l'auteur brosse l'arrière-plan théorique européen et décrit enfin la perception de la folie dans la vallée du Saint-Laurent ainsi que les réponses qu'on y a apportées.

Au chapitre des sources, l'appareil bibliographique est impressionnant : y figure à peu près tout ce que l'historiographie de la Nouvelle-France compte de sources imprimées. Il faut s'empresser de souligner l'extraordinaire filon exploité par l'auteur : Cellard est, à notre connaissance, le premier historien de la folie au Québec à avoir utilisé les documents d'interdiction et de curatelle. La tutelle et la curatelle sont les principales procédures à suivre concernant l'administration et l'entretien par une tierce personne des corps et des biens des individus incapables légalement, physiquement ou mentalement, de s'administrer eux-mêmes (p. 228). De manière plus précise, les archives de la curatelle fournissent le nom de la personne interdite, son sexe, son âge, sa profession, son lieu de résidence, la description de la maladie telle que présentée par les proches du malade et ses causes présumées, les attitudes adoptées, les questions posées par le juge et les remarques qu'il a formulées, enfin les commentaires de l'interdit sur lui-même et sur sa situation. Cellard a pu compulsor cent de ces documents pour le XVIIIe siècle et 489 autres pour le XIXe siècle. L'exceptionnelle richesse de cette source est évidente car elle documente, outre le cas de chaque individu, les avenues théoriques telles les attitudes mentales devant le fou, ainsi que l'évolution du regard médical sur celui-ci.

Cette histoire de la folie, par l'originalité et le traitement de ses sources, est un travail remarquable.

Martin Tétrault
Archives nationales du Canada


In The Gender of Breadwinners, winner of the Canadian Historical Association's Macdonald Prize, Joy Parr examines and contrasts two small, one-industry towns in Ontario — Paris and Hanover — from 1880 to 1950. Whereas Paris' economy was dominated by Penmans, a knitting firm that employed mostly female labour, Hanover was a furniture manufacturing town whose largest employer, the Knechtel Furniture Company, primarily hired men. These two communities also differed significantly in terms of their social and cultural composition; while Paris' population was comprised mostly of recent arrivals who had worked in textile firms located in the British Midlands, Hanover was settled by third-generation German immigrants, whose backgrounds were rooted in agricultural and artisanal work.

Using these two community models, Parr attempts to determine the role that work structure played in shaping gender relations at the industrial, domestic, and community level. While most feminist historians who approached this topic in the past focused solely on women's experiences within the workplace, Parr's analysis extends beyond this realm through the incorporation of other variables such as ethnicity, religion, and cultural background. All of these factors, she contends, formed a type of social web that influenced the development of gender relations in both Paris and Hanover.

Parr's selection of Paris and Hanover was hardly arbitrary: she specifically chose these two towns because of the internal industrial structures of Penmans and the
Knechtel Furniture Company as well as the different ethnic and religious composition of
the two towns that made them so unique. These differences enabled Parr to compare
and contrast the gender relations between Paris, which was viewed as a “woman’s town,”
and Hanover, which possessed a more typically male-dominated industrial and social
structure. These industrial differences, coupled with the particular social and religious
background of the town dwellers, she argues, served in influencing the character of
gender relations within these two towns. For instance, in Paris, the women often served
as the main or principal breadwinners in the household, since they were granted greater
employment opportunities at Penmans than the men. Due to their preferred status
within the knitting factory, Parr asserts, women began to assume a more prominent and
powerful role both within the home and the community as a whole. By contrast,
Hanover was a more traditional town, where men were the breadwinners and women
were only encouraged to work in the local textile mill until they married. Upon
marrying, they were expected to abandon wage work in favour of housework. Although
Paris is viewed by the author as an atypical town, it contrasts nicely with Hanover, which
was most likely closer to the norm during that period.

In addition to revealing the many interesting facets of the knitting and furniture
workers’ lives, Parr uses a plethora of interesting sources to document the history of the
two industries and communities. She relies not only on local newspapers, the Canadian
census, government, union, and business records from the National and Ontario
Archives, company records, municipal assessment rolls, and trade journals, but also on
two ambitious and successful oral history projects that she undertook in Paris and
Hanover. The author’s use of oral history enables her to piece together portions of these
workers’ lives that would not have been accessible through the use of primary documents
alone. These testimonies also enable Parr to interpret her subjects’ experiences at the
individual level, thus adding a much more personal and authentic quality to her study.

On the whole, Parr provides an interesting and insightful investigation into gender
relations within these two small Ontario towns. Her study probes such areas as ethnicity,
religion, and community values, factors that had long been overlooked in the past when
assessing the interrelationship between industrial development and gender relations.
Although she makes a strong case for the predominance of these various forces within
Hanover, they do not seem to possess the same centrality in Paris. This is evident when
one examines the impact that these factors had on Penmans’ female workforce. Parr
indicates that most of the female knitters who worked in the factory had been recruited
from factories in the British Midlands, where they had been raised in a more traditional
environment in which the men dominated both within the mills and the home. Rather
than drawing on their cultural roots, Paris’s female workers appeared to have quickly
and easily abandoned their traditional roles after their arrival, readily adapting to the
more liberating and equalitarian social relations that existed in Paris at the time. This
situation certainly brings into question the centrality of religious, ethnic, and cultural
values within the context of gender relations in Paris.

A second issue that comes to the fore when assessing this type of analysis is the validity
of using towns such as Paris and Hanover as clear-cut models in regard to gender
relations. For although there is little doubt that the women in Paris were far more
independent and liberated than their counterparts in Hanover, the analytical structure
of this work provides little or no room for any type of aberration from these two patterns
of relations. The sources also were clearly selected to support these models. Perhaps if
Parr had interviewed some of the female workers in Hanover, she might have discovered that they were able to devise certain networks or strategies that served to enhance their power and authority within this male-dominated community. One also is left to wonder whether Paris’ men were really as accommodating and helpful within the home as we are led to believe. While Parr has used the testimony of seven women to reach the conclusion that the men were often quite willing to engage in some of the chores around the home, she might have discovered that the majority of men were not quite as liberated had she interviewed a larger segment of the population.

Aside from these minor quibbles, *The Gender of Breadwinners* is a wonderfully written piece that makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of gender relations within two very different local settings. Parr creatively uses sources such as municipal assessment rolls and company payrolls to produce a chronological, occupational, and gender breakdown of both Paris and Hanover’s workforce. She also relies on these two sources to determine the age, marital status, and living accommodations of the workers. Her usage of these types of sources, as well as the oral history projects that she undertook, could open up new avenues of research for labour historians interested in documenting the activities of workers in local industries. Finally, Parr’s study has made a strong and vital contribution to the larger field of local labour history. Her new approach has provided a more dynamic alternative to the old and stale studies that focused more on workers’ industrial and organizational activities. Instead, Parr introduces a more comprehensive and complex analysis of working people’s lives by taking into consideration important forces such as gender, ethnicity, community and religion, all of which help to shape the lives and experience of Canada’s working class.

**Ellen Scheinberg**
National Archives of Canada


In September 1988 the Conservative government of Brian Mulroney, on behalf of all Canadians, formally apologized to the Japanese Canadian community for the mistreatment accorded them during the Second World War when thousands were uprooted from their coastal homes and businesses and relocated to the interior of British Columbia. Compensation for their economic losses was awarded to the survivors and their relatives upon validation of their claims by the Secretary of State. The Japanese Canadian community felt vindicated after many years of pressuring the Canadian government to right the wrongs of nearly fifty years ago. Other ethnic groups who also felt unfairly treated at the hands of previous Canadian governments took heart. The Chinese Canadians began to press for redress of the infamous “head tax” of $500 imposed on each immigrant from China who entered Canada to find work during the early part of this century. The Ukrainian Canadians renewed efforts to obtain some compensation for their ancestors, who had settled in the prairie provinces and subsequently were deprived of their property when about 5,000 were interned as “prisoners of war” during the First World War; a further 88,000 had to carry identification cards and report to the police regularly. Recently the Prime Minister