Document generated on 05/21/2024 1:45 p.m.

Journal of the Canadian Historical Association
Revue de la Société historique du Canada

Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Early Employment at the University of Toronto

Alison Prentice

Volume 2, Number 1, 1991

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/031036ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/031036ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0847-4478 (print)
1712-6274 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Prentice, A. (1991). Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Early Employment at the University of Toronto. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association / Revue de la Société historique du Canada*, *2*(1), 231–262. https://doi.org/10.7202/031036ar

Article abstract

Our knowledge of the unease generated by the presence of women in universities, exhibited by the use of terms like "bluestocking" or "feminist" to denigrate academic women, raises at least two questions about the early history of women who worked in Canadian universities. The first concerns such women's own image of themselves as academic workers; the second concerns the actual history of the movement of women into academic jobs. This paper begins an examination of the early employment of women at the University of Toronto. Outlining the structures of that employment over three periods ending in the 1940s, it also explores in a preliminary way how women's university work was perceived and experienced. Arguing that university employment remains gendered to this day, the paper calls not only for more research into its history, but also for a more politically conscious approach to the academic workplace, for greater equality for the female employees of universities, and for efforts to make universities less divisive and hierarchical workplaces altogether.

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada, 1992

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

https://www.erudit.org/en/

Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Early Employment at the University of Toronto

ALISON PRENTICE

Résumé

Our knowledge of the unease generated by the presence of women in universities, exhibited by the use of terms like "bluestocking" or "feminist" to denigrate academic women, raises at least two questions about the early history of women who worked in Canadian universities. The first concerns such women's own image of themselves as academic workers; the second concerns the actual history of the movement of women into academic jobs. This paper begins an examination of the early employment of women at the University of Toronto. Outlining the structures of that employment over three periods ending in the 1940s, it also explores in a preliminary way how women's university work was perceived and experienced. Arguing that university employment remains gendered to this day, the paper calls not only for more research into its history, but also for a more politically conscious approach to the academic workplace, for greater equality for the female employees of universities, and for efforts to make universities less divisive and hierarchical workplaces altogether.

* * * *

La présence des femmes à l'université a engendré un malaise qui transparait dans l'emploi de termes dérisoires à l'endroit des professeures, tels que "bas-bleu" ("blue-

This paper could not have been written without the help of many people and institutions. I would like, first of all, to acknowledge the research grant provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Secondly, along with students who were writing theses in related areas, I want to thank the members of my class in the history of women and higher education in the spring of 1991 for their enthusiasm for this project, especially James Leatch, Laverne Smith, and Kori Street, whose oral history projects for the course contributed valuable insights. I also wish to thank Nicole Keating, whose earlier paper also contributed; Cathy James and Penny Stephenson, who provided expert assistance with the quantitative research as well as many further insights; Jill Given-King, who helped on the technical side and created the tables; and the archivists at the University of Toronto, particularly Harold Averill, who generously shared his vast knowledge of the university's history and records. Several colleagues offered critical readings of an earlier draft: Marianne Ainley, Gail Brandt, Ruth Brouwer, Marg Conrad, Chad Gaffield, Ellen Jacobs, Wendy Mitchinson, Nikki Strong-Boag, and the anonymous reviewers for the *Journal* have been exceptionally generous with their time and knowledge. Finally, I would like to thank the women who were willing to share their own histories and experiences of university employment. I dedicate this essay to them, and to Marta Danylewycz, whose employment in Canadian universities was brief but important.

stocking") ou "féministe". Ce sentiment nous porte à questionner l'histoire des débuts du travail des femmes à l'université, sous les deux angles suivants. Le premier concerne l'image que ces femmes avaient d'elles-mêmes en tant que membres d'une telle institution: dans le second cas, il s'agit de l'histoire de l'accession récente de plusieurs femmes à des postes universitaires. Cet article constitue l'amorce d'une étude des structures de l'embauche des femmes à l'Université de Toronto, entre 1910 et le début des années 1940. Il présente une esquisse des perceptions et des expériences entournant le travail de ces femmes universitaires. Son propos est de montrer que les mêmes rapports sociaux de sexe qui ont déterminé l'embauche des professeurs au début du siècle, ont survécu jusqu'à ce jour. Il fait valoir la nécessité d'enquêtes historiques plus nombreuses sur ce phénomène, de même que le besoin de jeter un regard plus politique sur les milieux de travail universitaires. Il se termine par un encouragement à revendiquer des mesures qui contribueront à créer une plus grande égalité pour les employées des universités et qui, plus généralement, affaibliront le caractère hiérarchique des lieux de travail universitaires.

The presence of women in universities has always evoked a measure of unease, if not outright hostility, and this discomfort has generated pejorative labels. The old way of attacking the scholarly woman was to call her a "bluestocking," a term that evolved through several meanings from its rather benign eighteenth-century origins. Indeed, it was perhaps only in the late-nineteenth century, when women demanded and gained entry into the university, that the term became widely used to denigrate the *excessively* scholarly, too narrowly focused woman who appeared to devote too much of her time and attention to the pursuit of learning.[1] The derogatory term of choice more recently has been the label "feminist." Canadians were tragically reminded of this in December of 1989, when a young man went on a murderous rampage at the Université de Montréal. Calling his victims "a bunch of feminists," the killer ended the lives of fourteen women, most of them engineering students, before taking his own. Envy of their success in winning access to professional training in the university was clearly at the heart of his appalling act.[2]

1. According to *The Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles*, third ed., rev. with addenda (Oxford, 1955), 194, the term was first applied to men who wore blue worsted instead of black silk stockings to gatherings of eighteenth-century English intellectuals that included women, and only later to women exclusively. For discussions of the term and its nineteenth-century meanings, see Marjorie R. Theobald, "The Sin of Laura: The Meaning of Culture in the Education of Nineteenth-Century Women," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association/Revue de la société historique du Canada* 1 (1990): 269, and Johanna Selles-Roney, "'Not Bluestockings But Help Meets for Man?': Ladies College Education in Ontario," in *History of Women in the Christian Church in Canada*, eds. Elizabeth Muir and Marilyn Whitely (in preparation).
2. Our own Marta Danylewycz, the Canadian historian murdered by her brother in 1985, believed that his mental instability was partly traceable to envy of her success. It became a serious concern in the spring of 1984, just when Marta had at last achieved a tenure stream position in a university History department. For a brief discussion of Marta's life and death, see the preface to her posthumously published book, *Taking the Veil: An Alternative to Marriage, Motherhood and Spinsterhood in Quebec, 1840-1920* (Toronto, 1987). For discussions of the Montréal massacre, see the Canadian Association of University Teachers' *Bulletin* for the early months of 1990.

While the massacre in Montréal might be dismissed by some as the act of a deranged individual, the existence of considerable hostility to women's presence in the academy cannot be. University women, both in the past and currently, have had to evolve strategies to deal both with negative images of the female scholar and with outright discrimination. One strategy, of course, has been to avoid these issues, an approach tempting enough for the woman scholar deeply engaged in her work. Another has been to take the pejorative labels and make them our own. The "Bluestocking Club," for academically inclined female students at the University of Alberta, was an effort in this direction, even if its title was perhaps selected in a spirit of irony.[3] Our use of the word "feminist" has been far more widespread and unambiguous. Since the beginning of the 1970s, this term has been broadly embraced by women scholars, in a concerted and largely successful effort to focus on the positive, liberating, and paradigm-altering effects of women-centred scholarly endeavours.

A vital part of this work has been exploring women's history, particularly the history of feminism itself.[4] What has been less examined, until quite recently, is the history of women — and possibly feminism — within the academy.[5] What were the visions or strategies of our academic foremothers? Did they see themselves chiefly as erudite women, perhaps even bluestockings, whose basic quest was for an opportunity to live the life of the mind? Or did they regard themselves rather as career-oriented feminists, focusing more on women's right to superior training and to independent professions in the field of higher education? Or did they view themselves in a third way, chiefly as scientific or scholarly workers who happened to earn their livings in universities? It may well be that all three attitudes — as well as others not unidentified here[6] — informed the history of women's early employment in universities. What is

3. Formed by the wife of a History professor who had been chiefly responsible for the founding of an exclusive, all-male History Club that met at professors' homes, the Bluestocking Club was similarly exclusive in that it was "by invitation only." My informants regarding the club are Barbara Angel and Sylvia Van Kirk. The latter was not invited to join the Bluestocking Club, but became one of the first woman members and the first woman president of the University of Alberta History Club. It would be interesting to know more about the history of both groups.

4. See Judith Allen, "Contextualising Late-Nineteenth-Century Feminism: Problems and Comparisons," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association/Revue de la Société historique du Canada* 1 (1990): 17-36.

5. In the Canadian context, studies beginning to explore this history include Judith Fingard, "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie: Faculty Women before 1950," *Dalhousie Review* 59:4 (Winter 1984-85): 687-703; Alison Prentice, "Scholarly Passion: Two Women Who Caught It," (1989) reprinted in *Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching*, eds. Alison Prentice and Marjorie R. Theobald (Toronto, 1991), 258-83; Margaret Gillett, "The Lonely Heart: Maude E. Abbott, 1869-1936," in *Lone Voyagers: Academic Women in Coeducational Universities, 1870-1937*, ed. Geraldine Jonçich Clifford (New York, 1990), 183-222; Mary Kinnear, "Women Professors at the University of Manitoba before 1970," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* (forthcoming). For a first-person account dealing with her employment at the University of Toronto, see Jean Burnet, "Minorities I Have Belonged To," *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques du Canada* 13:1 (1981): 24-36.

6. The religious and social reformist concerns of women academics working in fields such as social service and household science come to mind. See Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform* (New York, 1990).

clear is that their motives, as well as the institutional and other contexts for the lives and careers of earlier women academics, deserve study.

This paper is a preliminary look at women's early employment at the University of Toronto, focusing chiefly on the general structures of that employment. Toronto is a useful university to examine because it was among the first in Canada not only to admit women to study, but also to become a large, research-oriented institution employing a substantial work force in a variety of academic and nonacademic roles. As the American historian of higher education Patricia Graham has shown, the expanding research university in North America was not an environment particularly friendly to women. On the contrary, for the most part the university has fostered the careers, the communities, and the highly valued work of men.[7] At the same time, it is apparent that the university has not been totally hostile to women. For all of the exclusion and exploitation that women have suffered in institutions of higher learning, it is clear that their levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and their feelings of justice or injustice, have varied — not just from one person to another, but from place to place and discipline to discipline. Moreover, even the most cursory look at the history of women in university employment suggests change over time.

It is helpful, in the Toronto case, to divide the early history of women's university work prior to the 1940s into three periods. The first takes us through the beginnings of women's work in higher education, a period that, given the University of Toronto records, it is convenient to end in 1921 for statistical purposes,[8] but which more properly draws to a close with the First World War. The middle of the story unfolds during that astonishing postwar decade, the roaring twenties, often seen as the decade of the newly emancipated woman and certainly an important period of development for women at the University of Toronto. The third period takes us into the years of the Great Depression, through to World War II, a decade which, surprisingly perhaps, saw further growth in women's work at the University of Toronto. Admittedly, the Second World War was a beginning as well as an end; indeed, the war inaugurated significant changes in the employment of women in universities, not only with hirings arising out of wartime manpower shortages, but also with the enormous expansions of the postwar decades. Nevertheless, patterns that we still see today had been set by the 1930s. It is these patterns that this paper seeks to examine.

i

It is important to recognise that women had not been completely excluded from higher learning prior to their admission to universities in the latter part of the nineteenth century. We are increasingly aware, first of all, of a social and familial world in which women's scholarly activity could take place in the late-eighteenth century and the early 1800s.[9]

7. Patricia A. Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3 (Summer 1978): 759-73.
8. The university's staff directories, containing comprehensive lists of the permanent academic staff and probably the vast majority of support staff, begin in 1921-22.
9. Marjorie R. Theobald, "The Sin of Laura," and her "Women's Studies in Colonial Victoria," *Melbourne Studies in Education* (1989-90): 14-22; and Pnina G. Abir-am and Dorinda Outram, eds., *Uneasy Careers and Intimate Lives: Women in Science, 1789-1979* (New

In addition, institutions fostering female scholarship flourished. Apart from a few coeducational experiments like the Upper Canada Academy in the 1830s, or the more permanently coeducational Oberlin College in the United States, by the midnineteenth century most women in the predominantly English-speaking, Protestant world of North America sought higher learning largely in segregated women's seminaries, academies, and colleges, such as those in Berwick and Wolfville directed by the Nova Scotia Baptists, Rebecca Chase and Alice Shaw, or in a variety of centres by Ontario's Methodist educator, Mary Electa Adams.[10] In pockets where the Roman Catholic faith was present or predominated, the equivalent of these institutions was the convent academy.[11] These schools varied enormously in the level of studies they provided, some embracing and others eschewing the Latin and Greek that were still so essential to men's higher studies at the time. The teaching of the more abstruse sciences also perhaps depended on whether or not a suitable professor of such subjects could be engaged. What all these women's seminaries had in common was their promotion of that which the Australian historian Marjorie Theobald insists we should recognise as the "women's studies" of the period: modern languages, music, the arts, and some natural science.[12]

Nineteenth-century women's studies were far from being as trivial or impractical as traditional educational history has portrayed them. Serious study had two purposes for nineteenth-century women. One was no doubt the pursuit of culture and intellectual matters for their own sake, or for the sake of the social cachet that such studies may have bestowed on their initiates. Yet a second, freely acknowledged, and equally important purpose was clearly an economic one. Countless were the Victorian women who

---

Brunswick, New Jersey, 1989), especially Chaps. 1 and 2. Mary Electa Adams and Agnes Maule Machar are Canadian examples of women who received their higher education largely in family settings. See Prentice, "Scholarly Passion," and Ruth Compton Brouwer, "The 'Between Age' Christianity of Agnes Machar," *Canadian Historical Review* 65 (September 1984): 347-70.

10. There is a rich literature emerging on the American seminary and academy movement, much of it cited in "Scholarly Passion." On women's academies in Ontario and Mary Electa Adams, also see "Scholarly Passion"; Susan E. Houston and Alison Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto, 1988), Chaps. 2, 3, and 9; and Johanna Selles-Roney, "'Not Bluestockings," and "'Manners and Morals' or 'Men in Petticoats': Education at Alma College, 1871-1898," in *Gender and Education in Ontario: An Historical Reader*, eds. Ruby Heap and Alison Prentice (Toronto, 1991), 249-71. On Baptist education for women in Nova Scotia, see James Doyle Davison, *Alice of Grand Pré* (Wolfville, 1981).

11. Micheline Dumont and Nadia Fahmy-Eid, *Les couventines: l'éducation des filles au Québec dans les congrégations religieuses enseignantes, 1840-1960* (Montréal, 1986); Marie-Paule Malouin, *Ma soeur, à quelle école allez-vous?* (Montréal, 1985); and Micheline Dumont, *Girls' Schooling in Quebec, 1639-1960* (Ottawa, 1990). See also Elizabeth Smyth, "'A Noble Proof of Excellence': The Culture and Curriculum of a Nineteenth Century Ontario Convent Academy," in *Gender and Education in Ontario*, 273-93, and her "The Lessons of Religion and Science: The Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph and St. Joseph's Academy Toronto, 1854-1911," EdD diss., University of Toronto, 1990.

12. Theobald, "Women's Studies in Colonial Victoria," and "The Sin of Laura"; see also her "'Mere Accomplishments'? Melbourne's Early Ladies' Schools Reconsidered," in *Women Who Taught*, and "Scottish Schoolmistresses in Colonial Australia," *Canadian History of Education Association Bulletin* 5:3 (October 1988): 1-17.

were schoolmistresses in (or, indeed, proprietors of) ladies' academies or colleges or who, in even greater numbers, taught music, the arts, or languages from their homes. Wherever or however their teaching took place, such women were able to gain what was referred to as "an independence." Indeed, they sometimes supported whole families by their work as teachers.[13]

It is fascinating to discover a carry-over from nineteenth-century women's studies to the early years of women's work at the University of Toronto. This transfer, surprisingly, was not initially in the teaching of modern languages, as one might expect, but in the area of music instruction. Not just one, but two music establishments were affiliated with the university in its early years: the Toronto Conservatory of Music, founded in 1887 and affiliated in 1896, and the Toronto College of Music, founded in 1888 and affiliated in 1890. Three hundred and seventy-one women were listed in the University of Toronto calendars as teachers of music at one or other of these two schools over a twenty-six year period.[14] Some, like Margaret Casey, who taught vocal music for the Toronto College of Music in 1909-10, appeared in the calendar only once. There were other women, however, who evidently carved out substantial careers for themselves at the affiliated colleges of music. For example, Lena M. Hayes of the conservatory taught violin and viola and subsequently the violin alone from the beginning of that institution's affiliation in 1896 until 1915-16. Norma Reynolds was also listed as a conservatory teacher from the beginning of the affiliation in 1896 — and may well have been the Miss Reynolds who taught at the college from 1891 to 1895-96. A teacher of singing, she was one of a substantial number of women who continued to be listed as working after marriage. Known as Miss Reynolds until 1900, she was subsequently listed as Mrs. Norma Reynolds-Reburn in the calendars, teaching under this name until 1905-06 and from 1913 to 1915. A Mrs. Sullivan-Mallon's career was not only relatively long but also appears to have been unbroken. She taught piano at the College of Music as a single woman for nine years, and then both piano and harp for seventeen more after she married. During the last year of the music schools' affiliation, the conservatory was providing work for one hundred women, and the smaller Toronto College of Music for twenty. One would have to go to other sources to find out how long these women were able to continue their teaching careers after the University of Toronto opened its own

13. Theobald, "Scottish Schoolmistresses." See also her "Agnes Jane Grant," in *Not So Eminent Victorians*, eds. R. J. W. Selleck and Martin Sullivan (Melbourne, 1984), 80-98, as well as the essays by Judith Biddington, Ailsa G. Thomson Zainu'ddin, and Gwyneth Dow and Lesley Scholes in that collection. On the same point, see also Selles-Roney, "Education at Alma College," especially 256.
14. University of Toronto Archives (UTA), University of Toronto Calendars, P78-0021. Unless otherwise indicated, all the information on the staff of the university or its affiliated colleges for the period up to and including 1920-21 is drawn from this source. After this point, it became the University of Toronto Directories of Staff and Students, P78-0171. The statistical methodology used in this paper is a very simple one. For the most part, I have simply counted the numbers of women (and, for Tables 1, 2, and 4, the men) listed in each period, subject, faculty, college, or rank. Card files were created for the women and tally sheets for the decade-by-decade tables. I wish here to repeat my thanks to Cathy James and Penny Stephenson for their expert help with the collection of the statistical information.

music faculty in 1918. What is clear from the university calendars is that the conservatory and the College of Music ceased at this point to be listed as affiliated colleges. Secondly, no women instructors were appointed to the university's new Faculty of Music.

Apart from this very large affiliated staff of female music teachers, women's presence even in a loosely defined University of Toronto work force was minimal in the early years after the official admission of women to lectures in 1884. Those employed by the Women's Medical College of Toronto, which was also affiliated with the university, were among the few listed in the Toronto calendars from 1890 until the college closed its doors in 1906. In the higher ranks were Susanna P. Boyle, who reached the rank of professor in Pathology and Histology in 1898, and Jennie Gray, whose work with the college brought her an associate professorship in Gynaecology in 1901. The well-known Dr. Helen MacMurchy bridged two women's worlds. She taught Anatomy at the Women's Medical College for three years, beginning in 1902; in 1904-05 and 1905-06, she was also listed as an instructor of Anatomy and Physiology, and as examining physician, at the Toronto Conservatory of Music. Altogether, eighteen women taught over a sixteen-year period at the Women's College of Medicine. Women were essentially excluded from teaching positions, however, when the college merged with the medical faculty at the university and ceased to exist as a separate entity. Apart from Helen MacMurchy, who was listed on several occasions as a demonstrator in Gynaecology, women's teaching roles after 1906 were performed in their capacity as staff doctors at the Women's College Hospital, which eventually rose from the ashes of the former college.[15]

The careers of women like Jennie Gray, Susanna Boyle, and Helen MacMurchy illustrate not only women's purpose in seeking admission to universities as students, but also their exclusion from the university's privileges and more powerful positions once they got there. The need for admission had two related causes. First of all, the ladies' academies and teaching sisterhoods of the nineteenth century were unable to give their students the formal training they required for access to the so-called learned professions. At the same time, these professions, which had once trained many practitioners through apprenticeships alone, were increasingly being defined on the basis of mandatory educational credentials. Women wishing to enter faculties of medicine were thus only the most noticeable of a large group of women who aspired to professional work not only as physicians but in at least three other areas: in the church, in the practice of law and, most numerously, in advanced levels of teaching. All increasingly required training in the university. Yet, as we have seen, exclusions did not end with women's admission to lectures. Professionalising musicians might give large numbers of women a chance as instructors in affiliated colleges, but it did not occur to them to consider women for teaching positions in the university's new Faculty of Music. Similarly, although schools of medicine were finally forced to open their doors to women, women had little chance to teach in them. Law schools eventually admitted some women as

15. For a brief history of the college, see Lykke de la Cour and Rose Sheinin, "The Ontario Medical College for Women, 1883-1906: Lessons from Gender-Separatism in Medical Education," in *Despite the Odds: Essays on Canadian Women and Science*, ed. Marianne Gosztonyi Ainley (Montréal, 1990), 112-20.

students, but also excluded them from the teaching staff. So too did the schools of divinity.[16]

We are inclined to think of the arts faculty as the nonprofessional faculty, but this view is misleading. Certainly, at the turn of the century, a woman's major avenue to professional independence after university work was far less likely to be in medicine, law, or the church, than in teaching in a girls' private academy or, increasingly, in one of the newly forged and growing provincial secondary school systems of Canada.[17] The brilliant Gertrude Lawlor, initially educated at St. Joseph's Academy in Toronto in the 1880s, was one of many early University of Toronto women graduates who went on to pursue careers teaching in Ontario high schools and collegiate institutes.[18] Indeed, there is every reason to believe that to teach secondary school was the typical expectation of a female university graduate who sought professional work in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, and that this would be the case for some time to come.[19]

If the university admitted women as students and encouraged their employment in secondary schools, it also eventually permitted a very few of them to teach in the university itself. At Toronto, they eventually taught in the four arts colleges — the non-denominational University College, Anglican Trinity, Methodist Victoria, and Roman Catholic St. Michael's — and in some of the more professionally oriented "university" departments and faculties that were gradually cobbled into the federation of colleges that made up the university. Mossie May Waddington, who earned her MA in 1913 and a doctorate in Philosophy in 1919, got her chance to teach Greek to Anglican Divinity students at Trinity College as a result of teacher shortages during World War I, and eventually made a career at the university, shifting after the war to University College, where she taught English and was, for a decade, Dean of Women.[20] Several women

16. Ruth Compton Brouwer points out that some women training to be Presbyterian missionaries were allowed to take individual divinity courses at Knox College in the first decade of the twentieth century, although the first woman was not admitted to the full programme until 1921. Personal communication, 5 August 1991 and her *New Women for God: Presbyterian Women and India Missions, 1876-1914* (Toronto, 1990), 62. An interesting professional field that may have been more welcoming to women in Ontario was pharmacy. The school, in Ontario at least, was not inside a university for many years, however. See E. W. Stieb et al, "Women in Ontario Pharmacy, 1867-1927," in *Despite the Odds*, 121-33.
17. For an analysis of the development of secondary education in Ontario, see R. D. Gidney and W. J. P. Millar, *Inventing Secondary Education: The Rise of the High School in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Montréal, 1990).
18. *The Lessons of Religion and Science*, Chap. 5; Susan Gelman, "The 'Feminization' of the High School: Women Secondary School Teachers in Toronto," in *Gender and Education in Ontario*, 73-104.
19. At least three oral histories suggest that this was the case not just at the turn of the century in Ontario, but in the 1920s and 1930s as well. UTA, Mossie May Kirkwood interview B74-020, recorded in 1973; interview with a University of Toronto instructor by Kori Street, April 1991; interview with an Ontario secondary school teacher by Rachel Gray, March 1991. The ongoing research of Susan Gelman on secondary-level teachers confirms this view. Bette Weneck has found the same expectations at Barnard College, the women's liberal arts college of Columbia University. See her "Social and Cultural Stratification in Women's Higher Education: Barnard College and Teachers College, 1898-1912," *History of Education Quarterly* 31:1 (Spring 1991): 1-25.
20. Prentice, "Scholarly Passion," 14-19.

had preceded Waddington. Margaret Addison, as Dean of Residence to the women of Victoria, had been lecturing in German since 1906 and it is almost certain that Mabel Cartwright had also done some teaching in her role as Lady Principal of St. Hilda's, the women's college of Trinity, beginning in 1904. The five other lectureships in languages that went to women before 1921, however, were appointments made either during or just after World War I. Altogether, very few women actually landed teaching jobs in the traditional arts colleges prior to 1921. Of the total of fifteen women with degrees who were listed as lecturers or assistant or associate professors during this period, only seven were teaching modern languages or Classics. There was a temporary lecturer in Physiology, but the remaining seven women in the lecturer/professor category were teaching in the new university division created especially for women, the Faculty of Household Science.

It is in the lower ranks that a more complete picture of women's employment at the university emerges. Data drawn from the auditors' reports on employees paid for teaching in the university departments and faculties and in University College clearly indicate that women were more numerous at the lower levels of an already-defined academic hierarchy. The university calendars, which bring in the other three colleges, tell the same story. Table 1, which takes a snapshot approach to university employment by decade, illustrates women's position in the hierarchy relative to men's. Another approach is to count all the women ever employed by the university in the period in question. By 1921, Toronto had employed altogether ninety-nine women with degrees, and a further forty-seven without degrees, for a total of 146 women in various instructional and research capacities at the level of instructor and below. In this group, languages once again employed only seven and History, Political Science, and Psychology a further seven. Of the remaining 132 women who found a job at one time or another before 1921-22 at the University of Toronto, the vast majority were employed in the natural and medical sciences.

While this may seem surprising, we know that women had not been altogether absent from science in the nineteenth century. The subject formed part of the women's studies curriculum in the ladies' academies, albeit chiefly taught by visiting professors who were men. We also know of a few outstanding figures such as the astronomer Maria Mitchell, who learned her science in her father's observatory and was able to carve out a career for herself at Vassar, an American college for women, or Marie Curie, who made her career as part of a family of scientists in France at the turn of the century. It is also clear that, in the days before science was professionalised, women were able to play vital roles in the sciences and particularly in the development of botany as a field. In a tradition dating back to the pharmacist nuns of New France, who sent medicinal plants to learned men in the old world, Ontario's Catharine Parr Traill made a name for herself as a botanist. She collected plant specimens which she sent to the University of Edinburgh, and she wrote on the subject, contributing a total of seven books and four articles to the field.[21] What the Toronto data provide is evidence of how women continued their involvement in science as it came increasingly under the control of professional men in universities. Once admitted to university, women seem to have engaged

21. Margaret W. Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* (Baltimore, 1982); Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from Their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s* (Boston, 1984); Mar-

Table 1
Women and Men Employed in Teaching and Research
At the University of Toronto By Decade, 1910-11 to 1940-41

		1910-11		1920-21		1930-31		1940-41	
Instructors,	F	14	7.5[1]	42	14.3[1]	82	17.7[1]	99	17.7[1]
Assistants, Etc.[2]	M	173		252		381		459	
Lecturers	F	2	3.5	20	23.6	22	23.7	37	25.9
	M	55		66		71		106	
Assistant	F	0		1	2.4	4	7.0	12	11.3
Professors	M	0		41		53		94	
Associate	F	2	3.8	2	3.4	7	6.7	4	4.0
Professor	M	50		56		97		97	
Professors	F	0		0		2	1.5	4	2.5
	M	79		99		131		158	
Totals		**373**	**4.8**	**589**	**11.0**	**850**	**13.8**	**1075**	**14.7**

Notes:

1 Percentage of total who were female.

2 A number of frequently overlapping and fluctuating categories have been collapsed under this title. They include instructors, demonstrators, tutors, fellows, assistants. associates, and clinicians. Many were clearly part-time employees, and many of these were undoubtedly graduate students. This group does not include researchers employed by the Connaught Laboratories or the Banting Institute.

Sources: University of Toronto Calendars and Auditors' Reports, 1910-11 and 1920-21, and Staff Directories, 1930-31 and 1940-41.

in scientific study as undergraduates from the beginning. Indeed, the first bachelor's degree earned in the British Empire by a woman was Grace Annie Lockhart's Bachelor of Science and English Literature, granted by New Brunswick's Mount Allison University in 1875.[22] Somewhat more slowly, women were also admitted to graduate study in the sciences, although here exclusions were probably more often the rule than not.

An outstanding example of exclusion from the higher echelons of Canadian science is Elizabeth Rebecca Laird, who graduated at the top of her University of Toronto Physics class in 1896 but was denied entrance to graduate study both at Toronto and at Cambridge University because she was a woman. Elizabeth Laird taught briefly at the Ontario Ladies' College in Whitby, finally winning a scholarship to Bryn Mawr, the renowned American college for women, and then a special Bryn Mawr scholarship to

---

ianne G. Ainley, "Last in the Field? Canadian Women Natural Scientists, 1815-1965," in *Despite the Odds*, especially 28 and 68; and Anne B. Shteir, "Botany in the Breakfast Room: Women and Early Nineteenth-Century British Plant Study," in *Uneasy Careers and Intimate Lives*, 31-43.

22. John G. Reid, "The Education of Women at Mount Allison, 1854-1914," *Acadiensis* (Spring 1983): 3.

study in Berlin under Max Planck. Her career in science eventually took her to Mount Holyoke, another important American women's college, where she became head of Physics. The University of Toronto recognised Elizabeth Laird by granting her an honorary degree in 1927, but only in her retirement years did Canada finally open its arms to this successful Canadian woman physicist. Owing to staff shortages during World War II, she was able to take up a volunteer post at the University of Western Ontario. The appointment was, by her own choice, unpaid, but it did enable Elizabeth Laird to become deeply involved in the new Canadian research on radar and to do physics in her country of birth until her second retirement in 1953.[23]

Elizabeth Laird had to move to the United States in order to have a university teaching career. In contrast, her sister, the food chemist Annie Lewisa Laird, managed to find a place in Canada.[24] The University of Toronto appointed Annie Laird associate professor in the newly created Household Science faculty in 1907. Laird shared the major teaching work of that department with her more famous colleague, Clara Benson, who in 1903 had earned one of the earliest doctorates in Chemistry to be granted by the University of Toronto. As we have seen, it was Household Science that employed by far the largest number of women at the rank of lecturer and above at the university prior to 1921, seven of the fifteen women in that category. Among those employed at the level of instructor and below, Household Science was also dominant among the professional faculties that were most welcoming to women. Of the forty-nine women employed at these levels over the years before 1921 in Education, Social Service, and Household Science, the last accounted for over 60 per cent.

Yet it was not Household Science that provided the largest number of jobs for women scientists employed by the university. If we add up all of the women who secured teaching and research jobs at Toronto prior to 1921 at *all* levels, the three professional faculties mentioned above and the arts and social sciences employed seventy-seven,[25] but the medical and natural sciences accounted for a larger number still. Medicine, including such subjects as Pharmacy and Physiology, topped the list, providing work for thirty women altogether and, surprisingly in light of Elizabeth Laird's experience, Physics provided jobs for an almost equal number. Admittedly, some of these women appear to have been employed by both the arts faculty and medicine to teach Physics; nevertheless, twenty-six women altogether were employed as teaching assistants or demonstrators, at various times, in Physics at Toronto prior to 1921. After Physics, Botany topped the list with eleven employees and this was perhaps prophetic, for it would be Botany that would eventually come to be regarded as the most welcoming science for women at the university. Taken all together, the medical and natural sciences employed a total of eighty-four women in various teaching or research positions. Nor were all of these women temporary workers who were simply passing through. Three of the physicists, Annie Theresa Reed, Florence Mary Quinlan, and Kathleen May

23. UTA, Newspaper Clipping Collection, A73-0026/214(03), especially "Noted Physicist Plans Her Second Retirement," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 26 June 1953.
24. UTA, Newspaper Clipping Collection, A73-0026/214(02).
25. Household Science employed thirty-seven, Social Science twelve, and Education seven; a further twenty-one women were employed in languages, History, and other arts subjects taught in the colleges.

Table 2
Women and Men Employed in Non-Instructional Positions At the University of Toronto by Decade, 1910-11 to 1940-41

		1910-11		1920-21		1930-31		1940-41	
		#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]	#	%[1]
Clerical	F	22	91.7	47	83.9	113	95.0	162	81.0
Staff	M	2		9		6		38	
Library	F	13	92.9	18	90.0	38	97.4	50	89.3
Staff	M	1		2		1		6	
Temporary	F	20	40.8	43	53.8	—		85	63.0
Staff[2]	M	29		37		—		50	
Miscellaneous[3]	F	—		—		34	60.7	60	44.1
	M	—		—		22		76	
Administrative	F	4	15.4	7	25.9	11	28.9	25	28.1
Staff	M	22		20		38		64	

Notes:
1 Percentages who were women of total employed in category.
2 Some switchboard operators were classified as temporary staff, even though they worked fifty-two weeks a year.
3 Includes mechanics, laboratory attendants, technicians, researchers, artists, photographers, etc.
4 Problems in interpreting the records, or records that are missing, account for areas left blank in the table. Totals were not attempted because of these blanks.

Sources: University of Toronto Calendars and Auditors' Reports, 1910-11 and 1920-21; Staff Directory, 1930-31; and Auditor's Report and Staff Directory, 1940-41.

Crossley, had by 1920 embarked on life-long careers in the Department of Physics that would take at least two of them well beyond the Second World War.

Finally, the university provided employment to women in a variety of capacities not directly associated with research or teaching. The auditors' reports reveal the extent of this employment in university faculties and departments and at University College; from the university calendars further information can be gleaned. Table 2 illustrates this trend. There were, by this time, residences for women students at the university and, as a result, variously titled individuals from deans on down to directors of households and their assistants obtained jobs in the arts colleges. There was also beginning to be employment for women in library work. For a period from 1901 to 1914, Victoria College also provided "physical culture" for its women students. Mrs. Emma Scott Raff and Miss L. A. Davin directed this activity and, over the years, employed five different women assistants.[26] Finally, the university had begun to participate in the

26. Emma Scott Raff also had her own independent educational establishment. For discussions of her innovative contributions to Canadian literary studies and theatre, see Heather Murray's studies in progress, "'We Strive for the Good and the Beautiful': The Margaret Eaton School of Literature and Expression," and "Making the Modern: Twenty Five Years of the Margaret Eaton School of Literature and Expression."

administrative revolution that Graham Lowe has described and to employ women as assistants in a variety of clerical capacities.[27] Like some of the early instructors, secretaries often cobbled together a number of employments, working for several people or departments rather than holding down a single, identifiable position. The university calendars were chiefly silent about these clerical employees until after World War I when they finally listed three women as holders of secretarial posts. Annie Wilkie Patterson, who had been employed by the university in various capacities since 1902 and was the president's secretary from 1908, appears as the secretary to the new Faculty of Music in 1919. In 1920, the Board of Graduate Studies and the Department of Physiology were recorded in the calendars as employing Nora Mackenzie and Marie Eva Armour respectively to do their secretarial work.

ii

The listing of secretarial workers in the calendars, and the appointment of Mossie May Waddington and a few other women lecturers in arts subjects, suggest that the Great War and its aftermath constituted a turning point for women's work at the University of Toronto. Available statistics on academic employment for women in both Canada and the United States also indicate expansion in the period following the war, although the figures are hard to interpret. If those instructing "prematriculation" students are included, women faculty in Canada numbered 754 in 1931, or 18.6 per cent of the slightly over four thousand men and women who were teaching in Canadian institutions of higher learning in that year. In 1921, they had been 14.6 per cent of all the full-time academic staff counted. If only instructors in "arts and letters," "the pure sciences," and "professional faculties" are taken into account, however, the percentages drop and the growth is much slighter. Women were 7.3 per cent of 2133 such instructors in 1921, and this percentage rose only to 8.8 (of 2809 men and women altogether) during the course of the decade.[28]

However one measures employment for women in higher education, there is evidence that not all academic women experienced the 1920s as a golden age. In an absorbing history of American women in science, Margaret Rossiter has argued that this era was still "filled with inequalities and discrimination" against women scientists aspiring to academic careers, at least at the coeducational universities where most of them worked. A survey of American women faculty, conducted in 1929 by Marion

27. Graham S. Lowe, *Women in the Administrative Revolution: The Feminization of Clerical Work* (Toronto, 1987).

28. J. Vickers and J. Adam, *But Can You Type? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women* (Toronto, 1977) 114, use the higher proportions in their tables (rounding off to 19 per cent in 1931) and Anne Innis Dagg and Patricia J. Thompson, *MisEducation: Women & Canadian Universities* (Toronto, 1988), 54-65, cite Vickers and Adam. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics sources on which Vickers and Adam relied can be interpreted in two ways depending on whether or not one counts the "prematriculation" column. See DBS, *Higher Education in Canada, 1940-42* (81-402), Section II, Retrospective Tables, 51. I would argue that the lower figures are more accurate indicators, especially if comparisons are to be made with the post-Second-World-War decades when prematriculation students were presumably less often to be found in colleges and universities.

Hawthorne and cited by Rossiter, strongly supports this view. Hawthorne's study revealed considerable unhappiness among many of her respondents. "Women of exceptional ability and proper influence" were a match for their male colleagues and secured good jobs in universities, Hawthorne reported, but "the rank and file" of women scholars were not happy. These women expressed considerable resentment and saw themselves as victims. Nor were those women who were fortunate enough to find faculty positions at the women's colleges necessarily much happier. Patricia Palmieri has painted an idyllic portrait of a women's academic community at Wellesley at the turn of the century but, by the 1920s, she reports cracks in the veneer as generational conflict emerged among Wellesley's all-woman faculty. In her study of the American women's colleges, Helen Horowitz also pointed to the dissatisfaction beginning to be voiced in the 1920s. The enthusiasm of the pioneer generation had, perhaps, worn off. Moreover, from the beginning, several of the women's colleges, including the prestigious Bryn Mawr, had accorded their male faculty more privileges than the women on staff. Now they also increasingly hired men to senior positions, often in preference to qualified women candidates. At the same time, as Rosalind Rosenberg has demonstrated, the great research universities like Columbia, Cornell, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and Stanford began to attract many of the best women students and ambitious women faculty, further weakening the women's colleges.[29]

In Canada, the overall picture seems to have been even worse. We know from Judith Fingard's research on the women who taught at Dalhousie prior to 1950 that this leading Nova Scotia university had barely begun to hire women by the 1920s. In the context of larger studies of women at McGill and the University of British Columbia, Margaret Gillett and Lee Stewart have provided similarly gloomy pictures. There were very few women on faculty in these institutions.[30] Nevertheless, some expansion did occur for academic women during the period from the First World War to the Great Depression. At the University of Toronto, certainly, significant development took place.

In most fields at Toronto, women were no longer excluded from teaching and the numbers of women on the instructional staff overall did increase. Not counting the affiliated colleges of Music and Medicine, the University of Toronto had employed a total of 146 women in various instructional and research capacities in its entire history prior to 1921. In the following decade, that number doubled. As Table 3 shows, the number of women who were lecturers, or assistant, associate, or full professors jumped from fifteen in the period prior to 1921-22, to sixty-seven, or about one-fifth of the total

29. Rossiter, *Women Scientists*, Chap. 7; Patricia A. Palmieri, "Here Was Fellowship: A Social Portrait of Academic Women at Wellesley College, 1895-1920," in *Women Who Taught*, 233-57; Horowitz, *Alma Mater*, especially Chaps. 12 and 17 to 19; Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (New Haven, 1982). Rosenberg demonstrates how marginal women's position was at the larger research universities, however. The same point is made for the present by Jennie Farley. See her "Women Professors in the USA: Where Are They?" in *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*, eds. Suzanne Stiver Lie and Virginia E. O'Leary (New York, 1990), 194-207.
30. Fingard, "Gender and Inequality at Dalhousie"; Margaret Gillett, *We Walked Very Warily: A History of Women at McGill* (Montréal, 1981) and "The Lonely Heart: Maude E. Abbott, 1869-1936"; Lee Stewart, *"It's Up to You": Women at UBC in the Early Years* (Vancouver, 1990).

Table 3
All Female Instructional and Research Staff Engaged Between 1921-22 and 1930-31 at the University of Toronto, Distribution by Subject

	Lecturers/ Professors		Instructors/ Assistants		Various Titles/ No Degrees	
SOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONS	#	%	#	%	#	%
Household Science[1]	17		23		1	
Social Service	4				5	
Nursing	2				1	
Library Science	2		2		2	
Education			5		3	
Physical Education			4		3	
Total	**25**	**37.3**	**34**	**19.5**	**15**	**24.6**
SOCIAL SCIENCES						
History and Political Economy	3					
Psychology	1		5		4	
Archaeology	1		1			
Total	**5**	**7.5**	**6**	**3.4**	**4**	**6.6**
SCIENCES						
Physics			17		1	
Botany	2		16		3	
Chemistry[2]			9		1	
Mathematics	1		9			
Biology	1		8		3	
Zoology			1		1	
Geology			1			
Astronomy			1			
Total	**4**	**6.0**	**62**	**35.6**	**9**	**14.8**
MEDICAL SCIENCES/PROFESSIONS						
Medicine			31		23	
Connaught Labs/ Banting Research	1		27		8	
Total	**1**	**1.5**	**58**	**33.3**	**31**	**50.8**
LANGUAGES						
Moderns	14				2	
Classics/Ancient History	9					
English	9					
Total	**32**	**47.8**			**2**	**3.3**
GRAND TOTAL	**67**	**100.0**	**174**	**99.8**	**61**	**100.1**

Notes:
1 Includes Food Chemistry.
2 Includes Biochemistry.

Source: University of Toronto Staff Directories, 1921-22 to 1930-31 inclusive.

number of women engaged in research or teaching in the period between 1921 and 1931. Of the remaining 235 women employed at any time during the decade, another fifth did not have degrees and therefore would probably not have expected to rise in the ranks, at least until a degree were acquired. Yet the great bulk of the women listed in the university's staff directories over the ten-year period, and who were in the nonlecturer/ nonprofessor category, did have degrees, many of them advanced. The women with degrees who worked at the rank of instructor or lower totalled 174, or a little less than three out of five of the women the university employed for instruction or research. Such women might well have hoped for a secure or rising place in the academy.

Of the sixty-seven with apparent job security and the rank of lecturer or above, the majority were clustered in the lower ranks, despite the fact that most had advanced degrees, a good many of them from universities other than Toronto. The organisation of the university's staff directories makes comparisons between the ranks of men and women relatively easy during the first three years that these directories were published, 1921-24. No women were admitted to the rank of full professor during those years and women were never more than 5 per cent of the associate and assistant categories. We can also examine distributions across the various faculties, departments, and colleges. As Table 3 indicates, university departments and faculties employed more of the sixty-seven women than the four arts colleges did, but only slightly more. Household Science still led the way; seventeen women were employed at the rank of lecturer or above by that faculty at some point during the decade, and it was Clara Benson of Household Science who became Toronto's first female full professor, in 1926. The higher-ranked women of Household Science were now joined by four colleagues in Social Service, and two each in the new professional faculties of Public Health Nursing and Library Science, areas that would employ growing numbers of women in both upper and lower ranks as time progressed. What was really new, however, was the apparent forward leap women made teaching languages and Ancient History for the arts colleges. A total of nine women taught English, seven Classics, two Ancient History, and fourteen modern languages, at the rank of lecturer or above at St. Michael's, University College, Trinity, and Victoria. Also new was a tiny group of women who succeeded in landing jobs as lecturers in the sciences and social sciences: one or two were listed in each of Biology, Mathematics, and Botany, and one or two more were also to be found in Psychology, Archaeology, Political Economy, and History.

Table 4 illustrates these trends in a different way, listing numbers and percentages of female compared to male teaching and research staff by decade. The power of what may be called the social and educational professions to make room for women is emphasised in this table. By 1930-31, 59 per cent of the lecturers and professors in these professional schools were female. The arts and social sciences provided more prestigious teaching positions to women than they had previously, but the percentage of professors and lecturers who were women in those fields overall had only risen from 9.8 to 13.3. The natural sciences admitted tiny percentages of women to the upper ranks, while the medical and applied sciences admitted almost none during the two years in question. What is fascinating to see is the proportion of instructorships and assistantships assigned to women. With a few exceptions, the proportion tended to remain constant across the social and educational professions, the arts and social sciences, and the natural sciences: between roughly one quarter and one third of these employees were women. Only in

Table 4
Numbers and Percentages of Women in Various Categories of Teaching and Research Staff at the University of Toronto, by Decade

	1920-21				1930-31				1940-41			
	Professors/ Lecturers		Instructors Assistants[1]		Professors/ Lecturers		Instructors/ Assistants		Professors/ Lecturers		Instructors/ Assistants	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Social/Educational Professions[2]	17	9	18	8	14	14	21	14	18	27	27	19
Percentage		34.6		30.6		50.0		40.0		60.0		41.3
Arts/Social Sciences[3]	119	13	11	6	151	20	19	11	159	19	18	11
Percentage		9.8		35.3		13.3		36.7		10.7		37.9
Natural Sciences[4]	47	1	49	16	51	2	80	31	82	8	90	22
Percentage		2.1		24.6		3.8		27.9		8.9		19.6
Medical Sciences/ Professions[5]	44	0	162	6	84	1	142	26	104	10	260	34
Percentage		0.0		3.6		1.2		15.5		0.9		11.6
Applied Sciences[6]	39	0	41	1	57	0	45	1	65	0	37	1
Percentage		0.0		2.4		0.0		2.2		0.0		2.6

Notes:

1 Includes demonstrators, laboratory assistants, research associates, fellows, etc.

2 Includes Household Science, Education, Nursing, Physical Education, Library Science, and Social Service/Social Work.

3 Includes Modern Languages, Classics, English, Fine Arts, Music, Religion, Ethics, Anthropology, Archaeology, Philosophy, Psychology, History, Political Economy, Transportation, and Military Studies.

4 Includes Physics, Geophysics, Botany, Chemistry, Biology, Genetics, Zoology, Geology, Astronomy, Minerology, Mycology, and Palaeontology.

5 Includes Medicine, Dentistry, Hygiene, Occupational Therapy, the Connaught Laboratories, and the Banting Institute.

6 Includes Forestry and the various branches of engineering.

Sources: University of Toronto Calendars, Auditors Reports, and Staff Directories.

the medical sciences were the fairly high numbers of women employed (twenty-six, for example, in 1930-31) dwarfed by even larger numbers of men, but these percentages are skewed by the many part-time teaching and research appointments held by men whose chief role was probably their medical practice. In the applied sciences, women were simply not present in any significant numbers.

Certainly, the entry of women into fields deemed masculine was less than triumphant in this period. In History, for example, of the four women Professor George Wrong had engaged as fellows or instructors prior to 1920, only one remained to teach in the following decade. Professor Wrong was probably well disposed toward the idea of women on faculty as his own daughter, Margaret Wrong, was for several years employed by University College, chiefly as Dean of Women. For at least part of her time at Toronto, Margaret Wrong also taught History but, by the 1920s, this pioneer had chosen a career that took her overseas[31] and the two other women had also left, leaving Marjorie Gordon Reid as the sole woman teaching in the Department of History. Although by the standards of the day for women, Reid had a relatively long career in History, beginning as an instructor in 1918 and becoming a lecturer in 1922, she too left when she married in 1926.

Reid was not alone in giving up her employment for marriage or for other reasons, for to leave was typical, even among the sixty-seven women who were ranked lecturer or above in the 1920s. Gladys Wookey, whose decade as a lecturer in English was finally crowned by a promotion to assistant professor in 1929, was forced to take a year's leave because of a "breakdown" in 1925. She eventually left her university teaching job altogether when she married Herbert Davis and opted instead to be a faculty wife, a role which ultimately took her out of the country, first to England and eventually to the United States as the wife of a women's college president.[32] At least one woman professor of the 1920s did not survive the physical strain of academic life. Cornelia Harcum, a young assistant professor of Industrial Art on the staff of the Royal Ontario Museum, was forced to retire and return to her home in the United States when a bout of influenza developed into pleurisy. She died in 1927.[33] Newspaper clippings on both Wookey and Harcum reveal a high degree of sympathy for and interest in these women. Harcum, for example, was frequently invited to give popular lectures on topics such as domestic life

31. From Wrong's point of view, her father's position as head of History may have been negative rather than positive for her continuation at Toronto. Ruth Brouwer reports that on at least one occasion Wrong cited her father's presence at the university as "an obstacle rather than an asset to her career there." Personal communication with author, 5 August 1991. For an interesting discussion of George Wrong and the question of women on staff and in the university generally, see Robert Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation: A Century of History at the University of Toronto* (Toronto, 1991), 49.

32. UTA, Newspaper Clipping Collection, A73-0026/525(80). The college was Smith in Northampton, Massachusetts, where Davis was an immensely popular figure. Gladys Wookey Davis did not leave scholarship behind entirely, for she eventually was inspired to research the history of the college's origins, publishing a slender monograph on the subject, *Miss Sophia's Legacy*, with Basil Blackwell of Oxford in 1950.

33. UTA, Newspaper Clipping Collection, A73-0026/137(93). Harcum, a graduate of Goucher with a doctorate from Johns Hopkins, was a specialist in Greek and early-Roman art, and curator of the classical collection at the museum.

in ancient Greece to community gatherings, lectures which were reported in detail in the popular press. The *Varsity* article reporting Wookey's breakdown and subsequent leave from her university work was a model of sympathetic concern. At the same time, the facts of illness and breakdown do suggest that these women may have experienced special tensions in their roles at Toronto.

Of the sixty-seven high-ranking women employed during the decade between 1921 and 1931, twenty-five or over one third had moved on to other work or retired by 1930-31. Many of the remaining forty-two, however, were at the beginning of life-long work at the University of Toronto. Most built careers in the social or educational professions or in languages, but two were among the pioneer career women in science: the botanist Jessie Gertrude Wright, who does not seem to have been promoted beyond the rank of assistant professor but would continue to teach at Toronto until 1949; and Norma Henrietta Carswell Ford, who would win distinction as a geneticist and would finally be promoted to full professor by the university when she retired in 1958, having worked at Toronto for some forty years.

While women like Jessie Gertrude Wright and Norma Ford were important, far more numerous at the university in the 1920s were the 174 women with degrees, many of them advanced, who worked at the rank of instructor or below. The contrasts between this group and the more favoured sixty-seven women who were ranked as lecturers and professors are significant. To begin with, far more of the lower-ranked women had University of Toronto training only: three quarters of them, compared to just over one half of the women at higher ranks. Secondly, their college/university affiliations were also sharply in contrast. Only fourteen of the lower-ranked women (8 per cent) worked for the arts colleges. The vast majority were employed by the various professional faculties and university departments. The explanation for this latter difference lies in the very different make-up of the group in terms of their subject areas. If one looks at all of the women employed over the decade between 1921-22 and 1930-31 (Table 3), the lower-ranked women with degrees employed in the women's professions, languages, and social sciences were outnumbered more than two to one by the women with degrees working in the natural and medical sciences, where women could find employment in a variety of helping roles in both laboratory and classroom work. Among these lower-ranked women, the natural sciences led the way with sixty-two degreed employees in all. Once again, the Department of Physics topped the list with a total of seventeen women who worked as demonstrators, class assistants, or instructors at one time or another during the decade. Physics was followed closely by Botany, with sixteen women employees, while various other departments followed with lower numbers. Many, indeed most, of these women may well have been graduate students who obtained assistantships for a brief period as a way of financing their master's or doctoral programmes. Others were at the beginning of careers working at the university. Three of the physicists, two of whom had already been employed before the 1920s, were in this group. So was the one geologist, Madeleine Fritz. A class assistant throughout the decade, she was finally promoted to lecturer in 1934 and would eventually make her name as a palaeontologist associated with the Royal Ontario Museum.[34]

---

34. Ainley, "Last in the Field," especially 31-36. There is also an interview of Madeleine Fritz in the University of Toronto Archives: B74-0022, Madeleine Alberta Fritz, recorded in 1973.

The majority of women employed as instructors or assistants in the sciences was perhaps not as lucky, or as ambitious, as Madeleine Fritz. Certainly, the snapshot approach of Table 4 demonstrates that few indeed would make it into the professoriate as she eventually did. Yet whatever their luck or long-term goals, it can at least be said that women scientists found employment in relatively large numbers at this lower level. Equally important were the significant numbers of women engaged by the university to assist with medical research and teaching. Here the existence of the Connaught Laboratories, and the fame of the Banting Institute following the discovery of insulin, clearly came into play. Of the fifty-eight women with degrees whose employment related to medicine or medicine-associated subjects, twenty-seven were working at the Connaught Labs or were identified with the "Banting Medical Research" although (as we have seen in our discussion of Table 4), women employed in the medical sciences overall were greatly outnumbered by men.

As the case of Madeleine Fritz suggests, a lowly title in one decade did not necessarily mean lack of access to a long career or a bright future. Dorothy Forward, a botanist who was employed as a class assistant while she studied for her doctorate during the late 1920s, was granted this degree in 1931. She did a second doctorate at Cambridge during the mid-1930s before eventually returning to a permanent and higher-ranking position at Toronto. In a 1978 interview, Dr. Forward recalled that the first job the Botany department offered her was the job of departmental secretary, a proposal that appears to have been common enough at the time for promising female graduates. Fortunately for her future career as a scientist, Dorothy Forward resisted the temptation and persevered in further study, teaching, and research.[35]

Some of the sixty-one women without degrees, who worked as researchers or class assistants, may well have been tempted by secretarial work for, as university departments expanded in the 1920s, so did the numbers of nonteaching personnel. At least four women who had degrees combined teaching with secretarial work. We have already mentioned Annie Reed, who eventually had a long and vital career as a class assistant and secretary of the Physics department, and is remembered by one of the early women physicists as a delightful Irishwoman who told wonderful stories.[36] Marie Eva Armour continued her secretarial and teaching job in Physiology. Applied Science and Engineering acquired a class assistant/secretary in the person of Miss D. Birkett. On the other hand, Miss Freya C. Hahn, a graduate who began to work first in the university library, and then for the History department in the 1920s, did not do any teaching. Miss Hahn was to be another long-term university employee, however; her reign over the History department office would continue for many decades.[37] She was not alone. One of the outstanding features of the 1920s for women at the University of Toronto was the rapid expansion that occurred during that decade in the number of permanent secretarial, clerical, and bookkeeping jobs that the university provided for women. Table 2 demonstrates the doubling of female clerical staff in the decade between 1910-11 and 1920-21, and again in the 1920s.

35. UTA, B78-0003, Dorothy Forward interview, recorded in 1978; author's interview with Elizabeth Allin, May 1991.

36. Author's interview with Elizabeth Allin, May 1991.

37. Miss Hahn's role and the atmosphere that she created in the History department are described in Bothwell, *Laying the Foundation*.

If secretarial workers were a growing force in the 1920s, so too were library assistants. Some women combined library with secretarial work for the departments or the colleges, but the majority of women were employed in the rapidly expanding university library. Overall during the decade, the number of women employed by this division was forty-seven, of whom thirty-five had degrees. Several of these women were clearly embarked on major careers.

A third group of women workers who were not directly connected with either teaching or research is difficult to classify, but represents another expansion, if not a new direction, taken in the 1920s. Medical artists, social workers and social hostesses, dental nurses, photographers, housekeepers, autopsy recorders, and managers of bookstores were to be found in about the same numbers as librarians overall. Although the records are inadequate for assessing the numbers in this miscellaneous category prior to the 1920s, by 1930-31 there were thirty-four women listed in the staff directory who fell into this category. Altogether, the clerical staff, the library staff, and the members of this miscellaneous group were, at 252 women, almost as numerous as the 302 women who were listed in the directories as employed in teaching or research over the ten years between 1921-22 and 1930-31.[38]

iii

One might have predicted either of two possibilities for women at the University of Toronto in the 1930s: that this decade would be very similar to the 1920s, or that the Great Depression might mean tremendous cutbacks in the employment of women. Neither, in fact, was altogether the case. The decade of the depression seems to have been a period of continuing expansion in jobs for women at the university, and even slight progress through the ranks. By 1940-41, women were 12.5 per cent of the university's lecturers and professors, compared to 9.9 per cent in 1930-31.[39] Patterns of employment also shifted slightly, as far as the deployment of higher-ranked women among the various colleges, faculties, and departments was concerned.

Among the colleges, the Roman Catholic St. Michael's had taken the lead, engaging over the decade eighteen, or one half of all of the women lecturers and professors in English, modern languages, and Classics employed in that ten-year period.[40] St. Mike's now boasted several associate professors who were women, some female faculty members with degrees from outside of Canada, and two who had doctorates. Nearly all

38. In arriving at these numbers, we were presented with the problem that a number of women held more than one type of job. Several combined library work, teaching, or research with secretarial work. When calculating totals, each woman was counted only once, and assigned to the category that seemed to predominate in her University of Toronto career.
39. Percentages are derived from the figures in Table 1. Toronto's percentages reflected national figures, which indicate that women had moved from 8.8 per cent of Canadian faculty in arts, letters, pure sciences, and professional faculties in 1931, to 12.2 per cent in 1941. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, *Higher Education in Canada, 1940-42* (81-402), Section II: 51.
40. Calculations of total numbers in the period between the academic years 1931-32 and 1940-41 are drawn from the examination of nine out of the ten staff directories. The directory for 1939-40 was not available when the research was done, owing to a strike; hence, any women who worked in this year *only* are not counted.

were members of either the Sisters of St. Joseph or Loretto; six of them were on faculty for almost the entire decade; and Sisters Agnes, Bernard, Dorothea, Margarita, and St. John had careers dating back to the 1920s.

A few women faculty in the other colleges also experienced promotions, although there were also setbacks. On the one hand, each of the three Protestant colleges had at least one woman associate professor and, depending on where Mossie May Waddington Kirkwood was (she left University College to return to Trinity in 1936), she made a second. On the other hand, a Miss F.A. Smith, who was appointed a lecturer in English at Victoria in 1931, remained in that rank for only one year despite her Yale doctorate. After that she was listed at the lower rank of instructor and, by 1940, she had left the university. Still, most of the women faculty working for the colleges appear to have had relative job security. Women like Jessie Macpherson and Kathleen Coburn of Victoria, Mary Craig Needler of University College, or Leila Scott of Trinity were making their marks as permanent and respected contributors to the academic life of the university. In the social and educational professions, Household Science continued to have the largest numbers of women at the level of lecturer and above, but there were now a few more upper-ranked women faculty in areas like women's physical education, library science, nursing, and education.

The more significant changes, however, were in the university subjects other than the social and educational professions. In some humanities and social science subjects like History, Archeology, Political Science, and Psychology, there was a falling off in the number of women. The museum employed two to guide and lecture to the public, and Political Economy made Irene Biss[41] an assistant professor, thus helping to launch an important career. Otherwise, no women were to be found at the rank of lecturer or above in these fields. The university subjects that did promote women, at least in a few instances, were the natural sciences. It was Physics, with three assistant professors, Biology and Botany with one each, and the other sciences with their several women lecturers that seem to have made something of an advance. Even medicine had finally admitted some women to their ranks. The new School of Hygiene employed two female assistant professors by the end of the decade, while two women were now lecturers in Medicine.

The most remarkable characteristic of the teaching and research staff at the university during the 1930s, however, was the continuing presence of large numbers of women working at the rank of instructor or below. Between 1931 and 1941, ninety women altogether served as lecturers or professors, and some 230 women with degrees and another eight-five without were employed at the rank of instructor or below. The social and educational professions contributed large numbers to the lower ranks. Among the seventy-one women instructors and researchers with degrees in these fields, twenty-six were in Household Science. The social and educational professional schools also accounted for important appointments in the nondegreed group, women who may not have been professors because they lacked degrees but were nevertheless high ranking. Such were Florence Emory, Assistant (and then Associate) Director of Nursing Education, and Miss A.C. McGregor, Assistant Director of the School of Social Work.

41. Later Irene Spry. See UTA, Newspaper Clippings Collection, A73-0026/30(6).

Table 5
Distribution of Women's Employment at the University of Toronto, 1930-31 and 1940-41

	1930-31		1940-41	
	#	%	#	%
Lecturers and Professors	35	11.2	57	12.6
Teaching and Research: Instructors and Below	82	26.2	99	21.9
Librarians and Library Assistants	38	12.1	50	11.0
Clerical and Accounting	113	36.1	162	35.8
Miscellaneous	34	10.9	60	13.2
Administrative	11	3.5	25	5.5
Total	**313**	**100.0**	**453**	**100.0**

Source: University of Toronto Staff Directories.

Once again, however, it was the natural and medical sciences that were responsible for the greatest numbers of female employees. Among the women with degrees, the natural sciences employed forty as instructors and reseachers, and medicine, the Connaught Labs, and the Banting Research Institute gave jobs to a further seventy-nine. The vast majority of these jobs were very short term; many of the women may have been demonstrators or class assistants as graduate students and then moved on to jobs in secondary-school teaching or elsewhere. Yet, once again, some worked for the entire decade as demonstrators, class assistants, research associates, or technicians, while others worked for three or four years and then disappeared from the record.

Equally significant, as Tables 2 and 5 demonstrate, was the continued growth of the female labour force that was not directly involved in either teaching or research during the 1930s. The ''miscellaneous'' category accounted for many of these individuals. Miss Algie was a social worker in the Department of Psychological Research, Miss Armstrong a nurse at St. Hilda's College, and Miss Frey was an assistant dietitian at Victoria College. They were among a group of some seventy-one women engaged during the 1930s, sixty of whom were still employed in 1940-41. Employment in library work also expanded: altogether, the university employed a total of eighty-six full-time librarians and library assistants during the decade, of whom fifty were still listed in the staff directories in 1940-41. Some of these may not have been working in the university library, for there were now many more college and departmental libraries employing, during the 1930s, a total of twenty-eight women full time. In addition to the full-time librarians, there were eight departmental librarians who also taught and twenty-three who doubled as departmental secretaries.

In the end, it was in secretarial and administrative work that most women were to be found. Altogether the university employed nearly three hundred women during the decade between 1931 and 1941 in clerical jobs. Although some worked only briefly, there were 162 women in clerical and twenty-five in administrative positions at the end of the decade (Tables 2 and 5). A large female support staff had now been created, with its own ranks and hierarchies. Secretaries and stenographers were joined by clerical assistants and clerks, and there were bookkeepers, fees clerks, and records clerks on the university payroll in greater numbers than ever before. In addition, there were now women playing roles as "assistants" in various administrative offices: the Alumnae Federation Office, the Department of University Extension, the Office of the Registrar, the Warden of Hart House, and the Bursar of Trinity were only a few among the many offices and officers who now required female assistants to carry on their work.

Given the large numbers of women employed in so many different roles at Toronto, it is not surprising to find a 1944 *Globe & Mail* article entitled "University: Staff Women Gain Numerical Strength."[42] The views expressed in this article are surprising, however, given the small number of women who achieved promotion into the higher ranks by the early 1940s. The author voiced the opinion that the one profession in which "the often purely theoretical 'equality of the sexes'" was "actually in flourishing practice," was the profession of "teaching in a university." The expert quoted on this was Dr. W. J. Dunlop, Director of the University of Toronto's extension programme, who claimed that, on a staff that totalled 991 people, there were now "literally hundreds of women working beside men." He added that "they hold every academic rank from professor to lecturer, demonstrator and lab technician. They are on the staffs of every faculty but forestry and the School of Chinese Studies. In the 36 departments of arts, women instructors have given only economics, Oriental languages, military studies and mineralogy a miss."

Of course, in some ways, Dr. Dunlop was right. No doubt the war had brought even more women into positions of responsibility and prominence in the university. Prior to the 1940s, however, many doors had already been opened. Women had in fact been admitted in large numbers into teaching and research at Toronto, although by no means were they on a genuinely equal footing with men.

How did women experience their employment at the university during the 1930s? Dr. Elizabeth J. Allin is among the women whose engagement at Toronto began in that decade and who can look back on her career at the university with satisfaction.[43] A whiz at math in the one-room school she attended, Elizabeth Allin had the good fortune to have parents, a grandmother, and an aunt who were tremendously supportive of her education. Her father ran a post office and store, but had been a highly regarded schoolmaster in his time, as had his father before him. He helped solve the math problems on those occasions when the local schoolmistress found them beyond her ability. Elizabeth Allin's maternal grandmother probably moved to Port Perry so that her granddaughter could attend high school. Her aunt had graduated from University College in 1898 and was one of the first women in Ontario to be a secondary-school principal, in Bowman-

42. Ibid., A73-0026/105(61).

43. Unless otherwise indicated, the information on her life and career comes from an interview I conducted with Elizabeth Allin at her home in May 1991.

ville, before she married and moved to the United States. It was this aunt who, along with her father, encouraged Elizabeth Allin to go to university.

Finding university mathematics a little too abstract for her liking, Allin shifted to physics, was encouraged in her ambitions, and earned a doctorate at Toronto in 1931, nine years after she had started as an undergraduate. In 1933-34, she was able to spend a year at Cambridge "trying to learn some modern physics," at the same time as Dorothy Forward was studying there for a second doctorate in botany. She then returned to an absorbing career in the University of Toronto's Department of Physics where, during the 1930s and 1940s at least, she was one of a relatively small number of instructors, lecturers, and professors that included two other women. There is a sense in which things might have seemed, during those two decades, to be very close to equal. Where inequality did exist, Dr. Allin freely acknowledges, was in job security and promotions. She believes that men and women were initially hired at the same salaries,[44] but there is no doubt that the men were promoted far more rapidly and readily. In Dr. Allin's opinion, this was because they were able to obtain other job offers. Women, this suggests, were either less mobile or seemed to be less mobile, and were therefore less likely to secure such offers. Secondly, Dr. Allin is quite certain that one way in which the university responded to the need to make staff cuts and save money during the depression was "to get rid of the women." At the same time, though, Allin notes that both men and women faculty took cuts in pay to make it through the difficult years before World War II.

The lives of Elizabeth Allin and Dorothy Forward also illustrate the themes of community and companionship in women's work in universities. At some point during their careers, the two scientists began to share housing; in retirement, they still are living together. Prior to that, Dorothy Forward shared a garret with her sister and a friend (an "apartment" would have been financially out of the question[45]), while Allin took advantage of one of the women's residences connected with University College. These were undoubtedly social centres of a kind and the one in which Elizabeth Allin found herself she particularly remembers for its excellent food, supervised as it was by a dietitian who demanded enough money for her students to eat well. The undergraduate Maths and Physics Society parties were then exclusively confined to students in those disciplines, and there were enough women in the group to make the parties seem reasonably balanced. Only later did the society become so dominated by men that they had to invite young women from outside to make up their parties. Elizabeth Allin was also part of a group of like-minded individuals, some the wives of male professors, who clubbed together on their own in organizations such as the University Women's Club and the Canadian Federation of University Women, when they were not gathering with the men, for picnics, theatre outings, and other social events they enjoyed together.[46]

44. This is hard to verify. In the 1935-36 auditor's report, Elizabeth Allin's salary emerges as lower than those of two male lecturers and of one man listed under the category "lecturers and demonstrators." On the other hand, she was paid more than the two other women and one other man listed in the lecturer/demonstrator category.

45. Dorothy Forward interview, 1978.

46. UTA, Newspaper Clipping Collection, A73-0026/005 (55). In 1947, Dr. Allin is described by the *Globe and Mail* as the head of the physics and chemistry interest group of the Canadian Federation.

Another woman, who was a teaching assistant on several occasions at the University of Toronto, also experienced a vibrant social life throughout her time at the university. An individual who was capable of lecturing in genetics and, in fact, was once called upon to do so, Bertha MacNamara Houston was nevertheless inclined to avoid the kind of single-minded dedication to scholarly pursuits that would have labelled her a bluestocking. She took teaching work in the university chiefly to save money for her forthcoming marriage, and gleefully recalled taking at least one such job in preference to other employment for the eminently practical reason that it was easier for her fiancee to park at the university when he came to pick her up after work than it would have been had she worked downtown. Bertha Houston, like Elizabeth Allin and Dorothy Forward, has basically untroubled memories of her employment at the University of Toronto, although her contentment may have derived in large part from the fact she had no ambition to pursue a scholarly career.[47] For Dorothy Forward and Elizabeth Allin, who would make teaching at the university their life's work, the sense they had of their departments as small and welcoming communities prior to the Second World War is also suggestive of social comfort. Dr. Forward characterised later times as less happy, marred as they were by generational conflicts within departments that were now much larger.[48] For Dr. Allin, physics in the interwar period was a particularly close-knit community. There were only five professors during her undergraduate and graduate student years and there was the marvellous story-telling Irish secretary, Miss Reed. During the seventeen years when Eli Franklin Burton was in charge of the Physics department (1932 to 1948), Dr. Allin remembers being "so at home in the place, we felt as though we owned it." This sense of belonging clearly lasted into her retirement. In the 1970s, Elizabeth Allin took on the task of writing the history of Physics at Toronto and the result is a valuable volume that the department published in 1981.[49] Clearly, the University of Toronto gave Dr. Allin the opportunity for a long and rewarding career, just as it did Dr. Forward. Both enjoyed their work and were proud of it.

Yet, beside such obvious success and satisfaction, we must place the interrupted careers and disappointment of many women who were not so fortunate or successful. At least one informant has suggested that a particular woman who might have had a career in physics at Toronto, beginning at the end of the period under discussion here, was discouraged, because she was married or because she was Jewish or both.[50] Mossie May Waddington Kirkwood certainly believed that she was obliged to step down as Dean of Women at University College because there was hostility to the idea of a married woman continuing in the job during the depression.[51] Another married woman, who had a master's degree from Radcliffe, was discouraged from entering a doctoral program

47. Interview with Bertha Houston by Laverne Smith, April 1991.
48. Dorothy Forward interview, 1978.
49. Elizabeth J. Allin, *Physics at the University of Toronto, 1843-1980* (Toronto, 1981).
50. Author's interview with Ursula Franklin, June 1990. The physicist in question was Mattie Rotenburg, who went on to an illustrious career in Jewish philanthropy, described by Rachel Schlesinger in "Volunteers for a Dream," *Canadian Jewish Historical Society Journal/Société de l'Histoire Juive Canadienne* 10:1 (Fall 1988): 20-33. Professor Franklin also recalled hearing of a rumoured suicide by a woman scientist who was having a difficult time during this period.
51. UTA, B74-020, Mossie May Kirkwood interview, recorded in 1973.

in biology that might have led to permanent employment. As a result, although happily connected to the university in various ways through her professor husband and several good friends who were in the sciences, she herself only taught for a year in the 1930s, as a class assistant in botany. She was recalled to teach during the Second World War, but lost her post again at the war's end.[52] Certainly, prejudice against married women's employment was profound in all levels of the educational system both before and after the war. Evidence as far as university employment was concerned appears in a 1936 *Canadian Forum* article entitled "Women, Are They Human?" Its author, Gwethalyn Graham, complained that the Board of Governors of an unidentified Canadian university had found it necessary "to dismiss married women instructors because they [were] married," a policy she saw as having a great deal in common with the policies regarding women flourishing at the time under fascist regimes in Europe.[53]

Clearly there were strains associated with university teaching for women in the 1930s, just as there had been in the 1920s, especially if women instructors were married. Not that the position of the single woman was entirely easy. The chief burden of Gwethalyn Graham's article was to criticise what she identified as a thoroughly retrogressive "School of Femininity," evidently appearing once again on the Canadian horizon in the form of a book on women by one Margaret Lawrence. Urging that the average woman was a "still, deep sexual being . . . a biological force under a compelling instinct to find a safe place to lay her babes, and before that . . . in a subconscious search for a man who will give her the babies and help her to find a place to lay them," Lawrence not only suggested that normal, happily married women would not wish to be gainfully employed, but that women who did not marry and have children were somehow abnormal.

That such views were gaining currency must have had an impact on female university employees who were single. An illustration of not-so-subtle pressure to marry and then, presumably, to leave the university, comes from the field of chemistry. Edna Victoria Eastcott's 1925 doctorate earned her a position, not on the promotion ladder, but as one of a group of female research assistants to Professor Lash Miller. In 1934, Eastcott was identified in the press as one of Dr. Miller's five women "students" whose discoveries were making remarkable advances in the field. Miller's presentation of their important findings to the Royal Society was an occasion, not only for a newspaper photo of the five women, but the publication of an interview on their work with Eastcott and one of her female coworkers, Dr. Helen Stantial. In the course of the interview, the two chemists had evidently been forced to defend their choice to do scientific research rather than marry. They were "searching for substances not husbands," the *Star* reported, and this search was their first priority until what they were looking for was found. Evidently a remark from the photographer for the newspaper had provoked an exchange of witicisms. "I'm not in any competition for husbands," was Dr. Stantial's "laughing answer" to the photographer's jibe about the quality of her smile.[54] Edna Eastcott remained

52. Interview conducted by James Leatch, May 1991.

53. *Canadian Forum* 16:1 (December 1936): 21-23. I am indebted to Susan Gelman for calling my attention to this article.

54. UTA, Newspaper Clipping Collection, A 73-0026/92(15).

an assistant in chemistry throughout the 1930s, in spite of her important scientific contributions. Dr. Stantial, who did achieve the rank of lecturer, nevertheless left the Chemistry department and the university before the decade's end. Her last year at Toronto, and her sixth year as a lecturer, was 1937-38.

Of the ninety women who were in the professor/lecturer category at any time during the decade ending in 1940-41, thirty-three had left by that year. Once again, as in the 1920s, this was slightly more than one third of the whole contingent. While the percentages leaving in both decades remained similar, Professor Margaret Ormsby, whose career unfolded at the University of British Columbia, corroborated in an interview Elizabeth Allin's impression that the depression years were, in fact, hard on women. Quite a few excellent women in her field and others were "eased out" of Canadian universities during the 1930s and forced to make their careers in the United States. On the overall question of relations between men and women in the university, Dr. Ormsby reported that in the UBC faculty dining room, women and men were genuinely equal.[55] Yet women were admitted to faculty dining rooms in very few Canadian universities in the early years. Margaret Gillett has described the extraordinary efforts of women faculty at McGill who, assisted by sympathetic male colleagues, finally managed to "liberate" the various dining rooms of their faculty club in the late 1960s.[56] Women were certainly excluded from the faculty club at the University of Toronto, not only in the 1930s, but until well after the Second World War.[57]

"Women faculty were thought of as difficult," Margaret Ormsby admitted. "But," she added, "a woman *had* to be difficult in order to survive." This academic's first working space, when she managed to obtain a job in a Canadian university in 1940, was a table in the ladies' washroom. The head of her department apologised that the department "had no offices for women faculty."[58] Her belief about the need to be difficult echoed similar words spoken by a woman whose teaching career in Sociology at the University of Toronto began in 1945. Professor Jean Burnet also felt the prejudice that women faced in academic life. As she put it in an interview in 1979, a certain "obstinancy" was important to the academic woman's success, even in the post-Second-World-War years at the University of Toronto.[59]

iv

The professions have complex histories that are only beginning to be explored in Canada. We know enough, however, to be certain that all of the professions were gendered in one way or another, and that what most of them had in common was the fact that they

55. Author's interview with Margaret Ormsby, June 1990.
56. Gillett, *We Walked Very Warily*, 402-06.
57. Susan Hoecker-Drysdale, "Women Sociologists in Canada: The Careers of Helen MacGill Hughes, Aileen Dansken Ross, and Jean Robertson Burnet," in *Despite the Odds*, 172.
58. Interview with Margaret Ormsby, June 1990. The university was McMaster.
59. Interview with Jean Burnet by Nicole Keating, November 1979. See also Hoecker-Drysdale, "Women Sociologists in Canada," in *Despite the Odds*, 152-76, and Burnet, "Minorities I Have Belonged To." In the latter, Jean Burnet outlines in detail the prejudices of male faculty against women at the University of Toronto during the 1940s and the decades following World War II.

depended increasingly on the employment of lower-status female workers in various assisting and less remunerative roles. Nurses and secretaries are only the more obvious categories of female workers whose existence increased the status and power of their professional employers. In a similar way, school principals and inspectors formed an important cadre of professional aspirants whose status was significantly increased by their authority over thousands of female school teachers whose training, salaries, and work experience did not quite qualify them for the professional label.[60] What is less often noted is the way in which the expanding university during the first half of the twentieth century fed into professional expansionism and monopoly by the employment of large numbers of women in relatively low-status helping or assistantship roles.[61]

At the University of Toronto, this was perhaps the most remarkable of the developments that occurred during the years prior to World War II. If we examine the distribution of women at the university in 1930-31 and in 1940-41, displayed in Table 5, it is apparent that little more than one out of ten women that the university employed were lecturers or professors, about the same proportion that were working as librarians and library assistants. A much larger proportion, almost one in four, were employed to assist with teaching or research as demonstrators, class assistants, research associates, and the like. By far the largest group, however, consisted of those women engaged in clerical, accounting, and middle-echelon administrative jobs or in the various miscellaneous employments. Indeed, about one half of all of the women employed at the University of Toronto were in these assisting roles. The expanding research university in the first half of the twentieth century was certainly providing work for women; indeed, it might be described as a mecca for women seeking scholarly or related employment. Although women were increasingly admitted to the higher ranks of university work during this period, however, their power in those ranks was, at best, minimal. As Table 1 reveals, of the fifty-seven women at the rank of lecturer or above in 1940-41, only twenty were professors and over half of the professors remained at the level of assistant.

Women's absence from the higher ranks continues to be a problem in all Canadian universities. There are even more profound exclusions caused by ethnicity and race in higher education; class exclusions are endemic as well. *Within* the university, however, the major division remains one of gender: the division that exists between the predominantly male professoriate and the vast underclass of teaching, research, clerical, and other staff who have supported the work of these institutions, often without job security,

60. Alison Prentice, "Patriarch or Public Servant? Teachers and Professionalism in Mid-Nineteenth Century Ontario," paper presented to the Workshop on Professionalism in Modern Societies, University of Western Ontario, March 1981. For a fascinating discussion of the Ontario Education Association as the site of male professional aspirations, see Nancy J. Christie, "Psychology, Sociology and the Secular Moment: The Ontario Education Association's Quest for Authority, 1880-1900," *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'études canadiennes* 25:2 (Summer 1990): 119-43.

61. This is not the focus of her discussion, but Rossiter calls attention to the number of women scientists who got stuck in research assistant positions in her study of the American situation in the universities. Rossiter, *Women Scientists*, Chap. 7. For a discussion of similar tendencies in contemporary Britain, see Sandra Acker, "New Perspectives on an Old Problem: The Position of Women Academics in British Higher Education," *Higher Education* (forthcoming).

reasonable working conditions, or fair remuneration, and whose ranks have been largely filled with women. Overall, the proportion of women on faculty remains low. For Canada as a whole in 1990 (excluding Québec, for which figures were apparently not available when the calculations were made), the figure given is 17.2.[62] It is also pertinent that the academic year 1990-91 saw three strikes at the University of Toronto (by teaching assistants and maintenance and library workers) and the nonrenewal of the jobs of a number of long-term sessional instructors employed by the university. We know that the vast majority of both the strikers and those losing their jobs were women. Tragically, when feminist academics attempt to rectify such inequities by pressing for affirmative action to get more women into tenure-stream positions and the upper ranks of the professoriate, we are not only accused of being difficult but also of interfering with academic freedom. Name calling and pejorative labels continue to plague us. In a mind-boggling reversal that would startle Gwethalyn Graham were she around to observe the university scene in the 1990s, feminist academics are currently accused of embracing fascist politics in the workplace. Proposed solutions to inequities in university employment are stereotyped as the work of a thought police who advocate them only because they are "politically correct."[63]

While we are working to take the sting out of old epithets like "bluestocking" and "feminist," perhaps feminist academics must also take up the challenge of this most recent label to be flung at us. In another context, and coming from a perspective that is, in fact, critical of narrow political correctness, the American historian Ellen DuBois has suggested a position that we might all agree upon as a substitute for such an approach, namely a stance that is "politically conscious."[64] Here is a position that allows for disagreement and debate, but insists nevertheless on the need to recognise inequities and injustices in our universities, both in the past and in the present.

It is remarkable to discover that, as early as 1910, one University of Toronto professor was already worried that women were underrepresented on the faculty. V. E. Henderson expressed his concern in a mildly worded article for the *University of Toronto Monthly*, whose title he put in the form of a question: "Would it be possible to strengthen our university life by appointing more women to the staff?" The answer, according to

62. See the CAUT "Special Report on the Status of Women" (1990), and "A Statistical Glance at the Changing Status of Women in Ontario Universities," CAUT *Bulletin* ACPU (December 1990).

63. See "The Silencers: 'Politically Correct' Crusaders are Stifling Expression and Behavior," *Maclean's* 104:21 (27 May 1991): 40-50. An interesting reply to the accusers of the "politically correct" is David Knechtel, "Putting 'correctness' in perspective," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 21 June 1991.

64. In "Making Women's History: Activist Historians of Women's Rights, 1880-1940," *Radical History Review* 49 (1991): 61-84, DuBois outlines the efforts of American feminists to reinterpret the history of the nineteenth-century women's movement, originally obscured by a version that was "politically correct" but left out much of the story and all of the internal conflicts. "From our predecessors we may learn not to patrol our own interpretive borders or insist on politically correct history, but to become more politically conscious about the history we are crafting" (80). In the end, DuBois calls for a history which engages with the politics of the historian's own times. I am indebted to Ruth Pierson for calling my attention to this article.

Henderson, was obviously yes. It is clear from his arguments, which focused on women students' need for guidance and role models and even raised the question of women professors who might marry, that he was not talking about appointing teaching or research assistants, or superintendents of women students, but women faculty.[65] Now, as the twentieth century draws to a close, perhaps we can finally come to grips with Professor Henderson's question.

Our female predecessors in universities, as this study indicates, have left us a complex legacy. Some, like Toronto's Elizabeth Allin and Dorothy Forward, were able to carve out rewarding teaching and research careers and make themselves "at home" in Canadian institutions of higher learning during the early and middle years of the twentieth century. Such a statement could also be made about many of the women who made their careers in library, secretarial, or administrative work. There were others, however, who were explicity excluded from full participation in university work or whose advancement was clearly blocked because they were women. The overall story of women's participation in the university labour force is thus an ambiguous one. Women employees of the University of Toronto probably largely eschewed the bluestocking label; probably most would also have disavowed the feminist one, although this is less clear. Much more research is needed before we will have a full understanding of the attitudes and ideas that motivated them. From our current vantage point, we may perhaps be forgiven for regarding them at least as incipient feminists. To my mind, they qualify as such for their pioneering efforts to open up new fields of professional employment to women and to establish, however imperfectly, women's basic right to earn their livings in a variety of roles in Canada's universities. What feminist academics of the present generation wish to add is the right of women to share equally in *all* of the roles that universities provide, and perhaps to work towards making universities less divisive and hierarchical environments altogether. No doubt we will need to emulate our academic foremothers who were not afraid to be seen as difficult in our pursuit of these goals.

65. UTA, *University of Toronto Monthly* 10:3 (January 1910): 144-47.