup>13</sup> This was to be the pattern of communication between the senate and the board of governors on this subject for the next twenty years.

Even more relentless than the senate in their remonstrances with the board of governors were the representatives from various women's organizations whose continuous petitions kept the matter of home economics from being forgotten. The Local Council of Women's interest in home economics education for girls was long-standing. Founded in Victoria and Vancouver in 1894, the Local Council of Women (L.C.W.) had succeeded in establishing domestic science instruction in the city schools and was familiar with the necessary process of applying pressure to the government and educating public opinion to achieve success.<sup>14</sup>

The L.C.W. initiated the campaign for home economics at the university, but a new association—the Parent-Teacher Federation—appeared in the twenties to carry the campaign through two decades to its final conclusions. The Parent-Teacher Federation (P.-T.F.), a provincial body composed of representatives from local Parent-Teacher Associations, was nominally an organization with a membership of both men and women. However, women consistently formed P.-T.A. executives and appeared to be the predominantly active members. Doubtless the P.-T.A. continued the association of women for their common interests in a tradition well established by the women's club movement; but the unrestricted membership ensured their emancipation from an image that now had conservative connotations. The P.-T.F. was, perhaps, one of the few organizations open to both men and women that women controlled—an indication that home and school were still accepted by the public as the legitimate spheres of women. One of the first and longest lasting interests of the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation was the campaign to establish home economics instruction at the university.

The initial strategy in the P.-T.F. campaign was to mobilize public support for home economics. Articles and the agendas of P.-T.F. meetings published in the daily and weekly newspapers kept alive the issue of home economics education in the university. By 1922 the "Parent-Teacher News and Views," which featured information about home economics and testimonials from educators who supported women's education for their work in the home, dominated the front pages of the official organ of organized women in B.C., the *Western Woman's Weekly* (W.W.W.).<sup>15</sup> This publicity encouraged a number of women's groups to join forces with the P.-T.F. both to raise funds to establish a chair of home economics at U.B.C. and to plead their case repeatedly before the university.

Before the end of the second decade, women's organizations focused their energies primarily on the senate, which was the determining body for educational curriculum at the university. But a growing awareness that their concerns required a political solution was evident after a home economics endowment fund was established in 1926 by the P.-T.F.<sup>16</sup> In a province-wide campaign women's organizations raised the sum of \$11,000, mostly through private subscriptions. At one point in the campaign, leading businessmen in Vancouver reportedly offered to subscribe \$20,000 provided the women could match this contribution, and also provided that the university would accept a \$40,000 diminishing endowment.<sup>17</sup> Despite U.B.C. President Klinck's avowed sympathies with the annual petitions received from the home economics supporters, the board of governors remained intractable and women's organizations began to lobby the provincial minister of education.

A delegation from the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation and the Local Councils of Women appeared again before the board, in December 1928, determined to undermine the resistance to home economics.<sup>18</sup> This delegation testified that public interest, rather than subsiding, was increasing, and there was a great demand for home economics teachers in the province. The delegation further reported that both the minister of education, Canon Joshua Hinchliffe, and Premier Tolmie were favourable to the women's petition, but had pointed out that their chief objection was that the authorities of the university had not asked for the establishment of such a course.<sup>19</sup> The women appealed to the board, therefore, to seek funds from the government to establish home economics in September, but were unsuccessful. It must have proved difficult for the P.-T.F. to imagine how the campaign that had raised a substantial sum of financial support—in addition to the moral support of public opinion, the U.B.C. senate, and the minister of education—could have failed to win official sanction from an allegedly sympathetic board of governors, or to evoke their request for additional votes from the Legislative Assembly for a home economics course. This revelation was a clear indication to the P.-T.F. that their powers of persuasion might be more profitably directed toward the provincial government.

The persistence of the delegation of women was rewarded in 1929 when a provincial grant was made available to the university for the purpose of establishing a course in home economics; but the U.B.C. board ruled the amount "entirely inadequate" and took no action.<sup>20</sup> After being advised that any unused portion of this grant allotted for home economics in 1929-1930 would not be carried over to 1930-1931, and that no additional funds would be available for home economics in 1930, representatives from women's organizations in Vancouver, Victoria, Nanaimo, New Westminster, and North Vancouver appeared again before the board of governors. Whereas previously this delegation had confined its efforts to lobby alternately the university and the government, it now attempted to perform brokerage functions between the minister of education and the university president.<sup>21</sup>

The women delegates had set up a "round table conference on all phases of the home economics situation" to be attended by the minister of education, Canon Hinchliffe, and by representatives of the provincial P.-T.F. and the Councils of Women. The delegation requested that President Klinck and a committee from the board of governors, "with power to act," be appointed to confer with the minister and the female delegates at the meeting in two days' time (April 2, 1930). This conference yielded positive results. The minister stated he would do his utmost to obtain the necessary funds to provide accommodation for home economics by 1931 and recommended that the president, therefore, should arrange courses for the first two years. The minister would provide money for additional expenditures if instructors needed to be hired before the end of the present fiscal year.<sup>22</sup> By May, the board had adopted a report from the senate outlining a two-year course in home economics to begin in the fall of 1931.<sup>23</sup>

Twenty-five women registered at U.B.C. in 1930 intending to take the first two years of the home economics course.<sup>24</sup> The P.-T.F. only awaited confirmation from the board of governors that plans were underway to establish the full four-year programme, before they transferred their endowment fund to the university. The board, however, could not give these assurances and the fund remained in the hands of the P.-T.F. In fact, in April 1932, the president advised the board to discontinue home economics and to return the unused portion of \$12,500 to the provincial treasury.<sup>25</sup>

The home economics course had survived for only one year when it became the casualty of the political struggles that enveloped the university from 1930-1932. A steadily reduced operating budget, resulting both from the antagonism of the minister of education towards the U.B.C. administration<sup>26</sup> and the effects of the economic depression in B.C., precipitated an internal crisis. Factions in the senate challenged the board's administrative policy. The eventual result was a vote by the senate in March 1932 of non-confidence in the president of the university.<sup>27</sup>

The board subsequently requested an enquiry into the problems of the university. Judge Peter Lampman, the commissioner of the enquiry, concluded that the chief issue of contention, internally, had been the costs of agricultural research and the apparent favouritism shown to this faculty by its former Dean Klinck in the face of declining enrolment and grants. Also, the distinctions between the decision-making powers of the senate and the board were imprecise, and the president proved to be an insufficient liaison between the two bodies.<sup>28</sup>

The extent to which home economics had become a political pawn in an external struggle for power was revealed by its emphasis in the Lampman Report. Lampman was highly critical of the government's role in establishing the department of home economics and pilloried the efforts of the women who promoted this course. Judge Lampman stated:

And herein lies one of the troubles of the University. Instead of competent authorities being allowed to fix courses of study, some

individuals, obsessed with the importance of some particular course, prevail upon the authorities to add their particular pet subject. This is all the more dangerous when a fund has been raised and subscribed for the purpose....I am suspicious of all such resolutions. The Government has apparently succumbed to the pressure as it actually provided money for that course. It is almost unbelievable, considering the state of finances at this time.<sup>29</sup>

Lampman may have been correct to censure the interference of the government in the educational decisions of the university. However, he appeared ignorant of the historical precedent in B.C. wherein voluntary associations played a role in affecting educational change.<sup>30</sup> More specifically, special interest groups had funded, previously, new university programmes "for the public good," for example, the department of nursing and public health.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, in the absence of any clear decision by the "competent authorities" with respect to home economics, their repeated assurances of sympathy accompanied by excuses of insufficient finances conveyed to the women's delegations the need for a political solution to overcome the apparent stalemate.

The preservation of academic freedom from political interference has always been the concern of universities that are funded by the state. However, the university surely has a responsibility to express its position on educational matters that are raised by public opinion. The president and the board, prior to 1929, had ample opportunity to either uphold or denounce home economics instruction on reasonable grounds. Instead, they chose to defer and resist all attempts by the senate and popular support groups to establish this course, while appearing to give it approval. The board's equivocations, which may have been a deliberate ploy,<sup>32</sup> seemingly shifted the responsibility to the government to provide additional funds. Lampman could not, therefore, reasonably charge political interference in a matter that so clearly invited political intervention.<sup>33</sup>

A prominent clubwoman, Alice Townley, attacked Lampman's judgements and defended both the interests of women and the decision of the government to fund home economics.<sup>34</sup> In a letter to the editor of *The Province*, July 31, 1932, Townley argued that

sometimes our women voters are inclined to think that their opinions and desires are not given that consideration that should be extended in all fairness, but in this matter we should appreciate the stand taken by the government. There are many other departments [at the university]. Why should Home Economics bear the brunt of Judge Lampman's high disapproval? Who are the "competent authorities" that should "fix desirable courses of study" in this case? It is a changing world....What about the Department of Agriculture? If it be reasonable to spend such an amount on teaching men to farm, why not encourage our women to learn how to manage the home, the foundation of the nation?<sup>35</sup>

Townley's letter indicated that Lampman's attack would likely renew the campaign for home economics despite the financial difficulties that threatened the continued existence of the university.<sup>36</sup> In fact, the P.-T.F. established in 1932 a Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Endowment Fund to take charge of the funds, to work for its re-establishment, to keep up a publicity campaign, and to award scholarships and prizes to students intending to pursue home economics elsewhere.<sup>37</sup>

The next decade saw this whole series of events repeated: the P.-T.F. and the Councils of Women sent letters and delegations to the board requesting a decision on the re-establishment of the department of home economics; the president and the board reiterated their sympathy with those requests but claimed they could not proceed without funds; and the board refused to include estimates for the course in their operating budgets submitted to the government.<sup>38</sup>

Late in 1936, representatives from the following organizations, under the auspices of the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation, met with the board of governors to urge the re-establishment of a degree course in home economics: the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation, Vancouver University Women's Club, Local Councils of Women (Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster), Business and Professional Women's Club of Vancouver, B.C. Teachers' Federation, B.C. Trustees Association, Women's Institutes, Trade and Labour Council, B.C. Girl Guides Association, Women's Educational Auxiliary of the United Church, Kiwanis Club, and the P.E.O. Sisterhood.<sup>39</sup> The wide cross-section of public opinion represented by this delegation prompted a report to the board of governors submitted by President Klinck on February 22, 1937.<sup>40</sup> Klinck's report reviewed the negotiations and costs for home economics from 1931-1932, and found

that the present financial position of the University parallels too closely the situation which obtained when Home Economics was discontinued to warrant a resumption of this course at the present time.

And further,

the board has definitely committed itself to the strengthening of a number of basic Departments now in existence, and for which the funds necessary to give effect to this policy have not been obtained.

President Klinck also recorded his own attitude:

Throughout the entire period of the negotiations, the President actively supported the request for the establishment of a Department of Home Economics. To him, the need was evident, the demand undoubted. The content of the courses, insofar as these were definitely determined, was



unquestionably of University grade. These reasons might be addressed with even greater force today.<sup>41</sup>

Clearly President Klinck wished to align himself with the supporters of home economics, but it was not then (nor had it ever been) included in the board's priorities for instruction, or projected into the budgetary requisitions.

Again, the women's delegations were led to believe that the strength of the university's opposition lay in insufficient funding; but they also had reason to hope that this obstacle might be overcome. The province was beginning to show signs of recovery from the effects of the depression. The university budget slowly expanded to include grants for research and public education. Furthermore, U.B.C. faculty member Dr. George M. Weir served as provincial secretary and minister of education in the new Liberal administration.<sup>42</sup> Dr. Weir had co-authored with J.H. Putnam the B.C. Schools Survey in 1925 (known also as the Putnam-Weir Survey), which was responsible for the integration of home economics into the regular school curriculum.<sup>43</sup> The P.-T.F. might reasonably expect Weir to be sympathetic to their cause, and early in 1937 they inquired about the board's policy in the event that a promise could be obtained from the minister of education for an appropriation for home economics in the next university budget (1938-1939).<sup>44</sup>

Perhaps determined to avoid a repetition of the 1929 fiasco, President Klinck advised the P.-T.F. Committee that the priorities set by the university, which did not include home economics, should not be placed at risk by any additional pleas for supplementary funds.<sup>45</sup> Evidently the P.-T.F. was forestalled and there was no recurrence, in this instance, of the minister's actions in 1929 that had resulted in the temporary satisfaction of the home economics proponents at the cost of dissension in the university.

The depression in the thirties thwarted the extension of instruction and facilities at U.B.C. Overcrowded conditions, after 1935, forced limitation of enrolment, especially in laboratory courses. Early in 1939 expectations of resumed building prompted requests from various delegations who were anxious not only to establish home economics but also to provide instruction in law, pharmacy, pre-medical training, and social services.<sup>46</sup> But the outbreak of the Second World War in August suspended all practical plans for immediate expansion in these areas.

By 1940 the university began to chart its course for the future. And so did the Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Endowment Fund. Alerted to the activity of other groups that were courting the approval of the senate and the board of governors for new courses, the committee decided to interview "certain people" prior to the next meeting of the senate (February 21, 1940), once again, to bring to its attention "the increasing need of the re-establishment of the home economics course."<sup>47</sup> The committee gained a substantial concession at this meeting when the senate recommended to the board of governors "that if and

when funds are available, the course in home economics be re-established prior to the establishment of any other course."<sup>48</sup>

A number of political and administrative changes occurred in the next few years that affected decisions about university education in B.C. In the provincial election in 1941 none of the three political parties received a clear majority. The Liberals and Conservatives were forced into an uneasy coalition with Liberal John Hart serving as premier. Early in 1942 the university came under attack in the Legislative Assembly. The minister of education, H.G.T. Perry, wanted more control over how the grants were spent by the university. Dorothy Steeves, C.C.F. member, announced her intention to sponsor a bill "to democratize the board of governors." Steeves charged the university was operating in a "sacrosanct vacuum," and Herbert Gargrave, C.C.F., complained that "the Legislature was subsidizing a class of society that can afford to pay for itself." Moreover, the five women in the Legislature—Laura Jamieson (C.C.F.), Tilly Jean Rolston (Conservative), Nancy Hodges (Liberal), Dorothy Steeves (C.C.F.), and Grace MacInnis (C.C.F.)—transcended their partisan differences to press for the establishment of a department of home economics. They were outraged that students had to leave the province to complete a degree in this field. Rolston and Hodges pointed out that \$17,000 had been raised by women's organizations to assist the funding of home economics but still no action had been taken.<sup>49</sup>

Sweeping changes in the administration of U.B.C. took place in this period. Although there were reasons for their resignations not clearly connected to the attacks in the Legislature, only three of the nine members of the board of governors in the session 1939-1940 remained in 1944-1945. President Klinck also prepared to retire early in 1944. Such a revision of personnel inevitably brought new perspectives to the U.B.C. governors.

Undoubtedly tensions raised in the Legislature prompted the minister of education, in September 1942, to request President Klinck to include an estimate of the costs of establishing home economics in the university's budget for 1943-1944.<sup>50</sup> The amount of \$14,570 was subsequently approved for the department of home economics to begin operations in 1943, utilizing the laboratories in one of the city schools.<sup>51</sup> For the second time, the decision to establish home economics instruction at the university was founded on political intervention. But the terms of the solution, which relied on borrowed facilities, suggest that in this round of negotiations, the board was equally anxious to settle this long-standing problem. In the face of a campaign that had endured for a quarter of a century, it is reasonable to ask why the provincial government pushed and the university yielded on the issue of home economics instruction at this time.

In education, as in other matters of social welfare, the balance of responsibility had shifted to governments to deal with inequities caused by the depression and emergencies caused by wartime circumstances. In B.C. a coalition government and a left-leaning party in opposition proved eager to exercise their commitment to a new political consciousness to solve social problems. The P.-T.F. campaign became an object of mutual interest to all political parties in

light of the criticism levelled by both the C.C.F. opposition and the minister of education against the university administration, and the solidarity of the five female M.L.A.s on the question of home economics. The existence of the home economics endowment fund clearly attested to a substantial basis of support for this course. In view of the recalcitrance of the university, the provincial legislators appeared justified in suggesting to U.B.C.'s president that estimates for home economics be included in the budget for the following year. The lengthy campaign of the P.-T.F. was thus aided considerably by the current mood of the government to place a more "democratic emphasis" on the administration of the university, and to make post-secondary education more responsive to the needs of the population.

The tenor of the times, perhaps, made government intervention more palatable to the university in 1942 than it did in 1930. With this "encouragement" from the minister of education, the governors appeared to quickly surmount obstacles that had impeded the establishment of home economics since 1919. The amount of money available for this programme in 1942 was actually less than the grants deemed insufficient nearly ten years previously.<sup>52</sup> If the use of high school laboratories had been rejected in the past as unsuitable accommodations, these objections were overcome in view of more pressing considerations.

The resolution of the senate in 1940 to give home economics priority over the introduction of any other new instruction at the university presented a problem in planning for the future of U.B.C. President Klinck and the board did not need a long memory to recall the increase in the university's enrolment that followed the First World War. That the present war would eventually end was certain, and the necessity for the university to accommodate the returning veterans, most of them men, was equally assured. But the university could make no plans before home economics was re-established.<sup>53</sup> Ultimately it was in the university's interests to institute home economics and clear the way for the senate's approval for instruction in new areas like social service work and in those areas of traditionally male expertise: law, pharmacy, and pre-med.

Early in 1943, the schedule to establish a department of home economics for the fall session was nearly disrupted when President Klinck's national search for suitable teaching staff fell short of his expectations. After having made a fairly exhaustive canvass of Canadian graduates in home economics, Klinck concluded that there was not one candidate who had the necessary academic qualifications or the professional and administrative experience necessary to head the department and establish it on a basis comparable with that of other departments in the university.<sup>54</sup>

The president considered the decisions by the Universities of Saskatchewan and Manitoba to go to the United States for women to head their home economics departments and questioned whether U.B.C. should follow this option. Klinck suggested also that a year's delay might allow more time for candidates to study

the local situation. He advised that the lack of departmental accommodation was a barrier not easily surmounted,

especially when one approaches members of large and generously equipped departments where specialization has been highly developed and where...a large staff is regarded as essential to desired professional recognition.<sup>55</sup>

Neither the U.B.C. senate nor the minister of education was in favor of any further delay and the president was authorized to conclude negotiations in May for prospective appointees.<sup>56</sup>

Women who had fought for the establishment of home economics at U.B.C. finally achieved their goal. Although aware that this victory for feminist politics was tempered by the current need for political and administrative expediency, the long-time supporters of the home economics campaign were more exhilarated by the installation of the course than critical of its shortcomings.

There is no better illustration of the dilemma that faced the proponents of post-secondary domestic education for women than was revealed by the president's attempts to hire women with doctoral degrees to staff the department of home economics. Without high academic standards for teachers and research facilities, the study of home economics would not achieve a status comparable to that of other departments in the university. Nor could it hope to raise the status of "women's work" to a level comparable with other professional training at the university. But while home economics education was continually deferred by the university, women were denied the opportunity to develop this field and to raise its credibility within the university community.

However, the real pitfall for the "separatists," perhaps foreseen by the "uncompromising," was that the success of education for women's social roles was measured by the capacity of the graduate to put her theoretical learning to practical use, and to fulfil the social expectations prescribed for her sex. Home economics was one of the few areas in which a graduate's marriage and subsequent work in the home was regarded as the practical employment of her post-secondary education.<sup>57</sup> Thus the ambition to pursue graduate studies was evidence that the student had defied (or denied) social expectations, to prepare, instead, for an academic career. As long as the choice between domesticity and scholarship was, for women, mutually exclusive, fewer women would pursue graduate degrees.<sup>58</sup>

While the observations about the conflict between graduate education and marriage held equally true for women in other disciplines, the implications of the paucity of graduate degrees in home economics were particularly debilitating in view of feminist aims. As long as the emphasis of education in home economics lay on the maternal and homemaking responsibilities of women, and not on specific scholarly research and professional expertise to enliven the field, it was difficult to encourage women to undertake graduate work in home economics.

Women, therefore, remained relatively underqualified in university departments that might have ensured a female sphere within the academy.

In fact, in the twenty-five years that the P.-T.F. petitioned the board of governors at U.B.C., domestic education ceased to retain the feminist complexion of its youth. Whereas initially the home economics movement encompassed aims both liberative and conservative, by 1942 the prevailing social ideals and realities of women's roles cast the movement into a more retrogressive mode. The idea that a degree in home economics might prepare for related professions those women who did not marry was put forward in the twenties. But by the thirties and forties, the inequities of society made increasingly visible by the economic depression, and the imperative to harness resources and ideals once again to the war effort, renewed a traditional emphasis on women's place in the home as the hub of social stability.<sup>59</sup>

It is more than coincidence that social expectations reaffirmed the ideal division of work according to gender at a time when women were visibly employed outside the home, often in conventionally male areas.<sup>60</sup> Both the depression and the war encouraged a female labour force that would prove temporary in light of a stabilizing economy, the return of enlisted men, and the revival of conservative attitudes toward women's work.<sup>61</sup> In the social climate that prevailed in 1942, domestic education for women represented a philosophy of women's education that was more conservative than progressive. In this respect, the reactionary aims inherent in the home economics movement intersected with the prevailing climate of social expectations; thus the education of women in home economics primarily served social imperatives before individual or feminist preferences.<sup>62</sup> The validity of this conclusion is borne out by the decisions made concerning the department of home economics in the years following the end of the war.

President Klinck's retirement in July 1944 coincided with a new era of building the university under assistance from the federal government, and the innovative, sometimes unorthodox decisions of President Norman A.M. MacKenzie. MacKenzie's installation address echoed the earlier convictions of U.B.C.'s first president, Dr. Frank F. Wesbrook, who also believed "the university should and must strive to serve the community and every group and individual in it."<sup>63</sup> To the P.-T.F.'s Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Fund, which was still intact while deliberating the best use for its \$20,000, Dr. MacKenzie's words promised "a friendly spirit of cooperation"; his request in 1945 that a member of this committee act in a consultative capacity with the university's home economics committee was "deeply appreciated."<sup>64</sup>

MacKenzie himself appreciated the service that the home economics department could render to his campus over the next few years. In 1945-1946, registration at U.B.C. almost doubled with 2,254 veterans in a total student body of 5,621.<sup>65</sup> Whereas President Klinck, who faced an increase in the student population in 1931, consulted the fire marshall and limited enrolment,<sup>66</sup> President MacKenzie recognized that the urgent need for both classrooms and student

housing could be met by utilizing the abandoned army and air force camps. Twelve camps were dismantled and their huts transported to the campus to equip as lecture rooms and laboratories. Four camps remained on their original sites to serve as living quarters for students; two of them, Acadia and Fort Camps, were adjacent to the campus; a third was on Lulu Island; and the fourth, situated on Little Mountain, was converted into suites for married students. The problem of how to feed 200 single and married university students in campus residences was solved by commandeering dietetic majors in home economics to operate the dining service at Acadia Camp as part of their instruction.<sup>67</sup>

Here, surely, was the denouement of that old debate between Evlyn Farris and Alice Ravenhill. Time had validated Farris' concerns that the emphasis on practical training for women at the university could divert their intellectual energies from what she termed "philosophic learning." The fact that women comprised the smallest minority of the student population in the post-war years,<sup>68</sup> while at the same time some women on campus were actively perpetuating women's domestic service role in society, made academic women appear to be an endangered species in the 1940s.

It did not appear that "women's work" was more highly valued when it was performed in the university setting, as the governors were not initially eager to make available adequately equipped facilities for home economics. A committee of the board of governors, in November 1946, allocated funds for permanent buildings based on "the most urgent needs"; at this time a home economics building was deferred in favour of an applied sciences building, and a biological science and pharmacy building.<sup>69</sup> The first head of the department of home economics, Dorothy Lefebvre, resigned on December 31, 1946, to be married.<sup>70</sup> But she took this occasion to protest the governors' assessment of priorities for permanent buildings and urged them to reconsider their decisions in view of gifts received for a home economics building.<sup>71</sup> Lefebvre was referring to a \$75,000 bequest from the late Jonathan Rogers<sup>72</sup> and the \$20,000 donation from the P.-T.F.<sup>73</sup> The board was unmoved by this request and the department of home economics continued to occupy six army huts until January 1949 when they were destroyed by fire.

There followed some hasty decisions to erect a permanent building with the money from Rogers' estate, the insurance settlement, and the P.-T.F. fund.<sup>74</sup> The department of home economics was thus comfortably housed by October 1949 in a modern building proclaimed to be "one of the newest and best equipped in all Canada."<sup>75</sup> Seven years later, the final objective of the home economics campaign was met when a home management house was opened in which students in their second year learned "skills and techniques of housekeeping as well as some managerial skills."<sup>76</sup>

Although home economics education appeared to serve ideologies that were more conservative than progressive, and was more oriented to social usefulness than to individual fulfilment, there were practical advantages for women with home economics degrees. In fact, the majority of U.B.C. graduates in 1946 and

1947 with degrees in home economics had little difficulty finding employment in hospitals, schools, and industry.<sup>77</sup> The maternal feminists in the interwar years were unable to solve the conundrum of social expectations of women in their efforts to promote domestic education, but they recognized, perhaps, that home economics might prepare women for economic roles unchallenged by men. The department of home economics at U.B.C. could begin to stimulate a demand for graduates that would expand economic opportunities for women.

Without the campaign that was sustained throughout the interwar period by women who wanted to elevate the status of women's domestic work in the home, it is unlikely that a programme in home economics would have been established at U.B.C. To this end, the home economics movement mobilized support in a manner reminiscent of pre-suffrage feminist politics. By reviving the arguments and strategies of maternal feminism, organized women educated public opinion, raised money for an endowment fund, and exerted continuous pressure on both the provincial government and the university in order to achieve their objectives. However, by the 1940s, education that continued to stress homemaking as women's essential function in society represented an attempt to solve new problems with old solutions, irrespective of feminism. In fact, domestic education for women now ensured that educational priorities for men might proceed unobstructed in the postwar plans to expand the university. Social expectations of femininity proved more persuasive than feminist politics in finally determining the decision of the board of governors to offer home economics for women in British Columbia.

## NOTES

1. Sara Delamont, "The Contradictions in Ladies' Education," in *The Nineteenth Century Woman: Her Cultural and Physical World*, ed. Sara Delamont and Lorna Duffin (London: Croom Helm, 1978), 134-63.
2. Evlyn Farris, "The University and the Home," Address to the Women's Educational Club of Columbia College, *The Vancouver Sun*, 26 Feb. 1914.
3. *The Daily News-Advertiser*, 13 Mar. 1914. From 1911 to 1919 Ravenhill, who was a founding member of the B.C. Women's Institute, worked for the department of agriculture to organize women's institutes and write bulletins for their use.
4. Estelle Freedman, "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870-1830," *Feminist Studies* 5, 3 (Fall 1979): 512-29.
5. For example, Mrs. D.L. MacLaurin, representing the Victoria L.C.W. to the Putnam-Weir Survey in 1925, expressed the importance of home economics courses for girls and young women in terms that were familiar to the maternal feminists. MacLaurin concluded her presentation:

We believe that the home is the natural and rightful domain of woman, and therefore that Home Economics, the science of the Home, is pre-eminently the proper and logical study for womankind; we believe...[that] many other social problems [will be] solved when the dignity of homemaking is adequately

recognized and Home Economics given its rightful place in a national...scheme of education.

- Maureen Sangster Chestnutt, "Origin and Development of Home Economics Instruction in British Columbia" (M.A., California Polytechnic State University, 1975), 43.
6. Adelaide Hoodless won Sir William Macdonald's support for home economics and the Macdonald Institute of Home Economics was established at the Agricultural College in Guelph, Ontario. In 1904 it provided the first college education for women in home economics in the country. Margaret Gillett, *We Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill* (Montreal: Eden Press, 1981), 348.
7. U.B.C. Building Plans, Thompson, Berwick, Pratt and Partners Architectural Records, U.B.C. Main Library, Special Collections. Also a letter to the premier from Chancellor F. Carter-Cotton, 17 Dec. 1914, projected the costs based on plans to provide for arts and science, mining, and other engineering branches in 1915; agriculture and domestic science in 1916; forestry in 1917; "these being the lines of work which most closely affect the wellbeing of the people and the life and the industrial development of the Province." U.B.C. Board of Governors, Minutes, 17 Dec. 1914.
8. The Universities of Alberta, Manitoba, McGill, Saskatchewan, and Toronto offered degree courses in household science by 1920. The department became a school at Saskatchewan in 1928 and the B.H.Sc. was substituted for the B.A. in 1929. Robin S. Harris, *A History of Higher Education in Canada 1663-1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 407.
9. U.B.C. Senate, Minutes of Meetings, 15 Mar. 1919; 2 Apr. 1919, vol. 1: 86, 95.
10. Ibid, 14 May 1919, 15 Oct. 1919; U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 26 May 1919.
11. U.B.C. Senate, Minutes of Meetings, 14 May 1919.
12. Ibid., 5 May 1920. The meeting took place 23 Feb. 1920.
13. Ibid., letter from Board of Governors, 28 Apr. 1920.
14. John Foster, "Education and Work in a Changing Society: British Columbia, 1870-1930" (M.A., U.B.C., 1970).
15. From December 1917 to July 1924 the *Western Woman's Weekly* was edited and published every Thursday in Vancouver by Miss Amy Kerr and her sister Mrs. Pollanger Pogue. It was the official organ of the most active of Vancouver's women's clubs. The purpose of this newspaper was to "reach and unite the greater public" on issues deemed important to the women of B.C.
16. "Synopsis of history of movement to establish a degree course..." in Home Economics Scrapbook, Box 1, Department of Home Economics, University of British Columbia Archives.
17. "Short History," Department of Home Economics, University of British Columbia Archives. This typed history by an unknown author contains the allegation that a brewery offered to match the sum raised by the women's organizations so that the chair of home economics could be established, but the president of the university was not willing to accept "tainted money."
18. U.B.C. Board of Governors, Minutes, 22 Dec. 1928. This delegation from the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation was led by (Mrs.) Olive Muirhead and (Mrs.) Charlotte E. Rae, who would remain the spokeswomen for the P.-T.F. campaign until 1949. The Local Council of Women was represented by (Mrs.) Paul Smith and Mary Fallis.
19. Canon Joshua Hinchliffe had been critical of the university and its policies since 1920. As an M.L.A. he joined in the attack on the history text by Canadian W.L. Grant, charging that it was anti-British. Mack Eastman and W.N. Sage of the U.B.C. history department



- defended the text but J.D. MacLean, Liberal minister of education, withdrew it from B.C. schools. Again in 1923, Hinchliffe attacked the "anti-British spirit" at U.B.C. as reflected in its texts and remarks made by Professor Sedgewick in defence of a student who voiced his objection to the British dismissal of Canadian valour in World War I. Hinchliffe's apparent receptivity to the home economics delegation was calculated, in all likelihood, to discredit the university administration and to strengthen his own potential to intercede.
20. A grant of \$20,000 was intended to establish both a department of home economics and department of economics. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 28 Jan. 1929, 1452
21. *Ibid.*, 31 Mar. 1930.
22. *Ibid.*, 28 Apr. 1930.
23. *Ibid.*, 26 May 1930.
24. Chestnutt, "Home Economics Instruction," 65.
25. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 22 Apr. 1932. Although President Klinck had travelled to eastern Canada in 1930 to study the equipment and accommodation needed for home economics, and to interview candidates to staff this department, only one appointment/expenditure was incurred. In October 1931, the first appointment charged to the home economics department was for a physics assistant—Mr. P. Armstrong. The unused portion of the grant was returned to the provincial treasury to be used for compensations to discharged employees—the result of the drastic reduction in the budget.
26. In view of this education minister's historical antipathy toward the university (see note 19) it is not difficult to imagine Hinchliffe's intentions to undermine administrative discussions. Harry Logan has observed that Hinchliffe did not approve of the university as it was then being administered, that his own experience with Canadian educational systems was negligible, and he had little sympathy with the ideal of popular education. He was convinced that the standards of the university were not high enough, and he suspected that many of the university's activities were wasteful. He disliked the professional and occupational courses and focused his attacks on the faculty of agriculture. Minister Hinchliffe also adopted the practice of attending board meetings and arranged for them to be held in the Minister's Room in the Vancouver Court House. This environment had a harmful effect upon the discussions. Harry T. Logan, *Tuum Est: A History of the University of British Columbia* (Vancouver: U.B.C., 1958), 110. It is doubtful that Hinchliffe's support of home economics represented anything more than a challenge to the president and the board of governors' management, while giving the appearance of responding to the demands of public opinion. The repercussions of these politics proved destructive to all interests.
27. The home economics issue was really the last straw in an internal conflict that saw faculties competing for scarce resources. For details of this complex and bitter struggle see Logan, *Tuum Est*, 109-20.
28. Judge Peter Lampman, Report, University of British Columbia Archives.
29. *Ibid.*
30. See Foster, "Education and Work."
31. Lee J. Stewart, "The Experience of Women at the University of British Columbia, 1906-1956." (M.A., U.B.C., 1986), ch. 3.
32. In the same way that Hinchliffe used the home economics contingent to undermine the university administration, the governors may have wished to gain public sympathy for the continual lack of funds.
33. Clearly, this conflict reflected a failure of the personalities involved to negotiate solutions to what amounted to their own ideological differences. This refers to Canon

Hinchliffe's understanding of Canadian post-secondary education in the twentieth century and also to President Klinck's.

34. Alice Townley was an active member of the L.C.W., Vancouver; founding member of the Vancouver Women's Press Club, Vancouver Womens' Canadian Club; member of the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Women's Musical Club, the King Edward Parent-Teacher Association, the Women's Institute, and other arts and scientific associations. Townley was also founder and president of the B.C. Equal Franchise Association, 1912-1917, and other political clubs. She was the first woman elected to the Vancouver Park Board, 1928-35.
35. Letter to editor from Alice Townley, *Vancouver Province*, 31 July 1932. U.B.C. Scrapbook #19, 43. Townley quotes (accurately) from Lampman's report. Here again the argument emerged that home economics education for women was the coeducational alternative to agricultural training for men. In view of the struggle of the department of agriculture to survive during the controversy at the university, this analogy had an increased significance.
36. See the findings of the Kidd Committee in Logan, *Tuum Est*, 119.
37. Address by Charlotte E. Rae, Co-Chairman of the Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Endowment Fund, delivered at the opening of the Home Economics Building, U.B.C., 26 Oct. 1949. Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.
38. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 30 May 1932, 30 Nov. 1936, 22 Feb. and 22 May 1937, 28 and 30 May 1938, 28 Nov. 1938.
39. *Ibid.*, 30 Nov. 1936. Also, Rae's address, Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.
40. President Klinck wrote his "Report to the Board of Governors" following the request by a delegation, under the auspices of the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation, that the degree course in home economics be resumed. Department of Home Economics, Box 1, Folder 2, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.
41. Klinck, Home Economics Report.
42. In 1935 the Liberals were elected with T.D. Patullo as the premier. Dr. G.M. Weir was on leave of absence as head of the education department at U.B.C. from 1933-1941 while he served as the minister of education and the provincial secretary.
43. J.H. Putnam and G.M. Weir, *Survey of the School System* (Victoria: King's Printer, 1925). Weir was regarded as a progressive educator. See Jean Mann, "G.M. Weir and H.B. King: Progressive Education or Education for the Progressive State?" in *Schooling and Society in Twentieth Century British Columbia*, ed. J. Donald Wilson and David C. Jones (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 1980).
44. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 22 Mar. 1937.
45. Letter to Isabel Salter, Secretary, Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Endowment Fund from President L.S. Klinck, 30 Mar. 1937, Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.
46. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 30 Jan. 1939. Dr. Weir wanted provision also for "Nutritional Dietetics."
47. Isabel Salter, Secretary, Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Endowment Fund, Typed Report, Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.
48. *Ibid.*
49. *The Vancouver Province*, 4 Feb. 1942. Home Economics Scrapbook, 30, Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.

50. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 28 Sept. 1942.

51. *Ibid.*

52. In 1929-1930 the grant was awarded for \$20,000 and in 1931 it amounted to \$25,000.

U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 24 Feb. 1930, 16 Mar. 1931. In 1943 it was \$14,570.

53. Although in the 1920s and 1930s the governors had not felt obliged to implement the senate's recommendations to establish a home economics course, the publicity surrounding the issue and the avowed sympathy of the president, in the 1940s, ensured that the board of governors could not easily overcome the senate's stipulation that home economics should be given priority.

54. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, vol. 22, 25 Jan. 1943.

55. *Ibid.*

56. *Ibid.*, 31 May 1943. (Miss) Dorothy P. Lefebvre, B.H.Sc. (Sask.), M.S. (Iowa State) was appointed Associate Professor and Acting Head for three years at \$3,800 per annum. (Miss) Charlotte S. Black was appointed Associate Professor at \$3,400 per annum. Stella Beil, B.Sc. in home economics, M.Sc. (Kansas State) was Assistant Professor at \$2,800 per annum. *Ibid.*, 28 June and 26 July 1943.

57. Charlotte S. Black, Director, "Report on School of Home Economics, 1951-1952," Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives. Black reported that home economics graduates could be found employed in hospitals, department stores, businesses, schools, and health departments, "so you may see that the School of Home Economics at U.B.C. is making a contribution in the country. Close to one half of the graduates are now married and in homes of their own...we have a large number of 'grand-children.'"

58. If a faculty woman were to marry she endangered her position. Stella McGuire was allowed to share the teaching duties in English with her husband, who suffered poor health after World War I. Dorothy Blakey in the forties sought Klinck's assurance that she could keep her position at U.B.C. when she married because she could not afford to marry without her job. Dr. Dorothy Blakey Smith, Taped interview.

59. Karen Anderson, *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women during World War II* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981), 110-11; Mary Vipond, "The Image of Women in Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s," in *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*, ed. Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 116-24; Ruth Pierson, "Women's Emancipation and the Recruitment of Women into the Labour Force in World War II," in *The Neglected Majority*, 125-45.

60. Vipond, "The Image of Women."

61. Pierson, "Women's Emancipation"; Susan Hartmann, "Prescriptions for Penelope; Literature on Women's Obligations to Returning World War II Veterans," *Women's Studies* 5 (1978): 223-29.

62. This conclusion is reached also by Jill K. Conway, "Perspectives on the History of Women's Education in the United States," *History of Education Quarterly* 14 (1974): 1-12. Conway states:

The development of women's professions should thus be interpreted as a conservative trend by which the potential for change inherent in changed educational experience was still-born and women's intellectual energies were channelled into perpetuating women's service role in society rather than into independent and self-justifying intellectual endeavor.

63. Logan, *Tuum Est*, 173.

64. "Report" by Olive Muirhead and Charlotte Rae, Co-Chairmen of the Permanent Committee of the Home Economics Fund, 25 Oct. 1959, Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.

65. The increased enrolment was possible because of the federal government's assistance, the admissions policy adopted by the National Conference of Canada on Universities, and the decision of the president and board of governors to reject no one with entrance qualifications. Logan, *Tuum Est*, 175-76.

66. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 25 Mar. 25, 1931; Logan, *Tuum Est*, 112. Initially limitation of enrolment was a matter for the government to decide before an amendment to the University Act empowered the board to enforce this decision.

67. Chestnutt, "Home Economics Instruction," 71.

68. *Student Population:*

Year	Women	Men
1945-1946	1736	4861
1946-1947	2336	9110
1947-1948	2441	8779
1948-1949	2245	6565

69. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 25 Nov. 1946.

70. Lefebvre was succeeded by Charlotte S. Black.

71. U.B.C. Board of Governors Minutes, 30 Dec. 1946.

72. The Rogers bequest was received in January 1946 for a building to house the department of home economics. *Ibid.*, 28 Jan. 1946.

73. In October 1944 the P.-T.F. relinquished the \$20,000 they had raised for home economics. The P.-T.F. and the U.B.C. board of governors agreed that the money would be used for the construction and equipping of a Home Management House on the university campus. *Ibid.*, 24 Apr. and 30 Oct. 1944.

74. The money from the P.-T.F. fund was actually "borrowed" at this time because it had already been designated for a Home Management House. The decision to erect a home economics building was not without further controversy. Contractors vocalized their criticism of the U.B.C. administration for not submitting the project for tender. President MacKenzie defended his actions by claiming that the building was needed immediately and funded by private, not public, monies whose exact amount was not known. MacKenzie was in the habit of expediting procedures and taking on heavy responsibility for decisions in the post-war period since he had been given authorization by the board of governors to take "emergency action...as may be necessary in respect of staff, equipment and accommodation"; *ibid.*, 24 Sept. 1945.

75. Muirhead and Rae, "Report." The large amount of money that had been left for the university for the home economics building by Jonathan Rogers convinced some people that the building should be named after this donor. This proposition was discussed by the board of governors who (sensibly and sensitively) decided a plaque and Rogers' portrait would suffice. It would have been a final irony, indeed, if the women of British Columbia whose energies were directed to this cause for many years had seen their project named for a male benefactor, albeit Rogers' bequest was gratefully received. *Ibid.*, 26 Sept. and 31 Oct. 1949.

76. "General History of Home Management Houses," "U.B.C. Home Management House History," Department of Home Economics, Box 1, Folder 4, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives. The Home Management House was built with further assistance from the Women's Committee of the U.B.C. Alumni Development Fund and the continued interest and donations of B.C. women's organizations.

77. "Reporting on the University," Department of Home Economics, Box 1, U.B.C. Library, U.B.C. Archives.