

The Emergence of Social Work in Toronto

JAMES PITSULA

The individual must be fashioned by techniques, either negatively (by the techniques of understanding man) or positively (by the adaptation of man to the technical framework), in order to wipe out the blots his personal determination introduces into the perfect design of the organization.

— Jacques Ellul¹

Jacques Ellul in *The Technological Society* puts forward the thesis that the most important feature of modern civilization has been the application of technique — defined as “the totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development)” — to all aspects of human life.² Ellul’s ideas find an echo in Robert Wiebe’s interpretation of the history of the United States between 1877 and 1920. *The Search for Order* gives prominence to the new middle class that imposed a bureaucratic order on the emerging urban-industrial system. This class consisted of professionals in such fields as medicine, law, economics, administration, social work, and architecture, and specialists in business, in labour, and in agriculture. They shared a consciousness of possessing unique skills enabling them to bring order to the chaos of modern society.³

The ideas of Ellul and Wiebe assist our understanding of similar developments occurring in Canada during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This essay analyses the application of technique to one aspect of urban society. Toronto in 1881 was a city of 86,400 people in which private citizens working as volunteers looked after charity. By 1921 the population had grown to 521,900, and paid social workers had to a large extent taken away the management of the poor relief system from the volunteers.⁴ Acceptance of the ideals of order, economy,

and efficiency brought about a thorough-going transformation of charity.

The citizens of late nineteenth century Toronto expressed their benevolence through a multiplicity of charitable societies and institutions. Although these philanthropies were privately operated, they received financial assistance from the municipal or provincial government. In 1894, for example, the City provided grants for 43 different charities, including 10 children’s homes, 5 homes for the aged, 3 homes for fallen women, and 16 dispensaries, hospitals, and nursing missions.⁵

Most of the outdoor relief available in Toronto, that is, the relief given to the poor who lived in their own homes, came from the House of Industry. Founded in 1837, the House was a private corporation governed by a Board consisting of 25 managers, elected annually by the subscribers, and 15 trustees with lifetime tenure. Its private status notwithstanding, the House depended on the municipal government for money. The institution spent on average \$10,255 annually between 1884 and 1894 relieving casuals and the outdoor poor; during the same interval the City allowed the House an average annual sum of \$9,452.⁶ The members of the Board could not fail to appreciate that the House of Industry’s financial position gave it a quasi-public status: “There are two dozen charitable institutions in this city, but with the exception of the Toronto General Hospital there is no one more generally regarded as what might be called a ‘State Institution’ than the House of Industry.”⁷ Thus the term “city relief” referred to relief issued by the House of Industry.

There were other agencies distributing considerable quantities of outdoor relief. Both the Ladies’ Relief Society and the St. Vincent de Paul Society attracted scores of volunteers and constructed formidable organizations that encompassed the whole city. Countless churches and missions extended charity to the needy, not to mention the national benevolent societies which looked after specific nationalities — the St. George’s Society for the English, the St. Andrew’s Society for the Scots, the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society, and so on.

But out of the welter of charities, the House of Industry stands out as the pre-eminent institution. By studying its methods and procedures, we can arrive at a fairly good understanding of the way the poor were treated in late Victorian Toronto. Obtaining fuel or groceries from the House involved two steps. First, a visitor was designated to interview the applicant in his own home. Those judged "deserving" then had to appear in person before a committee of trustees who made the final decision to grant or withhold relief.⁸

The investigation and disposal of hundreds of cases was a laborious and time-consuming operation, carried out entirely by volunteers, all business and professional men. The 28 visitors active in 1881 included 5 men with interests in finance, land investment, or insurance, 7 merchants, 7 clergymen, 2 barristers, a collegiate principal, a doctor, an accountant, and a government clerk. They were a remarkably distinguished group of men. The Honorable G.W. Allan sat in the Dominion Senate; W.J. Mac Donell held the position of French vice-consul in Toronto; Colonel Moffatt was a Commissioner of the Canada Company; J. Gillespie served as Treasurer of the Board of Trade; N.C. Love was vice-president of the Ontario College of Pharmacy; and W.H. Howland and Warring Kennedy were later mayors of the city.⁹ That men of their station in life should devote spare hours to knocking on the doors of the poor seems to us extraordinary. In the second and third decades of the twentieth century this job was mainly entrusted to poorly paid professional social workers, most of them women. The steps by which this transformation came about is the subject matter of this paper.

Something of the attitudes and methods of the old-fashioned volunteer visitor can be inferred from the visitors' reports which survive in the House of Industry case registers. The visitors heeded the guiding principle of the institution: "to discriminate between actual and pretended poor and to distribute charity accordingly."¹⁰ The poor were classified either as "deserving," individuals of good moral character who were destitute owing to misfortune and not through any fault of their own, or "undeserving," paupers who

were too lazy and morally degenerate to support themselves. The visitor's major preoccupation was to evaluate the integrity of the applicant. A quantitative analysis of 3,567 reports recorded between 1879 and 1882 disclosed 904 cases in which an explicit moral judgement was made. The poor belonged to two mutually exclusive groups: the "deserving," "respectable," "decent," "steady," "industrious," "hardworking," "worthy," "well-behaved," "quiet"; and the "undeserving," "not respectable," "not steady," "lazy," "worthless," and "disorderly."¹¹ The deserving poor felt shame and tried to conceal their condition:

Thomas Sheppard 232 Bathurst Street in room upstairs. English. C. of E. aged 50 years each. Gilder, can't get work. The wife not able to work for rheumatism. very decent people and before applying, sold nearly all their effects. Soft coal and bread.¹²

A candidate for aid was more favourably regarded if he did not directly ask for it: "I should be very glad if some flour and coal could be sent to them as I think they are specially deserving of the assistance which they would never ask for themselves."¹³

The visitors placed a high premium on cleanliness and tidiness. Seven per cent of the personal comments in the sample studied referred to hygiene and grooming habits. Half of the comments about furnishings and living conditions had to do not with squalor, overcrowding, or discomfort, but with neatness. One client was summarily dismissed as follows: "John Sinclair. 8 Sydenham Lane...think he looks rather lazy from look of house."¹⁴

Beyond discriminating between the worthy and unworthy poor, the visitor attempted to instill habits of industry and thrift and to promote self-respect and self-reliance. His approach was blunt:

Mary Dowding 514 King St. E. and husband. No children. says can't get work. fancy they don't want it. no reason why they should be in want. Recommend a little starvation until self-help engendered, probably drink.¹⁵

A judicious dose of generosity was sometimes

useful in keeping waverers on the right path: "I am informed that Mrs. McGrath is conducting herself much more satisfactorily than formerly living both industrious and sober. Perhaps a little encouragement might do her good and strengthen her desires to keep right."¹⁶ Not even the virtuous were completely fortified against the demoralizing effects of charity. The habit of dependency took hold of the best men and made paupers of them. Thus a visitor reflected on the case of a "respectable and industrious man in poor health": "The only objection to recommend [sic] relief is the danger of pauperization incurred by the acceptance of it."¹⁷

In daily practice it was not always possible for the visitors to enforce the hard-and-fast distinction between deserving and undeserving poor. Why should children suffer on account of the sins of their parents? A "worthless couple" who "used whiskey freely" nonetheless received aid: "If it were not for the child I would not recommend anything to them as I am afraid they would sell what they got."¹⁸ The spectacle of misery sometimes overwhelmed the visitor and vitiated the normal criteria for eligibility:

John Webb 35 Dundas Street...Baker by trade. English out ten years. 3 children. 8.5.4. Methodist. His wife for the last three months has been ill and has fits. they appear very badly off, but as far as I hear drink is the cause of it, they are really suffering however and would recommend coal.¹⁹

No matter how degraded the pauper, he was still a human being: "Bridget Hagan...Suppose must be kept from starving as she has a soul to be saved."²⁰ The intercession of all these factors softened the harshness of the House of Industry. Between 1879 and 1882, 53 per cent of the cases labelled undeserving were in fact granted aid.²¹ It is not known, however, how many people were deterred from applying to the House because of its forbidding image and techniques.

Although the visitors were unpaid and untrained, the managers expected a minimum level of experience and skill: "Persons qualified to act in that laborious and delicate character are not easily found. Visiting, like other occupations,

requires an apprenticeship, and, until a man has had some practical experience it is very possible that, with the best intentions he may do more harm than good."²² That being said, the Board fervently upheld the voluntary principle in charity. In 1888, 1891, and again in 1898, they voted down a proposal to hire a paid inspector to investigate applications.²³ While spontaneous benevolence ennobled both the giver and the receiver, the mercenary motive poisoned the charitable act. The Christian must love his fellow man directly and personally, not through an intermediary: "so fashionable, indeed, has it become to obey the commands of Scripture by proxy that it would be quite consistent for people to expect to go to Heaven by proxy: for if obedience may be proximal, why not its rewards?"²⁴

The ideal of voluntary charity, though abstractly refined and uplifting, was not tenable in an advanced urban-industrial setting. As Toronto grew in size from 44,800 in 1861 to 86,400 in 1881 to 208,000 in 1901, traditional poor relief became increasingly inadequate.²⁵ The volunteer system broke down and was replaced, in the interests of economy and efficiency, by welfare bureaucracies run by trained social workers. The transformation was brought about by two bodies: the Associated Charities, which came into existence in 1881 and lasted until 1913, and the Social Service Commission which fell heir to the functions of the Associated Charities in 1912. The policies and actions of these organizations had direct bearing on the emergence of social work.

The Associated Charities was part of an extensive charity organization movement that originated in London, England in 1869. By 1893 there were 75 associations in England and 92 associations in the United States professing loyalty to charity organization principles.²⁶ The principal goal was to systematize charity in order to eliminate indiscriminate almsgiving. The charity "organizationists" disapproved of material relief because it encouraged pauperism. The permanent regeneration of the poor was possible only through character regeneration. The C.O.S. "friendly visitor" cultivated a close personal relationship with his client, offering moral insights and human sympathy. The friendly visitor, who believed in

the differential treatment of the poor and who searched out the root cause of the client's problem, rather than blindly handing out a dole, was the forerunner of the social worker. The difference was that the social worker justified his intervention by his technical training and scientific knowledge of human behaviour. The friendly visitor relied on good will and a sense of moral superiority.

Charity organization societies adapted to local conditions and varied widely from place to place. The Toronto Associated Charities consisted of representatives from the main relief agencies: the House of Industry, the Ladies' Relief Society, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and the national benevolent societies. The association employed a secretary to coordinate activities and to refer needy applicants to the appropriate charity. A full-fledged staff of friendly visitors never evolved because some of the component organizations already had their own corps of visitors.

Even without friendly visitors, the Associated Charities advanced the development of social work. In 1883 it recommended to City Council the appointment of a civic relief officer. Private and voluntary charity was too haphazard and undependable to cope with urban conditions. Since the municipal government shirked responsibility, there was a vacuum of leadership at the centre. The Mayor, by default, had certain relief functions thrust upon him: the distribution of railway and steamboat passes to penniless travellers; the payment of hospital bills for the indigent poor; arranging for the care of foundlings; paying the cost of pauper burials. These harassing duties distracted the Mayor and used up his time. W.B. McMurrich complained in 1881:

From the short experience of duties attaching to the mayoralty, I am of opinion as regards one class of the same — the relieving of the wants of the indigent poor — a change is absolutely necessary, not so much to relieve the Mayor from these duties but to prevent imposition and give more time to the Mayor to attend to matters of greater importance to the welfare of the city.²⁷

The City Council in 1893, after repeated urging from the Associated Charities, finally selected a permanent relief officer. The President of the Associated Charities, Goldwin Smith, paid his first year's salary.²⁸ The appointment signified an important change. Charity was no longer a matter to be left entirely to the private sector and in the hands of part-time volunteers. The public authorities assumed some executive responsibility for the administration of poor relief. Edward Taylor, Toronto's first relief officer, had no professional qualifications for the position. A hatter by trade, he had a background in evangelical and charitable endeavours, notably the Prisoners' Aid Association and the Toronto Mission Union.²⁹ As relief officer, he carried out those relief functions previously assigned to the Mayor. He also collected statistics relating to the persons assisted by the various charities in receipt of civic grants. This information was useful to the aldermen in their preparation of the budget. Taylor did not himself distribute very much relief. He sent supplicants at City Hall to the House of Industry which continued to be the main vehicle for city relief.³⁰

Members of the Associated Charities were not completely satisfied with the improvement to the relief system achieved by the relief officer. The secretary of the association made the case in 1901 for the employment of expert charity workers:

Charity work formerly meant only amelioration; the temporary relief of wretchedness. Today charity includes economic, educative and ethical functions. It seeks to lay bare the sources of social failure and moral deficiency, and, having found the cause, to rehabilitate character and reinstate social obligations.³¹

It took skill to diagnose "the sources of social failure and moral deficiency," and to prescribe a remedy that would "rehabilitate character and reinstate social obligations."

Canadians were undoubtedly influenced by the advances in social work being made elsewhere, particularly in the United States. It was not unusual for American authorities on the subject to be invited to speak to Toronto audiences.³² The

major theoretician of professional social work in the United States was Mary Richmond, who was successively General Secretary of the Charity Organization Societies in Baltimore and Philadelphia, and Director of the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation in New York. Richmond believed that the basis for professional social work was the casework method which she defined as “those processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously effected, individual by individual, between men and their social environment.”³³ In *Social Diagnosis*, published in 1917, she meticulously described the steps to be followed in casework. First, the social worker collected “social evidence,” consisting of “any and all facts as to personal or family history which, taken together, indicate the nature of a given client’s difficulties and the means to their solution.” Then the evidence was subjected to critical examination and comparison and the “social difficulty” diagnosed. Finally the caseworker enlisted the participation of the client in putting into effect a plan for his more satisfactory adjustment to the social environment.³⁴

The role of the caseworker, as conceived by Mary Richmond, differed significantly from that of the traditional volunteer visitor. Unlike the House of Industry visitor, for example, the social caseworker was not interested in classifying his client as deserving or undeserving. Moral judgments were beside the point. The client, whether deserving or not, had a problem, and it was the social worker’s job to uncover its roots. The social worker was a technician of human relations. He maintained an air of professional detachment, neither raging at his client’s supposed moral shortcomings nor responding too emotionally to his client’s unhappiness. Implicit in the casework technique was the assumption that it was possible to have a scientific understanding of social dynamics and human behaviour.

Although officials of the Toronto Associated Charities gave lip service to the desirability of trained social work practitioners, the association engaged secretaries who lacked professional qualifications, viz., a Presbyterian minister, the former manager of a laundry, and an evangelical

mission worker. Only one of the secretaries, who had taken a course in applied philanthropy in the United States, could claim any formal training.³⁵

The Social Service Commission, superseding the Associated Charities in 1912, introduced professional social work to Toronto. It aimed at coordinating and rationalizing poor relief in the city, but unlike the Associated Charities, enjoyed an official connection with the municipal government. Because the Commission was appointed by City Council, it had leverage with the charities that depended on civic grants. Also, instead of a loose collection of representatives from the major relief organizations, the Commission consisted of five businessmen intent on making charity efficient.³⁶

One of its first recommendations was a request that the House of Industry hire an inspector to investigate relief applications. He would “reduce by many thousands the relief that will be necessary, and at the same time prevent duplication.” By 1917 there were three paid investigators who made 5,316 visits in the course of the year, compared with 263 made by the volunteers. The City saved an estimated \$5,817.³⁷

The House of Industry inspectors worked full-time for a salary, but they were not social workers. The three district secretaries employed by the Social Service Commission, however, were. They coordinated the distribution of outdoor relief within their particular districts according to modern social work principles:

Distress is relieved with care and sympathy, but the emphasis is not placed on mere relief giving. With each family helped the work includes cooperation with other agencies, diagnosis of need, decision as to remedy, application of remedy, subsequent care and tabulation of results. This is no haphazard “tinkering” with human beings but a real effort to render constructive and progressive service.³⁸

The Social Service Commission Report for 1915 provided an example of the results to be obtained through the application of the casework method. The head of one family had a drinking problem,

his wife became downcast and slovenly, and their twelve year old son quit school and found a job. The social worker talked the situation over with the mother who agreed to seek the help of the Juvenile Court. In due course the Judge summoned the husband for a "heart to heart talk," persuaded him to accept medical treatment, and placed him under the supervision of a probation officer. Within a week the man was back to work, and his son was able to return to school. The caseworker, by discovering the underlying cause of the difficulty and bringing the appropriate influences to bear, was able to remove the family from the city relief roll.³⁹

In a variety of ways, the social caseworker acted as the liaison between the client and the community. He enlisted the aid of the client's relatives, established or strengthened church connections, secured legal services, obtained medical treatment, arranged loans, and explored employment possibilities. The client was made aware of such resources as the soldiers' fund, the creches, the settlement houses, and of cultural, recreational and educational opportunities.⁴⁰

Good casework required sufficient time for the social worker to become thoroughly acquainted with the particulars of the case. Unfortunately, the work load of the Social Service Commission district secretaries crippled their effectiveness. The volume of cases passing through the district offices, 3,413 in 1915, "precluded all real constructive casework on the part of the secretaries themselves."⁴¹

The burden was eased after 1918 when the outdoor relief system underwent a fundamental reorganization. The Social Service Commission thereafter confined itself to the supervision of city relief, that is, relief given by the House of Industry. Private relief was channelled through the Neighborhood Workers Association which encompassed churches, missions, settlements, creches, relief societies, and so forth. The Social Service Commission (after 1921 the Social Welfare Division of the Department of Public Health) and the Neighborhood Workers Association each employed their own staff of social workers.

The new order based on efficiency and economy had arrived. The old charity had been

content to condemn pauperism while alleviating destitution temporarily through the dole. Social workers diagnosed the cause of poverty in each individual case and tried to effect a permanent cure. Preaching and moralizing were not nearly as important as getting results. Efficiency conveniently coincided with the extraction of maximum value for every charity dollar spent. The businessmen on the Social Service Commission were explicit about this:

At the risk of being considered mercenary we must point this out. If charity organization should become an established fact in Toronto, the burden hitherto borne by the City will be materially lightened; for real social workers have the utmost distaste for the relief of temporary need by tax-raised poor funds. The section of this report on Outdoor Relief ought to appeal very strongly to the man who fixes the tax rate and the man who pays it.⁴²

The new charity, or social welfare as it came to be called, was made possible by the application of technique to philanthropy. Those with mastery of the technique tried to constitute themselves as a new profession. In 1914 the University of Toronto opened the first school of social work in Canada. It was no longer necessary for Canadians interested in entering the profession to journey to the United States for their training. The President of the University chose an American as the first director of the school: "If we cannot find such a person in the United States, it may be necessary for us to make enquiries in England, but in many ways the social conditions of the United States are more similar to our own than English conditions would be."⁴³ Among the applicants passed over for the position was J.S. Woodsworth.⁴⁴

Twelve full-time and 293 part-time students enrolled in the social work training course in the first year. The full-time students spent ten hours per week in the classroom and ten hours per week doing fieldwork in social agencies. The curriculum consisted of courses in economics, psychology, ethics, and hygiene taught by professors from the respective university departments; a course

on the Family and the Community taught by Arthur Burnett, director of the Division of Public Service, Toronto Department of Health; and a general course on social service given by the head of the school. In addition to these compulsory courses, a range of electives were offered: Charities, Recreation, Medical Social Service, Settlement Methods, and Child Welfare.⁴⁵

The inauguration of a diploma programme in close association with the university enhanced the standing of social work. Professional development was further accelerated in 1926 by the organization of the Canadian Association of Social Workers. In its constitution the association dedicated itself to upholding professional standards, encouraging proper and adequate training, and cultivating and informing public opinion regarding the professional and technical nature of social work.⁴⁶ Also in 1926 the dormant Conference of Charities and Correction was revived as the Canadian Conference on Social Work. The annual meetings provided a national forum for the discussion of social work issues.

Members of the Canadian Association of Social Workers exchanged views in the columns of *Social Welfare*. The articles published in the 1920s revealed a profession in the process of shaping an identity: "Social work has not yet found itself. But there are sounds of rhythm and signs of oneness that make one certain that it is a living and united organism."⁴⁷ Contributors discussed such topics as the problems involved in formulating a code of ethics for social workers, the dangers inherent in specialization, and the obstacles that existed to educating the public as to the technical nature of social work.

Professional status was still an unfulfilled aspiration at the end of the decade. Charlotte Whitton lamented in 1930 the continued hiring of unqualified personnel by social agencies.⁴⁸ Schools of social work were not graduating students in sufficient numbers. It was estimated in 1929 that for every 30 graduates in Canada there were 100 openings.⁴⁹ Low salaries, not more than those paid to elementary school teachers, discouraged candidates and also helped account for the high proportion of women in the profession.⁵⁰

Whether or not social workers attained

professional standing in everyone's eyes hardly matters. The interesting phenomenon was the impulse to professionalism and the accompanying transformation of charity. The private, voluntary philanthropy of nineteenth-century Toronto did not survive mature urbanization. Orderly and efficient poor relief in a city of half a million people became a technical matter entrusted to those who claimed professional expertise. It has been suggested that the urban reform movement in Canada marked the beginning of the age of the specialist and the professional.⁵¹ The history of the emergence of social work in Toronto fully supports that interpretation.

NOTES

1. Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society* (London, 1965), p. 138.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
3. Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order 1877-1920* (New York, 1967), p. 112.
4. Jacob Spelt, *Toronto* (Don Mills, Ontario, 1973), p. 85.
5. City of Toronto Archives, Toronto City Council Minutes, Financial Statement, 1894.
6. *Globe*, May 1, 1894.
7. *House of Industry Annual Report*, 1886.
8. In 1887 a revised regulation empowered the visitor to grant immediate relief to those for whom it was impossible to attend at the House — for example, women with young children who could not be left untended. *By-laws, Rules and Regulations of the House of Industry*, 1887.
9. *House of Industry Annual Report*, 1880; Toronto City Directory, 1881; Henry J. Morgan, *The Canadian Men and Women of the Time*, 1898; George Maclean Rose, *A Cyclopaedia of Canadian Biography*, 1886.
10. *House of Industry Annual Report*, 1837.
11. *House of Industry Case Registers*, 1879-1882.
12. *Ibid.*, January, 1883, #396.
13. *Ibid.*, January 3, 1879.
14. *Ibid.*, February 27, 1880, #588.
15. *Ibid.*, January 3, 1882, #6.
16. *Ibid.*, January 16, 1880.
17. *Ibid.*, January 3, 1879.
18. *Ibid.*, December 30, 1879, #1143.
19. *Ibid.*, March 1, 1881, #850.
20. *Ibid.*, January 2, 1880, #4.
21. *Ibid.*, 1879-1882.
22. *House of Industry Annual Report*, 1878.
23. *World*, October 15, 1888; House of Industry, Committee of Associated Charities Minutes, October 13, 1888; *House of Industry Annual Report*, 1891, 1898.
24. *Globe*, January 14, 1888.
25. Spelt, *Toronto*, p. 85.
26. David Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), p. 234; Charles D. Kellogg, *History of Charity Organization in the United States, Report of Committee of National Conference of Charities and Correction* (Chicago, 1893), p. 1.

27. *Globe*, March 30, 1881.
 28. Goldwin Smith papers, Goldwin Smith to Edward Taylor, September 21, 1893; Toronto City Council Minutes, Bylaw 3198, September 25, 1893.
 29. Toronto City Directory, 1884, 1885; *World*, February 16, 1885; Janet Nelson, "Our Heritage from the Past," *Social Welfare*, June-July, 1926; *Globe*, October 17, 1910.
 30. *World*, April 25, 1895; Toronto City Council Minutes, Board of Control Report #1, January 25, 1897.
 31. Proceedings of the Canadian Conference of Charities and Correction, 1901, Miss L. Taylor.
 32. Well-known authorities like F.A. Almy, Secretary of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society, Edward Devine, Secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society, and Francis McLean, Field Secretary of the American Association for Organizing Charity spoke in Toronto at various times. *Globe*, November 11, 1898; November 7, 1903; Toronto City Council Minutes, Board of Control Report #23, October 14, 1912.
 33. Quoted in Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. 48.
 34. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
 35. *Globe*, November 17, 1910; Toronto Social Welfare Agencies, Box 1, Associated Charities file, "Charitable Work in Toronto," Goldwin Smith, November 6, 1901; Goldwin Smith papers, Henry Duke to Goldwin Smith, August 3, 1906; *Toronto City Mission Annual Report*, 1898.
 36. *Social Service Commission Report Dealing with the Origin, Duties, Growth and Work since November, 1912, 1921*, p. 6.
 37. Toronto City Council, Board of Control Communications, Social Service Commission to Board of Control, April 12, 1913; *House of Industry Annual Report*, 1917; House of Industry Executive Committee Minutes, December 30, 1916; House of Industry Board Minutes, April 17, 1917.
 38. *Social Service Commission Annual Report*, 1916.
 39. *Ibid.*, 1915.
 40. *Ibid.*, 1917.
 41. *Ibid.*, 1915.
 42. *Ibid.*
 43. Sir Robert Falconer papers, Box 32, Falconer to Mrs. H.D. Warren, May 15, 1914.
 44. Sir Robert Falconer papers, Box 32, File on applicants for the post of director of the school of social service.
 45. Agnes C. McGregor, "The Department of Social Science, 1914-1940," *Training for Social Work in the Department of Social Science, 1914-1940* (Toronto, 1940), p. 14; *Toronto Daily News*, October 31, 1914; University of Toronto, Department of Social Service, Calendar, 1915.
 46. Elspeth Latimer, "An Analysis of the Social Action Behaviour of the Canadian Association of Social Workers from its Organizational Beginning to the Modern Period," D.S.W. Thesis, University of Toronto School of Social Work, 1972, p. 52.
 47. Ethel Dodds Parker, "A Code of Ethics for Social Workers," *Social Welfare*, June-July 1926.
 48. Charlotte Whitton, "London Bridge is Falling Down," Proceedings of the Canadian Conference on Social Work, 1930.
 49. *Social Welfare*, November, 1929.
 50. *Globe*, January 31, 1919; *Social Welfare*, June, 1920.
 51. Paul Rutherford, "Tomorrow's Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880-1920," in Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan F.J. Artibise, *The Canadian City* (Toronto, 1977), p. 379.
-