

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FAMILY AGENCY

A Historical Review of the Calgary Family Bureau

by

ARTHUR HERBERT HOOLE

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK
in the School of Social Work

Accepted as conforming to the standard
required for the degree of
Master of Social Work

School of Social Work

1954

The University of British Columbia

Abstract

The purpose of this review is to demonstrate the growth of a family agency, The Calgary Family Bureau. This growth is related in a general manner to that of the Family Welfare Movement which had its roots within the Charity Organization Societies. In portraying this development, only the salient points are discussed, relating them as closely as possible to the functions of a family service agency. These functions which are two in number, are the accepted purposes of a modern family agency. They are, first, to provide a skilled case work service on problems of family living and individual social adjustment; and second, to provide and stimulate those resources that contribute to healthy social living in the community.

It is desired that the specific study of the development of the Calgary Family Bureau will: first, portray a parallel to the growth of other family service agencies as outlined in the first chapter; and second, to demonstrate those processes by which the past has influenced the agency at present; and third, to provide a basis upon which an assessment can be made of the present and the future of the agency. In respect of the latter, an attempt is made to evaluate and assess the agency, not only in terms of the past, but particularly in terms of the present. The assessment being geared to the functions of an accepted family service agency.

The reconstruction of the growth and development of family agencies in general terms was formulated through research of available authoritative sources relating to the general movement and the accepted standard of purposes for a modern family agency.

The specific analysis of the antecedents of the Calgary Family Bureau and the events leading to it becoming an independent family agency was undertaken after a study of historical data in the form of documents such as Minutes, Annual Reports, letters and an independent Survey. These were supplemented by personal sources of authentic observers. The same method was applied in a study of the present status of the agency but in this case also supplemented the personal observations of the writer.

The findings attempt to show that the needs of the Calgary community not only dictated the development of a social agency but lent themselves to its character and the service it provided. These needs were recognized and the forces of social action to meet them were implemented because of the concern and character of responsible personalities in the community. Personal attributes played a considerable role in the formation of and development of the Calgary Family Bureau.

The Calgary Family Bureau was also a product of pressures within the community and its standard of service was influenced by changing concepts. These concepts being the acceptance of the purposes of a recognized family agency. It has not been concluded, however, that the Bureau has reached the standards set for such agencies. It has acquired a foundation as a family agency. It must now acquire the techniques and policies inherent of the case work and community functions of a modern family agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	THE EVOLUTION OF FAMILY AGENCIES AND THEIR ROLE IN THE MODERN COMMUNITY	1
	The Charity Organization Movement	1
	The Role of the Family Agency in the Modern Community	7
	Summary	
II.	THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE PREDECESSORS OF THE CALGARY FAMILY BUREAU	12
	The Calgary Community	12
	The Associated Charities	15
	The Board of Public Welfare	20
III.	THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL OF SOCIAL AGENCIES AND THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FAMILY AGENCY	25
	The Origin of the Council of Social Agencies and Its Impact on the Board of Public Welfare	25
	The Effect of the Second Great War	33
	The Need for Separation between the Council of Social Agencies and the Family Welfare Bureau	36
	Status of the Family Welfare Bureau at the End of the Second Great War	38
	Separation and Independence Accomplished	41
IV.	THE INITIAL STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL FAMILY AGENCY	46
	The First Two Years as an Independent Agency	46
	Progress and Regression, 1946 to 1950	52
V.	THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE AGENCY	62
	Personnel	63
	Staff Development	65

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

Chapter		Page
	Staff Supervision	65
	Administrative Policy	66
	Statistical Records	67
	Case Recording	68
	Intake Procedures	68
	Programme	69
	The Board of Directors	71
VI.	CONCLUSION	76
	The Early Contributions	76
	The Casework Purpose	79
	The Community Purpose	83
	Provincial Welfare and the Community Chest	85
	The Need for Research	88
	The Future of the Agency	89
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	92

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FAMILY AGENCY

A Historical Review of the Calgary Family Bureau

CHAPTER I

THE EVOLUTION OF FAMILY AGENCIES. THEIR ROLE IN THE MODERN COMMUNITY.

The Charity Organization Movement.

Family service agencies of today help all kinds of families regardless of economic or social status. They are among the country's oldest social agencies, some of them in continuous service for a century or more. Public welfare agencies today carry the primary responsibility for families in economic need. But families and individuals often have other needs as pressing as those of food and shelter, and often as costly to the community and nation when unmet and unanswered. Problems of living in families, in jobs, in a community, are brought each year by the thousands to family service agencies. There friendly counsellors, family case workers skilled in dealing with the social and emotional pressures affecting individuals, are available to talk things over. Those who seek help are aided in making their own best decisions. As part of case work, family agencies often provide special services for troubled families. Some of these will be referred to later.

Each year an estimated three quarters of a million family members receive direct or indirect aid through family service agencies in the United States and Canada. Traditionally their efforts to serve families have extended across the community. Individually or through councils of social agencies, family service agencies bend efforts toward the improvement of family life. Increasingly today, these agencies are taking their knowledge to the community-at-large through programmes of family life education to help prevent family troubles or disruptions before they occur.

In its variety of services, the family agency employs many professional skills. These skills in helping people have slowly evolved from the time of the early professional and organized efforts to aid distressed families. Family social work began where the need was greatest - among the poor.

In the nineteenth century the predecessor of the modern family agency was founded in London. This agency, known as a Charity Organization Society, provided for the first time, a unified approach to the giving of assistance, a centre for the study of poverty and family life, and a repository of information and experience to be passed on to succeeding generations of social workers.

The first similar society in a large American city, was established in Buffalo in 1877. In their early years Charity Organization Societies in this country did not give direct assistance or relief to all who applied. Rather, through kindly visitors, they tried to help certain distressed families become self-reliant. Stress was placed on personal worthiness, and selected families of good character were sponsored. Jobs were found for the breadwinner; advice on home economics and child-rearing given to the mother. Funds were available for special needs. But more important still, the Charity Organization Society movement added a new emphasis - the determination to co-ordinate the work of numerous voluntary relief agencies in order to prevent overlapping and the waste of funds, and to improve the quality of service to clients.

In 1892 there were ninety-two charity organization societies in the United States and the movement was well under way. As family social work took root, individualized service to families was carried on by

volunteers, the friendly visitors referred to earlier. Their contacts with families increasingly convinced them that economic dependence develops from a variety of social and family maladjustments and also that family maladjustments may occur irrespective of conditions of financial need. Gradually the conviction grew that more of the work needed to be in the hands of trained, professional, salaried staff members. This need for training social workers in the special skills they require resulted in the establishment of the New York School of Social Work in 1898. Today there are a large number of graduate schools in United States and Canada providing training based on a growing body of professional knowledge.

In 1910 a group of fifty-six agencies interested in pooling experiences and stimulating the growth of a national family welfare movement joined in organizing the temporary National Association of Societies for Organizing Charity. The following year the organization became a permanent one which after many changes in name, became known as the Family Welfare Association of America. This association is today a voluntary federation of nearly three hundred leading public and private agencies in the United States and Canada.

In the fifty years preceding the establishment of the first Charity Organization Society, such organizations as, Societies for the Prevention of Pauperism and Associations for the Improvement of Conditions of the Poor, were searching for the causes of poverty, trying to alter poor social conditions, and giving financial help according to the person's need. It was not until the start of the Charity Organization Society movement, however, that the plan for co-ordinated effort provided a structure with continuity and stability. Within this structure it became possible not only to study

underlying causes, both personal and social, but also to pass findings on through a succession of workers who each built upon the knowledge of his predecessors. Thus in time, through a continuous history of seventy-five years, greater understanding of the causes and ways of alleviating family maladjustment has developed. This understanding has of course, resulted from the fact that there was "no appreciable doubt or confusion as to the functions of the charity organization society. They were threefold: first, and basic, the rehabilitation of the families which for any reason fail to be self-sufficient; second, the education of the community in correct principles of relief; and third, aid in the elimination of the causes of poverty." ¹

These basic functions of the Charity Organization Movement were retained and carried into the family agencies of today. The Charity Organization workers believed that they "should constantly strive to strengthen the ties of family life and to avoid doing aught that would tend to weaken family responsibility and solidarity. It is no mere coincidence either that the movement should be referred to as the "family rehabilitation movement," and that in choosing a new name many societies should select the title, "Family Welfare Society," and that the national organ of the movement should bear the title, "The Family."² The Charity Organization movement became the family welfare movement in fact as well as in name.

1. Watson, Frank Dekker, The Charity Organization Movement In The United States, (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1922)p.94

2. Ibid., p. 528-9.

If one judges the Charity Organization movement by its fruits, it takes high rank among the various social movements on the American continent. It not only brought system into the charity of the generation that saw its beginning, but it has ever since been the pioneer in evolving a technique of social case work. Although others have contributed to the methods of human adjustment, no one group has contributed more than a fraction of that contributed by the family social workers of the country. The oldest family service society, that of Buffalo, New York, exemplifies this in a statement of its purposes. "To achieve its purposes, therefore, the Family Service Society, has developed and concentrated upon three primary functions. These are to supply social casework treatment to all who seek its services; to carry on Family Life Education among those it serves directly or indirectly in the community; and to furnish capable community leadership in cooperation with other agencies in the field of social work."¹ The correlation with the basic functions of the Charity Organization movement to those stated above is only too obvious. They illustrate the continuity of purpose inherent in the family welfare movement to its culmination in the modern family agency.

In examining the growth of the family agency it is noteworthy that the depression years of the late twenties and early thirties placed these agencies with a tremendous and overwhelming financial burden. Recognizing the impossibility of fully meeting this mass need through private resources, most private family agencies joined with other forces in striving to lift

1. The Family Service Society of Buffalo, New York, Seventy-Five Years of Service - To Families in Buffalo and Erie County - 1877-1954. (Family Service Society, Buffalo, New York, 1932) p. 5.

the structure of tax-supported agencies beyond their traditional local moorings to include provincial and federal levels. In addition to this many private family agencies contributed to the leadership of the strengthened local public agencies and influenced in many cases the start of such agencies. This swing to municipal, provincial and federal acceptance of meeting the demands of financially impoverished families gave way to the principle that the public assume responsibility for all families in need of basic aid. Thus, for the most part, family agencies no longer carry the burden of providing such assistance, and concentrate on helping families and individuals solve the problems that interfere with healthy living.

From the fore-going it can be seen that the family agency in our modern community ideally has not only inherited the principle that the family is the primary unit of our society, but that certain skills are required in assisting to preserve healthy family life. The case work technique evolved in the Charity Organization movement is now an accepted method of service by which the family service agency offers help to families for a host of problems that can disrupt family life. At the same time a family agency cannot fully achieve its purposes unless the mass coverage responsibility for providing basic relief, health and welfare needs is being met by public agencies in the community. The field of public welfare has expanded greatly since the depression years and by doing so has permitted the family agency to concentrate on the less tangible aspects of human distress and to develop the case work principle.

It will be remembered that one of the primary concerns of the Charity Organization movement was "the determination to co-ordinate the work of

numerous voluntary relief agencies in order to prevent overlapping and the waste of funds, and to improve the quality of service to clients." Also in its stated functions that "the education of the community in correct principles of relief" and the function of "aid in the elimination of relief of the causes of poverty." In other words the Movement was vitally concerned with community needs. This concept has been carried into the modern family agency but is modified by agency policy and existing community needs.

The Role of the Modern Family Agency

The modern family agency "has two major purposes:

1) To provide a skilled case work service on problems of family living and individual social adjustment. 2) To promote auspices and resources that contribute to healthy social living in the community, and to combat social conditions that threaten to undermine it."¹ All family agencies adhere to these two major purposes and while they may vary in expression they do not vary in thought or content. For example, the Community Service Society of New York, one of the oldest of family agencies, states the "purposes of its present and future program; (1) Direct service to a large number of individuals and families, with ever-improved knowledge, methods and skills in meeting people's needs and in helping them to find their own best ways to a satisfying and useful life and to effective citizenship in a democracy. (2) Service to the community at large through a heightened understanding of broad social needs arising from close daily contact with people and their problems, and through action to meet these needs in a

1. McLean, Frances H. and Ormsby, Ralph, Organizing a Family Agency. (The Family Welfare Association of America, New York, 1944), p.1.

comprehensive way."¹ The first purpose given by this agency is a good practical definition of case work.

There is then agreement "that the family agency has a two-fold job to do - first, to provide casework service to individuals and families who seek this kind of help and second, to take the lead in building the kind of community in which good family life will be possible for all."²

There are forty-one family agencies in Canada which are scattered from Cape Breton to Victoria. They are to be found in cities with a population of twenty to twenty-five thousand or more as they need for survival enough interested people to ensure some degree of community planning and money raising ability. They vary in size from agencies with one professional staff member and a budget of a very few thousand dollars a year, to those with a staff of fifty to sixty workers and a total budget around a million dollars a year. Some of these agencies serve Canadians of every religious faith, others limit their services to those of a given faith, Catholic, Protestant or Jewish as the case may be.

All these agencies have those common purposes mentioned previously. Their work, however, is influenced by population and its distribution and is coloured by the local pattern of health and welfare services and the range of their services may be varied by municipal and provincial

-
1. The Community Service Society of New York, Frontiers in Human Welfare. The Story of a Hundred Years of Service to the Community of New York, 1848-1948. (The Community Service Society of New York, N.Y.) p.72.
 2. The Canadian Welfare Council, Canadian Family, The Family Welfare Division Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, Canada, Vol.II, No. 7 April 1952.

philosophies in regard to such matters as social assistance and child care. All of them regard the giving of case work services to individuals and families, who are concerned about a wide variety of personal and social questions, as their primary job. For a number of them, local conditions create variations in the ways in which they express their concern.

Keeping in mind all these factors, how does the family agency fulfill its role in the community in line with the two purposes which are being emphasized? Certainly these purposes are the very core through which the family agency maintains its role in the modern community.

First, skilled case work service. The family agency is the place to which persons may come for help with problems of family and personal relationships, assistance with the achievement of educational objectives, working out parent-child relation, marital adjustments, financial and vocational planning. Clients of the family agency seek consultation and advice in working out various solutions to their problems. Sometimes financial and material assistance may be needed along with the skilled counsel. Family social case work offers a range of services from knowledge of medical and other community resources to skills based on psychological understanding.

It is recognized in modern family social work, as with the early "friendly visitors" of the Charity Organization movement, that the difficulties confronting a family may be within or outside the family itself. It is, therefore, found that the means of treating a family problem may be environmental (utilizing specific resources or changing external factors so as to alleviate, diminish or remove the problem); or psychological, (that is, helping the individual to understand his problem and mobilize his

personality strengths to effect an adjustment). The goal of the family caseworker is to help the client to a better personal adjustment. This direct counselling with individuals is the primary way in which the family agency fulfills its first purpose. An indirect counselling service with other professions, such as with teachers, industrial personnel managers, ministers, and staffs of allied health and welfare organizations is then a natural development. The family worker can help such persons understand and handle family and individual problems with which they are dealing. The latter does have obvious implications when considered in light of the second purpose, which will be discussed later.

The modern family agency with a firmly established case work service will generally undertake certain specialized services. It should be emphasized, however, that case work should be its first concern and that it must be established since any specialized service will lay claim to its use. Home-maker service, budgetting service, special services for children, and psychiatric consultative service are examples of such specialized services.

Case work and specialized services bring the family agency close to the needs of the community, providing an opportunity for first hand knowledge and observation of social conditions and their effects on families in the community. This information can be used for specific or special study on such subjects as problems of the aged, housing, economic and cultural changes. Here the family agency can make an effective contribution back to the community as a whole and this is, of course, related to the second major purpose of a modern family agency.

The second major purpose is based on the fact that the family, as a unit, is not the sole maker of its destiny. The community and society have their influences and a family is affected by limitations in its

environment. The family agency is in a position to influence environmental factors that affect the nucleus of our society. It is, indeed, the responsibility for the family agency to engage in community activities, especially as there are always community conditions which lie outside the control of the individual but which block his capacity to lead a satisfying and socially useful life.

That concern that the Charity Organization movement had for social action should be and is, in fact, an inescapable responsibility of the modern family agency. The two fundamental purposes of family social work and the family agency in our modern communities - service to individuals and improvement of conditions for family life - are, therefore, seen to be complementary and interdependent.

Summary

The purpose in this review is to give the evolution of family agencies as a background and setting to a discussion of the Calgary Family Bureau. It is believed that the contribution which this organization has made, and which it plans to make in the future, can be rated as significant and essential. In tracing its development, it is hoped that parallels can be drawn indicating its kinship to the family welfare movement. But most important, there will be some explanation as to whether it has acquired the fundamental philosophy of a modern family agency. Only those who have made a study of social service over the years can fully comprehend how far this philosophy is from that in vogue a hundred years ago.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE PREDECESSORS OF THE CALGARY FAMILY BUREAU

The Calgary Community

The Calgary community has a population of one hundred and fifty-six thousand. It is a wealthy city in a wealthy province. Noted primarily for being an oil centre, Calgary is at present making headway industrially. It has been greatly influenced by its surrounding rich farming and ranching country and has been regarded for many years as being one of the largest livestock market centres in North America.

Possibly one would feel that Calgary and the Province of Alberta would have developed its welfare services to a high standard; for it is not hampered by the lack of financial resources. Unhappily this is not the case.

The Province of Alberta did little in the field of public welfare until 1936. Prior to that year the only public welfare legislation enacted by the Alberta government was The Neglected and Dependent Children's Act in 1909; the Mother's Allowance Act in 1918; and the Child Welfare Act in 1925. All of these measures came under the Department of the Attorney-General.

The economic recession of the 1930's forced the Alberta government into action in the area of public assistance. Prior to this the municipalities had been responsible for their own indigent population. A Commissioner of Relief was appointed in the early 1930's and was associated directly with the Treasury Department. Aided by Dominion relief grants Alberta took over responsibility for all relief services in drought areas, unorganized territories, for homeless men and non-residents. Otherwise, in the organized municipalities costs were split. In 1936 a Bureau of Public Welfare was established and its function was solely integrating and

administering a public relief programme. By 1943 public relief was rapidly diminishing and in order to provide more work for the Bureau, the Child Welfare Branch was transferred to it. Then in 1944 a Department of Public Welfare was created and all existing public welfare services were incorporated under its administration.

Private welfare agencies developed just as slowly in Alberta. A Canadian Welfare Council Survey of Private Welfare Services in Calgary comments:

This is a record of experience much shorter than that to be found in many other cities throughout Canada: and it is not surprising therefore that the initial impression created by an examination of Calgary's welfare agencies and co-ordinating services is one of incomplete and immature development. The reasons for this, however, are not far to seek; nor are they such as to reflect any serious discredit upon the community of Calgary, or to suggest that the citizens of this city have less concern for the welfare of their fellow-citizens than is the case in other communities. The fact is that Calgary in many respects is one of the youngest cities of Canada. It retained much longer than most of our other Canadian cities the characteristics of the pioneer frontier community. It is well to remember that the Province of Alberta in which it is situated did not actually become a Province of Canada until 1909. Calgary has been slower than many cities of a similar size in Canada to take on the mantle of urbanization. It has preserved its vigorous characteristics and has carried down to fairly recent times the free-and-easy, independent, individualistic outlook that people on the North American Continent have come to associate with the pioneer frontier communities of the West. In years and outlook as well, Calgary is one of the youngest members of the family of large Canadian cities. It is only natural, therefore, that it should pass through the various stages in the development of its welfare agencies and its organized welfare program at a somewhat later date than one would expect of cities whose history stretches back beyond the time when Calgary was born.¹

Private welfare agencies generally have spearheaded or influenced many of the measures implemented by government. In Alberta such agencies were either non-existent or in an early period of growth prior to 1940.

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, Survey of the Private Community Welfare Services in the City of Calgary. (The Canadian Welfare Council, 245 Cooper Street, Ottawa, Canada, December 1944) p.5.

Perhaps, because of this, the Alberta government tended to look to other provinces for patterns to follow for public welfare services. Once obtained, however, they had to put them under the administration of personnel with little or no understanding of Public Welfare. One consequence was a suspicion on the part of public welfare personnel toward the few professional social workers who became identified with the growing private agencies. This has not been modified since the public welfare authorities of the Province have perpetuated this attitude. For example, the Department of Public Welfare, at the present time, absolutely refuses to employ trained social workers. This lack of adequate staff to administer the provincial public welfare legislation in Alberta has lead to poor and inadequate service.

With the growth of private agencies came a greater awareness on the part of the public to the inadequacies of government welfare services. The divergence between private and public agencies came to a head in 1946 and 1947. Largely due to private agency pressure a study of welfare in Alberta was undertaken under the auspices of the Imperial Order, Daughters of the Empire. The study was taken very seriously and ultimately was the direct cause of a Royal Commission to investigate the provincial government public welfare services.

This produced an even wider gap between private and public welfare agencies and also professional and non-professional welfare staff. The latter due in part to the identification of the director of the study as a professional social worker. She was also an executive member of the Canadian Welfare Council.

The effect on the Calgary community is best exemplified by the fact that there is no formulated policies or active co-operation between the

provincial government and private welfare agencies, in that city. This is a difficult situation for Calgary; for its community cannot be served to the best advantage. Calgary is fortunate, however, in having a municipal government which does actively support, verbally and materially, private agencies services. Calgary's municipal public welfare agencies, the City Welfare Department and the Children's Aid Department, do have an integrated programme with private agencies and there is good co-operation.

The citizens of Calgary are unusually supportive of private agencies. They are also very community conscious. The Community Chest of Calgary enjoys a unique position in comparison to similar fund raising organizations in Canada. It has always exceeded its campaign objective. This speaks well for the financial support of the community especially when one considers there is still a multiplicity of appeals in Calgary.

The Calgary Community Chest has twenty-three member agencies, of which the Calgary Family Bureau is one. Unfortunately the Chest represents business in Calgary and has little understanding of the agencies which compose its membership. In spite of the publicity given as to its financial success, the agency members do not receive the financial support they might get. The campaign for funds is always successful; for the public responds. However, the campaign is never geared to agency needs with the consequence that increasing costs are stifling agencies who are not getting the funds they need. The campaign techniques are always the same and objectives which could be reached if they were altered are never attempted. Again, the Chest conducts its fund raising campaign as a joint effort with the Red Cross. The latter has tremendous prestige and appeal with the result that Chest agencies are very often overshadowed. Private agencies outside

the Chest membership recognize these shortcomings and are reluctant to participate as a Community Chest agency. For example, the Canadian Cancer Society has been invited to join the Chest and have been openly criticized for not doing so. This Society is afraid to curtail the financial freedom they now enjoy and are equally afraid of losing their identity. The same is true of others, such as the St. John's Ambulance and the Cerebral Palsy Association. It is only four years since the John Howard Society in Calgary joined the Community Chest. They are now considering withdrawing as they cannot obtain the finances they require as a member of that organization.

This is the setting into which the Calgary Family Bureau was to grow and the problems facing its future were and are influenced by the two agencies which have focused on in the foregoing.

The Associated Charities.

Prior to 1910, the only social welfare organization in Calgary was the Children's Aid Society. This Society was actually a municipal agency incorporated as a child protection agency. It was the result of legislation passed by the Alberta Provincial Government in 1909 called the Neglected and Dependent Children's Act. This Act had required every municipality with a population of ten thousand or more to establish such a society with a paid staff member. As the only welfare organization in the City of Calgary it soon discovered that its defined areas in meeting the needs of neglected and dependent children were extending rapidly because of the demands of an adult population.

As a growing and rapidly developing urban area, Calgary was experiencing an equally increasing demand for social welfare services. Indigent groups, for example, had no source of assistance other than

haphazard charity and there was a natural gravitation to an organized welfare agency. This situation was of concern to the Children's Aid Society and the government of the city, as they felt that the needs of children should be kept separate from those of adults. The Children's Aid Society did provide an ill-defined and casual assistance programme for adults because of the pressures.

Early in 1910 the family of the Reverend D.A. and Mrs. McKillop arrived in Calgary enroute to the Pacific Coast. They had reluctantly moved from Jamaica, British West Indies, where they had been in the mission field for fifteen years. They had come back to Canada to obtain better educational facilities for their two sons. Mr. McKillop had, as a young man, taken a position with the Y.M.C.A. in Toronto and at the same time had begun training for the ministry. Mrs. McKillop, the youngest daughter of the late Senator and Mrs. John MacDonald of Toronto, created much concern among her family and friends by joining the Salvation Army. She and Mr. McKillop became known to one another through mutual endeavours in the Toronto slums. They were married after Mr. McKillop was ordained and moved immediately to Jamaica as missionaries in 1895. After their arrival in Calgary both Mr. and Mrs. McKillop became absorbed in the needs and opportunities for their work in this city. They soon abandoned their idea of going further West.

Mr. McKillop had always been interested in people and the more he had continued in his missionary labours and other welfare activities the more he became non-denominational. It is certainly clear that he recognized that, regardless of race or religion, common human needs prevailed. In Calgary he was fascinated by the need for welfare services.

He embarked on several tasks which were to bring him to the attention of the citizens of Calgary. He established a soup kitchen. He persistently visited the cells of the city gaol and worked with the inmates before and after incarceration. He soon became a familiar figure in his attempts to assist the poor.

It was at this time that the City of Calgary was concerned about the functions of its Children's Aid Society. It is not surprising that they sought Mr. McKillop and requested him to organize a private charitable organization to meet the growing needs of Calgary's indigent population.

The City of Calgary established a grant of monies for the new organization which was named the Associated Charities. Mr. McKillop assumed the position of Secretary and a number of representative men from all walks of life were chosen as Directors. The Associated Charities was entirely non-sectarian and included on its governing Board clergymen from various denominations. The Mayor of the City acted as an ex-officio member. The annual fee for membership was one dollar per year and the cooperation of all those interested in welfare work was eagerly sought. An annual meeting was to be held in the month of February each year, when officers were to be elected for the ensuing year.

The operation of the organization and its policies were to be left entirely in Mr. McKillop's hands but, realizing the need for constant publicity and public relations, he left the actual organizing and detail functioning of the agency to Mrs. McKillop. Mr. McKillop's efforts soon produced flow of donations, clothing, produce and other material assistance for the work of the agency.

The office of the Associated Charities was established in the Strathcona Block on Third Street East in Calgary. Although small, it was

adequate for the agency's purposes. It was in this same location that the now expanded offices of the Calgary Family Bureau are presently located.

It was mentioned that the City of Calgary provided a grant of monies to the Associated Charities. These monies were to provide direct relief to local residents and to transients. In addition, clothing and relief-in-kind were other media of social assistance. The agency was geared to meet the greatest need - with the poor.

It is interesting that the contact with transients brought Mr. McKillop into contact with homeless elderly men. Their plight led him into another channel of activity; he rented a small house, asked for and received donations of bed and other essential equipment. He arranged for a cook and a housekeeper. In doing so he established what has grown to be the Calgary Old Folks Home. Thus the Associated Charities established a precedent; for the agency and its successors maintained and directed a programme for the aged through this home until 1942 when Mrs. McKillop took over as Superintendent on her retirement from the Calgary Family Bureau. She only recently left the Old Folks Home because of her advanced years.

In 1914, the Associated Charities was firmly rooted and although the war diverted Mr. McKillop's attentions, his wife continued to operate a very busy agency. For almost a year Mr. McKillop was business manager for the Calgary General Hospital. Near the end of the year 1915 he left to join the Y.M.C.A. for the wartime period.

In 1918, the Province of Alberta directly entered the field of public welfare. Up to this time, the municipalities carried the responsibility for welfare services. An abrupt departure came when the Alberta Government passed a Mother's Allowance Act in 1918. As this was really

a measure of social assistance, it relieved the municipalities' and private voluntary agencies' relief expenditures; since the basic costs of all those who could qualify for mother's allowances were now carried by the Province. Of real significance was the fact that the provincial government by-passed the administration of the municipalities and for the first time in Alberta's history a part of the welfare services was centralized under provincial control. Every city and town was required to name inspectors under the Act, who were paid by the municipality but who were to receive applications and forward recommendations directly to the Superintendent of Mother's Allowances. As mentioned previously, Calgary had no social assistance department, and as this work was being done by the Associated Charities, the agency was requested to administer Mother's Allowances in the City of Calgary. Here indeed, is a unique situation - a private agency ad-
NOT SO
ministering both municipal and provincial government funds.

At the close of the First World War the Labor Party in Calgary began to gain strength and to assert itself. It was successful in having the first Labor Council elected to office in 1920 under Mayor Adams. One of the planks of the Labor platform had been the need for a welfare department as a municipal unit. The Board of Directors of the Associated Charities were in agreement; for by this time the severe depression of the 1920's was creating an overwhelming problem for this agency. Mr. McKillop was asked to share the responsibilities of a new civic relief Department but he decided against it. In 1922, the City of Calgary formally established a city welfare department.

It was at this point that the character of Associated Charities took definite root towards its future development as a family agency.

It also exemplifies the spirit of the charity organization movement; for both Mr. and Mrs. McKillop felt there should be an agency where people could come with their personal problems, to receive counsel and understanding interest. In the true spirit of the pioneers and "friendly visitors" of the Charity Organization movement they perceived that there were causes for distress beyond financial need. They knew people could be assisted without financial or material aid and they intended to demonstrate this was so.

Mr. D. A. McKillop, their son, who is presently living in Calgary expresses their sentiments this way: "My mother and father both felt that there should be a place where people could unburden themselves and receive counsel and understanding interest in their great variety of troubles, so they decided to open a little office and see if they could not support it themselves. They called it the Board of Public Welfare. The uninitiated might wonder what this little office had to offer, but ten years' work had brought Mother and Father a place in the respect of Calgary citizens who continued to send donations of all sorts which they felt disinclined to send to a City Department, and while those in need went to the City for relief, they continued to come to the Board of Public Welfare with their problems, and although the little office furnished with odds and ends and with practically no facilities was a far cry from the well-appointed office of the Family Bureau, it was in the same location, and its objectives were much the same."¹

Thus, the Associated Charities took on a new name, that of the Board of Public Welfare.

The Board of Public Welfare.

The year 1922 marked the incorporation of the agency as the Board of Public Welfare. It was no longer acting as a governmental agent but was now, in fact, a completely private agency. It had to now, therefore,

1. Letter from Mr. D. A. McKillop, 1924 - 12th St. West,
Calgary, Alberta, July 17, 1954.

raise its own funds from private and community sources. The operation and administration soon passed completely into Mrs. McKillop's hands as in February 1923, her husband died.

As a community agency its Board of Directors, fees and meetings were patterned on those of Associated Charities. Unfortunately, neither the Board of Directors nor Mrs. McKillop kept any written records of the Board of Public Welfare activities. It was not until 1941 that any documentary material became available.

The Board of Public Welfare did continue to provide financial assistance on a very limited and casual basis. Its clothing, bedding and other supplementary forms of assistance did grow and these forms of assistance were in constant demand. As the agency took hold in the community it embarked on several projects that grew in proportion and became major activities. These projects, in fact, were the outstanding features of the Board during its eighteen year existence.

To finance the Board of Public Welfare, Mrs. McKillop organized an annual campaign for funds called "Violet Day". Violet Day became an accepted tag day in Calgary. It was held on the Saturday before Easter every year until the Community Chest was organized in 1941. It proved to be a great success not only as a fund-raiser but as a good publicity feature. It depended on practically every women's organization in Calgary since they obtained the materials for the artificial violets and also sold them on the streets. In this way it created a common personal effort which gave strength to the Board of Public Welfare. It was in fact a development of community social action.

Because of the participation of so many organizations, Mrs. McKillop was in very close touch with their executives. She used this

contact to develop other activities and projects. For example, the Board of Public Welfare still operated the Calgary Old Folks Home, and Mrs. McKillop was successful in arranging for an annual reception and open house at the Home which were run entirely by these same women's organizations.

Another project undertaken by Mrs. McKillop was the organization of two annual affairs for under-privileged children. These took the form of a summer picnic and in December a Christmas Tree and Party. Calgary merchants cooperated by providing treats, prizes and gifts but the Board conducted these affairs.

The only project organized by the Board which still functions annually is an annual picnic for aged people. At first Mrs. McKillop asked friends to go out and take the participants. Some of these friends were Rotarians and became interested, with the result that the Rotary Club of today has assumed the entire responsibility of this function. Up until 1941, the Board of Public Welfare organized this annual picnic and were assisted by the Rotarians. After 1941, the Family Welfare Bureau played a small role for two years then finally the Rotary Club and its women's auxiliary took over completely. Today it is one of their annual activities and looked forward to by the senior citizens of the Calgary Community.

Although the Board of Public Welfare was started in the hope that it would be of service in the field of counselling and as an agency providing help respecting personal problems, it never did assume such roles. In 1922 casual financial assistance was still being given and material aid was increasing in demand. With the success of its tag day, the agency was able to embark on its projects and maintain a small staff who conducted its daily affairs of relief-giving. This was increased when

the Agency took over the administration of a local fund-raising project in 1926.

During the First World War, the Calgary Herald (a local newspaper of the Southam Press), began soliciting and accepting donations with which to purchase Christmas gifts and hampers for indigent families. They turned the money over to the Salvation Army every Christmas, giving that organization a free hand in purchasing and distribution. The Calgary Herald called its effort "The Herald Sunshine." Each day in December of every year an article would appear telling of the plight of some family or individual. They would also publish receipts of funds given to that day. The idea met with much approval and the returns exceeded the need. As the Calgary Herald did not wish to set up a welfare staff, yet felt these funds could be used usefully throughout the year, as well as at Christmas time, it approached the Board of Public Welfare and requested the agency to administer the Sunshine Fund. At the same time the agency assumed an interpretive role in providing the daily stories for publication in the month of December. The Board of Public Welfare was therefore able to help families financially throughout the year. It increased the relieving aspect of the agency considerably to the exclusion of its hoped for case workservice.

As the projects for under-privileged children and the Sunshine Herald became a standard operation of the Board of Public Welfare at Christmas, it was soon realized that duplication was to be avoided. Accordingly Mrs. McKillop began organizing what she called a Confidential Exchange. The depression years of the 1930's had an influence in the formation of this exchange since large numbers of families were in need and it was necessary for as many to be assisted as could possible be.

Mrs. McKillop's Confidential Exchange became a clearing house for all organizations in Calgary at Christmas and proved useful and successful. The Exchange was not started until 1932 but was maintained by the Board of Public Welfare until it enlarged its function in 1941 under the Council of Social Agencies.

The projects, annual affairs and fund-raising took a considerable amount of Mrs. McKillop's time. She was not equipped to give case work service, but even if she were, the administration of so much activity would have curtailed any service she could have provided in this area. Her staff changed considerably as she only retained a part-time stenographer and a handyman, the latter acting as a clothes sorter and caretaker. As the daily work of the Agency grew a full-time assistant was employed in 1935.

The Board of Public Welfare gave impetus to social action in the Calgary community. Its projects drew interest and participation in worthwhile welfare endeavours. It aided the growth of a modern institution for care of the aged and was concerned for them. It carried on an intensive programme of relief-giving and material aid. In spite of all these contributions it was unable to establish the Board of Public Welfare as it was originally hoped to be. However, because of the lack of personal counselling and case work service it did markedly influence the community in its search for these services. There was an awareness that material assistance was not enough and the Board of Directors of the Board of Public Welfare began to search for the answer. In 1939, Mr. J. Wodell, President of the Agency began to investigate the matter personally and the result of his enquiries began to bear fruit in 1940.

CHAPTER III

THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL OF SOCIAL AGENCIES AND THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FAMILY AGENCY

The Origin of the Council of Social Agencies and Its Impact on the Board of Public Welfare.

In order to fully appreciate the development of the Board of Public Welfare in its growth and ultimate transition to a family agency, one must consider the impact other welfare services made upon that organization. Brief mention has been made of the Confidential Exchange and this is an indication of an awareness of the need to co-ordinate to some degree at least, other welfare services. However, the continuing growth of Calgary again had increased the welfare services in that community to the extent that much concern for co-ordination was being felt, not only by agencies operating such services, but also by informed community leaders.

One of the major consequences of this concern was an examination of Calgary's private agencies by the Canadian Welfare Council. The Executive Director and Assistant Executive Director of the Council, Dr. George Davidson and Miss Nora Lea, came to Calgary in 1944. They conducted an intensive survey at the invitation of the Calgary Council of Social Agencies. They have this to say of Calgary's social welfare development:

It may be correct to state that Calgary was slower in developing its machinery for co-operation among various welfare agencies of the community than many of its sister cities in Canada. Calgary's Council of Social Agencies first came into existence early in 1932, but after two years of effort, gave up the struggle in 1934 and remained almost completely inactive until it was revived in 1940 - the year in which the Calgary Community Chest was formed. The Social Service Exchange had, of course, in the meantime been organized and was operating with a very

limited degree of effectiveness. Without discounting or disregarding in any way these early, tentative efforts to develop the central machinery for more effective operation of Calgary's welfare agencies, it is probably fair to state that the machinery for co-operation did not really come into existence in any effective fashion until the year 1940.¹

The Board of Public Welfare played a leading role in the formation of the Community Chest and the Council of Social Agencies through the President of its Board of Directors, Mr. John E. Wodell. Mr. Wodell had been for several years associated with the agency since he had at one time managed the Herald Sunshine Fund. He was a newspaperman and an executive with the Calgary Herald. When this newspaper turned over its Sunshine Funds to the Board of Public Welfare, he maintained a contact which ultimately led him to taking an active part with its Board of Directors. In 1939 he was elected President of the agency and thereafter played a distinct and leading role in effecting changes within the agency. Mr. Wodell, however, did not confine his absorbing interest in welfare services to the Board of Public Welfare. He was acutely aware of the need for co-ordinated effort in the City of Calgary.

Miss Mary Livesay, who was to become the first Executive Director of the Calgary Family Bureau, gives this account of Mr. Wodell:

He headed up the Herald Sunshine which raised a considerable sum of money each year and Mr. Wodell worked with Mrs. McKillop as the money was spent through her agency. He, alone, seemed to understand and appreciate the need for complete reorganization. He asked to obtain copies of records and statistical forms from various Family Agencies in different cities and any information which could be used to acquaint him with up-to-date methods, costs of operation and set-up, etc. He was quite enthused about forming a community chest...Mr. Wodell talked the idea up with a number of influential and professional men and I was thrilled when he wrote and sent a news picture of the organizational

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, op. cit. p.5.

meeting of the Chest. Then of course Mr. Wodell was anxious to reorganize the Board of Public Welfare with a professional social worker on the job.¹

The above statement is revealing not only of a concern for coordination but most important that the need for a family agency was a matter of importance to Mr. Wodell.

It is, however, incorrect to suggest that Mr. Wodell was the single driving force for reorganization in Calgary. Businessmen, particularly those who were members of the Chamber of Commerce, were interested in the formation of a Community Chest. The question of multiple appeals had become disturbing and the Chamber of Commerce was actively interested. In addition, service clubs in Calgary were eager to have something done and formed an Inter-Service Club Committee in 1939 to effect action. "As the members of this committee were also members of the Chamber of Commerce, that body felt their interests were being served."² There also existed the latent Board of Directors of the Council of Social Agencies which had been inactive since 1934.

"On January 20, 1940 a meeting was held between the Council of Social Agencies and the Inter-Service Club Committee to revive the Council of Social Agencies, and to reopen discussion of a Community Chest. This time the effort was successful. Sparked by a meeting with Charlotte Whitton, at that time Executive Director of the Canadian Welfare Council, the Council of Social Agencies and the Inter-Service Club Committee were, together, able to revive the Council and set in motion those series of events which culminated in the formation of the Calgary Community Chest, at a meeting on June 13, 1940. During the year 1940 the Council was rapidly organized. One of its first tasks was to take over the work of the Board of Public Welfare, later renamed the Family Welfare Bureau, and operated under that name as a department of the Council until April 1945."³

-
1. Letter from Mrs. Mary Slater, May 23, 1954.
 2. Statement by Eric O. McGreer, former Executive Secretary, The Calgary Community Chest, personal interview.
 3. Annual Report of the Council of Social Agencies of Calgary for the Year ending December 1946. (The Council of Social Agencies, 1947) p.2.

The formation of the Council of Social Agencies began the first step toward the change of status for the Board of Public Welfare. Mr. Wodell became the first President of the Council of Social Agencies and remained as such until 1945. As the Board of Public Welfare was taken over by the Council he remained President of that organization. This change is attributable directly to Mr. Wodell and his power of leadership was sufficient to convince the Board of Directors of the Board of Public Welfare to undertake this transformation. In actuality the entire Board of Directors of the Board of Public Welfare remained in office for the year 1940 and until the election of officers for the Council in 1941 acted as part of its governing body. It is not too far removed from fact to say the Board of Public Welfare became the Council of Social Agencies.

This transformation did not become operationally effective until 1941. Until that year the Board of Public Welfare carried on its work unchanged with this exception; its funds were now obtained as a grant from the Community Chest. The minutes of the Council of Social Agencies' Executive Committee states, "The Board of Public Welfare is noted in these minutes as being one of the seventeen organizations which were approved by the Council for Community Chest participation."¹

It had been Mr. Wodell's desire to have the Board of Public Welfare assume the role of a family agency. He had noted that dual purpose agencies had been functioning in other cities, notably in Galt, Ontario; Cornwall, Ontario; and Edmonton, Alberta. He encountered a great

1. The Council of Social Agencies, Minutes of the Executive Committee, (The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, September 27, 1940) Extract.

deal of opposition from the directors of the Board of Public Welfare and from Mrs. McKillop particularly. They refused to accept a radical change of function for the Board of Public Welfare but they did finally consent to a change of name which would still hold a semblance of their former title. In December 1940, the name of the Board of Public Welfare had its name amended. The minutes involving that change read as follows: "The following resolution was moved by Mrs. Riley and Mr. Wodell:

Resolved on motion by Mrs. Riley, seconded by Mr. Wodell, that this Executive requests the Board of Public Welfare to accede to the following plan:

1. That the Board of Public Welfare remain inactive for the period of one year (1941)
2. That, during that period, the work of the Board of Public Welfare be operated by the Council of Social Agencies as a department to be known as "The Public Welfare and Social Service Bureau."
3. That for this year, 1941, which will be in the nature of an experiment, the personnel and equipment (together with the allotted budget) of the Board of Public Welfare will be available to the said Bureau.

Carried.¹

This action brought the Board of Public Welfare into the Council of Social Agencies as one of its departments. Its budget, personnel, and equipment also became the nominal property of the Council. It did not, however, change in any way the character of its service, beyond that mentioned of separating the Index from the Board of Public Welfare. The entire situation was complicated by the fact that the Board of Directors had little knowledge of how to proceed. Mr. Wodell, the President, did

1. The Council of Social Agencies, Minutes of the Executive Committee and Convenors of Committees, (The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, December 13, 1940) Extract.

realize the need for a trained person who could organize the Council of Social Agencies, especially as this had been one reason it had never flourished in 1932 to 1934. "It was probably because of failure to secure the services of a competent social work executive that the Council, after two years of struggle, became inactive and remained so until it was revived and reorganized with the formation of the Community Chest in Calgary in 1940"¹. Accordingly, the Council of Social Agencies advertised for a qualified social worker in early 1941 and did obtain the services of an ostensibly partially trained person in August of that year. The new staff member was Miss Mary Livesey.

Miss Livesey had received training at the University of Toronto in some social work courses while undertaking a course to become a deaconess for the Anglican Church. She received this training prior to the First Great War when social work training in Canada was very limited. She had been employed as a social worker in Toronto, and Fort William. During the war years she had come to Calgary and had worked for the Board of Public Welfare for a short time in 1918 and 1919. She had finally settled in Winnipeg where she took charge of the Children's Bureau. She visited Calgary regularly since her father resided there and, because of her previous contact with the Board of Public Welfare, she was well acquainted with various Board members, including Mr. Wodell. She knew the McKillops intimately, especially as her father was a close friend of theirs.

Early in 1941, she had been requested to come to Calgary to help organize the Council of Social Agencies but had consistently refused. However, the Council was experiencing difficulty in attracting a professional social worker and had, in fact, received no replies to their

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, Op. Cit. 6. 65.

advertisements. Mr. Wodell prevailed on Miss Livesey to reconsider her stand and in June 1941 she arrived in Calgary for an interview with the Board of Directors. It is not definitely clear what their decision was; for there is no record of the terms of employment. Miss Livesey was, however, taken on the staff of the Council of Social Agencies as of August 1, 1941.

According to Miss Livesey she came to take charge of the Council. She says, "When I arrived I found difficulties mountains high ... and since there existed the framework of a Council of Social Agencies I organized it to a degree which proved useful and satisfactory. I kept a strong finger on its direction."¹ This statement does not appear to be valid in light of subsequent events.

Prior to Miss Livesey's arrival the Board of Directors were discussing the need for a family agency and had reached a point of decision in December, 1940, when they changed the name of the Board of Public Welfare. Mr. Wodell was strongly in favour of a family oriented department within the Council; but there was a good deal of opposition to Mrs. McKillop relinquishing control, especially as many of her former board members were supporting her and were on the Council's Board of Directors. Miss Livesey had requested clarification of Mrs. McKillop's role and the function of the Public Welfare and Social Service Bureau. It had been hoped Mrs. McKillop, (who was now over seventy), would resign and make way for a completely new organization of a private family agency.

1. Letter from Mrs. Mary Slater, June 7, 1954.

Unfortunately, her supporters on the Board and she, herself, were opposed. Her supporters were not, however, in opposition to a professional social worker coming to the Council, but were eager for a compromise respecting division of authority. A compromise had already taken place relative to function in December 1940, when the Council requested the Board of Public Welfare to change its name and to function experimentally for a year, since this would not completely remove the possibility of the Board of Public Welfare of again functioning as an independent agency. To strengthen the Council's action, however, Mr. Wodell asked for an Administration Committee for the Bureau which was accepted and became a subcommittee of the Council's Executive Committee on January 16, 1941.

The arrival of Miss Livesey did complicate matters of administration. Although nominally brought to Calgary to work for the Council of Social Agencies, the nature of the agency and its work soon raised issues. The operational unit of the Council was the Public Welfare and Social Service Bureau and events, beyond the Council's control, were shortly to focus on the position of the Bureau. Miss Livesey's appointment did give impetus to the Council's Board of Directors to again alter the name of the once Board of Public Welfare. As mentioned previously, the majority of the Board of Directors had been interested in clarifying the nature and scope of the Board of Public Welfare activities. With the arrival of a social worker and with strength through the administration Committee of the Bureau, they deemed it an opportune time to fit a more appropriate title to the department of the Council which they hoped would assume a family service role. On September 8, 1944, the Executive Committee duly moved that "the Bureau name be changed from Public Welfare Bureau to Family Welfare Bureau."¹

1. The Council of Social Agencies of Calgary, Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee, September 8, 1941. (Extract)

The Board of Public Welfare had at last achieved a name recognizable as that of a family agency. Unfortunately, it achieved the status in name only. The functions of the newly named Family Welfare Bureau were to be influenced tremendously by the Second Great War and, before considering the development further, it is pertinent to examine the events imposed by the needs of a nation at war. They were to have profound effect, not only on the Family Welfare Bureau, but on the Council of Social Agencies as well.

The Effect of the Second Great War

In its beginning, the war had helped to speed up the organization of the Council of Social Agencies, as the various member agencies recognized the Council as a useful tool of help in adjusting their activities to wartime needs. Unfortunately, and of detriment to the continued growth of the Council, the war exacted its price, a most costly one to the machinery of coordination. On February 16, 1942, an agreement was made with the Dependent's Board of Trustees of the Department of National Defence which pledged the resources of the Calgary Council of Social Agencies to act as the investigating body for that Federal Department for all requests by dependents of service personnel for assistance from a Supplementary Grants Fund being administered by the Dependents' Board of Trustees. This agreement directly involved some reorganization and expansion of the Family Welfare Bureau since it was the only operational unit of the Council. At the same time it hindered the Executive Committee in its efforts to build up a smoothly operating Council, as literally a deluge of investigations came from the Department of National Defence.

The Executive Committee found itself devoting all its time to the administration of the Family Welfare Bureau, especially as the resources of the Bureau were at that time totally inadequate for the volume of work it was being called to do. As a result the planned development of the Council of Social Agencies came to a complete standstill. This situation became firmly entrenched, as by this time every member agency of the Council was having its wartime troubles of increased work, inadequate and changing staffs and insufficient money. Each of them, therefore, had no time to help or contribute to a well-integrated Council of Social Agencies.

The effect on the Family Welfare Bureau was most significant. Its work so increased that Miss Livesey and Mrs. McKillop were overwhelmed. The office secretary, the only other staff member, was recruited as a staff investigator and a part-time stenographer was employed as a replacement. The requests from the Department of National Defence continued to increase. In addition to investigations for the Dependents' Board of Trustees, the Department of National Defence now began to request investigations into home circumstances for service personnel who were applying for compassionate leave or for return to home from Overseas and from one posting to another. Home investigations and assessments were requested for men applying for postponement or cancellation of their call under compulsory service. By 1944 the staff of the Bureau numbered eleven as compared to only three in 1941.

With the Council of Social Agencies now having its entire focus on the Family Welfare Bureau, its administration was directly affected. At the same time, the Council's Board of Directors was very acutely aware of the standstill of the Council's real functions. The Board saw no immediate

remedy to this situation but, with thought to the future, realized the Council could only function when it became an entity to itself. Accordingly, the Board of Directors formulated a resolution which it presented to the Council's Annual Meeting in February 1943 and which was accepted by the meeting. This resolution had three points:

"1. Continuance of the control of the Agency now known as "The Family Welfare Bureau" for the year 1943 under the Council of Social Agencies, on the distinct understanding that at the end of 1943 there shall be set up a Board of Directors responsible for the operation of the Family Welfare Bureau as an independent agency, maintained by a budget from the Calgary Community Chest.

2. Also that during 1943 under the Council of Social Agencies' auspices the operation of the agency known as "The Family Welfare Bureau" shall be directed by Miss Mary A. Livesey who will be held responsible by the Council for its successful operation.

3. It is the intention of the Council of Social Agencies that the services of Mrs. D.A. McKillop as a Council of Social Agencies salaried employee in the Family Welfare Bureau, shall be retained in the capacity of Supervisor of Welfare distribution."¹

This resolution clearly indicated the plan for the future of the Council and the Family Welfare Bureau. It was a most important ruling since it specifically vested the direction of the Bureau with Miss Livesey and gave some status to Mrs. McKillop as a staff member. With the pressures on the Bureau from wartime need, Miss Livesey had in practice become a

1. The Council of Social Agencies of Calgary, Minutes of the Annual Meeting, February 6, 1943.

co-worker with Mrs. McKillop in the Family Welfare Bureau. It was therefore desirous to define the line of authority. This action divorced Miss Livesey from the Council's activities. It is interesting to note that Mrs. McKillop's title was Supervisor of Welfare distribution. She had always retained the role she had with the Board of Public Welfare, and she was to continue in that capacity. Miss Livesey and the staff investigators carried out the new work of investigations.

Thus the character of the Family Welfare Bureau and its services began to change because of the war's needs. The pressures on the Council of Social Agencies clearly indicated that a dual purpose agency could not function when the work of one completely curtailed that of the other. The war set the stage for complete independence to the Family Welfare Bureau.

The need for Separation between the Council of Social
Agencies and the Family Welfare Bureau

In the first Annual Report of the Calgary Community Chest, the President's message laid emphasis on the importance of obtaining trained social work leadership to give effective direction to the Council of Social Agencies and the community: "The Council, consisting of representatives of all welfare organizations in the city, has been reorganized and in a short time will engage the services of a trained social service worker. As the work of the Council develops, adequate facilities and trained personnel will be available to co-ordinate and direct the social service work in this city."¹

1. Annual Report of the Calgary Community Chest for the Year Ending December 1940. (The Calgary Community Chest 1941) p.1

In one sense it may be argued that the Community Chest and the Council of Social Agencies proceeded to fulfil the above statement through the appointment of Miss Mary Livesey to the staff of the Council in 1941. In another sense, however, and more accurately, it should be said that the fundamental requirement for trained personnel in order to successfully operate the Council of Social Agencies had not yet been met in Calgary. The fact is that Miss Livesey was soon engaged totally in the work of the Family Welfare Bureau and was never officially charged with the responsibility of directing the Council of Social Agencies. In less than a year and a half after her appointment to the Council, Miss Livesey became the Director of the Family Welfare Bureau which divorced her completely from assuming any role in the Council.

The Canadian Welfare Council Survey of 1944 clearly indicates whence the leadership came from:

"It is probably fair to state that the real direction and leadership for the Council operation in Calgary has been provided by the President of the Council himself. Here again Calgary has been fortunate in the type of citizen who has come forward to assume this particular responsibility for community leadership. The Council has been nursed through its infant years of development under sympathetic, patient, tolerant and understanding direction. Its lay leadership has been characterized by a sound understanding on the part of the President of the function of the Council in its community setting, the needs and weaknesses of the various welfare operations in the community, and the relationship which should exist between Council and Chest on the one hand and agencies on the other. The President of the Council has given evidence at every stage of the survey of his awareness of the fact that the Council is presently operating under almost insuperable handicaps, so far as its effectiveness is concerned, in its lack of trained professional staff direction on the Council side, and its attempts to carry along with the Council's main program the work of the Family Welfare Bureau.¹

This tribute to Mr. Wodell, the President of the Council of Social Agencies, also summarizes the problem faced by this agency in 1944. With

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, op. cit., p. 66.

the incorporation of the Board of Public Welfare into the Council in 1940, it was hopefully to be a dual purpose agency, but the difficulties which arose soon made it give way to the development of a family agency. It is likely this would have occurred eventually, as other cities had attempted to combine the functions of a family agency and a planning council with the same result. The war accelerated this process in Calgary.

The Council of Social Agencies had, by 1943, reached the point of realizing that the Council and the Bureau should separate. The resolution of February 1943 clearly indicates this. It was to be some time before this actually was performed. Much credit is due to the Council for its foresight in planning. Rather than blindly undertake a change, the Council of Social Agencies obtained the services of the staff of the Canadian Welfare Council to institute a survey of Calgary's overall welfare services. The Council's recognition that Calgary's health and welfare services were inadequate and in need of professional assessment resulted in a complete survey which was to serve as a blueprint for future planning. Insofar as the development of the Family Welfare Bureau was concerned, the survey clarified the Council's intentions in regard to separation and provided a clearer picture for its future structure.

It is, therefore, appropriate to consider the work and the status of the Family Welfare Bureau at this stage of development; for this is the period of final transition of this agency into a recognizable family agency.

Status of the Family Welfare Bureau at End of Second World War

A most important feature of the Family Welfare Bureau since its counterpart the Board of Public Welfare was drawn into the Council of Social Agencies was its relationship to its governing body, the Council's Board of

Directors. It had no directorate of its own and consequently it was governed by a board which had not been selected primarily because of the interest which its various members might have in family case work. It had to instead operate under a board, the members of which were naturally selected because of their interest in problems of planning and co-ordination of the community's welfare services, instead of in family case work. In addition, the early incorporation of members of the Board of Public Welfare directorate caused divergence of opinion, and although this changed very rapidly with new elections of officers, there did remain a minority whose interest still lay with the ideals of the old Board of Public Welfare.

The staff of the Family Welfare Bureau was an added weakness. Consisting of untrained people it could not contribute to the areas of family case work. In addition to this, it must be recognized that the agency came into existence just at the time when the demands of the Dependents' Board of Trustees and other wartime agencies for investigational services were mounting very rapidly. The Bureau consequently felt obliged from the outset to accept these special wartime responsibilities as part of its work, since all the family agencies in Canada were doing the same. The result was that the Family Welfare Bureau never was successful in establishing a distinctive case load of its own in the family counselling field to the extent that might have been possible in three or four years, had so much energy not been devoted to rendering service to the Dependents' Board of Trustees and similar wartime organizations.

"The fact is that the Family Welfare Bureau has developed very largely into an investigational agency."¹ There was no intensive case work

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, op. Cit., p. 90.

with individual families. Although this situation developed largely out of the fact that the need of the wartime organizations for straight investigational service in connection with their many applications for assistance from soldiers' families, was regarded as being of over-riding importance, it also must be recognized that this trend toward investigational as contrasted with a case work service was due to another factor. This has been referred to and is the problem of staff. The staff was untrained and had to learn on the job. It is naturally much easier in these circumstances to train persons to be useful investigators or visitors, able to carry out a sympathetic interview, obtain essential information, and prepare an accurate report which can be used as a basis of assessing material need. It is more difficult to train them as skilled case workers, capable of diagnosing intricate family problems, and bringing the family along, through its own processes and initiative, to a self-evolved solution of its problems. In addition to this the leadership of the Family Welfare Bureau was in the hands of actually an untrained person whose "own previous experience and training (largely with the Children's Bureau in Winnipeg, and previously as a trained Church Deaconess)... was such as to develop a sympathetic investigational approach rather than technical case work services."¹

The service provided by the Bureau at the end of 1944 was therefore largely an information and investigational service rather than a case work service. It provided a medium through which other organizations could obtain reliable and accurate reports on individual family situations.

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, op. Cit., p. 91.

At the same time it continued to do what the Board of Public Welfare had consistently carried on, of providing a link between families in need and those organizations which had been in a position financially to assist in meeting the need, as well as assisting with material aid as a relief measure.

This was the situation in 1944 and the Survey completed by the Canadian Welfare Council recommended to the Council of Social Agencies that in contemplating the change and planning the future for the Family Welfare Bureau that "the reorganized Family Bureau in planning its future development, should endeavour, as soon as possible, to obtain the services of a well qualified, experienced professional case worker who can bolster up this weakness in the Family Welfare Bureau's present program through demonstrating in her own case load what skilled case work treatment can accomplish."¹ It was also the recommendation of the survey that "the Family Welfare Bureau, operating now as an integral part of the Council of Social Agencies, be separated from the Council and constituted as an independent agency in its own right, with a Board of Directors and budget of its own."²

Separation and Independence Accomplished

We have seen a rapid sequence of events taking place from 1940 to 1944. First, the incorporation of the Board of Public Welfare into the Council of Social Agencies in 1940. Second, its change of name to that of the Public Welfare and Social Service Bureau in the same year; and at the same time the Bureau assuming a departmental role in the Council of Social Agencies. Third, the change in name to that of the Family Welfare Bureau in September 1941. Fourth, the impact of wartime needs on both the Family Welfare Bureau and the Council, which actually hampered the ideal growth of

1. The Canadian Welfare Council, op. Cit., p. 92.

2. Ibid, p. 69.

both agencies but brought into focus the desirable trend of separation with the resolution of February 6, 1943, indicating such action would take place. Fifth, the Survey by the Canadian Welfare Council of 1944, pointing the way for a planned future and giving impetus to the planned separation.

The Council of Social Agencies and the Family Welfare Bureau were now aware that they would eventually separate and function independently. The resolution presented and passed at the Council's Annual Meeting in February 1943, had expressly stated there would be a board of directors organized by the end of that year to be responsible for the direction of the Family Welfare Bureau as an independent agency. No action was taken in 1943 in spite of the expressed intention; because wartime pressures continued to increase. In the Council of Social Agencies' Annual Report for 1943, the President stated,

Acting temporarily as the directing and administrative body for the Bureau of Family Welfare your executive has found its responsibilities steadily increasing, chiefly due to wartime conditions and its association with government departments. So much of its time being occupied in an administrative capacity of the busy Family Welfare Bureau, your Executive is free to admit that it has more or less neglected its primary duties as a Council of Social Agencies' advising body. Anticipating by the end of 1944 full relief from this extra duty, it is our hope that incoming officers and committees, as well as members of the Council's divisioned sections, will concentrate more and more on those Council objectives for the achievement of which they are held responsible.¹

Separation of the Council and the Bureau was therefore delayed and no action was taken until 1945. At the Council's Annual Meeting held February 3, 1945, Mr. Wodell, who was still President, presented the continuing problems and the steps that were contemplated to remedy it.

1. Annual Report of the Council of Social Agencies of Calgary for the Year Ending December 1943. (The Council of Social Agencies of Calgary, 1944.) p.1.

"I am certain you will agree with me that our operations during 1944 indicate an extensive broadening of Social Service and Family Welfare effort in our city. In this connection let me explain a fact already known to many of you who are members of our Council. Most of the increase referred to above has to do with special service given to the government and military authorities by the Calgary Family Welfare Bureau and its staff of workers. That Bureau has been operated for some years under direct control of the Council of Social Agencies rather than under a Board of Directors of its own, which would be its normal status. Your Executive is pleased to report that arrangements are now under way to bring the Family Welfare Bureau once again under its own Board of Directors, when it will become an institutional member of the Council of Social Agencies, making its own application for a financial budget from the Community Chest. It is expected that this change will occur before March 31 of this year.

Removal of the Family Welfare Bureau administration by the Council of Social Agencies will release the officers of that body from a heavy duty load not contemplated as part of its regular functioning and leave them free to give full attention to the duties and responsibilities for which it was originally designed... either totally neglected or ignored... because of pressure of effort to carry on the imposed extra duties connected with the work of the Bureau ... Release from Bureau administration will pave the way for more concentrated effort in this direction by officers of the Council."1

The plans for reorganization began to assume concrete form in March 1945 when Mr. George McLellan, a graduate social worker, was engaged in a paid capacity as the first Executive Director of the Council of Social Agencies and also as Secretary of the Budget Committee of the Community Chest.

At the Annual Meeting of the Council of Social Agencies held February 3, 1945, when Mr. Wodell announced that arrangements were underway for separation of the Council and the Bureau, further action followed. Because of the planned move the President called for adjournment and requested that the Annual Meeting be reconvened. He said, "Owing to the fact that release from the Family Welfare Bureau administration will not come for at least two months your executive has deemed it advisable to postpone election of 1945 Council officers to a time more or less concurrent

1. Annual Report of the Council of Social Agencies of Calgary for the Year Ending December 1944. (The Calgary Council of Social Agencies 1945) p.1.

with that release date. Officers of 1944 have agreed to carry on until the change takes place and you will later be asked to vote on a motion to adjourn this Annual Meeting for the purpose of election of officers and other business to a date to be set by our executive."¹

On April 10, 1945, a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council of Social Agencies met to consider a list of prospective officers for the Board of Directors of the Family Welfare Bureau.

Mr. Wodell read a list of prospective officers which he proposed for the Family Welfare Bureau and which he said had been prepared in consultation with Mr. H.E. Howard, and the Director of the Council of Social Agencies. After some discussion, the following motion, moved by Father O'Byrne and seconded by Mrs. Harvey Price was approved: That the Executive of the Council of Social Agencies appoint a Committee of five, with power to nominate a slate of officers for a Provisional Board of the Family Welfare Bureau, also having power to call a general meeting, or both, of the membership of the Council of Social Agencies, or the citizens of Calgary, to execute the setting up of a Board, and that this Committee be also empowered to bring in a slate of officers and executive for the 1945 Board of the Council of Social Agencies.²

On April 24, 1945, a public meeting of interested citizens was held in the Calgary Public Library. This meeting approved and witnessed the final separation of the Family Welfare Bureau and the Council of Social Agencies. A Provisional Board of Directors for the Family Welfare Bureau was elected to carry responsibility for the new agency during the remaining months of the year. They numbered twenty-one directors. The Council of Social Agencies was charged with the responsibility of guiding and directing the work of the Provisional Board until the first Annual Meeting of the newly created independent organization. This meeting was to be held within the first three months of 1946.

-
1. Annual Report of the Council of Social Agencies of Calgary for the Year Ending December 1944 (The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, 1945) p.2.
 2. The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Minutes of the Executive Committee. (Calgary Council of Social Agencies, April 10, 1945) Extract

The long hoped for independence had been achieved. It was, however, shadowed by the retirement of Mrs. D.A. McKillop from the Bureau. She had requested a release in order to assume full time responsibility as Superintendent of the Calgary Old Folks Home.

The separation of the Family Welfare Bureau from the Council carried with it many problems involving equipment, finances, supplies and staff. Each was a problem in itself and it was not until the fall of 1945 that all the difficulties which the separation involved were successfully solved.

CHAPTER IV

THE INITIAL STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL FAMILY AGENCY

The First Year as an Independent Agency

The year 1945 marked the beginning of the Family Welfare Bureau as an independent, autonomous social agency. It also marked an overt movement toward achieving some of those aspects which were identifiable as professional attributes of a family agency. The war had directed the Family Welfare Bureau away from any preconceived plan of adopting a family agency programme. It had developed into an investigational agency, not through any fault particularly of its own. The staff had increased since the beginning of the war years in order to cope with the investigations the agency had been requested to deal with.

At the beginning of 1945 there were ten persons on the Bureau staff, as compared with only three in 1941. Of these ten, four were part-time investigators, two were clerical and four were full-time investigators. The latter included Miss Livesey and Mrs. McKillop. By the end of 1945 the staff had been reduced to six, of whom three were now serving as clerical and three were performing service to the community. None of the professional staff were trained. This reduction and change in staff was concomitant to the rapid decrease in investigation requests. As these requests diminished the agency was afforded an opportunity to examine its position as a community service and to take steps in moulding a family agency.

The new Provisional Board of Directors took its responsibilities seriously. Immediately after the election of officers at the general meeting of April 24, 1945, the Board met and appointed a nominating committee

in order to set up four standing committees to facilitate the organization of the now independent agency. On May 2, 1945, these committees were established. They were committees on Personnel, Constitution, Finance and Interpretation. An Executive Committee was formally installed. By the end of May, the Executive and Finance Committee had established an approved budget and after consultation with the Personnel Committee had established a scale of salaries.

At a meeting of the Board of Directors held May 11, 1945, the Chairman of the Personnel Committee reported, "The Personnel Committee concur in the desire to have trained case workers added to the staff but that these special investigators are very much needed until satisfactory trained workers can be engaged."¹

In less than a month of independence the Board were thinking in terms of a trained staff! At this same meeting the Board considered Conference expenditures for a staff member to attend the Canadian Conference on Social Work.

Most significant was the Board's attitude to the relief-giving policies of the Bureau. In the minutes of the same Board meeting of May 11, 1945,

much discussion arose over the item shown as relief in the Budget. Previous to the appointment of Miss Livesey, Mrs. McKillop, in administering the Herald Sunshine Fund, had given relief to applicants when there seemed to be no other place for them to go. Along with this, a clothing exchange had been operated. Miss Livesey pointed out that when she came she had endeavoured to direct applicants for relief only to other sources when, after reviewing their cases, she felt they should receive assistance elsewhere. Often this assistance was not forthcoming and they returned to the Family Welfare Bureau and received help. Another type of relief is that given to clients who come to the Bureau for assistance in solving their

1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held May 11, 1945. (Extract)

problems and during the time the case is receiving attention some material assistance is considered necessary.

The Executive members present felt that this latter type of relief was really Family Welfare work and that the former giving of relief to inoperable cases was not. Opinion was expressed that these inoperable cases could not be simply turned down but some operating arrangements would have to be made with other relief organizations to assume responsibility where the type of case shows that it falls in a particular class. Miss Livesey said it was not her intention to continue the clothing exchange when the clothing on hand had been dispensed. It was felt that a new Board would have to establish a principle regarding how and to whom relief should be given and that this whole matter of relief would have to be brought up again and studied.¹

The "inoperable" cases mentioned in the quotation are considered to be unable to benefit from any aid given; in that the financial assistance was only filling a temporary gap economically or providing assistance to clients who were unable to benefit by helping themselves after the aid. The Executive considered the latter as those would continually return with no other objective than to receive financial help.

The implications of the above excerpt are important; for it reflects the thinking of the Board of Directors in terms of what a family agency should be doing regarding financial assistance. Fundamentally their thinking is the same as that expected at present. The Board expressed direct concern about the inherited relief-giving policy of the old Board of Public Welfare. The relationship of giving financial assistance as a tool in a rehabilitative process is inherent in the Board's consideration, however ill expressed. Equally important, the Board considered it essential that other relief organizations should be used and that those

1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held May 11, 1945. (Extract)

in financial need should be referred and not just turned away. Miss Livesey's expressed intention of dispensing with the clothing exchange indicates an additional aspect of curtailing material aid.

On June 26, 1945, the Constitution Committee recommended that "the agency be known in future as the Calgary Family Bureau."¹ This title was put into immediate use, although the Constitution was in its formative stage and actually was not completed for legal recognition until 1947. It was a healthy sign, however, since it gave emphasis to the family and dispensed with the word "welfare", which was deemed having a narrow interpretation and connotation from the public standpoint.

In August 1945, the Calgary Family Bureau advertised for a trained social worker for the first time. A vacancy had occurred with the resignation of one of the investigators. The agency used this as an opportunity, demonstrating its awareness of the need for a professional staff to offer case work service to the community. Consequently in October 1945 Mrs. Sylvia Marshall, a graduate from the University of British Columbia School of Social Work, commenced her duties as a case worker with the Calgary Family Bureau. A milestone had been reached; the Bureau was now in a position to offer some professional case work service.

While it was important for these internal developments to take place, it was equally important that other agencies recognize the fact that a family agency was growing in Calgary. To illustrate, one private

1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held June 26, 1945. (Extract)

and one public agency should suffice to indicate this trend. The public agency, the Department of National Health and Welfare, had always adhered to the policy of having private agencies administer and investigate for and on behalf of their Family Allowances Branch. It had become common practice for this Federal Department to use family agencies, wherever they were available in the Dominion. In the fall of 1945 the Calgary Family Bureau was approached by the Regional Family Allowances Branch from Edmonton, Alberta, to undertake the administration of Family Allowances on behalf of children whose parents for diverse reasons were unable to look after the monies these children were entitled to. In addition, the Branch also requested the Bureau to investigate on their behalf certain cases which for many reasons had problems in need of clarification. The Family Bureau undertook this function in the fall of 1945, and while it is recognized that this may give the impression that the Bureau was once more undertaking investigations, the point which should be stressed in this instance, is the fact that the Department of Health and Welfare only delegated such work to recognized family agencies.

The private agency was the Calgary Branch of the Canadian Red Cross. It had for some years operated a Housekeeping Service in Calgary. They were, however, aware that this type of service was normally run and administered by a family agency. When the Council of Social Agencies and the Board of Public Welfare became a dual purpose agency in 1940, the Red Cross hopefully looked to those agencies to take over the Housekeeping Service. However, no action was taken and it was soon apparent that the Family Welfare Bureau could not handle such a service.

With the release of wartime pressures in 1945, the Red Cross approached the new Calgary Family Bureau to undertake the Housekeeping

Service. This could readily be undertaken since the Red Cross operated as a participant of the Calgary Community Chest and was convinced the transfer of funds to operate such a service could easily be accomplished. Negotiations were commenced with the Family Bureau to take over the Housekeeping service at the end of 1945 but no actual agreement was reached in that year. Unfortunately many delays hampered the development of the Housekeeping Service through the Family Bureau but it is not intended that the attendant difficulties should foreshadow the fact that at this stage of the Agency's development it was seen and recognized as a family agency service.

The only actual change in programme for the Calgary Family Bureau in 1945 was the commencement of a service to unmarried mothers. It was the first actual case work service offered by the Agency and really got its beginning because of the referrals of young women from the Armed Forces. There is no record of this service prior to 1945. One may assume that this is additional recognition of the agency by the Social Service Branch of the local Military District. Thirty young women were given counselling and placement service by the Agency in 1945.

This first year of independence did bring into focus the need for a revision of service in order to develop the Calgary Family Bureau as a professional family agency. The following extract from the Annual Report of 1945 summarizes the feeling of the Agency after its first year:

Throughout the early Spring days of 1945 we wondered about the outcome of the war, for family agencies had been very much a part of it all. Would the conflict continue and our work increase as consistently as it had done through years which seemed to us overwhelmingly filled with enormous piles of work and great responsibility ... or would the conclusion of hostilities relieve us of our war work, enabling us to

concentrate on the primary function of a Family Agency in peace time, the undergirding and strengthening of family life, helping individuals in developing both the capacity and the opportunity to lead personally satisfying and socially useful lives? An important event for us all came with the end of the war...Standards and techniques must be improved for the busy years of war, when a great volume of work rolled in with every insistent call for rapid service seriously impeded the real work of a family agency and while we all did our best to give the most adequate and satisfactory service which time and strength would allow we must admit that quality often had to be sacrificed to quantity.¹

In spite of the quite apparent thinking in terms of developing the Calgary Family Bureau as a family agency, very little was actually accomplished in 1945. The investigational factor still predominated; for example, the total case load for the Agency in 1945 amounted to 1496 cases of which 1330 were requests for investigations from Federal Government Departments. The war, although over, was still impeding development.

Progress and Regression 1946-1950

The year 1946 saw perhaps the greatest advancement of the Calgary Family Bureau as a family agency. By the end of that year the staff could be considered as professional as most family agencies in the Dominion. In February 1946 a graduate social worker was taken on staff to replace a retiring investigator. Again in June another graduate social worker was employed. The standard staff complement was now three professional case workers and the Executive Director and, although many changes were undergone from 1946 to 1954, this complement (in terms of numbers) remains to the present.

It was indeed a highlight of the agency to have practically a complete professional staff. As a consequence the standard of service increased and in the following year, 1947, there was a fifty-five percent

1. Annual Report of Calgary Family Welfare Bureau for the year ending December 1945. (The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau 1946) p.

increase of the number of families seeking case work service of the agency. Since this type of service depends entirely on the skill and techniques of the case workers it is important for such a staff to be maintained. Unfortunately by the close of 1947 the entire staff of trained personnel had left the Bureau. By September each of the social workers had been replaced by untrained personnel. This is reflected statistically in making comparisons between the number of cases requiring case work services for 1947 and 1948. For example, in 1947 two hundred and thirty-eight families came to the agency with problems needing case work service but by the end of 1948 the number coming to the agency with similar problems only numbered one hundred and twenty-one, a decrease of nearly fifty percent. Nor did the Bureau recover; for in 1950 the number seeking case work service was only one hundred and twenty-eight. Such a marked difference cannot be observed until trained personnel were again employed in 1952, when the families seeking case work service in that year came to over four hundred.

The importance of staff cannot be over-estimated, particularly in a family agency where the standards of performance can only be measured by standards in personnel. That the Bureau was aware of this and made every effort to employ trained social workers does indicate progress for the agency. Certainly the service given in 1946 and 1947 had a tremendous influence on the Bureau's development which was never lost in spite of the gap created by the loss of trained workers in 1947.

In viewing this situation objectively, the question of leadership cannot be overlooked. When the Family Welfare Bureau became an independent agency in 1945, Miss Livesay had been retained as Executive Director

since she had expressly been appointed as such as stated in the resolution adopted at the Council of Social Agencies' Annual Meeting in February 1943. The Provisional Board of Directors had accepted this situation but the newly-elected Board of Directors took a different point of view. They felt that Miss Livesay had been an employee of the Council of Social Agencies and, although nominally in charge of the agency, was so only as an Acting Director. The Survey recommendations of the Canadian Welfare Council exerted a great influence on their thinking and they were of the opinion that if the Calgary Family Bureau was to be a professional family agency it should have a trained person at its head who could not only give direction but provide the needed professional supervision for the staff. The minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors held June 1946 clearly indicate their stand. The chairman of the Personnel Committee presented a report which was moved for adoption and carried. It expressly stated, "that applications for the position of Executive Director be invited by advertisement. Emphasis in qualification be placed on securing someone with particular training and experience in case work and qualified to supervise the case work of the Agency as well as executive ability to direct the Agency."¹ The report recommended "that Miss Livesay continue as Acting Director at the salary as budgeted for Executive Director in 1946."² At a meeting of the Board held in October the

-
1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held June 4, 1946. (P. 44)
 2. Ibid (p. 45)

following motion was passed, "that the Secretary advise Miss Livesey by letter that the Board would continue to look for a new Director, and further that it is the opinion of the Board that Miss Livesey would not be happy nor would the best interests of the Agency be served if she were to continue in any capacity less than that of Director."¹ This decision of the Board created a good deal of disturbance and at the end of 1946 one of the Directors, Father O'Byrne, reported to the Board "that much talk had been occasioned in the community regarding the Board's decision to terminate Miss Livesey's services in February of next year, and that some members of the Council of Social Agencies and of the Community Chest were apprehensive lest it adversely affect their relations in the community which are none too secure and also lest it affect the Chest drive in the spring." He asked if the Personnel Committee had given consideration to the effect of the Board's decision on the whole social welfare picture in Calgary.² The Board of Directors, in discussion of the above, passed a motion to reconsider the matter of the Executive Director because of the poor publicity being received. They agreed to call a special meeting to discuss the matter.

The special meeting was attended by all the Board with the exception of two directors. One of the directors moved that the motion in the minutes of the October 11 meeting be rescinded but this was held as not valid. However, another motion was put to the floor stating that "recognizing the good work Miss Livesey has accomplished in this city I

-
1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held October 11, 1946.
 2. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held December 4, 1946.

move that we go on record as approving the retention of Miss Livesey as Executive Director of the Calgary Family Bureau...When the motion was put to the meeting it was declared carried by a vote of 11 to 7, the president not voting."¹ The chairman of the Board immediately indicated "it was his intention to resign."²

The controversy over the Executive Director was finally concluded but the repercussions on the Agency were to be felt for some time. The decision of the Board of Directors certainly had its effect on the Bureau for it will be remembered that the Canadian Welfare Council Survey had urged professional leadership by a qualified and trained person but now this could not become a reality unless the Executive Director could take further training. It is to the credit of the Executive Director that in all the time she was associated with the Bureau that she increased her knowledge and awareness of the needs of a family agency to the point where in fact she could be recognized as being equipped to administer an agency professionally. In 1946, however, and having been under a considerable amount of strain during the war years, the Executive Director was unable to provide adequate case work supervision or to actually guide the development of the Agency professionally. By September 1947 there was not one qualified case worker on the staff. In June 1947 two of the social workers were replaced by untrained personnel and in September the last social worker was replaced by one of the clerical staff. This situation remained unaltered until the Fall of 1951.

1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held December 13, 1946.

2. Ibid.

After the year 1946 the Board of Directors showed no great strength of leadership. The programme of the agency remained relatively unaltered. Case work service was to all intents and purposes at a standstill after 1947. Such counselling as was provided was useful to a point. The clerical worker who was appointed to the professional staff proved to be a very understanding, sympathetic individual and by sheer process of trial and error acquired enough skill to be of use in cases where disturbances were not too deeply imbedded. She was the only staff member to remain (with the Executive Director) from the time of her appointment in September 1947 till August 1951. The remainder of professional staff during the years 1947 to 1951 was constantly changed with the result that no adequate contacts were maintained.

Service to unmarried mothers developed almost completely as a placement service. The Housekeeping Service which was maintained financially by the Red Cross became practically disused. There was no housekeeper staff organized and the service was actually for clients in need of financial help through casual work, being used to assist clients in need of housekeeping service.

Stress once more was being given to financial assistance and, while verbally recognition was given to it as a means in the case work process, it actually was used as relief assistance to indigents. The financial assistance, now called Direct Aid, was considered important. The Community Chest, however, questioned this in 1948. The Bureau considered its position as follows:

The question has come up whether it is the function of the Family Agency to give out any direct aid at all. There was general discussion about this question. It was generally agreed that it would be impossible to eliminate direct aid in a family agency, as it is used as a tool in the case work process and it was felt that someone had to fill

in the gap which was left when a person was not eligible for assistance and needed it, or when a person was waiting to receive assistance. Moved..that it be explained to the Community Chest that the giving out of direct aid is an integral part of the case work process of our agency, and the Board is firmly in favour of giving out direct aid where believed necessary to assist this process. It was also thought that the general public expected our agency to do more in the way of direct aid.¹

No dispute can be made that direct aid has a function in a family agency but the facts in regard to the Bureau were that no case work was actually being done and it was, therefore, necessary to continue direct aid in order to justify agency function. To illustrate this point more completely, the average direct aid given by the Bureau during the years 1948 to 1951 amounted to approximately \$1,500.00. In 1947 it was nearly \$2,000.00. These figures may be compared to those for 1952 when again a trained professional staff was offering case work service. In that year it amounted to six hundred dollars; approximately a third of the expenditures of those previous years.

In 1948 a new service was taken over by the Calgary Family Bureau. This was to provide an intake service for children admitted to the Providence Creche, a local receiving home for children four years of age and under. The Bureau also agreed to collect maintenance fees for the children. This service was instigated at the request of the Sisters of Providence who operated the Creche, since they felt a great many of the parents and unmarried mothers who placed the children in this institution would be in need of case work service. Ideally, this intake service could be of benefit but unfortunately the case work service was not available, nor was any intake policy set up. Con-

1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held March 23, 1948.

sequently the Sisters became more and more dependent on their own resources to the point where the Creche openly admitted children and by-passed the Bureau. They did, however, continue to have the Bureau collect maintenance which created an unhealthy and ultimately open friction.

Intake service on behalf of an institution requires considerable skill. Persons availing themselves of the facilities of the institution are not necessarily receptive to counselling and advice. When they encounter a mere referral system, their needs are never met.

This service was curtailed in 1952 after a meeting between the Creche and the Family Bureau. The Creche took the stand that they were quite capable of collecting their own fees.

The Calgary Family Bureau's development was seriously handicapped during the years 1947 to 1948 for the reasons as outlined. There was actually little progress from the point of view of service to the community. There were, however, two important developments which did contribute to its growth as a family agency. The Constitution of the Bureau which was formulated in 1946 and revised in 1947, was finally ready for submission to the Province of Alberta as a requisite for the incorporation of the Bureau as a recognized society and agency. On May 20, 1947, the Board of Directors was informed that "we are now a registered society under the Act."¹ ; this being successful registration of the Calgary Family Bureau as it had fulfilled the requirements of the Societies Act of the Province of Alberta. The importance of this Constitution cannot be overestimated. First, it reflects the work and

1. The Calgary Family Welfare Bureau, Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors held May 20, 1947. (Extract)

desire of the Board of Directors in office during the years 1946 and 1947 to establish a family agency. Secondly, it was the very basis on which the Calgary Family Bureau was to develop as a family agency; for the Constitution was formulated strictly to conform with the suggested form of a family agency constitution as outlined by the Family Welfare Association of America. In fact so well was it drawn to the aims and objectives of a modern family agency that it has only been amended three times since its adoption and all these amendments did not alter in any way the policies as laid down by the Constitution. This constitution had a statement of its reason for existence, its aims and purposes, and a description of its structure and organization for carrying out its purposes. The Bureau constitution had value, therefore, as a guide by which it could, from time to time, measure how fully it was carrying out its stated purposes. Formulated when it was, it contained farsighted provisions and therefore it truly reflects the trend of the Bureau's growth; for its stated purposes were those of a modern family agency.

Another important feature was the renovation of the offices of the Bureau, not only in order to provide adequate space for the professional staff but with a view to the recognition of the client's privilege to privacy. The plans for the renovations were drawn in January 1948 and were effected during the summer of that year. Each professional staff member had an office and here interviews could be conducted privately.

In review, it can be said that the Calgary Family Bureau reached a peak in its critical development as a family agency in the years 1945 and 1946. In these two years the Board of Directors played a leading role in effecting changes and, although there was some stagnation in the years from 1947 to 1951, the essential machinery had been pieced together

which would ultimately affect its growth as a professional family agency.

CHAPTER V

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE AGENCY

A new phase in the development of the Calgary Family Bureau began to take shape in 1952. This phase was to unfold the characteristics which the Bureau presently possesses and to lay its foundations as a professional family agency.

Early in 1952 the Calgary Family Bureau began advertising for a new Executive Director. Miss Livesey was planning to be married and therefore announced her intention to resign. Miss Livesey was eager to employ a trained social worker in her place, stating that she felt the Bureau was now in a position to effect changes professionally. In May 1952 a graduate social worker, Mr. Arthur Hoole, was employed to take over from Miss Livesey. Fortunately, Miss Livesey was able to remain with the new Executive Director for a period of two weeks and was able to give practical, valuable orientation and assistance to the new incumbent. Particularly noteworthy was Miss Livesey's understanding that the new Executive Director would be expected to effect the growth of the Family Bureau. No one person could have appreciated the impetus, encouragement and foresight given by the outgoing Executive Director. There followed, as she expected, an almost complete transition in the affairs of the Bureau.

By the end of September 1952 many changes had been effected. It would be impossible to record completely all the modifications and innovations. The more important can be discussed to demonstrate the

guiding concept in the developments which came after May 1952. This concept was geared specifically toward nurturing that accepted purpose of providing a skilled case work service on problems of family living and individual social adjustment. It was, and still is, the stressing of the two major purposes of a modern family agency, namely, to strengthen family life by understanding problems people bring voluntarily to the agency and through the application of skills based on knowledge of people and human relations to strive and help them work out an acceptable solution; and to stimulate, to help organize, and to support community programmes which have as an objective the welfare of the individual and the family. In the discussion to follow comparisons are made to past operation, as the preceding chapter held little reference to actual programme and internal operation.

Personnel

The most important feature of a family agency is its staff. Its standard of performance and service can only be as good as the professional qualification of its staff. To give advice and to help any human being is far from a simple process. The human mind, human conduct and human motives are very complex and it is impossible to have too much in the way of understanding. It is equally important that the professional staff have supervision and a programme of staff development in order to develop their skills in line with their experiences in the agency. In other words, supervision and staff development must have the highest priority as techniques toward improving the service to the clients of the agency.

Immediately prior to assumption of responsibility by the new

Executive Director, the professional staff consisted of two untrained case workers and one trained, qualified case worker. This personnel had no direct case work supervision. They generally met once a week in staff conference to discuss mutual problems and on occasion one staff member might present a prepared paper on some case work problem. There was no professional direction or guidance, nor was there any organized plan for progressive staff development. This had been the situation since 1945, with the exception of irregular attendance at conferences. By April 1952 the total professional staff had indicated their intention to leave the Bureau. The two untrained workers had been with the Bureau nine and four years respectively. The trained social worker had been with the agency less than a year.

By September 1952 two qualified graduates and one untrained worker had been recruited. The latter had a Bachelor of Arts degree and had had some case work orientation. No previous untrained worker had a similar background. This staff remained intact until March 1953, when one trained worker was requested to resign because of poor adjustment and unsatisfactory case work skills. This reflected the focus of the agency in giving emphasis to case work service to its clientele. When this was not being done, the case worker had to be released. This worker was replaced by another qualified social worker with thirteen years experience in addition to academic qualification. In September 1953 the staff was stabilized with the addition of another trained social worker who was a graduate of the University of Toronto School of Social Work. This social worker replaced the untrained worker who left the agency in order to attend a School of Social Work. Thus September 1953 represents a milestone in the history of the Calgary Family Bureau. Its professional

staff was now completely composed of trained, capable social workers, whose thinking and daily tasks are guided by case work principles. There has been no change in this staff since September 1953.

Staff Development

Staff development had always been lacking in the Bureau. It is to Miss Livesey's credit that she did her utmost to maintain a level of staff performance through staff conferences but she lacked for resources in the community and agency to maintain any professional development. Little was accomplished after the new Executive Director took over since many administrative changes occupied his attention.

However, in November 1953, a Calgary psychiatrist (who had assumed the position as Psychiatric Consultant to the Bureau) agreed to spend at least one morning a month, or more if desired, in a staff development programme. Again, planned Conference time was established and went into effect when two of the case work staff attended the Western Regional Conference on Social Work in 1953. Another case worker attended the Mid-Winter Conference of the Canadian Welfare Council at Toronto in January 1954. The latter is of particular importance, for it represented recognition of the status of the Calgary Family Bureau as a family agency. The case worker who attended had been requested by the Canadian Welfare Council to be chairman of a discussion group.

Staff Supervision

Supervision commenced as an integral established procedure in June 1952. The supervision was not, and is not, of a recognized professional standard and has been a weak spot in the agency's case work

endeavours. The Executive Director assumed the duties of case work supervisor but had little to give in this area because of lack of experience and because of pressing administrative duties. In addition, he has carried a small case load. The consequence has been a real lack of adequate supervisory periods.

This situation has been eased to some extent over the last two years as with experience the Director has acquired more supervisory skill. More important, the senior case worker has been promoted to the position of Supervisor and has begun to share supervision with the Director. Arrangements have been made for this Supervisor to attend a School of Social Work to obtain further assistance and training in supervisory methods which, in addition to her previous training and long experience in the field of social work, (now over fourteen years) should strengthen this weakness in the agency's staff development.

Administrative Policy

Another important feature regarding staff is the lack of written administrative policy. There are no established Personnel Practices or Salary Schedule. This is a principle of effective administration which is seriously lacking. For approximately seven years there has been an ill-defined set of staff regulations dealing primarily with office procedure. These regulations are out-dated and so lacking in clarity that they have no use in the present structure. They have never been revised to meet changed staff policies and needs.

The Board of Directors has now established a Personnel Committee to investigate and develop Personnel Practices and a Salary Schedule which will include job classifications and descriptions. Since the summer of

1953, comparative material has been accumulated and this Committee now has a basis with which they can formulate and reach their objective.

Statistical Records

The changes effected in the agency's statistics and recording were more encouraging. Prior to 1952 the statistics were compiled chiefly to demonstrate volume of work. Minute detail seemed to be encouraged and often the most insignificant items were recorded. For example, letters and telephone calls were recorded in detail irrespective of the nature of the call. There were no daily work sheets to give case-workers a unity for recording their activity. Daily journals were kept but included therein were a multitude of activities, routine and otherwise. These daily notes were transposed to a monthly record which was supposed to total the monthly activities of the case worker. However, any attempt to accurately report the work accomplished was hampered in the transposition. The case worker had to try and correlate a maze of recorded activity.

The actual count of cases and their classification were recorded by the office secretary. File recording was through dictated narrative of events which had happened during an interview with no focus on case work detail.

By September 1952 the entire statistical, recording and intake procedures were revised. This revision was geared to the case work purpose of the agency. For example, where all letters were previously noted, the new arrangement called for recording letters which only had to do with service to clients. The new statistical methods were adopted from those which are standard and accepted by the Family Service Association of America and were only modified by the omission of certain forms

which normally would be used by a large family agency. These statistical forms were also geared to unified recording procedures so that each case worker, for example, compiled reports of a similar nature which ultimately could be transposed to a composite total of agency activity. Most important, the new statistical set-up included a method for evaluating the case work of the agency. Thus the statistics not only began to provide an accurate comparative means of measuring agency activity, but attempted definitely to measure the value of its work.

Case Recording

As mentioned briefly recording of case material was in the form of a descriptive narrative. This type of recording had been accepted from 1945 to 1951. Case material in record form for these years appear so subjective that often they coloured the client situation with the case worker's character and needs rather than the client's. There were, of course, many exceptions particularly in the case records for the years 1946 and 1947.

The present case recording is geared almost exclusively to the client situation and the case work method. This is important, not only from the point of view of providing an accurate continuing case record, but for the purposes of diagnosis, case work and supervision. These records are kept as objectively as possible and, should the worker need to give personal comment, it is separated and noted as the "Worker's Thinking".

Intake Procedures

Intake procedures have also undergone a complete change. The intake procedure up to 1952 was conducted in the following manner. A

client was registered with the Bureau by the office secretary who noted information about the client's family, such as name, address and some information relative to the problem. This information was given to the Executive Director, who then interviewed the client. Depending on the problem, the Director would assess the situation in terms of which case worker could best handle it. The client was then introduced to the chosen worker, who again reviewed the situation and proceeded to work with the client. In May 1952, this system was changed. First, the geographical area of the City of Calgary was divided into districts, with a case worker assigned to one. Each case worker then was responsible for a generalized case load for that district. Thus, if a client approached the agency for service, regardless of the problem and the district worker was free to interview, a direct contact was established. Should the district worker be occupied, a duty intake case worker interviewed the client and arranged for an appointment with the district worker. The intake worker was and is responsible for obtaining information so that the district worker may continue without a complete resume of the problem by the client. This system has worked satisfactorily in its objectives of respecting the dignity of the individual and giving service to the client.

Programme.

The salient feature of the present programme of the Calgary Family Bureau is case work service. Although the present programme of the Bureau falls within those areas where case work is essential, it is not intended to embark on a descriptive analysis of each. In short, the agency deals with such problems as marital difficulties, parent-child

relationship problems, individual personality difficulties, mental illnesses, physical illness and handicaps and unmarried parenthood. The help that is given to clients with these problems represents the core of the agency programme. To make service more meaningful, the following revisions of agency programme were made.

First, it must be acknowledged that the Housekeeping Service of the Bureau was most ineffective. Actually such a service was non-existent. The statistics given earlier portray this only too adequately. There were no housekeepers. There were no financial resources to carry out the service. The latter had been financed by the Red Cross but this was now the responsibility of the Bureau. In November 1952, with the assistance of the newspapers, a nucleus of women was recruited to train for a new service (akin to the former Housekeeping Service), and to be called Homemaker Service. After a ten week training period, which included orientation to the case work function of the agency, five women were selected as Bureau staff Homemakers. These women were to carry out the purpose of the service in providing satisfactory care for children in their own homes during temporary illness or incapacity of the mother. This plan is arranged after careful case work consideration by a Bureau case worker upon exploration of other resources and with regard to total family needs. The case worker and the homemaker work as a unit to meet the family's situation.

The Homemaker Service proved to be effective, not only by the calibre of the homemakers, but also because a firm financial basis was established. Homemaker Service was budgetted for and agreements reached with families to share or carry the cost. Money was available to fin-

ance the service where families could not pay.

Second, psychiatric consultation became an integral part of the Bureau's programme. The community is able to receive a better case work service because of the consultation, and many disturbed clients previously unable to receive service may now receive indirect psychiatric help. Of immeasurable value is the aid the psychiatrist provides in the staff development programme. As the occasion demands, the psychiatrist is available to give direct treatment to clients.

Third, the programme of the Calgary Family Bureau now includes Service to the Aged. The agency had for some time provided an investigational and administrative service to the applicants and recipients for Old Age Security on behalf of the Old Age Security Division of the Federal Department of Health and Welfare. However, this was not a case work service and it was recognized that many senior citizens seek other than financial assistance. Case work service to senior citizens commenced in the summer of 1952 and at the end of that year twenty-two older persons had received service as compared to one for 1951.

The Board of Directors

The board of directors of any agency is the legal, responsible authority of that agency and it formulates the policies under which the work of the agency is conducted. The management of the agency is vested in its board of directors and consequently it should take final action on all major questions of policy and general plans. As the governing body of an agency, it is very important that some examination be made, since the past, present and the future of the agency ultimately lies in the hands of the board of directors.

In this study, there has not been a focus on the Board of Directors up to this point. However, it has been indicated that the Board took a leading role in developing the agency after it became an independent body. For two years it contributed to the strength of the Bureau, provided leadership, and accepted its responsibilities seriously.

There are boards that dictate to the staff and limit what can be done. There are others who take absolutely no responsibility and leave the staff carrying the total job. Possibly the Board of Directors of the Bureau fell into the latter category when its activities are viewed during the years 1947 to 1952. But the important issue to-day, is whether or not the Board of Directors is accepting its responsibilities at the present time.

The responsibilities of boards include among others the determining of agency policy, the engagement of professional and clerical staff adequate in quality and quantity to carry out the purpose of the agency, the financing of agency service, interpretation of agency service to the community and interpretation of the community to the staff; an understanding of the agency's niche in the framework of community services; development of inter-agency policy; development of personnel policy in regard to staff. In these days of expanding public welfare services it is particularly important for boards of private agencies to understand the relations that should exist between public and private services. 1

This description highlights the important responsibilities of a board of directors and it is intended to relate them to the Calgary Family Bureau's Board of Directors in order to make some assessment as the present and future development of this agency ultimately lies with its Board. There are nine points.

First, there is the determining of agency policy. The Bureau's Board of Directors does not take an active part in formulating policy. To date they have relied entirely on the Executive Director to bring

1. Health and Welfare Services in Western Canada, Condensation of an Institute for Board Members and Volunteers, the First Biennial Western Regional Conference on Social Work, Regina, Saskatchewan, April 1947. p.70

policy matters to their attention, on which they adjudicate. While the Board does take the responsibility of discussing policy when such matters are presented they rely too heavily on the Executive Director's judgment. To date they have concurred with all changes in policy as presented by the Executive Director.

The second point relates to the engagement of professional and clerical staff adequate in quality and quantity to carry out the purpose of the agency. The board has taken this responsibility over completely. However, it is important to note that it is only within the last year that they have taken hold in this area. They have established a precedent of having only qualified case workers when they decided to employ a trained, unexperienced case worker in September 1953. At this time several applications had been received and the decision came to selecting a highly recommended partially qualified worker with family agency experience or a trained, qualified unexperienced worker. They decided on the latter because of the view that the agency would ultimately benefit more with the trained case worker.

While the expression was verbal, the newly formed Personnel Committee of the Board have indicated that this will be a written personnel policy henceforth. In another instance the Board have clearly shown interest in both professional and clerical staff. For example, they expressed concern over the increasing pressures on the staff because of increased case load and instructed the Executive Director to take steps to alleviate this situation. The Board has also requested evaluation of the staff.

Third, there is the financing of agency service. In this

area of responsibility the Board has again evidenced interest and concern. Certainly the present financial picture of the agency is good and this is directly attributable to the Board's direction and work in this area. Since 1950 the budget of the Bureau has been steadily increased to meet the demands of increased costs and the Board has pressed successfully for increases from the Community Chest and from other organizations in the City of Calgary. They are well informed as to the financial position of the agency.

Fourth, interpretation of agency service to the community must be considered. The Board is quite weak in relation to this point. It has actually accomplished little or nothing. At the present time the Board is actually in need of interpretation to themselves in order to equip them with a knowledge of the agency's function. They are well aware, however, of this weakness and time is devoted at every Board meeting to describing the agency's work. The lack of knowledge has contributed to a lack of interpretation to the community on the part of the Board. It is felt that this will develop as the Board acquires familiarity with the agency's services.

Fifth, there is the question of interpretation of the community to the staff. The Board has not been aware of this responsibility except to be an unconscious guide to the staff as to community thinking which, ideally, it represents. It is also felt that this will develop together with interpretation of agency service to the community. At this stage of the agency's development the two are related and will grow together. The Board certainly reflects community thinking but not as a process in board management.

Sixth, an understanding of the agency's niche in the framework of community services is essential. The Board of the Bureau has very little understanding of this responsibility. While a representative of the Board is a member of the Council of Social Agencies, little is brought back to the Board to enlighten the members. Again the Board has evidenced very little interest in this area, and it is felt that it is due to the fact that the agency is in a process of change of which the Board is a part. The seventh point, which deals with inter-agency policy, stands exactly as described above. No action nor interest has been forthcoming from the Board.

Eighth, the development of a personnel policy is basic to any agency. The Board has established and directed a Personnel Committee to bring in recommendations for early action. This is another example of the sense of urgency of the Board.

In relation to the ninth point, that of understanding the relations that should exist between public and private services, the Board has been quite ill-informed. Again they have evidenced little interest nor does the Board appear concerned.

It is hoped this brief resume covering nine essential responsibilities for a board of directors will give a picture of the Calgary Family Bureau's status when viewed through its governing body. The Board of Directors seem to be conscious and interested in the internal management of the Bureau but have little concern with the community and its welfare services at this present time.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Early Contributions

"Family social work began where the need was greatest - among the poor." The Calgary Family Bureau certainly had its beginning providing service to the "poor".

It has been shown how the needs of Calgary's indigent population prior to 1911 were not being met, but were recognized as a problem. The arrival of the Rev. and Mrs. D. A. McKillop in Calgary and their immediate recognition and concern of this situation provided the impetus for organization to meet it. Their efforts to effect services gained the respect of the people of Calgary and particularly the city administration which was important to the formation of Associated Charities agency.

The vigour and the pioneering spirit of the McKillops is rarely matched today and exemplifies that spirit of the founders of the Charity Organization Movement; the McKillops being akin to those practical-minded individuals who experimented with ways of doing something about living conditions they thought intolerable. In doing so they demonstrated to citizens that action for improvement was a responsibility to be recognized and carried by many, indeed by all, citizens.

There are those who would argue that the action by the city officials of providing funds and requesting the McKillops to organize the Associated Charities was the main factor in the formation of an agency which could co-ordinate and administer relief-giving in Calgary.

This argument cannot be accepted. The McKillops demonstrated the social action which gave impetus to the co-ordinated effort. It was not public concern but private energy which created a private agency to cover a public need. It did, however, demonstrate co-ordination between civic action and social investigation.

As a relief-giving agency, the Associated Charities resembled most Charity Organization Societies. "The so-called charity organization societies were often little more than informal relief societies."¹ However, in the case of the Associated Charities this function was extended in a sense, since public funds were being administered.

When the post-war depression (First World War) effected a change in the agency, it did use it as an opportunity to change its character. Up to and shortly after the city government of Calgary changed its relief planning, the Associated Charities really resembled the trend of the family welfare movement which many similar agencies experienced. For example, the Charity Organization Society of Salt Lake City, Utah, had a somewhat similar development. After the First Great War it changed its name to the Family Service Society. (The Associated Charities also changed its name.) "During the depression the Family Service Society acted as a district of the public welfare set-up and administered public assistance ... when the government changed the plan and public funds were no longer administered by private agencies, the Family Service Society had to determine what its future place in the community should be."²

-
1. Margaret F. Byinton, "The Pioneer", The Family Journal of Social Case Work, XXVII (March 1946) p.6.
 2. Kate Williams, "Guide, Philosopher and Friend," Ibid. p.15.

In 1922 the Associated Charities had to face the same problem. The fact that the agency became the Board of Public Welfare with plans to focus on helping individuals and families gave hope that the agency could eventually develop as a family agency. No one could deny that the motivation to stimulate such action was in the minds of the McKillops.

Although the Board of Public Welfare continued as a relief-giving agency, the projects carried on by Mrs. McKillop exemplified her drive and interest in assisting individuals and families. Her contribution to the Welfare services in the City of Calgary was so great that it is almost beyond assessment. She stimulated social action during those early years such as Calgary had never seen before or since. As a close associate has stated,

Mrs. McKillop had more ability and Christian aggressiveness than any other woman I have ever known. She had the strength mentally and physically which made her a real power in the city of Calgary with a host of strong supporters. If Mrs. McKillop had been able to take a course in Social Work (which of course was non-existent in her day) she could easily have been a Nora Lea or Charlotte Whitton.¹

As Mrs. McKillop helped to build welfare services in Calgary, she helped to build a family agency. As other welfare services came into being, so grew a need for their co-ordination. At the same time changing needs brought into focus the need for a family agency. The Board of Directors of the Board of Public Welfare slowly became aware that relief assistance and other material methods of assisting people were not enough. Spearheaded by Mr. Wodell, the President of the Board of Public Welfare, the agency began to take definite form as a family agency in 1940. In a sense, Mr. Wodell personified those in the Calgary community who recognized that its welfare

1. Letter from Mrs. Mary Slater, May 23, 1954.

services were in need of review and co-ordinated effort. In meeting the problems of revision, Mr. Wodell not only successfully guided the merger of two important agencies to ultimate goals of independence but he managed to resolve most of the conflicting concepts which were in opposition to their identity.

The effect of the Second Great War can never be minimized. It had a very marked effect on the growth of both the Calgary Family Bureau and the Council of Social Agencies. While it hindered the development in one way, it actually brought into focus the desirability of separation and accentuated the need both for a family agency and a planning council. The end of the war brought the end of complications and allowed the movement toward separation to flow unhampered. The Calgary Family Bureau was free to grow and dependent on itself for its future.

The Casework Purpose

The early growth of the agency in its first two years of independence is directly attributable to the Board of Directors taking a definite leadership role which has subsequently declined. Reference must be made also to Miss Mary Livesey's contribution, since the Board of Directors had to rely on her to a great extent. Miss Livesey certainly knew and understood how a family agency should function and under her guidance the agency laid a firm foundation for its present growth. It is difficult, therefore, to come to a reasonable conclusion as to why the agency showed little movement from 1947 to 1952.

There is, of course, the overwhelming fact that clients will only come to an agency when they are receiving the service they seek. Those

seeking case work help could not obtain it during these years since the staff were ill-equipped professionally. Those clients who previously received assistance in other forms continued to come since some of their needs were being met materially. This is a reasonable conclusion since so much depends on the staff of an agency.

It is essential that the executive secretary be a qualified family social worker who has had not only professional training in a graduate school of social work but subsequent experience in a family agency as well. Also, the caseworker or workers should be graduates of recognized schools of social work...Social work is an established profession...Family social work requires trained service...If the need for qualified staff is not recognized the agency may be a family case work agency in name but it cannot be one in fact. 1

This quotation illustrates the point in the preceding paragraph. The Calgary Family Bureau was, in fact, a family agency in name only from 1947 to 1952. The acquisition of a trained staff in 1952 brought the agency to the door of being a professional family agency as a service unit. The developments since 1952 indicate a definite trend to assuming the case work purpose of a family agency; but in its strictest sense the Calgary Family Bureau has not yet achieved complete status as such. This conclusion is the crux of this review and should be examined further.

It is true that a professional staff which is well qualified can perform an outstanding case work service to the community, but the staff cannot function alone. A private family agency is a lay and professional partnership. The Board of Directors has ultimate control and is the legally responsible body. It vouches for the work to the community and is the continuing life stream of the agency. It sets policies and standards and should take the lead in making the experience of the agency an influence in the community. Case work service is performed by the staff, and the

1. McLean and Ormsby, Op. Cit., p. 28.

Board relies and draws upon staff experience and opinion in the formulation of policies, new programme, and programme changes. This partnership has not yet been achieved in the Calgary Family Bureau. There is evidence that it will be.

As a premise to this historical review there was agreement that a family agency has a twofold job to do. First, to provide a case work service to individuals and families who seek this kind of help and second, to take the lead in building the kind of community in which good family life will be possible for all.

Steady progress has been and is being shown by the Calgary Family Bureau toward an objective of a high standard of professional social service for the agency's clientele. Trained case workers are being employed, and there is a programme for staff development and supervision. Other aids such as conferences are utilized. These are steps toward raising standards in case work service and have been made possible because this objective has been accepted. The Board of Directors is convinced that problems of family relationships and personal adjustments are intricate, complicated, and require a definite degree of skill on the part of the workers employed to treat them. No matter at what stage the case work service of the Calgary Family Bureau may be it must be recognized that this purpose is foremost.

It is no discredit to the case work of the Calgary Family Bureau that its origins, historically, lie in the broad field of philanthropy, and that much of its progress has been achieved under the cloak of charity. Indeed, there is a debt to those pioneers, as exemplified by Mr. and Mrs. McKillop and Miss Livesey, whose desire to help their fellowman enabled the agency to emerge and grow into maturity. But it is important for the

future development of the case work service that it be dissociated, in the public mind, from its exclusive connection with philanthropy.

The years when the Bureau was responsible for meeting the primary needs for food, shelter, clothing and other maintenance requirements of the community's underprivileged are still within the close memory of many of the Calgary community. In the process of giving assistance, an attempt was made to help the person marshal his inner resources to help him better relate himself to life about him. But this attempt was vague and never really came into conscious effort until after the Second Great War.

The history of the Bureau since that time has been a continuous, if slow, extension of the boundaries of its services in two directions. First, toward perfecting its case work techniques for improving service, and second, toward making its services available to a more diversified clientele. The President of the Calgary Family Bureau has stated that,

This past year we have noticed we are reaching new groups of people. The idea that the family agency deals only with the misfits of society is definitely past. There are times in the lives of most of us when a caseworker could steer us through a troubled period and prevent personal disaster, costly to our community...We know the community is becoming more and more aware of the Family Bureau and...staff members of our agency have accomplished much in preserving family life in situations where its continuance seemed most difficult. 1

The fact remains, however, that in the minds of the great mass of the community the Bureau is still associated with "charity". Moreover, the idea of charity is linked, for many people, with a sense of maladjustment or perhaps failure. This, then, is an impediment from which the Bureau must be freed if it is to assume its rightful place as a case work agency in the Calgary community. This, of course, is closely allied to

1. Annual Report of the Calgary Family Bureau for the Year Ending December 31, 1953. (The Calgary Family Bureau 1954) p.2.

the second purpose of a family agency which will now be reviewed.

The Community Purpose

It appears less is being done in the second area of family service; namely, the community responsibilities. There is a suggestion that this aspect of the job has been avoided because it appears to have been taken over by the local Council of Social Agencies. It is, however, safe to conclude that the focus on developing the standard of case work service has overshadowed any developments in the areas of community responsibility. The agency has been and is pre-occupied with the case work purpose to the exclusion of the other purpose. This is a natural phase, perhaps, in the agency's development. It will be recalled that it is only since 1952 that emphasis has been given to case work in its strictest sense. It still seems to be of major importance to develop service to clients particularly in relation to interpretation and inter-agency policies, as the ultimate community attitude will depend upon these.

This point does reflect on the Bureau's Board of Directors. There must be, for instance, conviction on the part of the Board (and the staff) that the agency has a real responsibility to give leadership to communities where conditions exist which militate against good family living or which hamper the work of the agency. There also needs to be a willingness on the part of the Board to study the problems and to work with other interested groups to seek a solution. This responsibility cannot be delegated to, though it should be shared with, the agency's staff. The Board of Directors of the Calgary Family Bureau have not been able to take over in these areas. In the early years of the Bureau the Directors appeared to be conscious of community responsibility but it is at present sadly lacking.

The Board could take a more active interest in the Council of Social Agencies. Councils of social agencies have taken over the responsibility for community action and it should be a major concern of a Board of Directors to utilize and participate with such a council in its endeavours. It is true that the Board of Directors of the Bureau does have representative to the Calgary Council of Social Agencies; but no effective contribution has been made. It is doubtful whether the Board realizes the value of the Council of Social Agencies as an instrument for community and social action. For example, problems of the aged and of housing have been noted as major community problems in Calgary. They have directly affected the work of the Bureau. These problems have been frustrating to the staff. Internal policy has modified to some extent the service given by the agency to aged clients; but it is only limited since community resources are lacking.

The Calgary Council of Social Agencies is making a determined effort in this area and while the staff members of the Bureau are actively participating, the Board has failed to show interest.

In regard to housing, there is no active body taking a lead. This problem affects the Bureau perhaps more than any other and been found impossible to cope with. Here is a problem which the Board of Directors could give some leadership locally, either through the Council of Social Agencies or independently. There is no reasonable explanation as to why the Board cannot carry this responsibility as it should, but it is clear that the Directors are in need of further interpretation and direction from the professional staff of the agency.

The organization of a family agency requires vision and steadfastness of purpose and must attract the interest and co-operation of a

representative group of citizens in the community. The staff can only carry this to a limited point; it is up to the Board of Directors to completely fulfil this aim.

Provincial Welfare and the Community Chest

Earlier in this review attention was given to the lack of co-operation between the Provincial Department of Public Welfare and private agencies. In our modern communities, both public and private agencies exist side by side even though they may perform similar functions. In many communities both types of agencies carry on family social work and experience shows that a community benefits by having two types of agencies furnishing services and leadership in the family field. Each needs the other to round out its unique strengths. No social agency functions in a vacuum.

There are no family case work services provided by the Provincial Public Welfare Agencies anywhere in the Province of Alberta. It might be assumed that the provincial welfare authorities would welcome the opportunity to utilize the existing services of such family agencies as the Calgary Family Bureau. Unfortunately it is completely ignored with exception of insignificant communication.

This attitude was criticised by the Alberta Royal Commission on Child Welfare in 1947 and included in its recommendations that "the soundness of family casework be recognized and made generally available."¹ This recommendation has never been paid the slightest attention and it reflects the present thinking in provincial public welfare at present. In fact, all the recommendations of the Royal Commission have never, with

1. "Child Welfare in Alberta", Canadian Welfare XXIV (The Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, Ontario, January 1949) p.41

one exception, been acted upon and the standard of public welfare in Alberta remains at a very low level. The Calgary Herald, Calgary's most influential newspaper, comments editorially:

The Alberta Government has finally admitted that it wasted the taxpayers' money in 1947 when it called into being the Royal Commission on Child Welfare. That Commission which sat for more than a year hearing the most damning evidence against the standards of welfare service in this province, made 23 specific recommendations for the improvement of welfare policies....only one of these recommendations has been implemented....the handling of child welfare will remain in the poor state it was found to be in three years ago. How long will arrogance and negligence continue unchecked.¹

The editorial also says, "Family case work, recognized by all other social workers as sound, will continue to be ignored in Alberta."²

The concern expressed by this newspaper illustrates the feeling regarding the standard of provincial public welfare services in Alberta.

It is true that the public puts a government into office but the nature of Alberta's provincial politics assures the present government of continued office (which it has possessed for many years). Thus no changes can be foreseen in Alberta's public welfare programme. The inadequate service persists because the public welfare authorities perpetuate the antipathy toward trained social workers and their concepts.

So long as this attitude on the part of the government continues the Calgary Family Bureau will work under difficulty. It does, however, point to the Bureau's need for concern in improving its case work services. In doing so, it not only demonstrates the value of family case work to the community, but it also provides a comparative measure for the community insofar as standards are concerned. The government's stand should be added impetus to the agency and its Board of Directors toward maintaining

1. The Calgary Herald, March 27, 1952.

2. Ibid.

vigilance in community affairs.

The Bureau's relationship to the Community Chest should also be commented upon. It has been implied earlier that the Calgary Community Chest does not have an understanding of its member agencies' work. Nor does it make any attempt to gear the Chest budget to the member agencies' financial needs. This situation has created hardships and particularly in the case of the Calgary Family Bureau, as it is expanding with the inevitable mounting costs.

Interpretation to the Community Chest is a necessity but it is difficult since it has been unreceptive to date. The Chest appears to have two major concerns. First, conducting and planning its annual campaign for monies and second, control on the disbursement of funds thus accumulated. The campaign has always been conducted under the direct control of the Chest Board of Directors and member agencies do not participate to any extent. The only activity in which the agencies do engage to any degree is with publicity. However, the publicity of agencies services during the campaign suffers from a lack of integrated effort. It is therefore only once a year that member agencies meet with the Chest and then only to discuss publicity. This has never taken more than one meeting.

The Community Chest maintains a good deal of indirect management over the agencies through its control of finances. The lack of understanding in the part of the Chest has created a situation where it has no real appreciation of agencies' financial needs. It is also difficult to have agency budgets increased.

The Chest stresses the fact that it does not try to control or manage member agencies since they have their own Board of Directors.

In practice, however, there is a very definite regulation. For example, the Calgary Family Bureau wished to re-allocate some of its funds toward its new service of Psychiatric Consultation. This was not a request for funds and it did not increase costs. The Budget Committee of the Chest turned the request down with no explanation. This refusal was given in spite of the Bureau's Board of Directors indicating the need for such a service. On an appeal, the Budget Committee clearly indicated they saw no need for such a service but finally agreed to a small allocation, with the stipulation that no expenditure in excess of this amount could be budgetted for in the next two years.

The above should demonstrate the difficulties facing the Calgary Family Bureau. In its own community there are two powerful agents which present obstacles to its growth and development. It is challenging to the agency, in spite of the frustration, to pioneer in the Calgary community. In the past its work could be understood in part; for such services as material aid are tangible. Case work is intangible and difficult to interpret but the Bureau can and must demonstrate its worth in order to survive as a family agency.

The Need for Research

If we agree that the Calgary Family Bureau is an organized family agency, its future can only be safeguarded by continual study and evaluation. In other words, research should be considered since research method and case work have the same general goals. Throughout this review no reference has been made to research and as such we must conclude it is not yet part of the Bureau's programme. The agency has reached the stage of examining and evaluating its case work service only in terms of

supervision, staff conferences and staff meetings. It needs awareness of the fact that only research will assist in solving the specific professional problems of the agency. The Calgary Family Bureau, however, is still in a period of early growth and it must extend and improve existing methods of evaluation, such as supervision before embarking on more ambitious research projects. In comparison to other family agencies, the Bureau does not need to be too concerned since research is actually in its infancy with the best of family agencies. Nevertheless if the agency is to progress it must be aware of the need for research and this includes an extension of internal evaluation.

The Future of the Agency

Family service agencies today generally state their major purpose as that of fostering healthy family life, particularly by offering case work services. Usually a further stated purpose concerns the stimulation and promotion of social thought and action for the betterment of the family. Significantly, however, this purpose is always secondary to the purpose of case work. The fact that the family agency has emerged with its major purpose that of rendering case work service should not be taken as an argument that family agencies ought not to engage in social action. In fact, the social needs we see through the practice of case work become our even greater responsibility, for who can better bear testimony to what we discover in our daily practice? 1

This above quotation would seem to be excellent comparative measure for the present status of the Calgary Family Bureau. It has demonstrated that its major purpose is the fostering of healthy family living by offering case work service. While it has not yet arrived at the period in its growth where it can rightfully command recognition as a force for social action in the community there are indications that this will come. More important, it has its focus on the improvement of its case work services in

1. Robert F. Nelson, "Suggested Principles for Social Action in the Family Agency", Highlights, Vol. XI., (The Family Service Association of America, Albany, New York, December 1950) p.145.

order that through this media the community will be better served with the ultimate social action as a concomitant. Only by stressing this major purpose can the secondary purpose of community responsibility become a reality.

Board members grow in awareness, and as they see the forces and the results of case work service they will be able to take hold. "The activity of board members is a unique experience in learning, through the dynamic instrument of the agency."¹ In other words board membership is a growth experience as necessary as agency growth and the two go hand in hand.

As a final conclusion it can be said that the Calgary Family Bureau is a family service agency in fact, as well as in name. It has achieved the position of being able to carry out the case work function of a family agency and is at the threshold of being able to carry out the second purpose of community social action.

At the same time it requires the vision and steadfastness of purpose. It must attract the interest and co-operation of the citizens of the community. Its continued establishment must be based on community needs and the conviction that these needs should be met by providing the best professional services available, and according to the best standards developed in the field.

Social institutions, of which the family agency is one, must always be on the alert that the traditions they develop are progressive and subject to change as circumstances outmode methods, structure, and knowledge. The fundamental purposes of the family agency are broad and firmly embedded in the needs of peoples and communities.

1. David E. Tanenbaum, "Broad Meanings of a Family Casework Program," Highlights Vol. XII (The Family Service Association of America, Albany, New York, June 1951) p.81

The family agency has a responsibility to its community, and beyond that to the field of family social work as a whole. The services, experiments, and social discoveries of a family agency may enrich the practices of another agency or make a real contribution to all family agencies and their clients. The interchange of ideas and experiences with other family agencies is a stimulus to the growth of the participating agencies.

Communities need social services just as they need health, educational, and public utilities services. Among the case work agencies that provide social services, the family agency occupies a central place of importance. A well-organized family agency offering an effective case work service under the auspices of a board and with the support of socially minded citizens will enrich family living in a community.

In spite of all the progress that has been made, the world has not yet discovered the ultimate formula which will wipe human misery from the earth. Indeed, as the complexity of modern living increases, the difficulty of individual adjustment to family and community life steadily grows. Although man's inner struggles and problems are at the base much the same today as they were a hundred years ago, the problems of society are, if anything, more formidable, and affect a far larger segment of the nation.

If we are to build a sounder, more able people, capable of dealing with the world of today and tomorrow, the work of understanding the individual and helping him to help himself must go on. So long as men, women and children at our very doorstep are finding life insupportable, there can be no armistice in the war against the forces of social maladjustment. New areas in human welfare need to be explored. To meet these challenges, and trying to work shoulder to shoulder with other organizations large and small, the Calgary Family Bureau looks to its future and its duty to the Calgary community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Frontiers in Human Welfare, The Story of a Hundred Years of Service to the Community of New York, 1848 - 1948. The Community Service Society of New York, New York, 1949.

Seventy-Five Years of Service - To Families in Buffalo and Erie County, 1877 - 1954. The Family Service Society, Buffalo, New York, 1952.

McLean, Francis H. and Ormsby, Ralph. Organizing a Family Agency. The Family Service Association of America, New York, 1944.

Watson, Frank Dekker, The Charity Organization Movement in the United States. New York, The MacMillan Co., 1922.

Reports

Annual Report of the Calgary Family Bureau for the Year Ending December 31, 1945. The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, 1946.

Annual Report of the Calgary Family Bureau for the Year Ending December 31, 1946. The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, 1947.

Annual Report of the Calgary Family Bureau for the Year Ending December 31, 1953. The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, 1954.

Annual Report of the Council of Social Agencies of Calgary, for the Year Ending December 31, 1943. The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, 1944.

Annual Report of the Council of Social Agencies of Calgary for the Year Ending December 31, 1944. The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, 1945.

Annual Report of the Community Chest of Calgary for the Year Ending December 31, 1940.

Health and Welfare Services in Western Canada. Condensation of an Institute for Board Members and Volunteers, The First Biennial Western Regional Conference on Social Work, Regina, Saskatchewan, April, 1947.

Survey of the Private Community Welfare Services in the City of Calgary. The Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, Canada, December, 1944.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Articles

Byington, Margaret F. "The Pioneer," The Family, Journal of Social Case Work, Vol. XXVII., March 1946.

Canadian Family, The Family Welfare Division, The Canadian Welfare Council. Ottawa, Canada, Vol. II., No. 7., April, 1952.

"Child Welfare in Alberta," Canadian Welfare. The Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, Canada, Vol. XXIV., 1949.

Nelson, Robert F. "Suggested Principles for Social Action in the Family Agency," Highlights. The Family Service Association of America, Albany, New York, Vol. XI., December, 1950.

Tanenbaum, David E. "Broad Meaning of a Family Casework Program," Highlights. The Family Service Association of America, Albany, New York, Vol. XII., June, 1951.

Newspapers

The Calgary Herald, March 27, 1952.

Letters

McKillop, D.A., July 17, 1954.

Slater, Mary, May 23, 1954.

Slater, Mary, June 7, 1954.

Unpublished Material

Minutes of the Executive Committee, The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, September 27, 1940.

Minutes of the Executive Committee and Convenors of Committees, The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, December 13, 1940.

Minutes of the Executive Committee, The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, September 8, 1941.

Minutes of the Annual Meeting, The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, February 6, 1943.

Minutes of the Executive Committee, The Calgary Council of Social Agencies, Calgary, April, 1945.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Unpublished Material

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, May 11, 1945.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, June 26, 1945.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, June 4, 1946.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, October 11, 1946.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, December 4, 1946.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, December 13, 1946.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, May 20, 1947.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, The Calgary Family Bureau, Calgary, March 23, 1948.