

## **Working Women Downtown: Single Women in Toronto 1900–1930**

Richard Dennis  
University College London

Between 1900 and 1930 the population of Toronto increased from around 200,000 to more than 800,000.<sup>1</sup> Physical expansion spread beyond the City of Toronto's administrative boundaries, which had themselves been extended several times by annexations (e.g. of West Toronto in 1909 and North Toronto in 1912), into independent municipalities where less restrictive building regulations, but also a more primitive infrastructure, had made for cheap living for new immigrants. The replacement in 1921 of the private Toronto Railway Company, which operated the city's streetcars but had declined to extend its services into newly annexed districts, by the municipal Toronto Transit Commission also facilitated urban growth and encouraged patterns of commuting between suburban homes and downtown workplaces. Meanwhile, as Richard Harris has noted, there was also an increasing suburbanisation of employment.<sup>2</sup> But the characteristic of employment that is of most concern for this paper was the increasing participation of women in the labour force, and especially the increasing numbers of single women working in banks and offices, mainly downtown, and in schools and health services across the city. By 1931, 68,000 women were in paid employment, more than a quarter of all persons employed in the City of Toronto. Almost a third (21,556) were in clerical occupations, and the number recorded in the professions (5,715) exceeded the number of saleswomen (5,495). Nonetheless, many women must have been relatively poorly paid: in domestic service (10,212) and manufacturing (12,132).<sup>3</sup>

My focus in this paper, arising from previous research on the expansion of apartment housing in early twentieth-century Toronto,<sup>4</sup> is on where these women workers lived, partly in relation to where they worked, but also in the context of contemporary anxieties about a 'girl problem' and 'women adrift' (the epithet for young single women who lived apart from parents or other close kin).

There is some evidence from other North American cities (e.g. in Joanne Meyerowitz's study of working women in Chicago) that employers favoured young women who lived with their families over more independently minded 'women adrift'.<sup>5</sup> Employers often justified low wages by assuming that their

female employees would live at home with parents, and that they did not expect a 'career' but merely short-term employment until they got married and became full-time housewives. In her study of Montreal bank employees in the first quarter of the twentieth century, Kate Boyer found that the average age at which women were hired was 20 and their average length of employment only two years. Women were assumed "to be 'naturally' more immobile and 'home-based' than men" so that if they did apply for promotion or transfers to other branches, it was interpreted as a sign of their instability.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, women who did not live at home might be treated with suspicion, as too independently minded, too liable to succumb to the temptations of bright lights or an immoral lifestyle, too likely to be inefficient workers, prone to gossip about their activities the night before, or to turn up for work late or tired out by too much leisure activity.<sup>7</sup> So young 'women adrift' were perceived as constituting a 'girl problem'. In Chicago, perhaps because of this discrimination by office employers, 'women adrift' were relatively concentrated in low-paid service jobs and under-represented in office work. We might, therefore, expect differences between the occupational structures of women living with parents, women who could afford to live 'apart', if not 'adrift', in apartments, and the core of 'women adrift' who were boarders or roomers.

In the United States, 'women adrift' made up around 20 per cent of all wage-earning women living in major cities at the beginning of the twentieth century. In Chicago, an increasing proportion of this group (28 per cent in 1880, 34 per cent in 1910) lived alone or with unrelated others rather than with a family or in a boarding house.<sup>8</sup> In Toronto in 1912, about 15,000 of Toronto's 40,000 single working women lived away from home (37.5 per cent). In the 1920s, estimates suggested that 20–30 per cent of 'working girls' (presumably a more restricted, younger group than all working women) lived apart from their families.<sup>9</sup>

The use of the word 'adrift' indicated that contemporaries—not only men but also professional female social workers and doctors—were far from relaxed about the trend. To them, these young women constituted a 'girl problem': as innocents cast adrift in an alien environment, they might suffer sexual exploitation; as 'good time girls' they might exploit and demoralise the city's (male) youth; at the very least, they might become slaves to 'low culture' and a hedonistic, purely materialistic lifestyle. In a city as strait-laced as 'Toronto the Good' this was not an attractive prospect.

At the least, therefore, substitute mother-figures and a stable home environment were prescribed. Hence the proliferation of specialist hostels for working

girls, including those provided by the YWCA and a variety of philanthropic agencies. The Toronto Housing Company's cottage flats on either side of the Don Valley, east of downtown Toronto, originally intended as co-partnership housing—the then fashionable way into working-class homeownership—but ending up as conventional limited-dividend rental housing, also came to be associated with groups of single female sharers.<sup>10</sup> The report of the City's Housing Commission, responding to the housing shortage at the end of World War I, observed that “there are numbers of business women who would be very glad to obtain small apartments, suitable for groups of three or four, and thus avoid the regrettable rooming system.”<sup>11</sup> City Controller O'Neill advocated relaxing the regulations which prohibited new apartment housing to allow the construction of, or conversion of existing dwellings into, three-flat apartment houses (triplexes), which he thought would provide ideal accommodation for groups of female sharers.<sup>12</sup>

We might expect that, with increasing affluence on the part of the employed population, boarding and lodging would have been replaced by apartment-house living. More people could afford ‘a home of their own’, even if that home was a rented apartment rather than the owner-occupied American-dream-house. In the case of Toronto, however, Richard Harris has pointed to the continuing significance of boarding for the family economies of new, and economically marginal, homeowners—the kinds of people who could only afford mortgage repayments by providing board and lodging to one or two boarders to help supplement the family income.<sup>13</sup> So how important was boarding for single working women in Toronto?

This leads to a further set of questions about the nature of journeys to work, especially for women working downtown. We might expect rooming houses run as full-time businesses to be concentrated close to downtown, but individual boarding to be situated in the suburban homes of low-income owner-occupiers. Young women (or their parents) would presumably favour the latter over the more obvious moral problems associated with cheap rooming houses, although both probably preferred, assuming a self-contained apartment was financially out of the question, a room in a regulated, well-supervised women's hostel.<sup>14</sup> Suburban boarding implied a lengthy journey to work, and there is some evidence, for example in work on Toronto by Vicky Bloomfield, of the lengthy journeys to work made by single women. In one sample year (1921) women's median journey to work exceeded that of men, and single women's median journey to work was double that of the small number of married working women included in her sample.<sup>15</sup> More than a generation ago, James Vance proposed a differentiation between ‘determinative’ and ‘contingent’ ties

between home and work: in most households, the location of home would be determined by the workplace location of the male head of household; the home-work ties for other household members would be contingent on this prior decision. Following Vance's ideas, we might expect working women who lived with their parents to have longer journeys to work than their fathers, assuming that the family home was located for the convenience of the male head of household, and especially given that many clerical or shop-assistant daughters working downtown would have fathers working in suburban factories.<sup>16</sup> But we might also expect differences if we compared the journeys to work of female household heads, lodgers and daughters still living with parents.

The Canadian *Labour Gazette* calculated in 1913 that the average wage of female factory workers in Canada was \$261 per annum. Waitresses in Toronto at this time also earned only about \$5 per week. Professional and skilled women workers, such as nurses and stenographers, earned around \$20 per week, but since nurses averaged only about eight months' employment in 1913, their annual income worked out at only about \$600.<sup>17</sup> Even in 1921, female earnings averaged only \$667 per annum.<sup>18</sup> For blue-collar female workers the average was only \$578 per annum, ranging from \$9.01 per week for women in service to more than \$15 per week in some forms of textile industry.<sup>19</sup> The Ontario Department of Labour calculated in 1919 that the cost of board and lodging for wage-earning women was at least \$6 to \$7 per week. Taking the latter figure, the Ontario Minimum Wage Act (1920) specified a wage of at least \$12.56 per week. But, among city women likely to be living independently, bank employees, teachers and nurses were not covered by the provisions of the act.<sup>20</sup> Note, too, that \$12.56 per week was almost exactly equivalent to the actual *average* earnings of \$667 per annum quoted above. Most 'women adrift' could not easily afford even as little as \$7 per week for housing and food, much less than it cost to rent a small, self-contained apartment. Either they were obliged to continue living in low-cost, low-quality lodgings or they might share rooms or, exceptionally, a purpose-built self-contained flat with other women like themselves, much as Controller O'Neill proposed.

In practice the ambitions of this paper are less comprehensive than my introduction might appear to warrant. My focus is on the geographical distribution of different types of working women across different types of housing, primarily through statistical descriptions based on samples of women householders living in apartment houses and of the female employees of Eaton's department store (and its associated manufacturing and distribution activities) and of selected banks, whether living 'adrift' or with parents. The data are drawn from city assessment rolls and directories. Additionally, and as an introduction to

the statistical interpretation, I also approach the accommodation of working women in two other ways: through an examination of the portrayal of young women in inter-war fiction, especially focused on the writing of the leading Toronto-based (and, in Canada, the first truly ‘urban’) novelist of the inter-war period, Morley Callaghan; and through a case study of one housing development which advertised itself as specially designed for women.

This multi-method and multi-source approach is based on the logic that while textual sources, such as diaries, correspondence or, in this case, works of fiction, provide important insights into values, attitudes and processes underlying decision-making, we cannot be sure of their representativeness or typicality of the population at large. Indeed, in the case of fiction, which rarely dwells on the routine or everyday, we may sometimes be dealing with the exceptional or the incredible. And, if we lay emphasis (as I do, in what follows) on the intrinsic authenticity and reliability of incidental and contextual detail, we risk reducing fiction to just another source of ‘information’, treating it as barely disguised reminiscence or autobiography.<sup>21</sup> This may not satisfy literary critics or cultural geographers concerned with geographies of rather than in the text. But it is still a legitimate way of generating new questions with which to interrogate the statistical record. In turn, while statistical analysis can reveal the generality of associations between demographic, socio-economic and spatial variables and the socio-economic outcomes of processes of choice and constraint in housing and job markets, on its own it can never be more than suggestive of motivation or causation.

### **Working women in inter-war fiction**

Morley Callaghan (1903–1990) grew up in Riverdale, just east of downtown Toronto, attended St Michael’s, the Catholic college of the University of Toronto, and worked briefly in a variety of summer vacation jobs—in a lumberyard, in Simpson’s department store and as a junior reporter on the *Toronto Star*—before publishing his first novel in 1928.<sup>22</sup> Between 1928 and 1937 Callaghan produced six novels and numerous short stories, predominantly set in an unnamed city that is culturally, socially and topographically Toronto. In the course of his direct and undecorated realism, we encounter numerous ‘women adrift’—students, teachers, waitresses—newly arrived in the city, making their homes temporarily in cheap suburban apartments or downtown rooming houses.<sup>23</sup>

For example, in Callaghan’s second novel, *It’s Never Over* (1930), Lillian’s parents live “in the country”.<sup>24</sup> She has been living with a maiden aunt in the

west end of the city, in “a big brick house with a wide veranda overlooking High Park”. But on the advice of her best friend, Isabelle, and as a first step towards independence, she moves into a small apartment on the third floor of a new apartment house in the north of the city, paying the rent partly by giving piano lessons, but also with the help of her boyfriend who, partly for reasons of respectability but also, one suspects, because she wishes to retain her independence, continues to live elsewhere.<sup>25</sup>

In *More Joy in Heaven* (1937), Julie, a waitress at a “black and white lunch counter” close to the centre of the city, lives “in an apartment overlooking the school yard on Temple Street”, a mile or two out in the east end of the city: a modest, first-floor apartment in a modest block. Julie, too, was a recent migrant alone in the city: her father lived in Pennsylvania, her mother in Buffalo.<sup>26</sup> In *They Shall Inherit the Earth* (1935), another single migrant, Anna Prychoda, whose Ukrainian parents lived in Detroit, occupies one room in an inner-city rooming house, close to the university but overlooking a square where the unemployed slept rough. Anna had been a student in New York and then worked as a fashion designer but, as the Depression deepened, she was forced to take a part-time job in the dress department of a store. Now she was unemployed. Meanwhile, “the city seemed to get much smaller because her experience became more and more restricted and her life more secluded. She had moved from place to place till she hardly knew anyone where she lived.”<sup>27</sup> Anna represented the downside of being a ‘woman adrift’—few friends and no money for new clothes or entertainment.

But living in a rooming house or a cheap apartment was not always a temporary rite of passage. In Callaghan’s comic short story, ‘A Wedding Dress’ (1927), Miss Lena Schwartz, aged 32, works in a millinery shop and lives in a quiet boarding house on Wellesley Street, the only woman among seven boarders. She had been there some time, engaged to be married to Sam for the past fifteen years, patiently waiting for him to get a good job. Her landlady had not wanted women boarders, who might get the house a bad reputation, but Miss Schwartz, plain and boring, was no threat to the house’s respectability until, at last about to be married, she succumbs to the temptation of a downtown department store, and steals a dress she cannot afford.<sup>28</sup>

Miss Schwartz’s transgression into the territory of ‘girl problems’ is an isolated occurrence, but less respectable rooming-house and apartment women also inhabit the pages of Callaghan’s fiction. In *Such Is My Beloved* (1934), two prostitutes, Ronnie and Midge, share two rooms in the seedy Standard Hotel, close to the Catholic cathedral and in the heart of the red-light district.

Again, they are relative newcomers—Midge (real name Catherine Bourassa) is from Montreal, Ronnie (Veronica Olsen) from Detroit.<sup>29</sup> But perhaps the greatest range of women currently or previously ‘adrift’ is to be found in Callaghan’s first novel, *Strange Fugitive* (1928), set in the mid-1920s. Vera Trotter had grown up in Toronto, but then moved to Chicago where she “had had an affair with a man who had been expelled from college for his unnatural habits” before returning to what she hopes will be a more settled married life in the western suburbs of Toronto. Julie Roberts is a war widow, now aged about 35, who runs a “book and novelty shop...up-town, close to the good conservative district” and lives alone in a nearby cottage. Anna is separated from her husband and living alone in a purpose-built apartment house in the vicinity of Sherbourne Street, east of the city centre. Farther east, “over the river on the other side of the park” (presumably in Riverdale, where Callaghan himself grew up) lived an unnamed “plump, kittenish lady of thirty-five” who could be observed through the blinds of her basement apartment entertaining “a different man...nearly every night”.<sup>30</sup> Of the four women, only one—Julie—is credited with a ‘proper job’, another presumably lives off her earnings as a prostitute, Vera is married and childless when the novel begins but appears to be a full-time housewife, and Anna must be dependent on what she has extracted from her former husband.

Other ‘apartment women’ and ‘women adrift’ feature in Hugh Garner’s novel *Cabbagetown*, published in abridged form in 1950 and in full in 1968, but drawing on his experience growing up in Toronto in the 1920s and 1930s. When she loses her job as a hosiery factory worker early in the Depression, 17-year-old Myrla Patson escapes the poverty of a slum cottage in Cabbagetown in Toronto’s east end by finding employment as a live-in maid in a house in North Toronto. But after losing this job too she becomes a waitress in the Union Jack Grill on Queen Street West. She lives first in a rooming house, then just north of the restaurant in a small two-room apartment, provided by her employer in return for sexual favours. When she turns full-time prostitute she moves from the west end back east, to the red-light district around Pembroke and Jarvis Streets, living in a succession of rooming houses.<sup>31</sup> At the other end of the social spectrum, the lesbian Barbara Summers hosts parties for an “artsy-crafty crowd” of writers, artists and university dons in an “apartment house in the north-central section of town” (presumably around Avenue Road).<sup>32</sup>

There are numerous examples here of ‘women adrift’ and of single, widowed or separated women living independent lives as waitresses, shop assistants, teachers or prostitutes in their own apartments or lodgings; but it may be objected that both Callaghan and Garner were male novelists, proud of their

masculinity, and liable to objectify or fantasise about their female characters. They were unlikely to write about women in everyday jobs, living quiet lives at home with their parents or in respectable lodgings. Was the apartment-based call-girl just a product of the misogynist novelist's or moral reformer's or anti-apartment activist's too vivid imagination?

There were few female novelists in Toronto prior to World War II other than romantic authors like Mazo de la Roche, and fewer still who chose to set their work in their home city.<sup>33</sup> Two post-war novels feature newly wed couples setting up home in apartments in the 1930s. In *The Torontonians* (1960), Karen grows up in a "big, old house on Elmdale Avenue" [in The Annex], later moving to "the apartment on Gavin Street where she and Rick had first set up housekeeping" and where her children were born.<sup>34</sup> But there is no intermediate stage of independent adulthood or paid employment. In Shirley Faessler's *Everything in the Window* (1979), Sophie Glicksman, 17 (the same age as her creator at the time the novel is set, in the 1930s), works in the offices of the Jewish 'Y' and lives with her parents in a rented house on Bellevue Avenue, in the heart of the working-class Jewish neighbourhood of Kensington, just west of downtown, and only a few minutes' walk from her workplace. When she marries and has a baby, Sophie moves into a three-room 'flat' (sharing a bathroom with the landlady's family) in a house on Palmerston Boulevard, a bit more upmarket than her parents' home and a few blocks farther from downtown. Later in the novel both Sophie and her husband have affairs with lovers who live in fashionable, purpose-built apartments.<sup>35</sup> The story confirms the image of 1930s apartment residents as unconventional, arty and morally 'other', but again it tells us little about the work situations, if any, of its female characters.

## Midmaples

Yet there were more conventional and respectable cases of working women living independently. Consider the women who lived in Midmaples, an apartment building on Huron Street, close to the University of Toronto. Midmaples purported to be specially designed for women: its building permit indicates that it was authorised, not as an apartment house but as a "4-storey brick and steel ladies' residence", and it was promoted by Home Suite Homes Ltd as "a residence for lady teachers, nurses and business women".<sup>36</sup> There was a degree of old-fashioned paternalism about the management: a 1914 publicity brochure noted that visitors were welcome to inspect the apartments "any time except on Sunday" and "The sale or use of alcoholic beverages anywhere on the properties" was "PROHIBITED". An advisory committee, comprised of

five tenants including a public health nurse, a kindergarten superintendent, a commercial (school)master, a school principal's assistant, and a member of the editorial staff of a leading publisher, "consented to advise with the manager in an effort to maintain at all times a standard of personnel and general conduct among all the lessees, so that no one may ever have occasion to be otherwise than 'proud to live in Midmaples'". The building contained "over 50 specially designed suites and suite-rooms, suitable for business and professional women and newly-weds".<sup>37</sup>

But despite the hype, the testimonials of satisfied lessees, and the claims to full occupancy of the building, the assessment roll for 1915 (compiled in 1914) indicates a less than full, and a less than fully female building; and a list of residents, dated 1 May 1914, recorded 65 'Miss' and six 'Mrs' but also 15 'Mr', 10 'Mr and Mrs' and five combinations of adults and children.<sup>38</sup> Several suites were occupied by groups of female sharers, sometimes sisters such as Minnie, Susan and Mary Habick, respectively stenographer (workplace unknown), milliner's employee at a shop on Bloor Street, and stenographer at the Adelaide Street office of the Milton Pressed Brick Company; sometimes apparently unrelated, such as Phoebe Scott and Roberta Doolittle, both school-teachers, in the Wellesley and Leslie Street Schools, and Sadie Hardwick and Mabel Patton, both stenographers, for a Bay Street real estate business and for the General Accident Assurance Co, situated across Bay Street in the Continental Life Building, who shared a very low rated (\$926), probably one-room apartment. Among 26 female occupants whose occupations could be traced in the city directory, 12 were stenographers, two were clerks, seven were teachers. The teachers' schools were scattered widely across the city—Leslie Street, for example, was on the opposite side of downtown from Huron Street—but the office workers almost all worked in downtown offices.

Midmaples illustrates in microcosm most of the characteristics of apartment-women revealed below by the aggregate statistics. Here were single women who were far from 'adrift' and unlikely to constitute a 'girl problem'. Modestly remunerated, no doubt, they comprised an elite of women workers by the standards of 1914. Yet by 1930, the building had evidently degenerated into a rooming house. Instead of a carefully compiled list of tenants, the assessment roll for 1931 simply listed the total number of occupants of the building, and the directory failed to distinguish the occupants of separate suites.

## Quantitative analysis

An analysis of tenants recorded in assessment rolls for a sample of purpose-built apartment houses in early twentieth-century Toronto, conducted by Ceinwen Giles and myself as part of an ESRC-funded project during 1997–8, found that female-headed households increased from fewer than 15 per cent to nearly 40 per cent of apartment-households between 1909 and 1930.<sup>39</sup> Of course, the total number of people living in apartments was also much higher in 1930. There had been major booms in apartment-house construction in the early 1910s and late 1920s.<sup>40</sup> But what was most striking was the growth of apartment-households headed by single women. In 1914, 37 per cent of female-headed apartment households were headed by unmarried women, and 59 per cent by widows. In 1930, the proportions were almost exactly reversed: 37 per cent of female heads were widowed, and 57 per cent were single (Table 1).

This was the starting point for the present interest in the housing of women workers. Unfortunately, the principal sources for reconstructing patterns of residence and employment—tax assessment rolls and city directories—are less than helpful when it comes to dealing with women. In Toronto assessment rolls, men had ages and occupations, women were accorded only their marital status. So it was necessary to link women's names in assessment rolls with entries in directories in order to ascertain their occupations. Suffice to say that this is an imperfect art.

Assessment rolls recorded only heads of household except where other household members had sources of income that were liable to taxation, something which applied to very few boarders, sharers or daughters. So recourse to city directories was again necessary. Fortunately, Toronto directories aimed to list everybody who was in regular employment, including lodgers, boarders and adult children. But there were still problems in distinguishing between women who were lodgers and those who were living with parents. In 1915, the directory recorded individuals as 'h' (for householder), 'l' ('lives at', usually regarded as a close member of the householder's family), 'b' (boards) and 'rms' (rooms, i.e. lodging without meals or services being provided). Unfortunately, by 1930 this elaborate notation had been abandoned in favour of a crude division into 'h' and 'r' (resides), eliminating the distinction between family members and lodgers.

There is, however, an alternative way of at least approximating the distribution of lodgers (whether boarders or roomers). We can check whether any indi-

vidual selected by sampling from the A–Z section of the directory shared the *same surname* as the householder listed in the street-by-street section of the directory at their address. Of course, this procedure will fail to identify women with different surnames from heads of household, but who were actually their stepdaughters, married (or widowed) daughters, nieces and cousins. But in the aggregate, and as a *comparative* measure, the procedure offers a way of distinguishing between different groups of women with higher or lower rates of lodging.

Assessment rolls also recorded employees at their place of work, but only if they were liable to pay local income tax. Unfortunately, few women earned enough to be liable. The threshold for tax-paying varied but, for example, in 1906 you needed to be earning more than \$600 per annum (or \$1000 if you were a householder).<sup>41</sup> On the basis of the wage rates discussed earlier, most female heads of household and many other lower-paid single women earned too little to be liable for municipal income tax.

I will focus firstly on the samples of female apartment tenants for 1914 and 1930, examining where these tenants worked; and secondly on samples of employees in selected downtown businesses, examining where and in what kinds of housing they lived.

The occupations of nearly 40 per cent of female apartment-tenants were recorded in the city directory in 1930 (Table 2). It appears that most single apartment-women, but only a small proportion of widows, were in employment. Their occupational structure was not very different in 1930 from what it had been more than 15 years earlier. More than 40 per cent of employed women in the sample had office jobs, as clerks, stenographers and bookkeepers, and there were also large numbers of teachers and nurses (Table 3). There were a few more senior ‘caring professionals’ such as doctors and social workers, but also some lower-paid women, listed as sales assistants or simply ‘employees’, perhaps hinting that some of the types of women who had been boarders or roomers in the 1900s were able to afford an apartment of their own by 1930, a consequence of increased wages, but also of the construction of cheap, so-called ‘efficiency’ apartments, often in suburban localities. But, by comparison with the overall occupational profile of women in Toronto, there were few women employed in manufacturing living in apartments. As early as 1911 the Canadian census recorded more than 42,000 women in paid employment in Toronto, of whom 27 per cent were in domestic service and 35 per cent in manufacturing. 29 per cent were in ‘office and sales’ work.<sup>42</sup> The proportion of employed women who were engaged in clerical work increased from 14.2 per

cent in 1911 to 30.4 per cent in 1931.<sup>43</sup> In other words, compared to the aggregate census figures, female clerical workers were massively over-represented among apartment tenants in 1914, and somewhat over-represented in 1930.

Table 4 compares the locations of apartments where different occupational groups lived with the locations of their workplaces. The locations have been simplified into three zones—downtown, inner suburbs and outer suburbs.<sup>44</sup> Not all workplaces were recorded—hence the X category in the second part of the table: nurses, for example, presumably operated mainly from home; only a few were recorded as working at a particular hospital. Perhaps as a consequence, most nurses *lived* downtown where they had easy access for home visiting or to a range of medical facilities where they might be employed. Teachers who lived in apartments were also concentrated downtown, although more teaching jobs were located in suburban districts. Office workers demonstrated a more usual pattern of commuting, from homes in suburban apartments to jobs in downtown skyscraper offices.

### **Eaton's**

The principal single source of employment for apartment tenants in 1930, but probably also for women in all kinds of housing situations, was Eaton's (Table 5). The Eaton empire comprised not only old and new department stores fronting Yonge Street, but also warehouses, clothing factories and a mail-order department on the streets immediately to the west.<sup>45</sup> About 50–60 per cent of Eaton's workers were female; but of an estimated female workforce of about 5,000 in 1915, only 85 were traced as liable to tax in the assessment roll, mostly clerks and salesladies.<sup>46</sup> Fortunately, Eaton's returned detailed information to compilers of city directories, recording the home addresses of their employees.<sup>47</sup>

So where, and in what housing situations, did Eaton's employees live? And how had this changed between 1914 and 1930?<sup>48</sup> Firstly, there was a big increase in commuting distances. Nearly half of Eaton's female employees lived in, or within walking distance of, downtown in 1914, but only a quarter of the workforce lived this close to their workplace in 1930 (Table 6). These results match Bloomfield's more extensive sampling of Eaton's workers at 10-year intervals between 1901 and 1951. Bloomfield found that whereas 87 per cent of female employees commuted less than 5km in 1911, by 1931, only 51 per cent lived this near to work.<sup>49</sup>

In 1914 nearly 40 per cent of Eaton's female employees were boarders or roomers; but the higher the status, the less likely were women workers to be boarders (as indicated by the lower proportions of boarders among women workers paying local income tax). The alternative measure of boarding and lodging, provided by comparing the surnames of employees with those of the heads of the households in which they lived, suggests only a slight reduction in lodging between 1914 and 1930.

Critically, lodgers and 'different surnames' employees were concentrated downtown. Of female employees who lived in outer suburbs, most lived with their families. In 1914 about 70 per cent and in 1930 over 80 per cent of Eaton's female employees who lived downtown lived in 'different surname' households, whereas fewer than 40 per cent of employees who lived in the suburbs had 'different surname' household heads (Table 7).

Despite my emphasis earlier in this paper on women who lived in apartment houses, it must be stressed that only a small, albeit increasing, proportion of all women workers occupied such accommodation: two per cent of Eaton's employees listed in the city directory in 1914, increasing to six per cent in 1930. Unsurprisingly, better-paid employees (those listed in 1914 assessment rolls as paying income tax) were more likely to be living in apartments: five per cent of Eaton's 85 taxpaying employees and eight per cent of women listed as paying tax as employees of major downtown banks.

Combining the geographical *and* housing situations of different occupational strata within the Eaton's workforce, it appeared that office workers were more likely to be household heads or to live with at least one parent (and my impression is that in quite a large proportion of cases the household head was a widowed mother), and were more likely to live in the outer suburbs; sales workers were relatively concentrated in inner suburbs and factory workers downtown.

Finally, some brief comments on the situations of 96 female employees of downtown banks and 29 schoolteachers listed in 1914 assessment rolls. As many as eight per cent lived in purpose-built apartments (and in 1914 apartments constituted only about two per cent of all dwellings in the city), and rather more of this group than of Eaton's employees lived in households headed by persons with different surnames. They were also less likely to have been returned as 'boarders' (provided with board and lodging) than as 'roomers' (catering for themselves), in contrast to Eaton's workers, who were much more often boarders than roomers. Presumably, the greater independence implied by these statistics did not translate into their being 'adrift' or a 'problem'. After

all, bank employees and teachers were the elite of women workers downtown, assumed capable of handling their independence responsibly, unlike shopgirls and waitresses. While these results on their own are suggestive, statistical patterns are never an end in themselves. We may want to infer processes from them, but in the end there is no substitute for more personal evidence—if not the novels I reviewed earlier then company records, correspondence, diaries, or (remaining in the statistical realm) a longitudinal study tracing the changing housing and employment circumstances of selected women, rather than relying on cross-sectional comparisons; all of which indicates the need for further intensive archival research.

## Conclusions

I have focused in this paper on the fictional and quantitative evidence for the presence of independent working women and their residence in purpose-built apartments and other kinds of housing in the first third of the twentieth century. In this conclusion I return to the relationship between my results and the cultural histories of ‘women adrift’ and ‘girl problems’ in early twentieth-century North American cities. Carolyn Strange argued that the nature of Toronto’s ‘girl problem’ shifted from the 1880s, when young women first entered the labour market in positions other than as domestic servants, to the 1930s, by which time it was taken for granted that single women from all social backgrounds would find full-time paid employment when they finished their formal education. In the nineteenth century the single working girl living apart from parents was perceived as a moral problem, vulnerable to sexual assault or exploitation and in danger of being led astray. By the 1920s her equivalent was a self-aware, resourceful, occasionally even predatory ‘good-time girl’, capable of looking after herself but still liable to make the ‘wrong’ choices. In these circumstances, progressive reformers sought to inculcate “a discipline of work *and* pleasure”, something for which the YWCA, Sherbourne House and Georgina House and their associated women’s clubs attempted to cater, although only a small proportion of working girls could be accommodated in this way.<sup>50</sup>

Boarding in single-family dwellings carried with it the possibility of sexual exploitation of or by male family members, though the room-registry system offered some safeguards; and boarding was sustained in the early twentieth century by the massive growth of homeownership and mortgagors’ needs to take in boarders to help meet their mortgage repayments. However, there was also a switch from the personal, if sometimes too personal, social relations of boarding to the impersonal relations of rooming, where no meals or other

housekeeping services were provided. No doubt many new homeowners so valued their newly won privacy that they were reluctant to open their homes to unrelated others more than was absolutely necessary. So roomers were dependent on the cafes and lunch-counters that feature so prominently as pick-up sites in Callaghan's and Garner's novels. Boarding with families also implied a journey to work by public transport from suburbia, raising questions for further research focused on the social relations and personal relationships associated with commuting. By contrast, rooming was linked more closely to the inner city and to shorter journeys to work, probably on foot.

But the shift to rooming and renting, whether of rooms carved out of an old house or of a purpose-built apartment, also implied greater privacy for the renter. C.S. Clark in the 1890s suspected girls of renting rooms pretending to be seamstresses or in regular employment, but actually operating as prostitutes; and the police chief constable shared Clark's suspicions, noting the difficulty of detecting and prosecuting illicit activities in "separate apartments".<sup>51</sup> The increasing availability of the telephone, especially associated with apartment-life, also enhanced the privacy of private accommodation.<sup>52</sup>

On the other hand, the shift to renting apartment suites probably reduced rates of residential mobility among women workers. Kate Boyer contrasts the perception of young women as mobile—presumably because they were often girls newly arrived in the city, they moved from one rented room to another quite frequently, and they were not expected to stay in the workforce for very long before getting married and starting a family—with their lack of freedom and immobility within the workplace. Many typing pools resembled nineteenth-century textile mills in their disciplinary regimes and surveillance.<sup>53</sup> But living in apartments made women less mobile in the residential environment, too. Although apartment-house tenants moved house more frequently than homeowners, it seems probable (though as yet insufficiently researched) that they were less mobile than roomers.<sup>54</sup>

Graham Lowe noted that the greatest surge in women's clerical employment occurred between 1911 and 1921, only partly as a consequence of women taking what had previously been men's jobs, for example in banking, during World War I.<sup>55</sup> Yet this was a decade in which there was a slowdown in the construction of apartment housing, following the introduction of anti-apartment by-laws in 1912 and a general lack of new construction during war years when labour and materials were scarce.<sup>56</sup> Hence the crisis in accommodation that prompted the Toronto Housing Commission's report in 1918 and hence

an apparent mismatch between changes in the job market and changes in the housing market during the early 1920s.

Further research could usefully focus on this period immediately following World War I, differentiating more clearly than I have in this paper between the financial and housing situations of different kinds of working women. It would also be worthwhile, though methodologically very difficult, to examine the residential mobility of female boarders and roomers in comparison with apartment tenants.

**Table 1: Female Heads of Household in a Sample of Toronto Apartment Houses**

<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>1914</b>	<b>1930</b>
Single	37 (36.6%)	307 (56.9%)
Married	4 (4.0%)	30 (5.6%)
Widow	60 (59.4%)	199 (36.9%)
Not known	-	4 (0.7%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>540</b>

Source: City of Toronto Assessment Rolls, 1914 for 1915, 1930 for 1931.

**Table 2: Female Heads of Household in a Sample of Toronto Apartment Houses Whose Occupations Were Listed in City Directories**

<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>1914</b>	<b>1930</b>
Single	19 (51%)	175 (57%)
Married	- (0%)	9 (30%)
Widow	3 (5%)	26 (13%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22 (22%)</b>	<b>212 (39%)</b>

Source: City of Toronto Assessment Rolls for 1915 and 1931; Might's Directories for 1915 and 1931. Percentages in brackets refer to the proportion of all female heads in each category (whose total numbers are recorded in Table 1) whose occupations were listed, e.g. in 1914, 19 single female heads (51% of the total of 37 single female heads in the sample) were listed in the directory with an occupation.

**Table 3: Occupations of Female Heads of Toronto Apartment-Households**

Occupational Group	1914				1930
	Total	Single	Married	Widow	Total
Office workers*	9 (41%)	79	3	11	93 (44%)
Teachers/Librarians	7 (32%)	35	-	3	38 (18%)
Medical/Social**	3 (14%)	23	-	1	24 (11%)
Proprietors/Managers	1 (5%)	1	-	4	5 (2%)
Dressmakers	1 (5%)	4	1	-	5 (2%)
Salesladies/Employees	1 (5%)	13	1	1	15 (7%)
Switchboard operators	-	4	-	1	5 (2%)
Other	-	18	4	5	27 (13%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>212</b>

Source: as for Table 2: \* includes accounts staff, bookkeepers, clerks, secretaries and stenographers; \*\* includes nurses, social workers and doctors.

**Table 4: Zones of Residence and Employment of Female Heads of Apartment-Households, 1930**

Zone of Residence	Occupation				
	Office workers	Teachers/Librarians	Medical/Social	Salesladies/Employees	All Occupations
Downtown	49%	55%	63%	60%	53%
Inner	28%	32%	29%	33%	30%
Outer	23%	13%	8%	7%	17%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>212</b>

Zone of Employment	Occupation				
	Office workers	Teachers/Librarians	Medical/Social	Salesladies/Employees	All Occupations
Downtown	63%	8%	29%	73%	46%
Inner	16%	29%	4%	20%	18%
Outer	4%	39%	0%	0%	9%
X	16%	24%	67%	7%	26%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>212</b>

Source: City of Toronto Assessment Rolls and Might's City Directory for 1931. X: Workplace not known: either not listed (inc. some women who probably worked from home), or several possible workplaces (e.g. employer listed as 'Post Office').

**Table 5: Workplaces of Female Heads of Household in Toronto  
Apartment-House Sample for 1930**

<b>Employer</b>	<b>Work Address</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Their Addresses</b>
Eaton's (department store, mail order, and factory)	190–218 Yonge St	13 employees, inc. 3 clerks, 2 buyers, stenographer, telephone operator, kitchen helper, designer, examiner	Athelma x 2, Kenson, Maitland, St Joseph Ct, La Plaza, Merlan, Alicia, Allington, Cawthra, Villa Nova, Lakeview, Buckingham
Simpson's (department store)	160 Yonge St	2 salesladies, 1 buyer	King Edward, Maitland, Shel-drake
Dept of Public Health	Queen's Park	5 nurses, 1 secretary	Kenson, Maitland, Hampton, St James Ct, Hillholme, Lakeview
Wood Gundy (investment bankers)	36 King St west	3 clerks, 1 saleslady	University Apts, Oriole, Hillholme x 2
Tytler & Sproule (barristers)	#1103, 320 Bay St	stenographer, bookkeeper	Hampton, Parkview
Loyal Protective Insurance	371 Bay St	2 stenographers	Sheldrake, Willowdale
Ontario Hydro	190 University Avenue	stenographer, secretary	St Joseph Ct, Queen's Ct
Riverdale Collegiate	1094 Gerrard St east	2 teachers	Queen's Ct, University Apts
Normal School	Gould & Gerrard St east	2 teachers	Maitland, Lawton Blvd

**Table 6: Percentage of Eaton's Female Employees Living in Each City Zone**

<b>Zone</b>	<b>1914 assessment</b>	<b>1914 directory</b>	<b>1930 directory</b>
Downtown	17	13	6
Inner	45	33	18
Outer	39	51	59
Beyond city	-	2	14
n.k.	-	1	3
<b>Total no. of employees in each sample</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>208</b>

**Table 7: Percentage of Eaton's Female Employees with Different Surname from that of the Householder at whose address they lived**

<b>Zone</b>	<b>1914 assessment</b>	<b>1914 directory</b>	<b>1930 directory</b>
Downtown	71	68	83
Inner	47	51	38
Outer	15	39	39
Beyond city	No data	n.k.	33
<b>Total no. of employees in each sample</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>208</b>

Note: The figure in each cell in Table 7 is the percentage of Eaton's female employees with addresses in that zone whose surname was different from that of the householder recorded at that address. For example, 83% of Eaton's female employees who lived 'downtown' in 1930 had surnames different from those of householders listed at the same address in the 'streets' section of the directory; whereas only 38% of employees who lived in the 'inner' zone had different surnames from those of householders at the same address. This table can be read in conjunction with Table 6, which indicates, for example, that only 6% of all Eaton's female employees lived 'downtown' in 1930, compared to 18% who lived in the 'inner' zone. In absolute numbers, therefore, we are dealing with 83% of 6% of 208 (=10) and 38% of 18% of 208 (=14) in these two cells of Table 7.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> For population statistics and contextual historical information, see J.M.S. Careless, *Toronto to 1918* (Toronto, 1984) and J. Lemon, *Toronto since 1918* (Toronto, 1985).
- <sup>2</sup> R. Harris, *Unplanned Suburbs: Toronto's American Tragedy 1900 to 1950* (Baltimore, 1996).

- <sup>3</sup> Figures from Table A.8 in C. Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem: The Perils and Pleasures of the City, 1880–1930* (Toronto, 1995), 221.
- <sup>4</sup> R. Dennis, 'Apartment housing in Canadian cities, 1900–1940', *Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine* 26 (2) (1998), 17–31; R. Dennis and C. Giles, 'Modernity and multi-storey living: apartment tenants in Canadian cities, 1900–1939', End of Award Report to ESRC (March 1999).
- <sup>5</sup> J. Meyerowitz, *Women Adrift: Independent Wage Earners in Chicago, 1880–1930* (Chicago, 1988).
- <sup>6</sup> K. Boyer, "'Miss Remington'" goes to work: gender, space, and technology at the dawn of the information age', *Professional Geographer* 56 (2) (2004), 201–12. See also G.S. Lowe, 'Women, work, and the office: the feminisation of clerical occupations in Canada, 1901–1931' in V. Strong-Boag and A.C. Fellman, eds., *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History* (Third Edition) (Toronto, 1997), 253–70.
- <sup>7</sup> Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, esp. 187–94.
- <sup>8</sup> Meyerowitz, *Women Adrift*, 70–77.
- <sup>9</sup> Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 126, 184.
- <sup>10</sup> S. Spragge, 'A confluence of interests: housing reform in Toronto, 1900–1920' in A. Artibise and G. Stelter, eds., *The Usable Urban Past* (Toronto, 1979), 247–67; L.F. Hurl, 'The Toronto Housing Company, 1912–1923: The pitfalls of painless philanthropy', *Canadian Historical Review* 45 (1984), 28–53; S. Purdy, "'This is not a company; It is a cause": Class, gender and the Toronto Housing Company, 1912–1920', *Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine* 21 (1993), 75–91.
- <sup>11</sup> City of Toronto, *Report of Housing Commission* (December 1918), 10.
- <sup>12</sup> Communication of Controller John O'Neill to Members of Commission on Three-Family Apartments, 28 October 1918, 30–1.
- <sup>13</sup> R. Harris, 'The end justified the means: boarding and rooming in a city of homes, 1890–1951', *Journal of Social History* 26 (1992), 331–58; idem, 'The flexible house: the housing backlog and the persistence of lodging, 1891–1951', *Social Science History* 18 (1994), 31–53.
- <sup>14</sup> Carolyn Strange also notes the existence of the YWCA's room registry established in 1919 "to match respectable women and respectable boarding-homes", *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 177, 185.
- <sup>15</sup> A.V. Bloomfield and R. Harris, 'The journey to work: a historical methodology', *Historical Methods* 30 (2) (1997), 97–109; A.V. Bloomfield, 'Gender Perspectives on the Journey to Work in Toronto, 1901 to 1951', unpublished PhD dissertation, McMaster University (1995).

- <sup>16</sup> J. Vance, 'Housing the worker: determinative and contingent ties in nineteenth-century Birmingham', *Economic Geography* 43 (1967), 95–127.
- <sup>17</sup> L. Rotenberg, 'The wayward worker: Toronto's prostitute at the turn of the century' in J. Acton, P. Goldsmith and B. Shepard, eds., *Women at Work: Ontario 1850–1930* (Toronto, 1974), 33–69.
- <sup>18</sup> Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 221.
- <sup>19</sup> Equivalent figures for adult males were \$1053 per annum for those in blue-collar employment and \$1605 per annum for white-collar workers: M.J. Piva, *The Condition of the Working Class in Toronto – 1900–1921* (Ottawa, 1979), 31, 40.
- <sup>20</sup> Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 199–201.
- <sup>21</sup> See the critique of geographies of literature by Marc Brosseau and James Kneale, and Brosseau's exemplification of his own approach: M. Brosseau, 'Geography's literature', *Progress in Human Geography* 18 (1994), 333–53; idem, 'The city in textual form: *Manhattan Transfer's* New York', *Ecumene* 2 (1995), 89–114; J. Kneale, 'Secondary Worlds: Reading novels as geographical research' in A. Blunt et al, eds., *Cultural Geography in Practice* (London, 2003), 37–51.
- <sup>22</sup> G. Boire, *Morley Callaghan: Literary Anarchist* (Toronto, 1994).
- <sup>23</sup> G. Woodcock, 'Callaghan's Toronto: the persona of a city', *Journal of Canadian Studies* 7 (3) (1972), 21–4; see also R. Dennis, 'Morley Callaghan and the moral geography of Toronto', *British Journal of Canadian Studies* 14 (1) (1999), 35–51.
- <sup>24</sup> M. Callaghan, *It's Never Over* (Toronto, 1972), 96.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 44–48.
- <sup>26</sup> M. Callaghan, *More Joy in Heaven* (Toronto, 1992), 53, 58, 90.
- <sup>27</sup> M. Callaghan, *They Shall Inherit the Earth* (Toronto, 1992), 12, 106–7, 151–3.
- <sup>28</sup> M. Callaghan, *Morley Callaghan's Stories* (Toronto, 1959), 56–61.
- <sup>29</sup> M. Callaghan, *Such Is My Beloved* (Toronto, 1989).
- <sup>30</sup> M. Callaghan, *Strange Fugitive* (Toronto, 1973), 8, 13–5, 24, 47, 100.
- <sup>31</sup> H. Garner, *Cabbagetown* (Toronto, 1968), 114–9, 139, 234–5, 242, 263, 358, 379.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 286–7.
- <sup>33</sup> J.R. Colombo, *Writer's Map of Toronto* (Toronto, 1991) lists two works set in Toronto and written by female authors prior to 1950: Annie Greg Savigny's *A Romance of Toronto* (1888), available through 'Early Canadiana online', and Isabel Ecclestone MacKay's *Mist of Morning* (1919).
- <sup>34</sup> Phyllis Brett Young, *The Torontonians* (Toronto, 1960), 26.

- <sup>35</sup> Shirley Faessler, *Everything in the Window* (Toronto, 1979).
- <sup>36</sup> City of Toronto Archives, Building Permits (RG 13 C4), 1912; *Toronto Sunday World*, 19 May 1912; see also an advertisement, soliciting investments, in *Saturday Night*, 11 May 1912, 24.
- <sup>37</sup> “Midmaples Group” and “Allan Gardens”, promotional booklet (1914), copy in Dinnick Papers, MU 904, Archives of Ontario.
- <sup>38</sup> Letter dated 7 Dec 1915, from James J. Walsh, described in the promotional booklet as “co-operating capitalist”, to W.S. Dinnick, pres. Dovercourt Land Co., notes that the 1914 rentals, “previous to war”, totalled \$18,500, that “annual revenue on present basis of rentals” totalled \$14,500, but that “after the war no doubt the rents will run up into \$20,000 a year”. Dinnick Papers, MU 904, Archives of Ontario.
- <sup>39</sup> Dennis and Giles, ‘Modernity and multi-storey living’.
- <sup>40</sup> Dennis, ‘Apartment housing in Canadian cities, 1900–1940’.
- <sup>41</sup> Personal communication from Gunter Gad. See also G. Gad and D.W. Holdsworth, ‘Looking inside the skyscraper: size and occupancy of Toronto office buildings, 1890–1950’, *Urban History Review/Revue d’histoire urbaine* 16 (1987), 176–89.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 37, 220.
- <sup>43</sup> Bloomfield and Harris, ‘The journey to work’, 107, derived from Census of Canada, 1911, 1931.
- <sup>44</sup> These three zones were defined originally for the analysis of apartment-house assessment data in Dennis and Giles, ‘Modernity and multi-storey living’. ‘Downtown’ = south of Bloor, west of (and including) Jarvis, east of (and including) University Avenue; ‘Inner’ = west of the Don, east of Bathurst, south of Lonsdale, but excluding ‘Downtown’; ‘Outer’ = rest of City of Toronto as defined in 1930 (i.e. including North Toronto, Danforth, the Beaches, Parkdale and High Park).
- <sup>45</sup> On the history of Eaton’s prior to World War I, see J.L. Santink, *Timothy Eaton and the Rise of His Department Store* (Toronto, 1990); M. Kluckner, *Toronto: The Way It Was* (Toronto, 1988), 45, includes a map showing the disposition of Eaton’s stores, factories and warehouses between Yonge and Bay Streets.
- <sup>46</sup> Note that Santink, *Timothy Eaton*, 233, reported 170 female Eaton employees on sufficiently high incomes to be paying tax in 1906. However, levels of exemption varied over time.
- <sup>47</sup> Bloomfield and Harris, ‘The journey to work’, 100. Bloomfield, ‘Gender Perspectives on the Journey to Work in Toronto, 1901 to 1951’, chapter 6.

- <sup>48</sup> Samples were drawn from city directories for 1915 and 1931 (reflecting the situation in 1914 and 1930). From the right-hand column of every fifth page of the city directory, the first entry for a female worker at Eaton's was selected, yielding a sample of 150 employees in 1914, 208 in 1930.
- <sup>49</sup> Bloomfield, 'Gender Perspectives on the Journey to Work in Toronto, 1901 to 1951', 125.
- <sup>50</sup> Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, chapter 8: quotation on 210 (emphasis in the original). For similar sentiments on the changing assessment of women clerical workers in Chicago, see L.M. Fine, *The Souls of the Skyscraper: Female Clerical Workers in Chicago, 1870-1930* (Philadelphia, 1990), esp. 144. On Sherbourne House, see also J. Forbes, 'The Sherbourne House Club: Home for "The Girl of the New Day"', unpublished paper presented to the Canadian Historical Association, Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities, Toronto, May 2002.
- <sup>51</sup> C.S. Clark, *Of Toronto the Good, a Social Study: The Queen City of Canada as It Is* (Toronto, 1898, 1970); Strange, *Toronto's Girl Problem*, 95–6 and 147, quoting Annual Report of the Chief Constable (1904), 26
- <sup>52</sup> For a condemnation of apartment living, even for married women, see W. Langton, 'Apartment life', *Canadian Architect and Builder* 16 (1903), 77: "a woman has little to think of now if she has credit and a telephone."
- <sup>53</sup> Boyer, "'Miss Remington' goes to work', 206; see also A. Kwolek-Folland, *Engendering Business: Men and Women in the Corporate Office, 1870–1930* (Baltimore, 1994), chapter 4.
- <sup>54</sup> See Dennis and Giles, 'Modernity and multi-storey living' for some initial results on this theme.
- <sup>55</sup> Lowe, 'Women, work, and the office', 257.
- <sup>56</sup> On anti-apartment legislation, see R. Dennis, "'Zoning" before zoning: the regulation of apartment housing in early twentieth century Winnipeg and Toronto', *Planning Perspectives* 15 (2000), 267–99.

