

Such failures were generally attributed by the public, and by WAAC trainees, to the numbers involved in the expansion program, or to the difficulty of procuring women's garments in an organization accustomed to dealing only with men's. The latter view was at times held by WAAC Headquarters itself, which noted in one criticism of The Quartermaster General's action: "Two manufacturers of women's wear said . . . any one of fifty stores in the country supplied many more women with many more items."³ However, upon later analysis, shortages—as distinguished from defects in style—were seldom found to be due to Quartermaster inexperience or inability to let contracts for the relatively small numbers of women in the Army, but rather to simple failure to let WAAC contracts to manufacturers in time. This in turn was caused by the repeated refusal of Requirements Division, Services of Supply, to approve The Quartermaster General's proposals without lengthy delay and debate over possible discrimination in favor of women. At other times failures resulted, in The Quartermaster General's opinion, from the Services of Supply's action in approving G-3's expansion plans without the concurrence of supply agencies.

Difficulties in this respect could be traced back to the moment, a few days after the passage of WAAC legislation, when WAAC Headquarters and The Quartermaster General completed and sent to Requirements Division for approval the Table of Basic Allowances for winter clothing. Its approval was believed routine, since General Marshall had personally viewed and approved every listed item at the time of the WAAC's establishment. Nevertheless, approval was not forthcoming, and upon inquiry it was

found that Requirements Division took issue with the fact that women's military clothing, like their civilian clothing, was scheduled to cost more than men's. A Waac's outfit would cost \$177.45 as against \$102.33 for a man's. In its efforts to equalize the total costs, Requirements Division noted that, whereas men received only one overcoat, women were scheduled to get two—the heavy winter coat like the men's and the light waterproof utility coat instead of the men's field jacket. Requirements Division at once determined to save \$15.00 per woman by deleting the utility coat.

Director Hobby, when informed, pointed out that Requirements Division's action had been taken in ignorance of the previous months of planning on the WAAC uniform, in which the whole outfit had been keyed to the two coats. Thus, women's winter uniforms and underwear were of a lighter weight than men's, and women were not given either wool shirts or field jackets. The heavy overcoat was too warm for wear in spring and fall, and she felt that sickness would result if women faced those seasons with only cotton shirts and light covert cloth uniforms. The Quartermaster General sided with the Director, pointing out that no saving would result from the deletion, since one utility coat and one overcoat would wear as long as two of the more expensive overcoats, while a utility coat would protect the overcoat from rough wear in rain, mud, and motor convoys. The Chief of Administrative Services, General Grunert, likewise backed the Director in her arguments.⁴ Requirements Division nevertheless re-

³ MS Draft, The WAAC—Its Mission, 6 Apr 43. Folder, Plng Serv Notes, WAAC Planning files.

⁴ Memo, CofAdm Serv for Reqmts Div SOS, 25 Jun 42. Same file.