

Industrial Efficiency, Social Order and Moral Purity: Housing Reform Thought in English Canada, 1900–1950

Sean Purdy

Volume 25, numéro 2, march 1997

Special Issue on Housing

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1016069ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1016069ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Purdy, S. (1997). Industrial Efficiency, Social Order and Moral Purity: Housing Reform Thought in English Canada, 1900–1950. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 25(2), 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1016069ar>

Résumé de l'article

L'article trace l'évolution de l'idéologie qui a permis la réforme du logement au cours de la première moitié du vingtième siècle. Il fait une analyse critique des idées et des méthodes mises en œuvre par un certain nombre de réformateurs et d'organismes clés qui y ont participé. Le mouvement pour l'amélioration du logement se fondait sur les croyances de la classe moyenne en la nécessité de l'intervention de l'État et en la capacité des experts dûment formés à atténuer les conflits sociaux. Il était centré sur une conception de la « communauté » qui transcendait ostensiblement le capital et la main-d'œuvre et visait l'harmonisation des relations sociales pour le plus grand bien de la nation. À cette fin, on mit l'accent sur l'amélioration des conditions de logement des travailleurs dans le but d'accroître la capacité de production de la main-d'œuvre. Toutefois, l'attention portée à la qualité physique des habitations des travailleurs était également liée à l'objectif idéologique plus global de renforcer la famille nucléaire, pierre angulaire de la nation et de l'État pour les tenants de la réforme. Le discours de ces derniers était centré sur le rôle de la réforme du logement en tant qu'élément d'un projet plus vaste, soit assurer le consensus social en stabilisant la structure familiale et en contribuant à l'édification d'une identité nationale distincte. Les progressistes voulaient que l'État intervienne dans le domaine du logement afin d'atténuer l'impact de l'industrialisation et de préserver la coopération de classe et la hiérarchie sociale. Toutefois, sans négliger l'importance de cette pression régulatrice distincte venue d'en haut, il faut expliquer comment les experts en logement et les décideurs ont réussi à louver entre les contradictions de la société urbaine d'une manière créative qu'ils considéraient eux-mêmes comme plus ou moins désintéressée.

Industrial Efficiency, Social Order and Moral Purity: Housing Reform Thought in English Canada, 1900–1950

Sean Purdy

Abstract:

This paper traces the evolution of reform ideology in the housing sphere in the first half of the twentieth century by critically analyzing the ideas and practices of a number of key housing reformers and agencies. Premised on middle-class beliefs in the necessity of state intervention and the capacity of the trained expert to alleviate social conflict, the movement for housing betterment centred on a doctrine of 'community' that ostensibly stood above labour and capital, aiming to harmonize social relations for the greater good of the nation. To this end, stress was placed on bettering the physical conditions of workers' dwellings in order to improve the productive capacity of the labour force. But the concentration on the physical quality of workers' homes was also tied to the wider ideological goal of strengthening the nuclear family — a cornerstone of the nation and the state in the estimation of reform-minded citizens. The role housing reform could play as part of the larger project of securing social consent by stabilizing family structures and contributing to the construction of a distinct national identity constituted pivotal concerns in the discourse of the reform effort. Progressives aimed to extend state intervention in the housing sphere in order to allay the impact of industrialization and preserve class cooperation and social hierarchy. Yet without losing sight of this distinct regulatory thrust from above, it is also necessary to chart how housing experts and policy makers groped through the contradictions of urban society in a creative manner they themselves saw as more or less disinterested.

Résumé:

L'article trace l'évolution de l'idéologie qui a permis la réforme du logement au cours de la première moitié du vingtième siècle. Il fait une analyse critique des idées et des méthodes mises en oeuvre par un certain nombre de réformateurs et d'organismes clés qui y ont participé. Le mouvement pour l'amélioration du logement se fondait sur les croyances de la classe moyenne en la nécessité de l'intervention de l'État et en la capacité des experts dûment formés à atténuer les conflits sociaux. Il était centré sur une conception de la « communauté » qui transcendait ostensiblement le capital et la main-d'oeuvre et visait l'harmonisation des relations sociales pour le plus grand bien de la nation. À cette fin, on mit l'accent sur l'amélioration des conditions de logement des travailleurs dans le but d'accroître la capacité de production de la main-d'oeuvre. Toutefois, l'attention portée à la qualité physique des habitations des travailleurs était également liée à l'objectif idéologique plus global de renforcer la famille nucléaire, pierre angulaire de la nation et de l'État pour les tenants de la réforme. Le discours de ces derniers était centré sur le rôle de la réforme du logement en tant qu'élément d'un projet plus vaste, soit assurer le consensus social en stabilisant la structure familiale et en contribuant à l'édification d'une identité nationale dis-

tincte. Les progressistes voulaient que l'État intervienne dans le domaine du logement afin d'atténuer l'impact de l'industrialisation et de préserver la coopération de classe et la hiérarchie sociale. Toutefois, sans négliger l'importance de cette pression régulatrice distincte venue d'en haut, il faut expliquer comment les experts en logement et les décideurs ont réussi à louvoyer entre les contradictions de la société urbaine d'une manière créative qu'ils considéraient eux-mêmes comme plus ou moins désintéressée.

In the Autumn of 1910, Henry Vivian, British M.P. for Birkenhead and prestigious housing reformer, visited numerous Canadian cities to present a series of "illustrated lectures" on city planning and housing reform. Vivian's graphic description of slums and dilapidated housing conditions in the Old World surprised few listeners. Tales of squalid hovels with overcrowded 'inmates' breeding crime and moral degeneracy were commonly associated with European and, increasingly, American cities. What startled the sensitive scruples of Canada's social elite was Vivian's pointed depiction of widespread slum conditions in Canada. In a lecture in Ottawa, Vivian sternly noted that in most Canadian cities "less science and forethought are given to the care of human beings than a modern farmer gives to the raising of his pigs."¹

Vivian was not the first person to raise concerns about housing conditions in Canada. Moral reformers in the late nineteenth century had isolated the inferior state of working-class housing as one of the key social ills of Canada's burgeoning industrial cities. Yet there was still a sense of unease about the nature of the problem and the need for intervention in 1910 since Canadian cities, it was widely believed, had avoided the acute social problems of urbanization characteristic of Europe and the United States. Moreover, the view that active intervention by concerned citizens and the state was needed to solve economic and social problems was still the preserve of a few forward-minded intellectuals and labour movement activists. This all changed in the tumultuous years surrounding the First World War as the housing reform movement blossomed under the auspices of governments convinced of the necessity of solving the critical problems of poor housing conditions. Amidst widespread social unrest, governments were forced to act by establishing the first housing programs, setting the stage for the expanded social housing ventures which marked the post-Second World War era.

This paper traces the evolution of reform ideology in the housing sphere in the first half of the twentieth century by critically analyzing the ideas and practices of a number of key housing reformers and agencies. Premised on middle-class beliefs in the necessity of state intervention and the capacity of the trained expert to alleviate social conflict, the movement for housing betterment centred on a doctrine of 'community' that ostensi-

bly stood above labour and capital, aiming to harmonize social relations for the greater good of the nation. To this end, stress was placed on bettering the physical conditions of workers' dwellings in order to improve the productive capacity of the labour force. But the concentration on the physical quality of workers' homes was also tied to the wider ideological goal of strengthening the family - a cornerstone of the nation and the state in the estimation of reform-minded citizens.

The role housing reform could play as part of the larger project of securing social consent by stabilizing family structures and contributing to the construction of a distinct national identity constituted pivotal concerns in the discourse of the reform effort. Progressives aimed to extend state intervention in the housing sphere in order to allay the impact of industrialization and preserve class cooperation and social hierarchy. Yet without losing sight of this distinct regulatory thrust from above, it is also necessary to chart how housing experts and policy makers groped through the contradictions of urban society in a creative manner they themselves saw as more or less disinterested. As the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci insightfully put it: "The intellectuals are breaking loose from the dominant class in order to unite themselves to it more intimately."²

Responses to the Housing Problem Before 1914

The 'Housing Question' in Canada evolved out of the broader urban reform movement which emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.³ Middle- and upper-class reformers attempted to come to terms with what they perceived as an alarming rise in urban poverty, child neglect and crime - all regarded as corrosive influences on the social order. In the first decade of the new century, the residues of nineteenth-century social thought were still evident, as housing reformers stressed individual responsibility and moral virtue as the fundamental traits of social and economic well-being. However, explanations of the urban crisis usually began to combine these moral imperatives with distinct consideration for efficient living conditions which spoke to the widespread apprehension about the effects of poverty on economic performance and social harmony.

Housing first became a major concern in Canadian urban centres due to the increasing dangers of contagious diseases and 'immorality' which seemingly spread from the slums to more affluent neighbourhoods. Since infectious diseases could spread to the entire city there was a clear incentive for reformers to clean up the slums. As Paul Rutherford aptly notes: "Disease did not respect social standing."⁴ Squalid housing conditions were an important impetus behind the emergence of the modern public health project around the turn of the century. While most public health ideas at the time incorporated elements of both schools of current medical thought - environmentalism and eugenics⁵ - medical officials concentrated on the slum 'environment,' arguing that once these slovenly blots were removed the housing problem would vanish. In keeping with this ecological emphasis, dwelling inspections,

building standards and sanitary regulations provided the early groundwork for public health activity.

But there was a pronounced interest in eradicating the moral failings of slum dwellers as well. J.J. Kelso, the founder of the Children's Aid Society and an early advocate of housing reform, applied the metaphor of disease to the moral degeneration of the urban environment itself, likening the slum to a rotting community, a "perfect labyrinth of hovels."⁶ Social purity campaigns of the era and sensationalist critiques in newspapers and urban affairs journals were wedded to a traditional focus on moral depravity.⁷ A 1906 editorial in the *Toronto Daily News* indicates the emphasis placed on public decency: "...the Ward [a slum] constitutes a constant menace to the physical and moral health of the city. It is an open sore from which flow fetid currents which cannot but be corrupting to the whole community."⁸ The physical scarring of the city was linked explicitly to the slide into moral impurity, adding ideological ammunition to the reform crusaders' attempt to repair the social fabric of the city.

In the face of intense market competition, some manufacturers soon added their voice to the chorus of concern for the working-class housing problem. While partially couched in arguments about the moral consequences of substandard living conditions on workers, industrialists were more attentive to the threat to workplace efficiency that inadequate dwellings posed. Although they upbraided "rapacious landlords"⁹ for raising the costs of housing and thereby increasing the pressure for wage increases, employers hinted that blame lay beyond the sole responsibility of unscrupulous individuals. Presaging the later obsession with instilling efficiency in all facets of life, they discerned that there was a direct link between the factories and the homes of workers, a relationship that needed to be reinforced. "It is the best class of philanthropy that which results in raising the condition of our citizens and thereby increasing their efficiency," *Industrial Canada*, the organ of the Canadian Manufacturers Association (CMA), asserted in 1911.¹⁰ Bettering the housing conditions of the working class also promised to offset the spectre of class conflict. Recognizing that by improving home environments a healthy, contented workforce could be generated, sections of the business community joined reformers in calling for action on the housing question.

Since the family was to many in the upper classes the very wellspring of community life, early reformers often isolated the physical and moral effects of substandard housing quality on family life as a prime motive for action. The home in reform discourse was more than merely a physical structure; it reflected a widely held set of ideas about society, the family and women. Declining birthrates, the transformation of industrial production and women's increasing participation in the wage labour force prompted early reformers to focus upon the threats to the 'natural' role of women as mother and provider in the family home. Kelso echoed the sentiments of many in the reform community when he described the family home as the "foundation stone of the state."¹¹ The early domestic science movement aspired to fortify the mortar by applying rational techniques to

living in order to reinforce the 'proper' family form and enhance workplace efficiency. "Until women have learned the science of living and properly regulating the household expenditure in proportion to the income," one domestic scientist declared, "wage earners at least will be labouring under a disadvantage."¹² Improving housing aimed to ensure stable family arrangements free from the insidious influences of the city.

The responses of moral reformers, some far-sighted capitalists and even public health officials to the problem of working-class housing were usually based on superficial impressions gained from first-hand observations or lurid newspaper stories that exposed the racy underside of Canada's metropolises. The paucity of solid data on living conditions in the cities provoked observers to embark on detailed studies to ascertain the precise nature and extent of the problem.

In Montreal, wealthy manufacturer Herbert Ames published *The City Below the Hill* in 1897, a statistical examination of social conditions in Montreal's working-class west end. Ames's study charted incomes, rental costs, and housing density and types through survey and mapping techniques. Frequent comparisons to the European housing situation and the inclusion of model house plans reflected Ames's awareness of international conditions. In a vein characteristic of public health reform, he stressed the lack of proper sanitary facilities, insufficient sunlight and air, and constricted living space in working-class tenements which resulted in deficient public health and high mortality rates. Despite its limited precision, the study provided some hard data which reinforced the general impression that housing conditions were in need of substantial improvement.

Ames combined an essentially idealistic view of social reform with an empirical orientation on urban problems. He highlighted the necessity of "scientific knowledge," but advocated decidedly moderate philanthropic solutions based on his belief that the "business experience" of the upper classes should be rationally applied to urban problems.¹³ Where many of his contemporaries trod a fine line between environmentalism and individualism, Ames grasped the centrality of wider social conditions in the causes of urban degradation. He refuted the argument that "drink, crime or voluntary idleness"¹⁴ were the underlying factors behind urban misery. Still, moral regeneration loomed large in Ames's approach. He looked to the enlightened attitudes of philanthropists to solve the housing problem and disapproved of state intervention in the housing market. He shared the same concerns and assumptions of crusading journalists: the moral effects of overcrowding, the individual responsibility of tenants and landlords, and the essentially self-correcting tendencies of the economy. By providing minimal state assistance through sanitary regulations and the moral uplift of reform from above, Ames hoped to raise society as a whole: "Increase in ability to surround themselves with influences which improve the mind, morals and health of this part of the community means elevation for society from its foundations, whereby all above is also raised."¹⁵

Bridging the spiritually-based moralism of nineteenth-century social criticism and the scientific social analysis of the twentieth century was the Social Gospel Movement. Its primary reform component, the Social Service Congress of Canada, consisted of representatives from the Protestant churches, farm and labour groups, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. In the words of one its spokespersons, it concentrated upon "the impressive fact that in this civilized and Christian country both civilization and Christianity are challenged by the economic, industrial and social conditions upon which the fabric of the state is erected."¹⁶ The magnitude of social dislocation and the incapacity to achieve effective reform compelled a shift in emphasis to the wider social environment. In 1913 the Congress undertook comprehensive surveys of five urban and two rural areas throughout Canada. Attention was drawn in these studies to the problems of shoddy dwelling construction, inadequate sanitation, and the attendant moral decay, conditions which were particularly marked in the industrial cities.¹⁷ Social Gospellers' concern with social investigation demonstrates that the scientific bases of housing reform were beginning to overtake the individualistic and philanthropic inclination of early reformers, although they were still animated by traditional moral imperatives.¹⁸

For the majority of middle- and upper-class commentators, it was still convenient to attribute poverty and criminality to individual weaknesses rather than structural flaws in the economy and society. But, despite the limited restrictive solutions suggested to the housing problem, early housing reform responses should not be underestimated. The Victorian creed of the "inexorability of material and moral progress"¹⁹ and faith in individualistic solutions were gradually eroding in the face of palpable threats of class conflict and the recognition of the increasingly interdependent nature of modern society. So threatening were these social dislocations that *Industrial Canada* cautioned that: "Out of the slums stalk the Socialist with his red flag, the Union agitator with the auctioneer's voice and the Anarchist with his torch."²⁰ In order to stave off such conflictual social relations, as well as the menace to family life posed by women's changing role and the dilution of the emerging national identity by immigrants, reformers appreciated that some form of sustained intervention was required.²¹ The crucible of the First World War would accelerate the appeal of social scientific analysis, interacting neatly with a growing state prepared to intercede more directly in the housing question.

War and Society: Housing Reform from 1914–30

The drive for scientific approaches to urban difficulties began before the First World War but received a great boost during wartime as governments faced the exigencies of rapacious international economic and military competition. In the housing sphere, this was manifested in a heightened sense of urgency for state intervention, predicated on the belief that only a rational, state-supported approach to urban-industrial problems would offset the perils of economic crisis, labour strife, family dissolution and the dilution of 'Canadian' citizenship. It was in

this period of anxious reassessment of the country's social problems that the movement for housing improvement first blossomed. The years from the First World War through the early 1930s saw the establishment of a city planning profession with housing as a principal component and irregular but expanding government initiatives to improve national housing conditions.

The Commission of Conservation, 1909–21, was the first federal organization devoted to considering the afflictions generated by industrialization. It was commissioned in 1909 and charged with investigating the general field of natural and human resource conservation, collecting, interpreting and publicizing information, and advising on policy issues. The Town Planning Branch published a monthly bulletin, *Conservation of Life*, whose circulation reached 12,000 in 1917.²² The Commission also extended its activities into the academy, inaugurating lecture courses at the University of Toronto and McGill University in 1919–20. The stress on extensive publicity and education echoed the contemporary belief that enlightened public opinion would ensure effective action. Indeed, an appreciative article in *Saturday Night* on the eve of the Commission's demise, proclaimed that in the sphere of town planning it had "shouldered the burden of creating, so to speak, a national conscience."²³

The Commission's public health branch was first appointed to deal with housing issues. This is indicative of the concern with the environmental health aspects of housing hardship - sanitation and disease prevention. Traditional medical advice focused on personal hygiene, community sanitation and health education mixed with a hereditarian strain which viewed the corruption of the social order as a result of the biological inferiority of certain persons, especially immigrants. But the rapid and erratic economic growth of the period also brought to the fore the pressing issues of anarchic urban development and failures of the residential construction industry to provide adequate quantities of affordable housing. The new profession of town or city planning sought to fill the gap by promising a more wholistic approach to land development and housing. The masthead of the *Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada* concisely defined the profession's function as "the scientific and orderly disposition of land and buildings in use and development with a view to obviating congestion and securing economic and social efficiency, health and well-being in urban and rural communities."²⁴ As Martin Dauntton puts it, town planning strived to ameliorate the vagaries of unbridled free enterprise, introducing "order and discipline for the benefit of market forces by creating an agreed framework of debate for planners, developers, and politicians."²⁵

Public interest in town planning culminated in a decision by the Commission to seek a full-time advisor on town planning. Successful petitions to hire British planning expert, Thomas Adams, came from the CMA, the Canadian Public Health Association, the Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the National Council of Women, the Board of Trade of Hamilton and numerous charities. Adams was a noted planner associated with the British

Garden City Movement.²⁶ He was a prodigious writer, editing and writing much of *Conservation of Life*, and altogether publishing 139 articles from 1914–21 and a major book, *Rural Planning and Development: A Study of Rural Conditions and Problems in Canada*, that drew national and international acclaim.²⁷ Under the auspices of the Commission, Adams assisted in the creation of national and local Civic Improvement Leagues and successfully promoted the establishment of a national town planning organization, the Town Planning Institute of Canada.²⁸ Most of the provincial planning legislation of the period was either written or aided by Adams; he worked as a consultant to the Ontario Housing Commission and was instrumental in planning designs for the Halifax Reconstruction Commission and the Federal Housing program of 1918.²⁹ The Commission, under Adams's guidance, played a central role in providing ideological legitimation for the emerging theory and practice of town planning and helped promulgate its merits to a wide network of reformers, academics and politicians.

The *efficiency movement*, exemplified in the sphere of production relations by scientific management guru Frederick Taylor, was alive and well in Canada in municipal government and social welfare reform and was central to Adams's views on the housing question. "This is an age in which 'efficiency' is a great catchword," A.G. Dalzell, a former assistant to Adams, outlined in a 1920 speech to real estate agents. "Industrial efficiency, commercial efficiency, national efficiency and personal efficiency are terms constantly before us."³⁰ The war provided a solid impetus for emphasizing efficient home life. "As a result of the past three years experience," Adams noted in 1918, "we have been made to see very clearly the extent to which the output of war industries and the production of food depends not only on the organization of labour but also on the conditions under which the labourer lives."³¹ The Hydrostone scheme in Halifax was designed with this in mind: "To properly house the worker, to give him air space and light, pure water, and efficient means of transportation to his work, is merely exercising enlightened self-interest in the interests of our industries - for labour is the most costly and important factor in production, although it is frequently least considered."³²

The ambitious post-war drive for social and economic reconstruction punctuated the reform community's trepidation over intensified social conflicts. The National Industrial Conference (1919) and the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations (1919) both highlighted poor dwelling conditions as one of the chief causes of the working-class upheaval and recommended immediate measures to tackle the problem. CMA President Thomas Rodens warned his fellow manufacturers about the urgency of housing reform in 1918, stressing "it was that condition that brought about the downfall of Russia, the indifference of the guiding class to these conditions."³³ By war's end, housing reform was no longer considered a local issue of concern only to the poor but rather was seen as a major obstacle to the advancement of a industrial nation.³⁴ In his initial report to the Housing Committee of the Federal Cabinet in November 1918,

Adams underscored the critical demand for state intervention in the housing sphere: "We cannot have these things [social peace] if we hold hard to antiquated notions regarding the license to use the rights of property to the injury of mankind. Property has duties as well as rights."³⁵ Co-partnership schemes, a model of housing provision in which private investors and tenants would buy shares in a housing company, employing the combined revenue to build houses, would encourage cooperation and dissuade "socialistic ideas."³⁶ Uppermost in Adams's mind was the belief that the contending classes could be brought together in a cooperative alliance for collective national preservation.

Recourse to nationalism proved to be a helpful means of blunting the bruising social conflicts of the war period. As a ruling myth, nationalism strived to eclipse other social divisions, especially class, by positing an overarching national identity. Along with immigration controls, social policies proved a particularly convenient means of shaping the contours of the 'nation.' Social policies worked to define the boundaries of the 'national' working class by sanctioning a specific model of class structure - what constitutes a proper 'citizen' - and by attempting to mould social relations within the nation - what constitutes the proper behaviour of these officially defined citizens.³⁷ The discourse of housing improvement, along with its counterparts in other areas of social policy, assisted in cultivating the popular fiction of Anglo-supremacy and spreading the racist message that 'outsiders' were to blame for the country's problems.

The threat of 'race suicide' loomed large in the outlook of housing reformers as it did in all the social improvement campaigns of the era.³⁸ It was believed that the miserable health of the working class, most visibly demonstrated in the high failure rates in military medical inspections and the large-scale 'infiltration' of non-British immigrants, would jeopardize the future of the Anglo-Saxon 'race'. Neither was there disagreement that the physical, mental and moral state of the 'race' faced grave danger unless speedy action was taken. W. Struthers, a prominent public health official, expressed reformers' concerns succinctly: "Poor housing conditions, lack of light and ventilation, uncleanness, ignorance of proper care of the body and of the laws of health, unwholesome and improper food and drink, the prevalence of venereal and other diseases are rapidly producing a degenerate race."³⁹ Charles Hodgetts argued that temporary shantytowns on the margins of urban areas were becoming the "overcrowded permanent homes of a foreign population - hot beds of parasitic and communicable diseases and breeders of vice and inequity."⁴⁰ Such bigotry was extended to working-class British and American immigrants as well, revealing the new-found view that race degeneration stemmed partly from urban-industrial life. The distinguished psychiatrist C.K. Clarke regarded them as "failures at home, and are often so because of congenital defects. Their progeny may rise above their own level, but they never cease to suffer from their misfortunes of birth."⁴¹ It was not the wretched housing condi-

tions that immigrant workers had to endure that was isolated as the problem, but rather the immigrants themselves.

The construction of race was developed in relation to external economic and political pressures as well as internal conflicts. In an era of competing imperialisms, the menace posed by detrimental living conditions on economic and military capacity caused great apprehension among social commentators and policy makers. In an article entitled "Defective Children" Dr. Helen MacMurchy, a noted Ontario paediatrician and leading eugenicist, favourably cited British Prime Minister Lloyd George's admonition that "You cannot have an A1 army on a C3 population."⁴² Detailing the impressive housing schemes in the German city of Ulm, Noulon Cauchon, future president of the Town Planning Institute of Canada, argued that Canada needed to meet the challenge of the enemy: "Such is the efficiency of the enemy whom we will have to fight industrially after the war and reveals one of the reasons why he can compete so successfully — wherein he has learned to live efficiently and cheaply."⁴³ The influence of 'social imperialism',⁴⁴ in which social reform ideas were thoroughly permeated with imperialist assumptions, was striking.

Since the home was regarded as the basic unit of social organization, it was chosen as the chief site in the battle for 'Canadianization.' Racial and ethnic assumptions intersected with the dominant views of woman's role as nurturer of the 'race.' Henry Vivian spoke to a receptive Calgary audience, contending that: "the future of our Empire, the future of our race depends upon the preservation of those conditions that make for the retention and the strength of that individuality, and upon that our future really exists. The individual home, the individual family, the individual brought up in home, and the association of home life — upon that all our success depends."⁴⁵ "There is no more sacred word in the English language than 'Home'," Dr Charles Hastings, Toronto's Medical Officer of Health articulated, "and on the retaining of the sacredness and significance of our homes depends the future of our municipality and our Nation."⁴⁶

Home life was to be improved through programs directed at regulating the domestic labour of working-class and immigrant women, focusing on child-raising and household work. To social imperialists, as Anna Davin has shown, "population was power"⁴⁷ so motherhood needed to be placed on a scientific basis to ensure the continuance of the Anglo-Saxon race and to bring unhealthy immigrants up to scratch. If Taylorism pledged to increase efficiency in the labour process, domestic science vowed to 'modernize' daily home life. A properly kept, compact family home fitted with the increasingly common amenities of electric lighting, water, cooking appliances and indoor toilets offered a certain future, free from the vagaries of cramped, unsanitary lodgings.⁴⁸ It is likely that many reformers were motivated by genuine personal consideration for the casualties of industrial capitalism. But altruistic concerns are overshadowed by the vital effort to create a stable family unit comprised of fit and complacent workers which guaranteed the protection of the nation.

In tandem with the crude procedures of house inspections and condemnations, the emerging public health education project was utilized to instill the values of thriftiness, efficiency and 'Canadianness'. In 1911, housekeepers were hired by the Industrial Hygiene and Housing Division of the Toronto public health department to provide advice on "cleanliness, sanitation and Canadian methods of housekeeping."⁴⁹ Speaking of the Ward, Toronto's 'notorious' immigrant slum, Joseph Howes of the Bureau of Municipal Research, recommended that since the "majority of the residents are usually foreigners, often not speaking our language, not fully understanding our laws, and frequently without the Anglo-Saxon ideas of sanitation" the reform effort should be concentrated on the "the process of education and Canadianization."⁵⁰ With this attitude in mind, Charles Hastings sent out women sanitary inspectors to go into immigrant's houses to "teach them how to clean up and keep clean their homes and environments...Many of these people, by reason of birth and environments, have neither the moral stamina or the intellect to rid themselves of their vices and shortcomings."⁵¹ The process of racial 'degeneration' was believed to be best tackled by 'Canadianizing' housewives in order to equip families with the tools of citizenship needed to build a sound nation.

The favoured tenure choice in the project of protecting the sanctity of the family and nation was the single-family dwelling. All municipalities, Charles Hastings said, "must have a keen sense of the social and national significance of the term 'home' as being of one-family dwellings."⁵² Reformers had a keen sense of the benefits of the single-family dwelling since it promised to uphold stable family life in a manner consistent with the market economy. The promotion of house plans drafted to rationalize and improve women's domestic labour served a similar purpose and were evident in the housing designs of the co-partnership and government-sponsored ventures of the period. The proper single-family dwelling included well-designed facilities for domestic labour and suitable moral content in design through clearly-defined thresholds between bedrooms and between houses to ensure privacy. The social gravity of atomized family and domestic life in bourgeois reform thought was striking.⁵³ Housing improvement advocates joined social workers and maternal feminists to intervene in family life in order to maintain the family unit and protect motherhood, domesticity, children and, by extension, the nation.

The housing innovations that women's organizations urged centred on women's 'instinctive' role as mother and housewife. Mrs. Campbell MacIvor of the Women's Party petitioned the Ontario government in 1918 boldly contesting that: "Men have been telling us for years that women's place is in the home and now they have appointed a Housing Committee which is sitting up at the Parliament Buildings and there's not a woman on it."⁵⁴ Marjorie MacMurchy of the Canadian Reconstruction Association, accentuated "the need for women's brains and experiences in planning homes."⁵⁵ The Ontario Woman Citizen's Association wrote to Ontario premier Hearst demanding a part to play in housing policy, contending that: "It seems only reasonable that

those who are by nature and experience best qualified to advise on these points should be empowered to give other women the benefit of their wisdom at first hand."⁵⁶ The ideology of maternal feminism informed the political culture of the women's movement and their housing reform agenda as they aimed to extend the boundaries of women's sphere to the enlarged realm of 'social housekeeper.'

Despite the decline of the reform impulse in the 1920s, housing reformers could point to the First World War era as a catalyst which sparked the first comprehensive planning legislation, several co-partnership housing ventures and a national housing program. Moreover, the ideological and political precedents had been set for the recognition of the necessity of state intervention in housing provision. While some state involvement in the housing sphere was accepted, few of the intellectuals and philanthropists advocating housing progress saw the need to directly contradict the private market. The concept of the right to decent housing, whatever the fluctuations of the market, would have to await the crucial decade of the 1930s. Fewer still believed that capitalist society itself was responsible for the lack of decent shelter opportunities. It would take the most devastating economic crisis in the history of world capitalism and changing political conditions to advance beyond this limited outlook.

The Triumph of the Professional Houser: Housing Reform in the 1930s–40s

Just as the economic and social uncertainty of the First World War motivated a push for scientific competency in housing analysis to supersede the impressionistic views of amateur reformers, so too did the stormy ordeal of the depression and Second World War years clinch the professional and scientific status of proponents of housing advancement. Reflecting wider developments in the social sciences, housing reformers found an attentive audience in government circles and universities founded academic positions in the field of urban studies. Throughout the 1930s–40s, there was a plethora of reports, commissions and surveys at all levels of government and academia dealing with the housing question. Wartime mobilization and the fear of economic depression and social unrest after the war precipitated significant legislative and regulatory interventions in housing and sustained ventures in government housing provision.⁵⁷ Much of the reform discourse was interwoven with social democratic viewpoints, embracing a conviction that governments should permanently intervene through technocratic planning within the capitalist system to ensure that decent housing was available to all people. But there were decidedly conventional solutions proposed to the question of women's role in the housing sphere and assumptions of moral respectability stood alongside deeper critiques of the system.

The 1930s marked a coming of age of the new social sciences as academics and policy makers were given renewed incentive to apply practical scientific knowledge to social problems because of the abject failure of governments to solve the economic crisis. Social scientists skilfully cultivated support from

the civil service and business community, arguing that social science was able to meet the challenge of social and economic adversity and thereby thwart radical challenges to the system.⁵⁸ They forcefully asserted that “laissez-faire” policies were anachronistic in the context of a complex, interdependent industrial economy. A cooperative relationship between government, business and academia hinged on sensible intervention in the workings of the market was therefore deemed essential to remedy the crisis.

Social democracy found intellectual expression in the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR), an eclectic group of intellectuals associated with the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF). The LSR’s platform combined redistributive economic policies under the rubric of technocratic central planning with social policies intended to deliver essential services for victims of the market economy. The League worried that the unchecked profit motive of monopoly capitalism rode roughshod over stable family life and overall social and economic progress.⁵⁹ The most renowned housing reformers of the era, Harry Cassidy, Leonard Marsh and Humphrey Carver were all members of the LSR and theories of state-directed economic regeneration found a larger audience in liberal political circles.

The inclusion of a program for housing progress in the LSR’s manifesto, *Social Planning For Canada*, attests to the importance housing was accorded in the grander schemes of social democratic modernization. Written by Humphrey Carver, a Toronto architect and later a key official in the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, it stuck to the LSR’s general critique of the “unrestrained system of profit-making enterprise” in capitalism, encouraging the mass production of low-cost rental units for the working class to improve work habits and uplift family life. The capitalist, Carver chastized, “is ready enough to scrap obsolete machinery in his plant [but] is not interested in the domestic equipment of his employees.”⁶⁰ The only solution was to reject the principles of “private profit” and “remunerative investment” by dispensing direct grants for public housing projects.⁶¹ The existing building industry was to remain the chief instrument of this program, but if private contractors were found to be unwilling nationalization of the building industry was threatened. The age-old problem of exorbitant land costs and speculation was to be dealt with in much the same way as Thomas Adams’s proposals during the First World War: through a comprehensive system of urban and industrial planning, under the central coordination of a Federal Housing and Town Planning Authority. Unlike Adams, however, Carver was amenable to using the full power of an interventionist government to expropriate slum lands for public housing ventures.⁶²

The concept of technical expertise was also fully extended to include the standardization of building production methods and materials. Carver recognized the obstacles that inefficient construction processes posed for proper dwelling conditions:

“...it is necessary to apply to the design and construction of homes the same scientific rationalization that has been applied,

for instance, to automobile plants; to reduce the costs of fabrication and assembly so that modern living conditions may become the normal possession of every householder.”⁶³ In a 1948 study sponsored by CMHC, Carver suggested that governments should take an active role in the formation of a large-scale building industry to expedite standardization, reduce labour costs and generally smooth out the building labour process to allow cheap and competent dwelling construction.⁶⁴ Carver and his contemporaries spurned the predominant views on home ownership promotion espoused by liberal policy makers, but shared the opinion that dwelling forms should be refined through rationalized designs in order to facilitate mass production and consumption standards.⁶⁵

The brutal misery of the 1930s induced governments to continue the tradition of civic surveys established by the Social Service Congress earlier in the century. Extensive studies of Halifax, Hamilton, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Montreal and Toronto in the early 1930s showed a proliferation of critical slum conditions and rampant social distress. The ground-breaking Toronto study, known as the Bruce Report, was considered a milestone in the movement for housing betterment. Written by University of Toronto professors, Harry Cassidy and Eric Arthur, it utilized precise survey techniques and identified the heavily skewed distribution of income, high unemployment and anarchic land development as the main culprits of slum housing. A review of the Report by Leonard Marsh, a McGill economist who later gained fame as a key player in the government’s post-war reconstruction plans, lauded the analytical depth of the study and its proposed solutions. Marsh explicitly emphasized the relation between income distribution, consumer demand for shelter and general patterns of economic development and endorsed the author’s call for a National Housing Commission to oversee and implement reform measures.⁶⁶ In the depths of economic crisis, expert opinion reiterated once again that housing was a national concern.

The establishment of an informal housing advocacy group to follow up the recommendations of the Bruce Report speaks to public housers’ recognition of the importance of merging grass roots activism with conventional lobbying to spur action on the public housing front. A drop-in housing centre was set up on the University of Toronto campus “to gain community interest and support” for public action in slum clearance, public housing and centralized planning. A number of Toronto academics, architects and reform-minded politicians used this forum to discuss and debate housing betterment and eventually the group organized two national conferences in 1939 which criticized the federal government’s Dominion Housing Act (1938).

A sense of balanced community life, deep-seated trust in the efficacy of centralized intervention and citizen participation formed key planks of the public housers’ platform. Carver believed that efficient community planning would “promote loyalty to local government, churches, recreation centres, institutions.”⁶⁷ The Citizen’s Planning and Housing Association (CPHA), formed during the war to promote subsidized rental

housing in Toronto, endeavoured to elevate citizen participation in the reform process through continuous propaganda and lobbying of government officials. Regent Park North, the first full-fledged public housing project in Canada, was the successful conclusion of what Carver called the CPHA's "sustained evangelistic effort..."⁶⁸ Despite their reservations about the eventual outcome of the project, the new breed of idealistic public housers, termed "Citizens in Action" by Albert Rose, a main backer of Regent Park, considered their exertions an eminently patriotic contribution to national democratic life.⁶⁹ Indeed, Harry Cassidy, who became Professor of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley and Humphrey Carver saw social welfare measures such as public housing as a bulwark against Fascism and class conflict.⁷⁰

The necessity of dealing with the widespread slum conditions found in civic investigations brought out the crudely environmentalist streak in 1930–40s planning ideology. Direct slum elimination was bandied about by public health officials decades earlier, but the political will for comprehensive action was not yet paramount. The genuine social concerns of most planners differed from the routine insensitivity of government officials. Yet callous urban renewal strategies were the preferred initial course of action in public housers' strategy since they thought that the removal of slums would stimulate the development of public housing projects by freeing up cheap land for municipal housing authorities.⁷¹ Furthermore, it was held that the elimination of slum dwellings would mitigate the pathology of slum areas. It would not do, Humphrey Carver contended, to simply renovate the affected area. Only slum elimination integrated with a comprehensive approach to city planning would suffice: "It is as unwise as ever it was to put new wine into old bottles; a repaired slum still remains a slum."⁷² Analysis of slum areas was still confined to narrow sociological analyses of the 'pathological imperative,' a presumption which connected social 'deviance', crime, physical degeneration of facilities and immorality to slum dwellers. The repressive aspects of the technocratic initiative thus went hand-in-glove with the creed that every citizen had a right to decent housing.

If the professional housers more or less clearly discerned class divisions in the housing question, they certainly retained restrictive views of women's proper social role, especially in the domestic sphere. In the name of the preservation and bolstering of the family, reformers paid particular attention to domestic architecture. Simplicity, efficiency and economy were the key words in the arrangement of domestic environment as well as external housing form. As Carver put it in *Social Planning For Canada*: "the mechanization of household equipment and the economy of bedroom space to be cleaned would help to liberate the housewife from the monotonous servitude of domestic chores and allow her to develop family life in more fruitful directions."⁷³ Albert Rose seconded Carver's optimism, lauding the Regent Park scheme for raising "maternal efficiency."⁷⁴ It is noteworthy that when discussing the importance of making special provisions for 'untypical families' in public housing, Eric

Arthur, a Toronto architecture professor and member of the federal government's Subcommittee on Housing and Community Planning, referred to families with large numbers of children rather than other 'untypical families' such as those led by sole support parents.⁷⁵ The proposed model of social relations within the home were still hinged on a strict notion of nuclear family life, delimiting individual aspirations, especially those of women. If women were mentioned at all outside the strict realm of family life it was to champion their skills as potential housing estate managers which called for a combination of "social worker and business manager,"⁷⁶ pointing to the common judgment that women's 'natural' home management skills should be applied to the community as a whole to ensure the smooth functioning of society. As Ruth Roach Pierson and Margaret Hobbs have demonstrated in their study of the Home Improvement Plan, instituted by the federal government in 1936 to 'upgrade' housekeeping and dwelling forms, all but a small minority of socialist observers accepted assumptions of women's traditional role as nurturer of sturdy family life.⁷⁷

A lecture series on town planning and housing instituted by the University of Toronto's School of Social Work in 1944 furnishes an illuminating glimpse of the accumulated experience of the 1930–40s housing reform movement. In a survey of Canada's housing policy history, Leonard Marsh, now Executive Secretary of the federal government's Committee of Reconstruction and author of the influential 1943 government study *Report on Social Security*⁷⁸ which provided the intellectual framework for the post-war Canadian welfare state, presented the most articulate expression of the attitude that sustained government commitment was necessary for superior shelter provision. Favourably quoting American houser, Catherine Bauer, on the progressive social vision of Marx, William Morris, and Roosevelt's New Deal, Marsh, while no Marxist, insisted that "Housing cannot be regarded as an isolated or departmentalized field, but only as a basic part of the modern social environment, and also as a product of all the social forces at work."⁷⁹ While he separated economic needs and social criteria in the housing policy realm, he underscored the connection between employment, income distribution and decent shelter opportunities — all necessary for the collective vitality of the nation.

Eric Arthur similarly emphasized the need for a comprehensive and integrated public housing plan. Reflecting his personal knowledge and admiration of the New Deal housing projects in the United States, he suggested that public housing schemes should include community centres, health clinics and laundries under the close supervision of well-trained housing managers.⁸⁰ Public housing provision could only successfully proceed if it was integrated with detailed town planning and community infrastructure development. In contrast to early twentieth century reform currents, the strict regulatory thrust was tempered by social democratic reformers' support for citizen participation and inclusive community development schemes.⁸¹ Nevertheless, an attempt to instill in project dwellers a sense of middle-class morality and social order was evident. Arthur, while

believing in the “goodness and decency” of low-income tenants, endorsed the view of an American public housing manager that tenants could not be entrusted to care for lawns in housing estates.⁸² Combining confidence in the benefits of well-planned public dwelling provision with a clear accent on the regulation of inhabitants, wartime reform thought would presage the dominant thrust of post-war social housing practices.

The growth of the state bureaucracy in the Second World War era assured reformers that their special capabilities had an important place in modern society. By employing the methodological insights of the social sciences and recognizing the necessity of probing deeper into the system itself, they identified inequities of income distribution as one of the main causes of the lack of adequate shelter provision. Only a comprehensive policy of income maintenance and social policy measures within the parameters of an permanently interventionist government could hope to secure decent housing for all. Yet existing social divisions were tacitly sanctioned and by reducing essentially political questions to the technical exigencies of science, the common ideological conviction that there were technical solutions to profound social and economic problems was fortified.⁸³

Conclusion

The uneven evolution of housing reform from the amateurish dabbling of philanthropic businessmen to the statistically-based inquiries of university trained economists spanned three crucial decades in the growth of the capitalist social order and the modern state. Despite operating strictly within the confines of capitalism, housing reformers nevertheless believed that their suggestions for social advancement transcended class boundaries, working for the greater benefit of the community. Oblivious to the contradiction in this formulation between an all-embracing ‘community’ and a class divided society, reformers believed that moderate amendments in the housing sphere were essential in the struggle for economic modernization and social harmony. To an anxious middle class in a time of political uncertainty, the push for industrial efficiency, moral righteousness and social stability pledged to ameliorate the urban crisis by providing suitable shelter for workers, striving to shape a stable and productive workforce. The scientific uplifting of home life on ‘Canadian’ lines through various state-directed reform measures promised to check urban deterioration and reinforce the nation. In this way, housing reformers, in concert with the larger social reform effort, occupied a significant place in the project of nation-building by helping shape a healthy, productive and divided workforce.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Adam Givertz, Bryan Palmer, conference participants, anonymous referees and the editors for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper and the Ontario Graduate Scholarship and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Fellowship for financial aid in researching and writing this paper.

Notes

1. Paraphrase of Vivian’s Speech in “The Urgency of the Housing Problem in the Province of Quebec,” *Conservation of Life*, (hereafter *COL*), (January 1919): 4.
2. Antonio Gramsci, “Some Aspects of the Sexual Question,” in David Forgacs ed., *The Gramsci Reader* (London: Lawrence and Wishart 1988), 281, 296. See also David Harvey, “Labor, Capital, and Class Struggle Around the Built Environment in Advanced Capitalist Societies,” in Kevin Cox ed., *Urbanization and Conflict in Market Societies* (Chicago: Maaroufa Press 1978), 23. On the complexity of the reform movement’s response to urban problems see Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1988), 5, 44.
3. For a bibliography of housing reform literature in this early period see J. David Hulchanski, *Canadian Town Planning, 1900–1930 A Historical Bibliography*, Volume II, Housing (Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto 1978).
4. Paul Rutherford, “Tomorrow’s Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880–1920,” in G. Stelter and A. Artibise eds., *The Canadian City: essays in urban history* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart 1977), 370–371. For the focus on sanitary conditions in the European housing reform movement see Nicholas Bullock and James Reid, *The Movement for Housing Reform in Germany and France, 1840–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985).
5. Alan Sears, “Immigration Controls as Social Policy: The Case of Canadian Medical Inspection, 1900–1920,” *Studies in Political Economy*, No. 33 (Autumn 1990): 105–106, n.5.
6. J.J. Kelso, “Can slums be abolished or must we continue to pay the penalty?” (Toronto, nd.) in Paul Rutherford ed., *Saving the Canadian City: the first phase 1880–1920, an anthology of early articles on urban reform* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1974), 166. For the use of metaphors of disease to describe the city in Europe see Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow*, 35.
7. Rutherford, “Tomorrow’s Metropolis,” 371. For an interpretation that stresses the “moulding of subjectivity” through moral reform see Marianna Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap and Water, Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885–1925* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart 1991).
8. *Toronto Daily News*, 8 November 1906. See as well Maria, “Forced to Live with Crime and City Lands are Vacant” *Toronto Globe*, 2 December 1906.
9. Thomas Roden, “The Housing of Workmen,” *Industrial Canada*, (March 1907): 654.
10. *Ibid.*, (August 1911): 52.
11. Kelso, “Can slums be abolished...,” 167.
12. “The Labor Question and Women’s Work and Its Relation to ‘Home Life’” in Ramsay Cook and Wendy Mitchinson eds., *The Proper Sphere, Women’s Place in Canadian Society* (Toronto: Oxford University Press 1976), 153. For a thorough analysis consult Veronica Strong-Boag, *The New Day Recalled, Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919–1939* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman 1988), Chapter 4.
13. Herbert Ames, *The City Below the Hill* (1897; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1972), 114.
14. *Ibid.*, 75.
15. *Ibid.*, 37.
16. Quoted in R.C. Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada 1896–1921 A Nation Transformed* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart 1974), 294. Also see Richard Allen, *The Social Passion, Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914–1928* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1973). On the transition from religiously based morality to secularized social reform see Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators, Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1985), 5, 169, 231.
17. Allen, *The Social Passion*, 12, 24.
18. For the more developed “crisis of intellectual authority” in the American case that eventually led to the dominance of secularized social science see Thomas

Housing Reform Thought in English Canada, 1900–1950

- Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1977), vi-viii, 234–255.
19. David Ward, "The progressives and the urban question: British and American Responses to the inner city slums, 1880–1920," *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers* 9 (1984): 303.
 20. *Industrial Canada*, (May 1912): 3.
 21. On this point, note Doug Owsam, *The Government Generation, Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900–1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1986), 57.
 22. "Report of the Committee on Press and Co-Operating Organizations," *Commission of Conservation Annual Meeting* (1917) (hereafter *COC Annual Meeting*), 277.
 23. "The Commission of Conservation," *Saturday Night* (January 1921): 9.
 24. *Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada*, (June-August 1921): 1.
 25. Martin Dauntton, *House and Home in the Victorian City* (London: Edward Arnold 1983), 5. For Canada, see Walter Van Nus, "The Fate of City Beautiful Thought in Canada, 1893–1930," in Stelter and Artibise eds., *The Canadian City* and Ian Guntton, "The Ideas and Policies of the Canadian Planning Profession, 1909–1931," in G. Stelter and A. Artibise eds. *The Usable Urban Past* Carleton Library No. 119 (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada with the Institute of Canadian Studies, Carleton University 1979), 181.
 26. Stelter and Artibise, "Conservation planning," 24. Note also Michael Simpson, *Thomas Adams and the Modern Planning Movement* (London: Mansell 1985).
 27. D.J. Hall, *Clifford Sifton*, Vol.2, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 1985), 258. For Adams's international reputation see Stelter and Artibise, "Conservation Planning," 25.
 28. On the Leagues, see Civic Improvement League, *Report of Preliminary Conference held under the Auspices of the Commission of Conservation* (Ottawa: Commission of Conservation 1915) and *Civic Improvement, Report of a Conference held In Co-operation with the Commission of Conservation* (Ottawa: Commission of Conservation 1916).
 29. A perusal of the Annual Reports of the Commission and *COL* indicates that Adams had a vast sphere of influence. See also Oiva Saarinen, "The Influence of Thomas Adams and the British New Town Movement in the Planning of Canadian Resource Communities," in Stelter and Artibise, eds., *The Usable Urban Past*, 273.
 30. *Town Planning and Conservation of Life* (hereafter *TPCL*), (July- September 1920): 66.
 31. "The Housing Problem and Production," *COL* (July 1918): 49.
 32. Adams, "Civic and Social Questions in Canada," *COL*, (April-June 1916): 54–55. While this paper is not directly concerned with the responses of the "clients" of housing reform it is important to note that reform schemes were often resisted at some level by workers. In the Hydrostone case, for instance, some former residents of the area protested the reordering of the neighbourhood along top-down reform lines. See John Weaver, "Reconstruction of the Richmond District in Halifax: A Canadian Episode in Public Housing and Town Planning, 1918–1921," *Plan Canada* 6 (March 1976): 36–47. For a similar response in the case of the Toronto Housing Company scheme see my article "This is not a company; it is a cause": Class, Gender and the Toronto Housing Company, 1912–1920," *Urban History Review* XX1 (April 1993): 88–89.
 33. Bacher, *Keeping to the Private Market*, 79–80.
 34. See Susanni Magri and Christian Topalov, "Reconstruire: l'habitat populaire au lendemain de la première guerre mondiale, étude comparative France, Grande-Bretagne, Italie, Etats-Unie," *Archives Européennes de sociologie* 29 (1988): 319–370.
 35. "Civic and Social Questions in Canada," *COL*, (April-June 1916): 55.
 36. "Partner-Ownership Building Societies," *COL*, (October 1919): 78, 72–79.
 37. On these insights see the pioneering work by Sears, pp.91–92 and George Steinmetz, "Workers and the Welfare State in Imperial Germany," *International Labour and Working Class History* 40 (Fall 1991): 18–23. For a more detailed explication of this argument in the Canadian case see Sean Purdy, "Building Homes, Building Citizens: Housing Reform and Nation Formation in Toronto, 1900–1920," *Canadian Historical Review* (forthcoming, 1997).
 38. Consult Carol Lee Bacchi, "Race Regeneration and Social Purity: A Study of the Social Attitudes of Canada's English-speaking Suffragists," in J.M. Bumstead ed., *Interpreting Canada's Past*, Vol.2, After Confederation, (Toronto: Oxford University Press 1986), 192–207.
 39. W. Struthers, "The Point of View in Medical Inspection of Schools," *Public Health Journal* 4/2 (1913), 67 cited in Sears, "Immigration Controls," 92.
 40. Charles Hodgetts, "Unsanitary Housing," *COC Annual Meeting*, (1911), 56.
 41. C.K. Clarke, "The Defective Immigrant," *COL* (April 1919): 37. On immigrants see as well Charles Hastings, "The Modern Conception of Public Health Administration," *COL*, (October 1917): 90. Alan Sears explains why British immigrants were not spared the rancour of the social imperialists. See Sears, 92–93, 99, 107 n.5.
 42. Helen MacMurchy, "Defective Children," *Social Welfare* (March 1919), On MacMurchy see Angus McClaren, *Our Own Master Race: Eugenics in Canada, 1885–1945*, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart 1990), Chapter 2.
 43. Public Archives of Canada (hereafter PAC), Cauchon Papers, MG30 C105, Vol.1, Address to the Rotary Club of Hamilton, August 2, 1917. Admiration for Germany's brand of welfare capitalism was widespread before and during the war. The only caveat offered was that Germany was perhaps too rigid in the implementation of its measures. See Dr. Charles Hodgetts, "Comments," *Report of the First Canadian Housing and Town Planning Congress*, Winnipeg, 15–17 July, 1912; PAC, MG28 I275, Vol.16, Papers of the Canadian Institute of Planners, Report of an Address to the Calgary City Planning Commission, Henry Vivian, "Town Planning and Housing," 9 April 1912, p.15.
 44. See Sidney Jacobs, "Race, empire and the welfare state: council housing and racism," *Critical Social Policy* (1984), 11.
 45. NA, MG28 I275, Vol.16, Papers of the Canadian Institute of Planners, Report of an Address to the Calgary City Planning Commission, "Town Planning and Housing," 9 April 1912, 15.
 46. City of Toronto, Minutes of the City Council, *Report of the Board of Health 1918*, Appendix A, 711.
 47. Anna Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," *History Workshop* 5 (1978): 10.
 48. Suzanne Mackenzie, *Women and the Reproduction of Labour Power in the Industrial City: A Case Study*, Working Paper No. 23, (Brighton: Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Sussex University 1980), 85.
 49. MacDougall, *Activists and Advocates*, 79. Marilyn Barber has discovered that immigration literature intended for British domestic servants, while promoting Canada as a British country, also stressed that British women must "learn Canadian ways." Consult "Sunny Ontario for British Girls, 1900–1930," in Jean Burnet ed. *Looking Into My Sister's Eyes: an Exploration in Women's History* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario 1986), 63.
 50. Joseph Howes, "Housing Needs in the Ward; and their Relation to the General Housing Situation in Ontario," *Social Welfare* (October 1920): 15.
 51. Charles Hastings, "The Modern Conception of Public Health Administration," *COL*, (October 1917): 89,90.
 52. "Suggestions for the Housing Problems," *Industrial Canada*, (August 1912): 66.
 53. Dauntton, *House and Home*, 37. Nuclear family privacy is something Elizabeth Cohen has found American reformers sought to inculcate in working-class homes. Consult "Embellishing a Life of Labor: An Interpretation of the Material Culture of American Working-Class Homes, 1885–1915," *Journal of American Culture* (1980): 759.
 54. *Toronto Daily News*, 26 November 1918.
 55. Review of "Better Houses for Canadians," *Toronto Daily News*, 17 May 1919.

Housing Reform Thought in English Canada, 1900–1950

56. Public Archives of Ontario, (hereafter PAO) Sir William Hearst Papers, Correspondence, MU 1307, Ontario Woman Citizen's Association to Hearst, 16 December 1918.
57. For a comprehensive bibliography of reform literature and government housing studies and an outline of government legislation in the 1930–40s see J. David Hulchanski, *Canadian Town Planning and Housing, 1930–1940: A Historical Bibliography* (Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto 1978) and *Canadian Town Planning and Housing, 1940–1950: A Historical Bibliography* (Toronto: Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto 1979).
58. Barry Ferguson and Doug O'wram, "Social Scientists and Public Policy from the 1920s through World War II," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 15 (Winter 1980–81): 3–17.
59. Michiel Horn, "Leonard Marsh and the Coming of the Welfare State in Canada," *Histoire Sociale/ Social History* 9 (May 1976): 197–204.
60. Humphrey Carver, "A Housing Programme" in *The Research Committee of the League For Social Reconstruction, Social Planning for Canada* (1935; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1975), 451–452.
61. *Ibid.*, 458. It is worthwhile noting here that key figures in the building materials and construction sectors supported public housing programmes, hoping that they would provide much-needed demand for their products. See John Bacher and David Hulchanski, "Keeping Warm and Dry: The Policy Response to the Struggle for Shelter Among Canada's Homeless, 1900–60," *Urban History Review* 16 (October 1987): 151.
62. Carver, "A Housing Programme," 461.
63. *Ibid.*, 459. Also note E.G. Faludi, "Housing the Nation," *Canadian Forum* (November 1941): 242.
64. *Houses for Canada, A Study of Housing Problems in the Toronto Area* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1948), 61–63.
65. On this point see John Belec, John Holmes, Tod Rutherford, "The Rise of Fordism and the Transformation of Consumption Norms: Mass Consumption and Housing in Canada, 1930–1945," in Richard Harris and Geraldine Pratt eds. *Housing Tenure and Social Class* (Gavle: Institute for Building Research 1988), 227–228.
66. Leonard Marsh, Review of the "Report of the Lieutenant-Governor's Committee on Housing Conditions in Toronto," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 1 (February 1935): 119–122.
67. Humphrey Carver, "Analysis of Planning and Housing," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada* (September 1937): 195.
68. *Ibid.*, 82.
69. On the development of Regent Park see Albert Rose, *Regent Park, A Study in Slum Clearance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1958).
70. Harry Cassidy, *Social Security and Reconstruction in Canada* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1943), 3–6; Humphrey Carver, "The Architecture of Democracy," *Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada* (October 1938): 221.
71. See Carver, "A Housing Programme," 460–461. This analysis is expounded in the American context by Marc Weiss, "The Origins and Legacy of Urban Renewal," in Pierre Clavel et al. eds. *Urban and Regional Planning in an Age of Austerity* (New York: Pergamon Press 1980), 54.
72. Carver, "A Housing Programme," 460. See also Harry Cassidy, *Social Security*, 59. On slum pathology note Gerald Daly, "The British Roots of American Public Housing," *Journal of Urban History* 15 (August 1989): 417.
73. Carver, "A Housing Programme," 463. Carver also shared the same concerns of World War I era reformers over separating boys and girls in housing projects. See his "Analysis of Planning," 195.
74. Rose, *Regent Park*, 108.
75. Eric Arthur, "Housing for Canada," Lecture 16, in *Planning of Canadian Towns with Special Reference to Post-War Opportunities in Town Planning and Housing*, A Course of Lectures Arranged by the School of Architecture in the University of Toronto, Volume 5, (Toronto: School of Architecture, University of Toronto 1944), 14.
76. Carver, "A Housing Programme," 458.
77. Margaret Hobbs and Ruth Roach Pierson, "A kitchen that wastes no steps...": Gender, Class and the Home Improvement Plan, 1936–1940," *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 41 (May 1988): 9–39.
78. Leonard Marsh, *Report on Social Security for Canada* (1943; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1975).
79. Leonard Marsh, "Industrialization and urbanization in Canada with their implications for Housing," Lecture 3 in *Planning of Canadian Towns*, Volume 1, 11–12.
80. Eric Arthur, "Housing for Canada," Lecture 16, *Ibid.*, 1–16. These suggestions did not extend to communal facilities but were akin to the coin laundries and other facilities common in private apartment buildings. For the much more far-reaching design proposals of early feminists see Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs in American Homes, Neighbourhoods and Cities* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press 1981).
81. For a contrasting view see Charlotte Whitten, *The Dawn of Ampler Life* (Toronto: The Macmillan Company 1943) which was a conservative response to Leonard Marsh's *Report on Social Security*. Historian Frank Underhill criticized the reform movement for its policy of "nice genteel agitation," placing his hopes for housing reform in a powerful labour party. "The Housing Fiasco in Canada," *Canadian Forum* (October 1937): 228.
82. Arthur, "Housing for Canada," 10. In fact, he seemed to sympathize with the manager's statement that "poison ivy, surrounded by barbed wire, would be a godsend" in maintaining lawns in the project. A glimpse of the social control aims of 1930s housing reformers is shown by Humphrey Carver's appreciative reference to the fact that a fellow CHPA member, Harold Clark, was the grandson of a close friend of the Cadbury family, famous for their ultra-paternalistic British company housing scheme, Bourneville Garden Village. See Carver, *Compassionate Landscape*, 86. For a satirical look at such corporate reform endeavours in Britain in the early twentieth century see George Bernard Shaw's play, *Major Barbara*, in Lee Jacobus ed. *The Bedford Introduction of to Drama* (New York: St. Martin's Press 1989), 555–596. For a penetrating look at the top-down reform approach of Viennese social democrats in the housing sphere see Helmut Gruber, *Red Vienna, Experiment in Working-Class Culture, 1919–1934* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1991), 46–65, 146–179.
83. Magali Larson, "The Production of Expertise and the Constitution of Expert Power" in Thomas Haskell ed. *The Authority of Experts, Studies in History and Theory* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press 1984), 64.