

THE FAMILY WELFARE BUREAU OF GREATER VANCOUVER

Its Origins and Development, 1927 to 1952

by

ROBERT JAMES GORDON MITCHELL

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

1952

The University of British Columbia

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

School of Social Work

ABSTRACT

The Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver has now been in existence for twenty-five years, and it is the purpose of this study to trace its development from its origins in the recommendations of the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey of 1927, to the present day.

Material for this purpose was collected from the minutes of the Executive Board of the Bureau, 1927 to 1952; the annual reports of the Director for the same years; personal interviews with the Director and other staff members; other related records and literature of the agency; and numerous pamphlets and publications of the Family Service Association of America. This latter body is a standard-setting association of family agencies to which the Bureau has belonged from its inception.

In the course of its life, the agency has been faced with many unforeseen difficulties, the more drastic of these being the depression years of the 1930's and the war years of 1939 to 1945. These two periods of economic and social stress are reflected clearly in the workload of the agency, and it would have been understandable had this new organization strayed from its original objective, which was to do family casework. An appraisal of the work of the Bureau shows clearly, however, that: (1) it has filled a definite need within the overall framework of agencies in the community, and (2) it has steadfastly maintained its original purpose of providing family casework services. In addition, (3) it has constantly striven to improve its standards of professional competence, and (4) it has followed the traditional role of private agencies in experimenting in the provision of new services. The record also indicates that, even though the community is showing increasing acceptance of casework services, continued and careful studies will have to be made to determine the most effective way of interpreting to the public, on which the Bureau depends for its financing, the meaning and value of these non-material services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Evolution and Founding

The changing nature of the family. The objectives of social work. The Charity Organization Movement. The British Columbia Child Welfare Survey and some of its recommendations. The founding of the Central Welfare Bureau.

Chapter 2. The Depression Years - 1929 to 1939

Re-activating the Social Service Exchange. Development of the Council of Social Agencies and the Welfare Federation. The meaning of Federation to the Bureau. The impact of the depression. Non-resident families. The Work-Relief Scheme. Establishment of the Visiting Homemaker Service. The work-load of the Bureau during the depression.

Chapter 3. The War Years - 1939 to 1945

Legal Aid. The outbreak of war. The increase in financial assistance. The need for budgetting services. International problems. The Dependents' Board of Trustees. The closing years of the war. The work-load in the war years. Fee charging.

Chapter 4. The Post-War Years

Financing difficulties. The decreases in staff and services. Homemaker Service for "T.B. families". The "unemployed employables". Effects of housing shortage. New immigrants. A review of the work-load. Forecast of future developments.

TABLES IN THE TEXT

	Page
Table 1. Families receiving services from the Family Welfare Bureau, 1928 to 1939.	27
Table 2. Families receiving personal service and relief, 1928 to 1939.	29
Table 3. Proportion of servicemen's families to civilian families, 1939 to 1946.	40
Table 4. Relief cases, 1939 to 1946.	41
Table 5. Amount of relief, 1939 to 1946.	43
Table 6. Families receiving personal service and relief, 1946 to 1952.	54
Table 7. Trends in caseloads, Family Welfare Bureau, 1931 to 1952.	56

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge the assistance and patience of Miss Mary McPhedran, Executive Director of the Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver.

THE FAMILY WELFARE BUREAU OF GREATER VANCOUVER

CHAPTER 1

EVOLUTION AND FOUNDING

In the not so distant past, the family--the basic institution of our society--had much greater self-sufficiency than it has today. The typical family embodied the joint enterprise of its members; the children worked at helping their parents and were soon an economic asset; many of the necessities of family living were produced at home, such as food, clothing or fuel. In his family the child received his chief and perhaps his only education. In religious observances and in social activities the various members of the family united, from the oldest to the youngest.

The modern family, however, is quite different. Its character has been altered radically by the economic and social changes of the last century and a half. Many aspects of family life which centred formerly in the home are now taken care of by people or organizations having little direct connection with the particular home. For its bread or for its entertainment, the family today tends to depend on outside sources. The family's most important function now, apart from providing the necessities of life for its members, is to provide them with the atmosphere of affection and support that promotes their fullest development. This function, always implicit in family life, by the

deletion of these other factors has become the major force in maintaining family unity. Too often this function is performed inadequately. This fact, along with an expanding knowledge of the reasons for human behaviour, has brought the family under the close examination of doctors, psychiatrists, sociologists and social workers.

The latter group is one of the newest professions interested in the problems that arise within families. The wider objectives of social work have been stated as follows:

"Reduced to a simple statement this enormous area can be compassed within two major fields and two major objectives of social work, namely, economic well-being or a health and decency standard of living, and satisfying social relationships. Probably all professions would state an interest in these objectives, but there is little doubt that social work occupies a particularly inclusive position in regard to both. For the social worker the problems involved in economic well-being and social behaviour are usually interwoven. It is this essentially dualistic relationship which consistently has shaped social work and given it its distinguishable if not yet wholly distinctive pattern." ¹

From this statement, it may be seen that the problems which people bring to social agencies may be divided, for the most part, into those arising from the environment of the individual, and those arising within the person himself, or they may be a combination of both. The former problems--"environmental"--are usually alleviated by the social worker utilizing specific resources available within or to the agency. Granting of financial assistance, obtaining housing, providing food or clothing, giving legal advice, are

1. Hamilton, Gordon - Theory and Practice of Social Casework
New York, University Press, 1944, page 4.

some examples of environmental help to an individual or family. This service often tends to be material in nature, though not necessarily so. The other major class of problems--"psychological"--demands that the social worker try to help the individual understand his problem and mobilize himself to effect an adjustment.

Early relief giving agencies operated on the premise that, if a family's basic necessities were provided for, its problems were well on the way to solution. Gradually, experience showed that economic need was often not the real problem complicating family life. It was recognized that a person might have as many problems within himself as without; psychological problems could be every bit as serious as environmental ones. This change of attitude led to the growing science of social casework, the knowledge and principles of which were, to a great extent, developed in the family agencies. It has been defined thus:

"Social casework consists of those processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously effected--between men and their social environment." ¹

In the light of this definition, social casework may be seen as a process which develops an individual's personality by helping him make better social adjustments.

While certain techniques and principles of casework are particularly appropriate for those persons whose problems are, in the main, psychological, it is important to note that principles of casework are inherent in any contact or interview

1. Richmond, Mary E., What is Social Case Work? New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1922, page 268.

with any client regardless of the problem with which he comes to the agency.

Family Social Work

Family social work has as its main focus the family as a social unit of primary importance to the individual and to society. The family is seen as that basic unit wherein the individual has the opportunity of developing as an individual and as a member of a group.

Most family agencies have at least these two purposes:

"1. To provide a skilled casework 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

In practice, these two purposes usually mean that the family agency today must be prepared to deal with a wide variety of problems, and such an agency has been described as: "...the place to which persons may come for help with problems of family and personal relationships, help with the achievement of educational objectives, working out parent-child relations, marital adjustments, financial and vocational planning, health needs, and similar matters." ² This is a far cry from the "charity" agency of bygone days, which aimed mainly at meet-

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

2. Ibid., p. 1.

ing economic need.

Charity Organization Movement

The background of the Family Welfare Bureau lies in the Charity Organization Movement, which began in London, England in 1869. At that time in England, there were numerous voluntary organizations devoted to relief-giving and to charitable work in general. The multiplicity of these charitable organizations often resulted in overlapping of services and waste of funds. The Charity Organization Society of London, while being a further attempt to alleviate the sufferings of needy families, was fundamentally an organization whose main purpose was to co-ordinate the work of the other voluntary agencies. In this respect, it was a new idea. A co-ordinating agency such as this made for continuity and stability in work with these families. This in turn encouraged an increased study of the causes of poverty. Knowledge gained could be passed on to successive persons.

Of equal importance was a new approach to helping people which was exemplified in the words of Edward Denison, one of the founders of the "C.O.S.":

"No man may deliver his brother, he can but throw him a plank." ¹

This is the idea of self-help, which is basic to social casework as practiced today. This idea of self-help, combined with the growing belief that economic need was but one factor in many family problems, gradually developed the role of the "C.O.S." as a fam-

1. Watson, Frank Dekker, The Charity Organization Movement in the United States, 1922, New York, p. 58.

ily social casework agency. Less and less emphasis was placed on straight relief giving.

From England the "C.O.S." idea was brought to America, where the first agency was opened in Buffalo in 1877. Fifteen years later there were 92 Charity Organization Societies in the United States. In 1899 the first Canadian family agency was established in Montreal. It was called "The Charity Organization Society"; its function was "to co-ordinate local welfare services and to help the poor."¹

By the time the Vancouver Family Welfare Bureau was opened, ten other similar agencies had been established in Canada.

Child Welfare Survey

Vancouver, in 1927, was a progressive and busy city of some 120,000 people. There were a number of private social agencies and, like some other Canadian cities, a City Relief Department. Years before, different voluntary organizations had attempted to provide financial assistance to families in need of it, but in 1912 the city had accepted this work as its responsibility. Its standards were apparently good, for in 1923 the American Family Welfare Association, after surveying the quality of its work, included Vancouver in its directory. Thus a good foundation existed for subsequent development.

In 1925, the Rotary Club of Vancouver had accumulated

1. Canadian Welfare, January 15, 1949, The Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa.

\$25,000 to be used for community service. Various requests for assistance from the fund were made by social agencies in the community. In view of the amount of money available and the number of requests, the Board of Directors decided that a careful study should be initiated to determine how the money could best be used. A committee was established, and soon recommended granting \$10,000 toward the erection of a Preventorium for children with tuberculosis. In addition to this, their observations convinced them that the whole field of child protection needed further investigation by people trained in this field. After consulting the Canadian Council on Child Welfare, it was decided to have a comprehensive survey made of the whole field of child care and protection in British Columbia. Five service clubs agreed to underwrite the cost of the project. In addition to the Rotary Club, there were the Vancouver Kiwanis Club, the Vancouver Lions Club, the Vancouver Gyro Club, and the Harmony Service Club of Vancouver. The members of the survey team were selected by the Canadian Council on Child Welfare.

These consisted of Mr. R.E. Mills, Director of the Children's Aid Society of Toronto; Miss Margaret Nairn, Family Worker, Toronto; Miss J. Vera Moberly, Executive Secretary of the Infants' Home, Toronto; Miss Leila O'Gorman, Catholic Welfare Bureau of Toronto; and Miss Charlotte Whitton, at that time Executive Secretary of the Canadian Council on Child Welfare, Ottawa. Mr. Mills, Miss Nairn and Miss Whitton were especially active in making the survey, and particularly in encouraging the

formation of the new family agency.

The Survey team examined all the agencies connected with child care and protection in British Columbia. It found almost without exception that the only method used to deal with children in need of care was to place them in an institution. The report of the Survey stressed the fact that the natural environment of the child is the home, and that the goal of the agency in caring for the child must be to return him to the normal community life in which he would eventually be establishing his own home. How could he learn in an institution what good home life is like? The first effort of the agency, therefore, should be to keep the child in his own family setting; or, in cases where this was impossible or undesirable, to place him in a foster home approximating as nearly as possible what his own home should be.

This did not answer a more fundamental question: why did the child need care? In the majority of cases, it was because of some difficulty of conduct or relationship on the part of the adults of the family. However, none of the existing social agencies were doing any large amount of work with the families of the children in their care; nor did it seem desirable that they should divide their energies in pursuing this line of work, to the neglect of their own special fields.

As a background to all child care and protection work, therefore, the Survey team urged the development of a private, non-denominational, family agency to supplement and complement the work of the existing agencies. The Survey team's idea is

seen in the following statement:

"While the Survey has been primarily concerned with care and protection of children and hence especially with organizations formed to carry out this purpose, there is a service which is so fundamental to the carrying on of any social work with specialized groups, that some attention must be given to the facilities that exist for rendering this service. We have reference to family welfare work, family 'casework', to use a technical term." ¹

Another recommendation made by the Survey and relevant to this history was one stressing the need for co-operation amongst the various social agencies in Vancouver. Too often the Survey team had found one agency working in ignorance of the work of another agency with the same family. This meant waste of time and money; even more fundamental, it meant less benefit to the client, for the agency was not drawing on the past experience of the other agencies.

To fill this need the Survey report suggested the future formation of a Council of Social Agencies, a Financial Federation (i.e., Community Chest) and a Social Workers Club. The Council of Social Agencies would be a co-ordinating body made up of representatives of member agencies. It would provide a meeting ground where various agencies could discuss matters of common interest. The Financial Federation would provide for a co-operative collection of funds for those agencies who appealed to the public for their financial support. The Social Workers' Club would enable the individual workers to meet and exchange ideas and points of view arising from their individual fields. All these methods of co-operation would serve, ultimately, the inter-

1. Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey, 1927, Vancouver, p. 41.

ests of the individual clients.

Apart from these, however, the Survey report urged the immediate formation of a Social Service Exchange. This is "...a central card index in which is entered identifying data of each family 'registered' and also the name of any agency that registered as having knowledge of that family and the date it did so. It is a species of private directory accessible only to responsible people."¹ This central registry would enable an agency to learn whether a client had had any previous contact with another agency. If so, it could refer to the other agency for co-ordinated discussion around past or present problems. The greater the number of agencies using the Exchange, the more valuable it would become. The Survey report stressed the importance of the Exchange being in the charge of a worker familiar with various kinds of social work. It was felt that the family social worker would be the person best suited to this work.

It may be noted here that such an Exchange had been in operation in the City Relief Department, but had fallen into disuse, apparently because there had not been sufficient appreciation of the wider value of the Exchange. It had been thought of chiefly as a Christmas Exchange, and had been used as a means of co-ordinating "Christmas Cheer" work.

While urging the immediate reorganization of the Exchange, underwritten if necessary by some lay group in order to

1. Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey, 1927, Vancouver, p. 48.

get it started at once, the Survey report pointed out that the Council of Social Agencies, when formed, would be the logical organization to assume responsibility for operating the Exchange.

A number of specific recommendations were made to the individual agencies that came within the scope of the survey, but it is with these two that this study is most concerned:

"The Survey recommends that in Vancouver a non-denominational family case working organization be created to supplement the work of the excellent relief agencies and special services. In such an organization social adjustment and family rehabilitation would be stressed and material relief should be made as small an item as possible." ¹

"As a first step toward facilitating co-operation it is recommended that the Social Service Exchange be re-organized for continuous service as an autonomous agency, and that the possibilities of a Council of Social Agencies and a Social Worker's Club be kept in mind for future development." ²

The Formation of the Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver

In June of 1927 the Child Welfare Survey was published. The Survey members had felt so strongly the importance of the two recommendations just quoted that they made efforts of their own to interest local groups in the problem. Miss Whitton (the Executive Secretary) singled out the recently disbanded Auxiliary of the Vancouver General Hospital as a promising means of getting these projects launched. Mrs. J.B. Rose of the Auxiliary appealed to other members of her group and organized the first meeting to discuss how these recommendations could be realized.

1. Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey, p. 37.

2. Ibid., p. 38.

"There can be no question but that the credit for the initial efforts to launch this new activity belongs entirely to Mrs. J.B. Rose. Selected, as already mentioned, by Miss Whitton, Mrs. Rose undertook this effort with a determination that made failure an impossibility." 1

The first meeting was held on June 30th, 1927, in the Boardroom of the Metropolitan Building, Vancouver. Mr. J.H. Roaf presided; and, in addition to Mrs. Rose, there were present Mrs. E.S. Lee and Mrs. P.A. Wilson. They were addressed by Miss Nairn of the Survey team, who explained clearly and emphatically the need for both the private family agency and the social service exchange.

By October 12th, 1927 this group had increased, through Mrs. Rose's efforts, to thirty; it had made sufficient headway in its plans for a constitution to be presented and adopted on this date. Much work had been done in the intervening months. Leading visiting social workers had come to various meetings to discuss the operation and organization of private family agencies and social service exchanges in other cities outside of British Columbia. It had been decided to combine these two purposes in a single agency. Because this was to be a private agency--that is, one supported not by taxation but by philanthropic contributions--a major consideration was the financing of this new venture. The service clubs that had originally sponsored the Survey had been approached for their financial support. Some support

1 Strong, G.F., M.D., Early History of the Family Welfare Bureau

had been promised, but the committee had found that they must look elsewhere for the major portion of the funds. They were encouraged, however, by the promise of \$5000 by an anonymous donor, on the condition that they could raise a like amount. The selection of a name for this new agency had been another important step. The name, "Central Welfare Bureau", had been chosen, to reflect its dual function as a general welfare agency (in contrast with the specialized agencies then existing) and as a central registry.

At the meeting of October 12th, after the adoption of the constitution, the first permanent officers were elected. Dr. G.F. Strong, who had replaced Mr. J.H. Roaf as chairman after the first four meetings, was elected President. Major C.C. Owen became Vice-President, Mr. H.C. Hewetson was Honorary Treasurer and Mrs. P.A. Wilson Honorary Secretary. The Executive Committee was composed of Mrs. Bryce Fleck, Mrs. Edgar Lee, Mr. J.H. Roaf, Mr. Arthur Cowan, and Mr. J.D. Kearns. Mrs. J.B. Rose, now that she saw the project so well launched, declined to take office, though promising her fullest interest and support.

The constitution stated clearly that this agency was to be a non-sectarian charitable institution supported by voluntary subscriptions. Its objectives were to do family welfare work in Greater Vancouver; to maintain a Social Service Exchange for all social welfare organizations in Greater Vancouver and the surrounding districts; and to do such other welfare work as the Executive might consider advisable. A membership was to be developed with different classes of fees. From the membership would be el-

ected the Executive officers and these, with eleven other members, would comprise the Executive Committee. Meetings of the Executive Committee would be held monthly to deal with the management of the Bureau. The officers of the Bureau were to be elected annually at a meeting to which all members of the organization would be invited, at which the annual report would be given. The Director of the Bureau was to be appointed by the Executive Committee, and responsible to the Committee for the operation of the agency.

The choice of this Director was the next important step. The importance of obtaining trained social workers had been stressed in the Survey report. The Committee accepted this idea, but to obtain such a person they found they would have to go to eastern Canada. The selection demanded great care if the agency was to be launched successfully. By means of an Executive Committee member who was in Toronto, two prospective candidates were approached but they were not available.

The position of Executive Director was then offered to Miss Mary McPhedran, Supervisor of Family Work for the Neighbourhood Workers' Association, Toronto. This agency was a private one doing family work. Miss McPhedran at first declined,¹ but was

1 It is interesting to note that Miss McPhedran (still Director of the agency today) relates that she had been to Vancouver on a holiday in the fall of 1927, at the time the findings of the Survey were made known. Social welfare conditions in British Columbia seemed so depressing to her that she "...swore at that time that I would not come to Vancouver for anything." Later, when offered the position, she reconsidered and saw it as a challenging opportunity to pioneer family social work in Vancouver.

finally persuaded to accept the position. Meanwhile, the Executive Committee had secured office space in the Dominion Building. They continued to hear addresses by outside social workers, which informed and encouraged them in their project.

The new office was opened upon the arrival of the Director on February 15th, 1928. She was at once heavily involved in informing the community at large about the new agency, and in particular in contacting the various agencies in order to get the Exchange established. The Reorganization of the Social Service Exchange was the major effort at first. In addition, at the Director's first Board meeting she proposed membership in the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work (now the Family Service Association of America), a standard setting body for family agencies. This proposal was accepted, and membership was taken out.

The new Bureau received much favourable publicity in the newspapers. An exception was a lengthy article in The Morning Star of March 14, 1928 attacking the Bureau, chiefly on the ground that expensive "wise women from the East" were being imported to tell Vancouver how to distribute its 'charity money'.

Undeterred, however, the Central Welfare Bureau held its first Annual Meeting six weeks later, on April 23rd, and considerable progress was reported. Four agencies were using the Exchange, and over one hundred cards had been indexed. A stenographer had been hired and a car obtained. The Director had ad-

addressed several clubs and other organizations, informing them about the work of the new agency. She had also found time to give case-work services to ten families. It is significant that the problems they presented had little direct connection with relief, demonstrating from the very beginning that the new agency was filling a definite social need.

CHAPTER 2

THE DEPRESSION YEARS: 1929-1939

The major concern of the Central Welfare Bureau at first was the reactivating of the Social Service Exchange. The old Exchange, which had been operated and used solely by the Vancouver City Relief Department, had had as its main purpose the elimination of duplication amongst recipients of "Christmas cheer". The Survey Report had pointed out that it should have the much wider and more positive function of enabling the various agencies in the city to co-ordinate their efforts continuously to the greater advantage of their clients. It should, in short, be set up on a permanent basis.

The greater the number of agencies using the Exchange the more useful it would be, and much time was spent by the Director of the Bureau in explaining to the various agencies the working of the Exchange, and in enlisting their participation. By the year ending March 31st, 1929, twenty-two agencies were using it, with registrations increasing daily, which meant a constant increase in the work of operating the Exchange.

Accompanying this, and to a degree which surprised the Executive Committee of the Bureau, there was a steady increase in the family work of the agency. In addition to the work directly connected with the Exchange and with the family services, the Dir-

ector was invited to address meetings to publicize the objectives of the new agency, and was conferring with other agencies on matters of common interest. By September, 1928, less than six months after the agency opened, it became apparent that if the Exchange was to be developed properly without neglecting the family services, another worker would have to be employed. Trained workers were not plentiful in this community, and it was not until February, 1929, that even a part-time worker could be found. By the summer of 1929 a fulltime worker was finally secured, and in September, 1929, a second fulltime worker was employed.

In the meantime, as envisaged by the Survey, a Social Workers Club had been formed. Through this group the idea of a Council of Social Agencies was being developed. They aimed also at the establishment of some form of consolidated appeal to the public for financial support--in other words, a Community Chest. The Central Welfare Bureau actively promoted these projects, and anticipated that the Council of Social Agencies when formed would take over the Social Service Exchange, as recommended by the Survey.

The Vancouver Board of Trade was equally interested in some type of consolidated appeal. Together with the Social Workers Club it was instrumental in bringing to this city Mr. J. Howard T. Falk, then of the Montreal Council of Social Agencies, to give experienced direction to these projects. By January, 1930, a Council of Social Agencies was established, and plans were made for a Welfare Federation. The Welfare Federation was to make its first

campaign for funds in the fall of that year.

On April 1, 1931, the Council of Social Agencies assumed full responsibility for operating the Social Service Exchange. Historically, this meant that the Bureau, which had had its roots in a coordinating organization, had now transferred that function to others and was now a family agency in its own right. At this time also, the Welfare Federation began to supply the necessary funds for the operation of the Central Welfare Bureau. This lifted a heavy load of responsibility from the shoulders of the members of the Bureau Board.

The Meaning of Federation to the Central Welfare Bureau

Federation meant, primarily, an assured budget, and, equally welcome, a larger budget. For the first year of Federation, the budget of the Bureau was \$20,957; for the previous year the budget had been \$10,500. Even this had been secured with considerable effort on the part of the Executive.

Previous to Federation, the financing of the operations of the Bureau had often taxed the ingenuity of the members of the Executive. The new agency had been merely another competitor for funds to the public. Annual campaigns for funds had been held in 1928, 1929 and 1930, but financing had been a hand to mouth business at best, and overdrafts at the bank were not unknown. Full credit is due the members of the Board whose perseverance and resourcefulness secured sufficient funds in these first few years to carry on the work of the Bureau; and when the agency entered

the Federation it did so with a clean balance sheet.

With the departure of the Social Service Exchange, and at the same time freed from the pressure of financial uncertainty, the Central Welfare Bureau could, hopefully, devote itself to the growing demands of the family service work of Vancouver. For this reason, and to avoid confusion in the public mind with the new coordinating function of the Council and the Welfare Federation, the Executive of the Bureau decided that its name should be changed. In August of 1932, therefore, the name was changed to The Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver.

Family social work could now receive the attention that the Executive and staff of the Bureau felt it deserved. Significantly, however, the Annual Report of the year ending March 31st, 1931, mentioned for the first time a problem which was to have increasing importance for the work of the agency in the years to come: "...unemployment is the most frequent misfortune affecting people today." ¹

The Impact of the Depression

There had been a steady growth in the number of clients applying to the Bureau from the time of its opening, but 1931 saw the largest proportionate increase. In the year from April 1st, 1928 to March 31st, 1929, 173 families received some type of service from the Bureau; in the year 1929 to 1930, 296 families; but in the year 1930 to 1931, there were 636 families, or more

¹ Director's Report, Annual Meeting, April 27th, 1931.

than double the previous number. In addition to this, there was a constant increase in the number of families who required services continued from one year to the next. There was another substantial increase in the number of clients in 1932; significantly, over twice as many as in the year previous required material relief (see Table 2). Accompanying this increased demand for services came, in November of 1931, a budget cut. The proposed budget for 1932, which had been approved by the Welfare Federation, was cut from \$22,775 to \$18,000. Budget cuts were made chiefly in the form of salary cuts, and continued to be necessary until 1934.

At the same time, the caseworking staff had to be increased. On January 1st, 1932, there were four caseworkers; by the end of the year there were seven. This is the largest proportionate increase of any year in the history of the agency.

The increases in staff pointed up the need for larger office space, and in December of 1933 the Family Welfare Bureau moved to its present location in the Children's Aid Society Building. The increase in work on the North Shore had suggested the opening of a branch office there, but there was not enough money in the budget to permit this.

The depression threatened also the course in Social Service at the University of British Columbia, which had been established in the fall of 1929. The Director of the Family Welfare Bureau, who had lectured at the school since it opened,

along with others offered to lecture without salary, rather than have the school close.

Non-Resident Families

One of the more contentious problems confronting the Bureau in the early years of the depression was that of non-resident families. These were the families who had not been in a municipality or the province long enough to establish residence. While both the city of Vancouver and the provincial government had programmes of financial relief, neither was prepared to accept responsibility for the non-resident families. Many of these families turned to the Bureau for assistance. While the Bureau was not fundamentally a relief-giving agency, it was felt that help could hardly be refused some of these families. The Bureau could not afford this drain on its resources, however, and pressed the provincial government to accept this as a public responsibility. In such a time of general economic stress, it was necessary to establish firmly the line of responsibility between public and private agencies; and the Bureau was determined that its work as a family casework agency should not be submerged.

By January of 1933, the Bureau was helping non-resident families on the understanding that it would be reimbursed by the provincial government. But by May 13th, 1933, as no money had then been received, it was decided to notify the provincial government that the Family Welfare Bureau would not expend any more money for these families, and that all such applicants

would be referred in future to the provincial relief authorities. It was not until June that the first cheque, of over \$900, was received from the government. After this, the Bureau felt it could give financial assistance to these families where necessary, knowing it would be reimbursed. This meant a great deal to the staff of the agency, as the decision not to help these families had been a difficult one to make. The question of municipal and provincial responsibility in matters of relief was at last clarified by the passing of "The Residence and Responsibility Act", which did not take place, however, until the fall of 1936.

The Closing Years of the Depression

In April, 1935, at the Annual Meeting, Dr. G.F. Strong was succeeded as president of the Family Welfare Bureau by Mr. R.H. Tupper. While no one person can be given sole credit for the progress of the Bureau in these first difficult years, it is evident that his sustaining leadership from the very inception of the Family Welfare Bureau had played a major role in its success.

As early as 1931, the Family Welfare Bureau had felt that it would be valuable to have on its staff a Roman Catholic worker to work principally with families of that faith. In February of 1932, a Catholic worker had been secured. In 1935, however, a Catholic Family Welfare Bureau was established, and the Family Welfare Bureau was able thereafter to refer and transfer Roman Catholic clients to the new agency.

In 1935, the Family Welfare Bureau revived the project of opening a branch office in North Vancouver. The North Shore communities had developed their own Council of Social Agencies, and had requested the Bureau to open a district office there. The Welfare Federation of Greater Vancouver approved the necessary budget, and in February of 1936, the North Vancouver office opened, with a worker from the Vancouver office spending half time there. There was also, at this time, a request from Burnaby that the Bureau open a branch office there, but this project was postponed. It was felt that the local demand was not unanimous, and it was not the policy of the Bureau to thrust itself on a community. In the North Shore caseload, however, a steady growth indicated the need for a fulltime worker in the North Vancouver office, and in January of 1938 this was filled.

The Work-Relief Project

In 1938, there came a substantial increase in the amount of financial relief provided by the Bureau, as compared with the earlier years of the depression. In the year April 1st, 1936 to March 31st, 1937, for instance, 406 families received \$6,632 in relief; while in the year 1937 to 1938, 677 families received \$10,968 (see Table 2). This increase was a direct result of the Work Relief Project of the Vancouver City Relief Department.

The purpose of the Work Relief scheme was to get able bodied men off the relief rolls and on to public work projects.

When they had been transferred to work the case was closed as far as the City Relief office was concerned. The men's morale may have been improved by the activity, but the economic fact was that they received less money than they had on relief. The maximum a family could receive in relief was approximately \$68 a month. They could also get free medical care, and some clothing. The maximum the family could get from the Work Relief Project was \$44 a month, with no medical care or clothing. It had been difficult enough to budget on the relief allotment, but many families found it impossible to manage on the wages received from the Work Relief scheme. More and more of them applied to the Family Welfare Bureau for financial assistance to supplement their income. The Bureau found it was again being forced into the role of a relief-giving agency, to the detriment, it was felt, of its true function, which was to supplement the relief-giving agencies. At the same time, it was very difficult to refuse to help. The only solution for the time being was to request additional funds from the Welfare Federation to meet this emergency. The problem was not entirely solved until the war began, when the men began to enlist or to work in war production.

The Visiting Homemaker

In January, 1938, the Executive of the Family Welfare Bureau set up a sub-committee to consider the possibility of developing a programme of Visiting Homemakers. A Visiting Homemaker acts as a substitute mother in a home where the real mother is either ill or out of the home for some other reason. For

some time, the social workers of the Bureau had become increasingly aware of the serious problems that could develop in homes where the mother, for one reason or another, could not fulfil her responsibilities. Often the father, trying to handle extra medical expenses, could ill afford either to employ a housekeeper or to take time from work himself. A Visiting Homemaker meant that the family could be kept together; the children were not neglected; the mother's mind was at rest; and the father could get on with the job, and enjoy a good supper when he returned from work.

Often the Visiting Homemaker had only to fill in for a few weeks, but sometimes for an extended period of time; in some cases her chief object would be to train an older daughter to carry on for her mother. These Homemakers were paid by the Bureau at the current rate for housekeepers.

In March of 1938, the first Visiting Homemaker service was provided on an experimental basis. Later, a Home Economist was engaged to supervise this service, and by May, 1939, the Director was able to state in her Annual Report that the Homemaker service was filling a real need in strengthening family life. Six families had had the services of a Visiting Homemaker, and the service could have been extended to a number of others if the budget had permitted. Later, additional funds were obtained from the Federation, and more Homemakers were employed.

The Work-load and the Depression

The total number of families receiving the services

that the Bureau provided increased fairly constantly each year from 1929 to 1939, as shown in Table 1.¹ These have been divided into three groups:

1. Intensive care, which are those cases which have two or more personal contacts with the agency;
2. Short time care, being those cases which have less than two personal contacts with the agency;
3. Indirect service, comprising reports and investigations for other agencies in Vancouver and other cities.

Table 1 - Families Receiving Services from the Family Welfare Bureau, Vancouver, 1928 to 1939.

Year (ending March 31st)	Intensive Care	Short time Care	Indirect Service	Total Families
1929	68	67	38	173
1930	165	113	76	354
1931	261	416	137	814
1932	377	651	187	1215
1933	497	776	269	1542
1934	561	914	353	1828
1935	575	746	414	1735
1936	656	694	555	1905
1937	683	785	420	1888
1938	693	1206	534	2433
1939	672	1226	565	2463

It will be noted that there are three years when there

1. The figures and classifications are taken from the annual statistical reports of the agency, but were compiled in this manner for the purpose of this table.

were especially large increases in the total number of families receiving services: 1931, 1934, and 1938. In 1931, the depression was an undeniable fact, but the relief agencies had not yet organized themselves to meet the problem. As municipal and provincial governments considered what to do, families struggling with the problems of unemployment came in increasing numbers to the Bureau. In 1938, one of the principal factors accounting for the rise was the problem of non-resident families. In 1938, the statistics show the effect of the Work Relief project.

Within the total number of families, it will be seen that the number of cases receiving "Intensive Care" and cases of "Indirect Service" show a fairly constant growth. It is the number of cases of "Short time Care" which reflect the marked increases of 1931, 1934, and 1938. These families were seeking not intensive casework services but rather immediate help with a specific problem. It might have been easy for the Bureau to become "another relief-giving agency"; However, it never lost sight of its objective--to provide casework services to families, and to supplement the work of the existing relief agencies.

There seems to be clear evidence from the facts that, during these ten years, the main emphasis of the Bureau was on the provision of non-material services rather than on relief (Table 2). The classification in this table is as follows: ¹

1. The figures and classifications are taken from the annual statistical reports of the agency, but were compiled in this manner for the purpose of this table.

1. Total Direct Service, which includes only those families directly served by the Bureau, as distinct from those classified as Indirect Service in Table 1.
2. Personal Service Only, which were those families directly served by the Bureau who did not receive relief.
3. Relief, meaning the number of families receiving some form of material assistance from the Bureau.
4. Amount, being the total value in dollars of the material assistance provided to these families each fiscal year.

Table 2 - Families Receiving Personal Service and Relief, ¹
1928 to 1939.
(Direct Service Cases Only)

Year (ending March 31st)	Families Receiving			Amount (\$)
	Personal Service Only	Relief	Total Direct Service	
1929	106	29	135	\$ 496
1930	222	56	278	1,141
1931	525	152	677	2,002
1932	698	330	1028	4,326
1933	842	431	1273	7,600
1934	1031	444	1475	5,687
1935	929	392	1321	6,812
1936	941	409	1350	7,388
1937	1026	406	1468	6,632
1938	1222	677	1899	10,968
1939	1210	688	1898	12,012

1. The word "Relief" is used by the Family Welfare Bureau, although the term "Financial Assistance" is in general usage elsewhere.

2. To the nearest dollar.

It may be seen that there were substantial increases in the "Total Direct Service" cases in 1931, 1934, and 1938. This might be expected, from the factors discussed with reference to Table 1. These peaks coincide with those in the families coming for "Personal Service Only". In the "Relief" grouping, however, the peaks appear only in 1931 and 1938; in 1934, while there is a slight increase in the number of families receiving relief, the amount expended for relief is actually lower. It will be recalled that, with respect to the non-resident families problem, the provincial government had not only agreed to reimburse the Bureau for relief to them, but was beginning to assume some direct responsibility for them. These families show up, however, in the "Personal Service " column.

It is significant to examine not only the total number of families receiving relief and the total amount of relief provided, but also the average amount which each family received. In 1931, 152 families received an average of \$13.17 in financial assistance; in 1934, the average was \$12.80, and in 1938, \$16.30. Of course, some families would receive less, and others much more. Some families might receive money as part of the casework plan, which would continue over several months; others might be given a small amount of money to tide them over a weekend. However, the averages demonstrate that, even when the total numbers of families and the total amounts of financial assistance increased, the Bureau never attempted or desired to provide relief on anywhere near the same scale as the other relief agencies. The

manner in which the depression and its problems affected the actual workload of the individual caseworker is followed through in the concluding chapter.

The most important conclusion to be drawn from the facts assembled up to this point, is that this new agency not only had an increasing number of families coming to it for services, but that by far the larger proportion of these families were coming for non-material help, which was the main object in establishing the agency.

CHAPTER 3

THE WAR YEARS: 1939 to 1945

In 1939, the Family Welfare Bureau was still expanding its services. In January, 1939, at the request of the West Vancouver Welfare Society, a branch office was opened in West Vancouver, with a worker spending two days a week there, as the increased number of cases seemed to warrant it. Previously, these cases had been handled from the North Vancouver office.

In April of 1939, the Vancouver Bar Association set up a Legal Aid Committee to give free legal services to people who could not afford to engage their own lawyer. The Family Welfare Bureau had been approached to act as a clearing house for all referrals of civil action, and it was decided to undertake this for three months on an experimental basis. The Bureau's function would be, first, to determine the financial eligibility of the applicant, second, to consider the social aspects of the need for advice, and third, to determine the nature of the problem presented, and whether it could be dealt with by other agencies without recourse to legal action. This liaison between the Bar Association and the Bureau was experimental at first; there was no way of knowing how much work it would involve for the Bureau. It was felt that the service must be allowed to grow slowly until sufficient experience had been gained to permit a permanent

policy to be laid down.

This measured expansion was accelerated abruptly by World War II. "The request of a British naval reservist on September 1st (1939) for advice in planning for the family during his absence overseas brought home to us that, as an agency, we should have to adapt our programme to include work with soldier's families." ¹

Between September 1st, 1939 and March 31st, 1940, 253 families of servicemen came to the Bureau for some kind of help. It is significant that 137 of these needed financial assistance. This prospect was to be borne out in the months to come, and of the increasing numbers of servicemen's families who came to the Bureau for help, a large proportion required financial assistance. While some of these cases required help for special emergencies, in many cases the economic deprivations of the previous ten years left the family with no financial reserve to carry it until the first dependent's allowance should come through. The Family Welfare Bureau was constantly being called upon to provide funds to tide the family over. To meet this emergency, an extra allotment had to be obtained from the Federation.

This problem, which was really a carry-over from the depression, accounts for the remarkable fact that the Bureau's allotment for relief continued to increase right into the war

1. Director's Report, Annual Meeting, 1940.

years, and, in fact, reached its peak in 1941.

In addition to actual financial assistance, many of these families requested assistance in budgetting. As far as the Bureau's records show, this was directly attributable to the depression. They had been accustomed to small but weekly cheques; when the cheques were larger but arriving monthly, it was very difficult for many of these wives to make them stretch over the whole month. Along with this, it was difficult to resist purchasing many of the comforts the family had done without for so long. It was easy to get credit, and installment buying was alluring. Soon it was difficult to stretch the allotment to meet the various payments. Much of the Home Economist's time was spent working with these families over their budget problems. This was such a common problem that the Bureau found it necessary to discuss with Merchants Associations the desirability of being more careful in granting credit to servicemen's families.

The Bureau was soon concerned also with the increasing difficulty of locating suitable housing for servicemen's families. The transiency of service life, and, of course, the same factor in civilian families moving from one area to another in war work, brought more and more families to the Bureau for help in this matter. Often there was little that could be done to help the individual family, but the agency, along with other organizations, made every effort to focus public attention on this problem.

In November of 1939, the Bureau entered into an agreement with the federal government to make investigations for the Dependent's Allowance Board. This was the federal agency which distributed the allowance a serviceman made to his dependents. It was frequently necessary to check the validity of the allotment, especially for those which went to persons other than the man's legal wife. The Bureau agreed to perform these investigations for a small fee per case, filling in a four-page form and reporting on the situation. The Dependent's Allowance Board in Ottawa had the authority to continue or withhold any allowance, basing its decision on this report.

International Problems

New problems appeared thick and fast. In the summer of 1940, while the community was preparing for the arrival of evacuated British children, another group of children with their mothers were arriving from Britain. These became known as the "Overseas Families". Many had apparently decided to sail suddenly, and some had only nominal invitations from some friend or relative here.

Soon after they arrived, these families were placed in a very difficult position, when the new Foreign Exchange Control Regulations came into force in Britain. No money could be sent to them from home, though later a few exceptions were made, in exceptional circumstances. It was not possible for either their relatives or their friends to assume responsibility for these

families indefinitely. Many of them turned to the Family Welfare Bureau.

"...since no one over sixteen or under sixty, except returning Canadians and adults with children, was allowed to leave Britain, the chances for employment for these war guests was slim." 1

The Bureau was able to help in many cases with temporary financial assistance or personal counselling services to aid them in formulating a plan. To meet their financial needs, the Co-ordinating Council for War Work and Civilian Services (a wartime co-ordinating body in Vancouver) established a trust fund. It should be noted, however, that the problem of these families was not peculiar to Vancouver; the situation was so acute in eastern Canada that it was felt, for a time, by some social agencies and other individuals, that national action was necessary. Soon, however, there was a definite decrease in the number of families coming across, and those already over were gradually finding their feet. The Imperial Order, Daughters of the Empire established a trust fund for them, and by 1943, the problem of the "Overseas Families" was a thing of the past as far as the Family Welfare Bureau was concerned.

As might be expected, after the start of the war enemy aliens were finding difficulty in obtaining employment, and at the request of the Canadian Welfare Council, the Family Welfare Bureau agreed to act on a local committee with the Swiss consul in order to administer funds for the assistance of German nat-

1. Director's Report, Annual Meeting, 1941.

ionals. The job of the Bureau was to estimate the need of supplementary assistance, and to determine what form the assistance should take. Naturalized Canadians of German origin were also experiencing similar difficulties, and were turning to the Bureau for assistance.

While these tasks did not constitute a major portion of the work, they are indicative of the variety of extra war services which the Family Welfare Bureau was called on to undertake.

The Dependent's Board of Trustees

The amount of work involved in these tasks was comparatively light in comparison with that in doing the investigations for the Dependent's Board of Trustees. In 1942, the federal government established this wartime agency, which could authorize supplementary financial assistance to those persons or families receiving their cheque from the Dependents' Allowance Board. This, in effect, meant a "means test", but instead of setting up any new machinery of its own, the government utilized existing social agencies, both public and private, to carry out any investigations necessary to determine eligibility for additional grants of money. The Bureau was to be paid a set fee for each investigation made. They took on this work willingly, but without realizing the extent to which it would add to their work load. "D.B.T." became a very familiar term in the agency, as hundreds and hundreds of investigations were made. Some idea of the extra work involved in this wartime service may be gained

from the fact that between March, 1942, when the Board was established, and March, 1946, 10,170 reports were completed by the Bureau. The great majority of the families required this supplementary assistance for medical care, or for medical debts. It seems reasonable to assume, from available records, that this also was a carryover from the depression.

The Closing Years of the War

By 1943, the war had established a fairly definite pattern of work for the Bureau: while they were still wrestling with one major problem, another would come treading on its heels.

From the beginning of the war the Bureau had been working with the families of men who had enlisted; almost as soon, they began working with the discharged men. These were few in number at first, but, by 1943, there was a distinct increase in the number of ex-servicemen coming to the Bureau. Similarly, the problems of the "overseas families" were replaced by those of war brides getting their bearings in a new country. On the other hand, Legal Aid, which had been started experimentally, was functioning smoothly and was now an established service. In the Homemaker Service, sufficient experience had been gained to enable the Bureau to plan more carefully for it in Intake; the Homemakers were now regarded as members of the staff and were paid a monthly salary. Relief expenditures were declining substantially (see Table 5). The work for the federal government, however, continued to mount; in 1945, for example, over 4000

"D.B.T."s were completed, or almost as many as the total for the two preceeding years. It is worthwhile to note that in some of these cases, Homemaker service was provided, with the Board of Trustees paying for it.

For the first time in many years, therefore, the Bureau was not so entirely dependent on the Welfare Federation for financing itself; considerable revenue came from the federal government. This made budgetting a little easier, and made possible salary increases which were necessary to attract staff. Just as there were problems of work, so there were also problems of workers. Like many other organizations, the Family Welfare Bureau had difficulty in securing and retaining both clerical and professional staff during the war years. Heretofore, the Bureau had always been able to employ trained social workers only, but with so many social workers taking positions created by the war, it became necessary to hire untrained workers who were known as "case aides", to help cope with all this extra work.

The Work Load and the War Years

The extent to which the Family Welfare Bureau gave assistance to the families of servicemen is shown by the following table. There are four classifications in this group of "Direct Service" cases:

1. Civilian Families, being those individuals or families whose problem was not directly connected with war service.
2. Servicemen's Families, being those families with a principal member in one of the armed forces.

3. Total, being the total Direct Service cases.
4. Percentage of Service Families, being the percentage of the total Direct Service cases which were servicemen's families.

Table 3 - Proportion of Servicemen's Families to Civilian Families
September 1, 1939 to March 31, 1946. ¹
Family Welfare Bureau.

Year (ending March 31st)	Direct Service			Percentage of Service Families
	Civilian Families	Servicemen's Families	Total	
1940	1696	253	1949	13%
1941	1475	668	2143	31
1942	1156	737	1993	37
1943	834	2124	2958	72
1944	652	3005	3657	82
1945	631	3841	4472	86
1946	895	3580	4475	80

It will be noted that the number of servicemen's families increased rapidly, and by 1943, the great majority of the families coming to the Bureau were in this category. It was in the last year of the war that the highest proportion was reached, and the proportion continued to be very high even in the year after the war. There is a corresponding decrease in the number of civilian families, but it should be noted that the total number of "Direct Service" cases increased greatly during the war;

1. The figures and classifications are taken from the annual statistical reports of the agency, but were compiled in this manner for the purpose of this table.

it was not merely a case of civilians reappearing in uniform. Most of the "Servicemen's Families" were "D.B.T." cases, of course.

The war is commonly thought of as a time of full employment, but Tables 4 and 5 show that some time elapsed before this effect became apparent in the Bureau's figures for relief. The "Percentage" column is omitted, but otherwise the classifications are the same as for Table 3.

Table 4 - Relief Cases, September 1, 1939 to March 31, 1946 ¹
Family Welfare Bureau

Year (ending March 31st)	Relief Cases		Total
	Civilian Families	Servicemen's Families	
1940	701	137	838
1941	619	303	922
1942	535	212	747
1943	231	194	425
1944	129	150	279
1945	116	100	216
1946	115	167	282

These figures show clearly that 1941 is the peak year for relief. This may, at first sight, seem surprising; but it

1. The figures and classifications are taken from the annual statistical reports of the agency, but were compiled in this manner for the purpose of this table.

must be remembered that employment did not pick up fully until 1941, and in addition, many people had been affected by the new relief regulations introduced in September of 1940. At that time, the province ruled that all married men under forty years of age were to be taken off the lists. This change was made on the grounds of improved economic conditions, but many were unable to find work and turned to the Family Welfare Bureau.

Although the figure for "Civilian Families" is still high in 1941, it is principally the "Servicemen's Families" who account for the rise. Enlistments were high, and many families were awaiting the first allowance cheque. In addition to this, many of these same families had medical bills or other debts accumulated from the depression years, as was shown clearly in the "D.B.T." work. By the end of the war, figures for relief had dropped substantially, although there is a slight rise again in 1946. This comes in the "Servicemen's Families" category, due principally to problems created by discharge and rehabilitation.

As might be expected from the previous tables, the peak year for expenditure of relief was 1941 (see Table 5). This is due to the large increase, principally, in the amount going to the families of enlisted men. By 1944, there were relatively few people who were unable to secure jobs, and the total relief expenditure dropped sharply. This was the first time in ten years it had gone so low.

Table 5 - Amount of Relief, September 1, 1939 to March 31, 1946. ¹
Family Welfare Bureau.

Year (ending March 31st)	Civilian Families	Servicemen's Families	Total Amount of Relief
1940	\$ 14,745	\$ 1,590	\$ 16,335
1941	11,764	5,532	17,296
1942	10,551	4,893	15,444
1943	9,062	3,438	12,500
1944	3,823	1,793	5,616
1945	3,708	2,270	5,978
1946	2,573	1,443	4,016

It is interesting to compare these tables (4 and 5) with Table 2. In the midst of the depression, when there were large numbers of unemployed, the total number receiving relief and the total amount of relief provided through the Bureau was less than half the number and amount provided in 1940 and 1941, when most people considered the depression was over. It was not until 1943, and still more in 1944, that a really large drop occurs in the expenditures for relief.

There is no doubt that the work of the Family Welfare Bureau took on a new scope and meaning during the war years. It was not merely that the great majority of their clients were servicemen's families; these families were facing new problems.

1. Compiled from Family Welfare Bureau statistics, to the nearest dollar.

The family unit that had generally had a stable residence became a scattered and shifting group. Many mothers were trying to cope with growing children without the help of their husbands. To the Bureau, this meant that these people needed more help in maintaining normal living, since they were deprived of the stabilizing influences to which they had been accustomed formerly. Lack of adequate housing often added a further strain to family living; as time went on this problem became increasingly acute, and the staff of the Bureau promoted in every way possible community action on housing.

Employment opportunities during the war years lured many mothers out of the home. This presented two potential dangers: neglect of the children, and strain on marital relationships. For older people and pensioners, the increased cost of living presented many hardships, and it is noteworthy that, in spite of the pressure of extra work, the Bureau never lost sight of such groups as these. For the majority, however, the war helped to create an improved standard of living.

As might be expected, the staff was hard pressed to keep abreast of the work during these years. This reached its peak in 1941 as far as interviews were concerned, when an average of $12\frac{1}{2}$ staff members had over 18,000 interviews during the year. This, and other trends in caseloads, will be discussed later, in the concluding chapter. In addition to their heavy work load, staff members served on various committees concerned

with problems arising out of the war. Some of these were: Delinquency, Housing, Care of the Pre-school Child, Care of the Aged, Protection of Women, and the Family Court.

Fee Charging

It seems understandable that, during the closing years of the war, with employment at its peak, the question of fee charging began to be considered by the Bureau. In 1943, the Director had been able to report to her Board that an increasing number of clients were expressing a desire to pay for the counselling service which they had received. It was known that some experiments in fee charging had been carried on in other family agencies in the United States. The Bureau decided at this time, however, that the idea of charging a "fee for service" was one which would require careful study, insofar as it was historically contradictory to the philosophy of the "charity movement". The clients who wanted to pay were encouraged to make their contribution to the Community Chest. The idea was not discarded, but it was some time before a definite policy was established by the Bureau.

Because of its war service programme, the Family Welfare Bureau was better known in the community. In addition to this, the federal government using the Bureau for its work brought a new clientele to the agency, and by 1945, although extremely busy, the agency seemed to be able to take matters in its stride. It was in this year that they foresaw, not only the

end of the war, but also "a postwar slump". The difficulties of rehabilitation of the discharged servicemen were anticipated, as well as the big question of the whole readjustment that the community would be making to a "civilian life".

CHAPTER 4

THE POST-WAR YEARS

The depression of the 1930's, and the war years following it, had created many hardships. The former had been a time of distressing economic conditions, and many were the demands made upon governments to take action to relieve matters. Relief schemes of various types were established, but the provinces felt that the federal government should be the body to assume chief responsibility, insofar as it had much wider powers of taxation. That the federal government had resisted doing so is well known, but in the next few years, under the necessity of conducting a "total war", it was to assume more responsibility for controlling the economic life of the country than it had done heretofore, and did it with the general approbation of the citizens. The war had undoubtedly wrought many personal hardships and had created much personal distress, but in spite of this the standard of living had improved. For the first time in years, many people had economic security, which was directly attributable to wartime conditions.

In addition to this, the prosperity of the war years had encouraged the federal government to introduce such constructive pieces of legislation as Unemployment Insurance and Fam-

ily Allowances. There was also the extensive veterans' rehabilitation program, which meant that another fairly large segment of the population was being assisted by the government. In this province, social legislation had been revamped to afford more comprehensive services. It is not surprising, therefore, that in 1946 the annual report of the Family Welfare Bureau was entitled: "The Government is Doing It! Why the Family Welfare Bureau?" The answer to this is one that had been especially apparent in the depression years; however carefully a regulation is drawn up, it cannot allow for all situations. There is always the problem of the individual whose circumstances are not covered by the legislation. It is the private agency, with its greater flexibility, that can help these people. Furthermore, the Bureau was a specialist in family problems, and could apply its knowledge and experience in a way that public agencies could not. This was particularly true of the public agencies, which in spite of their broadened programmes, still tended to concentrate on meeting financial need.

The work that the Bureau had been doing for the federal government did not cease abruptly with the ending of the war; in the work-load of 1946, a large proportion of the cases were still servicemen's families (see Table 3). By the end of 1946, however, this work had been completed, and, of course, the revenue from it came to an end, which in 1946 alone had amounted to \$10,000. This meant that the Bureau was again dependent principally on the Community Chest for its financing. The com-

munity, evidently, was not too ready to resume the responsibility of supporting the Chest campaigns. One of the first features of the post-war years, as far as the Bureau was concerned, was the necessity of making drastic cuts in their budget. In the fall of 1946, just as the income from the federal government was ceasing, it became apparent that the proposed budget from the Chest for 1947 would have to be cut by \$11,500, from approximately \$76,500 to about \$65,000--approximately the amount the Bureau had received from the Chest for the 1946 budget.

Reductions both in staff and in services had to be made in order to balance the books. From a peak staff of 20 caseworkers in 1946, the staff was decreased to an average of 17½ workers during 1947. A further reduction was necessary in 1948, when the Chest campaign again did not meet its quota. Since that time, there has been an average of 16 workers employed annually by the Bureau. The limitations imposed by these budget cuts were not wholly detrimental; the fact that they had to accept a smaller number of clients meant that they were able to give them more intensive service.

The Homemaker Service

By the end of the war the value of the Homemaker Service had been amply demonstrated. In addition to the personal value of keeping the family intact, it had been found that it was actually less expensive to provide homemaker service than to place the children in foster homes, in families where there

were two or more children. It had been found that its most valuable use was for short-term, emergency cases. Long-term cases not only tied up the Homemakers, so that the Bureau was unable to meet emergency needs, but proved too great a drain on the agency's budget. The provincial agencies had recognized the value of the service to the extent that they were agreeable to paying 80% of the cost for those receiving public assistance, although Vancouver city could not see its way clear to paying the remaining 20%. The necessity for budget cuts in 1947 meant that the Bureau could not afford to take any more long-term cases unless payment was assured, or the whole Homemaker programme would be endangered. These long-term cases were usually those where the mother had tuberculosis. It was decided, therefore, that as of January 1st, 1947, no more applications would be accepted for this service from "T.B. families" unless full payment was guaranteed. The Metropolitan Health Committee was particularly interested in the work with the "T.B. families" who were not in receipt of public assistance, and in March, 1949, the Committee was instrumental in obtaining a federal grant to be used in paying for Homemaker service from the Bureau for "T.B. families". The grant was made on an experimental basis, and continued until 1952. Today, however, this extra money is no longer available, and it has again been necessary to limit the work with these families. The problem of financing Homemaker service for long-term cases is still unsolved.

Other Post-War Problems

An old problem which reappeared in a new form was that of the "unemployed employables". The depression was not so long

concluded but that the agency could feel alarmed at the increasing numbers of these people. Families were again turning to the Family Welfare Bureau for assistance, and in 1947 they were alarmed to find that much of the time of the Intake worker was being taken up with applications for unemployment relief. During the depression, it will be recalled, the municipal and provincial governments had accepted responsibility for these cases, but they were now taking the position that this should be a responsibility of the federal government. The Bureau found that, if it gave any of these families temporary assistance, the municipal and provincial authorities were simply encouraged to refer more cases to them. With their reduced budgets, the Bureau could not assume this added expense, and they were determined not to show even tacit acceptance of the responsibility. Finally, in November, 1948, the Bureau had to decide that no more relief would be provided to these families, unless there were very exceptional circumstances. At the same time, they were using every means to emphasize to all levels of government the need for action on the problem. They have continued to press for a solution, but today the federal government has not yet accepted this responsibility, and the "unemployed employable" is still a social problem.

While the "unemployed employable" problem appeared after the war, in the question of housing it was a case of a bad situation getting worse. The serious housing shortage had

grown progressively worse during the war years, and immediately after the war the influx of returning servicemen anxious to establish their own homes further aggravated the problem. The dangers that bad housing present to family living is illustrated in the following statement from the annual report of 1947:

"Breaking up families seems too costly a way of dealing with the housing shortage, but unless the whole community presses for a low cost housing scheme, the family social workers are fighting a losing battle in their efforts to prevent family breakdowns in too many otherwise stable situations." ¹

The Bureau cooperated in every way possible in promoting low cost housing schemes and urging community action, and in supplying data to organizations interested in housing. While various housing projects have alleviated the situation to some extent, the agency is still aware of it as a serious problem.

Two other problems that seem to characterize the immediate post-war years come under the heading of recent immigrants. Many of these had difficulties in finding suitable jobs, and, even more than other people, were at the mercy of the housing shortage. The agency did what it could with the individual problems, but they also urged the authorities to make a more careful screening of prospective immigrants to ensure that they would have sufficient resources to maintain themselves until they got their bearings, and to see that they were more adequately informed of conditions that they would encounter in this country.

1. Director's Report, Annual Meeting, 1947.

A special group was that of the "overseas wives" who had married Canadian servicemen. In the majority of these cases, the problem was one of marital difficulty.

The sense of united effort that had permeated the community during the war years had more lasting effects for the social agencies; a feature of the post-war years was a greater sense of cooperation amongst them.

A Review of the Work-Load

The work-load of the Bureau has changed considerably in the past twenty-five years. The most interesting post-war development is the sharp decline in the total number of Direct Service cases (see Table 6). The figures for 1946 are included for comparison, when the cases still included a large number of servicemen's families. By 1947, the agency was again on a "civilian" footing, and also, it will be recalled, their reduced budgets made it necessary to be more selective in the number of cases accepted. After the sharp drop in 1947, the total "Direct Service" cases continue to drop, but more gradually. The classification in this table is as follows:

1. Total Direct Service, which includes only those families directly served by the Bureau, as distinct from those classified as Indirect Service in Table 1.
2. Personal Service Only, which were those families directly served by the Bureau who did not receive relief.
3. Relief, meaning the number of families receiving some form of material assistance from the Bureau.

4. Amount, being the total value in dollars of the material assistance provided to these families each fiscal year.

Table 6 - Families Receiving Personal Service and Relief from the Family Welfare Bureau, 1946 to 1952. ¹
(Direct Service Cases Only)

Year (ending March 31st)	Families Receiving			Amount (\$)
	Personal Service Only	Relief	Total Direct Service	
1946	4193	282	4475	\$ 4,017
1947	2217	218	2435	7,543
1948	1742	193	1935	5,558
1949	1472	186	1658	3,449
1950	1434	207	1641	3,802
1951	1355	155	1510	4,417
1952	1206	198	1404	5,679

The "Personal Service Only" cases have shown a steady decline, but the indications now are that they have levelled off. Likewise, the figures for relief, apart from the striking rise for 1947, continue to remain at about the level they have been since the later war years (see Table 5). This rise in the amount of relief in 1947 seems, in part, due to the "unemployed employables" who were turning to the Bureau for assistance.

There has also been considerable change in the size of

1. The figures and classifications are taken from the annual statistical reports of the agency, but were compiled in this manner for the purpose of this table.

2. To the nearest dollar.

the caseloads of the individual workers, and these are examined in Table 7. The classifications in this table are as follows: ¹

1. Average Workers Monthly, being the average number of caseworkers employed each month over the year.
2. Average Active Cases Monthly, being the average of the monthly totals of active cases.
3. Average Active Cases per Worker, which is the average number of active cases per worker per month. This is computed by dividing column (3) into column (1).

It will be seen that Table 7 begins in 1931, when the Bureau was relieved of the Social Service Exchange and became a family agency exclusively. The first striking feature here is the steady decrease in the size of caseloads (see column 4). These were very high during the depression, but as the Bureau was able to increase its staff, the loads went down. Even during the war years, when the number of families increased to numbers never before experienced, caseloads generally declined. The sharp drop following the war was mainly the result of the end of the wartime work for the federal government. Combined with the drop in caseloads over the years has been the steady increase in the size of the staff. From 1931, when there were 3 workers, the staff grew at an average rate of more than one per year, culminating in the peak staff of 20 in 1946. This meant an increase of 17 workers in 15 years. During the years 1931 to 1939 inclusive, the average staff was 7 plus. During the years 1940 to 1946 inclusive, this was doubled to an average of 15 plus. In the last six years the average has been 16 workers.

1. The figures are taken from the annual statistical reports of the agency. The classifications are those of the F.S.A.A.

Table 7 - Trends in Caseloads, Family Welfare Bureau, 1931 to 1952.

Year (ending March 31st)	Average Workers Monthly	Average Active Cases Monthly	Average Active Cases Per Worker
1931	3	190	63.3
1932	4½	296	64
1933	6½	425	65.3
1934	7	475	67.8
1935	8	470	58.7
1936	8	493	61.6
1937	8½	527	62
1938	9½	688	72.4
1939	10	585	58.5
1940	11	650	59
1941	12½	697	55.7
1942	13	648	49.8
1943	15	803	53.5
1944	18	851	47.2
1945	19	825	43.4
1946	20	827	41.3
1947	17½	509	29
1948	15½	474	30
1949	15	392	26.1
1950	17	397	23.3
1951	16	375	23.4
1952	15½	368	23.7

One might well wonder how the caseloads of the Family Welfare Bureau compare with those of other family agencies. The best yardstick here seems to be the Family Service Association, to which the Bureau has belonged from its inception. Recently, the Association made a comprehensive survey of trends in family agencies for the years 1936 to 1950 inclusive.¹ As far as caseloads are concerned, it is only since 1946, that the Family Welfare Bureau has approached the caseload of the median F.S.A.A. agency.²

Although it is not the purpose of this study to examine the qualitative aspects of the family casework,³ it is worth noting, in comparing Table 7 with Table 6 and Table 2, that in 1934, 7 caseworkers were handling 1475 Direct Service cases, with an average of 67.8 active cases per month; whereas in 1952, there were 15½ workers handling 1404 cases, with an average active caseload of 23 per month. This is indicative of the changing proportions of the types of problems that clients bring to the Bureau. The Bureau has always been actively working with problems of personal adjustment, but in the years around 1934, it is understandable that a large number of clients were chiefly concerned with environmental problems. In contrast, in the years since the war, "psychological" problems--those of personal and

1. Shyne, Ann W., Operation Statistics of Family Service Agencies 1950, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1950.

2. Based on Family Welfare Bureau statistics.

3. For this see Calnan, Wilfred M., The Effectiveness of Family Casework, University of British Columbia, 1948.

family adjustment--have been forming an increasingly large part of the work-load. These are a more time-consuming type of problem. There has likewise been an increase in the number of office visits, as compared with the number of home visits. Here again, the Bureau differed considerably from other family agencies. For the years 1936 to 1950, the median F.S.A.A. agency did 69% of its interviews in the office and 31% in the homes.¹ For the same period, the Family Welfare Bureau did 53% in the office and 47% in the homes.¹ In the past two years this has changed, and the Bureau is now doing more office interviews and less home visiting. This also ties up with the fact that more intensive work is being done, wherein it is considered better social work practice for the client to come to the office. The larger amount of home visiting done previously would seem to be a reflection of conditions during both the depression and the war, but especially the latter, when there was the tremendous load of work for the federal government which required home investigation.

An event which occurred in January of 1947 is of more than passing interest. It had been at her first meeting with the Executive Board that the present Director had proposed and got membership in the then Family Welfare Association of America. Throughout the years, the Bureau had received a professional nurture from this body that was sustaining to it in almost every facet of its work. The Association is a standard setting body

1. Based on studies made at the Family Welfare Bureau.

which is constantly guiding the direction and scope of the work of its member agencies. As a medium of exchange, it enables its membership to keep abreast of current developments in the family welfare field.¹ However, the Canadian Welfare Council was assuming more responsibility in this field, and it was decided, therefore, that commencing January, 1947, there would no longer be any direct membership in the Family Service Association of America, as it is now called. The Canadian Welfare Council was to pay the F.S.A.A. for services and consultations on behalf of Canadian family agencies. The Family Welfare Bureau of Vancouver was anxious, however, not to lose its association with the F.S.A.A. Pacific Northwest Region, and necessary arrangements were made for the regional F.S.A.A. representative to visit the Bureau periodically.

The Past and the Future

In the past twenty-five years the Bureau has given case-work services to over 33,000 families. When the agency was first opened, most of these clients were referred to it by other social agencies in the community, but of recent years almost fifty per cent of the clients have been coming of their own initiative, or have been referred by friends or relatives. In short, the agency seems to have taken root in the community. While it is not the purpose of this study to make a critical evaluation of the Family Welfare Bureau, nor to compare it with similar agencies elsewhere, but

1. The F.S.A.A. supplies its member agencies, which are autonomous, with a voluminous literature on every aspect of family welfare work. Wherever relevant to this study, this literature has been consulted.

rather to trace its development, nevertheless certain questions do present themselves as we survey the agency today and consider its future.

Firstly, how can the Bureau attract more male workers? It has always had some male students, and male workers have been employed periodically since 1940. However, at the time of this study, there is only one male social worker out of a total staff of fifteen (including the Director). As more and more husbands and fathers are being interviewed, thus increasing the number of male clients, the value of having male workers on staff is recognized. But not all male workers want to work in a treatment setting; many prefer a field where there are more opportunities for administration, and, equally important, where there are more attractive salary schedules.

It will be recalled that, from its inception, the Bureau has insisted on professional training for its staff, and with the exception of the war years, when case-aides were utilized, every one of the caseworkers has had at least one year of professional training. Furthermore, out of the present staff of fourteen workers, seven have completed their second year of training, and many of those with only one year's training have taken further courses. In addition, every effort has been made to have staff members attend professional conferences. It is worth noting, too, that the Bureau gives financial recognition to the value of this second year in the form of a higher salary scale. It was during

the depression years that the first worker with an M.S.W. (Master of Social Work) joined the staff, remaining for several years. The Bureau does not appear to have suffered from the characteristic of transiency that seems to be such a feature of the social work profession. As of March 31, 1952, the average length of service of the fourteen workers was 5.1 years. This includes three workers who have had one year or less, and does not include the Director. This has made for continuity and stability. The best example, of course, is the Director, who is now in her twenty-fifth year of service. This stability has been combined with a willingness to change policies to meet changing needs and to utilize new knowledge of social work practice.

The problem of retaining good workers brings up the larger question of financing. The Family Welfare Bureau now has an annual budget of around \$100,000, and the greatest proportion of this is devoted to salaries. Although financial remuneration is not the only factor in attracting and retaining staff, it is still evident that the Bureau has a problem in not being able to match the salary schedules offered by some of the public agencies.

A member of the Executive Board has always acted as business adviser for the Bureau, but considering the size of the budget, its probable continued growth, and the fact that the time the Board member can devote to this work is necessarily limited, the question arises whether it might be advantageous to hire a paid business adviser, even on a part-time basis.

The Family Welfare Bureau is dependent for its financing almost entirely on the Community Chest. It has, however, access to a number of trust funds which can be made use of in special cases. In 1947 it was asked by the Women's Auxiliary (Vancouver) to the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada to administer their welfare fund accumulated during the war. A trust fund of \$10,000, it was to be used to assist families of members of the regiment, and later a similar fund was established for educational purposes. Two years later, the Bureau agreed to make any necessary investigations in Vancouver for the British Columbia Youth Foundation. This is another fund that has been established in the province for the purpose of assisting students in continuing their education. In addition to this, the Bureau has access to a number of other benevolent funds which are available to help returned servicemen.

Generally speaking, though, the Bureau is dependent on the success of the annual appeal of the Community Chest. The objectives of these appeals have become larger each year,¹ and the Bureau receives one of the larger shares of the funds collected. At the same time, there is the trend toward more tax-supported welfare services. It is important for the Bureau to keep the public informed as to what it is doing, and why such an intangible service requires its continued support. A continuing problem for the agency, therefore, is the need for good public relations. At

1. The objective of the 1951 campaign of the Community Chest was just over one million dollars.

F.S.A.A. conferences in 1950 and 1948 the Bureau was awarded first and second prizes respectively for public relations activities. Understandably, the agency must keep in mind the number of clients it can serve most effectively and intelligently, and therefore its public relations will be aimed primarily at winning public understanding and support rather than at building a large clientele. In the past, the private agency has tended to depend to a large extent on its Board and membership to interpret its work. Is it time for definite research on this whole question of public relations, and the most effective methods of developing goodwill?

Evidence of the Bureau's willingness to welcome research is not hard to find. In the last three years, for example, three theses have been completed using the work of the agency as the focus of study,¹ and the School of Social Work has specifically sent students there on research placements. With the guidance of the F.S.A.A., certain aspects of the Bureau's work have been evaluated by the staff; but these people are primarily caseworkers. Is it possible for them to give sufficient attention to such problems of research as, for example, the value at this time of a casework rating scale, or the possibility of improving

1. Burch, Gwendolyn, Supervised Homemaker Service in a Vancouver Family Agency. University of British Columbia, 1951.

Carscadden, Lillian, An Evaluation of the Client-Worker Relationship. University of British Columbia, 1951.

Gilchrist, Margaret, Homemaker Service for Tuberculous Mothers. An analytical study of Family Welfare Bureau cases. University of British Columbia, 1952.

the statistical record? While the Bureau is aware of such trends as having more clients from higher income groups, or more male clients, these two points do not show up statistically. Would it be worthwhile, also, to study the need for an organized follow-up of cases, in order to determine more accurately the effectiveness of the work done? Fee- charging, of which mention has already been made, is another matter that will require further continued study. During 1948, data was collected in an effort to come to a decision on this question, but it was some time before the Board could be convinced that the agency should charge any fees. It was not until October, 1951, that it was decided to establish fee charging as a policy, on an experimental basis. Today, there is a schedule of fees established, and clients are informed that they may pay or not, as they choose; but the amount of money collected has been small, and cannot be regarded as a reliable source of income as yet. At the same time, some other family agencies, notably in the United States, anticipate that the fee-for-service might, in the near future, be based on the actual cost of the service and not as a nominal charge. Is the staff of the Bureau, and the community, ready for this?

In the preventative field, there is the whole matter of family life education. On different occasions members of the staff have taken part in pre-marriage and marriage counselling courses, but the amount of work to be done in this area is very large. Could these activities be increased? Would it be possible, for example,

to organize regular pre-marriage counselling courses, perhaps charging a fee? Could the Bureau foster child-study groups for parents? Many might be glad of an opportunity to benefit from the experience and training of the agency staff. Such questions as these suggest the use of a research consultant. A well-qualified person could give objective leadership and guidance in studying these and similar problems.

In the near future, it may be necessary for the Bureau to plan for being open in the evening. Their North Vancouver office has been staying open one night per week for the past year. Is it time now for the Vancouver office to establish this practice, for the benefit of those who could not visit the agency at any other time? There is also the problem, of which the Bureau is acutely aware, of inadequate office accommodation. The agency has never had sufficient space, and yet interviewing facilities as well as office efficiency would seem to demand that some changes be made.

Another important question is that of the future relationship of the Family Welfare Bureau with the Children's Aid Society. Here we have two large agencies in the same building and doing related work, but with separate offices, staffs, budgets and records. Apart from the saving that might be realized in labour and money, would not the fact that the work of the two agencies is fundamentally complementary suggest the possibility of amalgamation? There is an example of this close at hand, in Victoria, B.C.

That there is much to be done is something that the agency is well aware of. Since 1946, it has been utilizing the provincial psychiatric clinics for consultation, but the Bureau sees the need for greater psychiatric services, for adults as well as for children. They will also continue to make use of the casework consultant, whom they have had since 1948. The Bureau will still be serving as a training ground for students. It will still be necessary to press for action on housing, better social legislation to cover the aged, the chronically ill, and the unemployed employable. As a family agency, all of these problems are part of their daily work, similar in some ways to that of the public agencies, but yet so different in emphasis. The public agencies, for the most part, still concentrate on meeting material needs; the Family Welfare Bureau offers help to those whose need is in the intangible realm of interpersonal relationships.

Because its work is principally with the family, the Bureau is in a unique position to be aware of the social and economic pressures affecting this institution. The agency also knows that, because of the changing nature of these pressures, that they must always be prepared to adapt themselves to new knowledge and to recognize new needs.

Which way will the Bureau turn next? It is difficult to predict; the answer may lie in a statement made by the Dir-

ector in her first annual report in 1928:

"One cannot predict just what the course of the...Bureau will be, for like all other journeys, its route will depend upon the inter-play of the vast network of human activity....The private family agency has significant contributions to make but these are all influenced by the functions of other social agencies and by all community activities....This will mean that the family welfare movement will never leave the stage of 'arriving' because of the changing nature of society itself."

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Work of Family Agencies

- Hamilton, Gordon, Theory and Practice of Social Casework. New York, University Press, 1944.
- Richmond, Mary E., What is Social Case Work? New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1917.
- Watson, Frank Dekker, The Charity Organization Movement in the United States, New York, 1922.

Records and Reports

- Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey, Vancouver, 1927.
- Minutes of the Meetings of the Executive Committee of the Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver, 1927 to 1952.
- Annual Reports of the Executive Director of the Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver, 1928 to 1952.

Articles and Pamphlets

Much of the relevant literature for this study was published by the Family Service Association of America, 122 East 22nd Street, New York, N.Y. Of particular interest are the following publications:

- McLean, Francis H. and Ormsby, Ralph, Organizing a Family Agency, New York, Family Service Association of America.
- Report of the Committee on Current and Future Planning, New York, Family Service Association of America, 1946.
- Highlights, New York, Family Service Association of America, February, 1942, April, 1949, and April, 1952.