Document généré le 19 avr. 2025 00:40

**Historical Papers**
**Communications historiques**

# Tomorrow's Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880-1920

Paul Rutherford

Volume 6, numéro 1, 1971

St. John 1971

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030466ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/030466ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)
1712-9109 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Rutherford, P. (1971). Tomorrow's Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880-1920. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, *6*(1), 203–224. https://doi.org/10.7202/030466ar

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada,1971

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

# TOMORROW'S METROPOLIS: THE URBAN REFORM MOVEMENT IN CANADA, 1880-1920

PAUL RUTHERFORD
*University of Toronto*

Between the census of 1881 and the census of 1921, the urban population of Canada increased in absolute terms from 1.1 million to 4.3 million, and in proportional terms from one-quarter to one-half the total population.[1] This demographic revolution was largely unexpected. True, the Canadians of the 1860s had envisaged a great and populous future, but as an agricultural nation with a vast western frontier, not an urban frontier. As early as the 1870s, however, newspapers commented upon the steady drift of population towards the cities and by the turn of the century the theme of rural depopulation had become common throughout eastern Canada. Worse, urban growth led more to the expansion of cities than towns, which threatened to change the whole economic and social character of the Dominion. In a prophetic passage, J. S. Woodsworth warned that the railway, the telephone, and similar technological innovations were carrying the city into the countryside, a process which would ultimately give the whole nation a metropolitan image.[2]

The Canadian response to the urban fact, especially to the appearance of the "big city", was generally unfavorable. At one level, it is true, cities were regarded as the physical embodiment of progress, the home of literature and the arts. Yet many people, looking to the sad experience of Europe and America, feared the further spread of the city.[3] Rural apologists emphasized the debilitating influences of city life upon the individual.[4] Social conservatives inveighed against the rampant materialism of the new culture.[5] Even urban writers admitted that there was a dark side to the city where disease, crime, prostitution, and general misery flourished.[6] In the city all the ills of modern society were concentrated and highly visible. By the beginning of the twentieth century, it was widely accepted that urban growth posed a serious menace to the future of the nation.

It is only in retrospect that reform seems the logical solution to the urban crisis. Well into the twentieth century, there were public leaders who continued to hope that a new wave of agricultural develop-

ment would direct the city dweller back to the farm.[7] It took four decades of agitation before the reform movement achieved a national prominence. During the 1880s, various daily newspapers, the exponents of what was called "people's journalism", turned to the idea of urban reform, then attracting considerable attention in the United States.[8] These papers appealed to the expanded reading public of their cities, which was as interested in urban affairs as in provincial and national problems. The Montreal *Star* launched a series of crusades against municipal corruption and incompetence and sponsored such welfare projects as the "Fresh Air Fund" to send poor women and children out of the city in the summer months. The Toronto *World* appeared as the champion of the interests of the people in the city's many battles with local monopolists and utility companies. The Vancouver *News-Advertiser* argued the case of labor and demanded the increased political involvement of all city dwellers (excepting, of course, the Chinese) in civic affairs. Though inspired as much by hopes of a higher circulation as civic spirit, these papers popularized the idea of reform long before intellectuals discovered urban problems.

By 1900, however, the journalist had been replaced by the expert. In 1897 Herbert Ames, a businessman, published *"The City Below the Hill,"* a statistical analysis of social conditions in Montreal. A decade later, another businessman, S. Morley Wickett of Toronto, edited an anthology on municipal government with wide-ranging suggestions for reform. In 1910 in Quebec a somewhat different study of municipal government by a one-time *bleu* journalist and provincial minister, G.-A. Nantel, was published postumously by friends. This book, *La Métropole de Demain,* proposed a scheme of metropolitan federation and civic beautification for the island of Montreal, based upon the experience of Paris. And in 1911 appeared J. S. Woodsworth's *My Neighbor,* an impassioned plea for the reform of living conditions in Canada's cities.

These works were only a portion of the material which reached the public. No annual session of the Canadian or Empire Clubs, those so eminent representatives of opinion in English Canada, seemed complete without one address on urban problems — and not only by Canadians, but by visitors from Britain and the United States.[9] These were supplemented by conferences sponsored by the churches, women's organizations, and eventually town planning and civic improvement associations. Specialized magazines, like the *Municipal World* and the *Western Municipal News,* appeared as house organs of municipal government and consistent advocates of reform. Even academics joined the move-

ment: in 1913 the new Canadian Political Science Association held a special seminar on municipal government, involving American and Canadian municipal officials.[10]

Urban reform was less a single creed and more a common approach to a wide variety of urban problems. Early reformers concentrated upon the redemption of the urban environment, a theme which extended back to the mid-century. The old ideal of civic improvement had emphasized the construction of stately buildings, colleges and academies, eventually libraries and museums, to bolster the prestige of the city.[11] But as the cities became more and more congested, this concern was replaced by the attempt to make the city healthy, moral, and equitable.

Public health reform was founded upon the sanitary ideal, a British doctrine long popular in Canada. Originally the sanitarians concentrated upon the issues of pollution and pure water. Even before the acceptance of the germ theory, it was widely recognized that water pollution was a public hazard and waterworks were one of the first utilities subject to direct municipal improvement. In the 1870s Toronto invested some $2,000,000 in the construction of an effective waterworks system.[12] By this time, of course, the city was moving into the general field of health control, with an emphasis upon the prevention of disease. After 1880 reformers tackled the problems of vaccination, pure food, and living conditions, especially as these related to the health of the poor and the proletariat.[13] Such reform was not always welcomed — in 1885 during the short but severe Montreal smallpox epidemic, spokesmen for the francophone proletariat fiercely opposed the whole idea of vaccination.[14] Ideally, reformers hoped to impose a strict code of public health upon all city dwellers. Without pure environment, they warned, the city would soon die. Charles Hastings, the medical officer of Toronto during the war, pointed out that the contamination of any class would soon lead to the infection of the rest of the community. Disease did not respect social standing.[15]

During the 1880s clergymen, temperance societies, and women's organizations set out on a long crusade to purify city life. William Howland, elected in 1885 as Toronto's first reform mayor, was a stout advocate of moral reform — in fact, he founded that city's department of morality — and he left an influential party on city council which carried on his work for decades. These crusaders were most famous for their attacks upon organized sin — the saloon, the gambling den, the

house of prostitution, even the theatre. They were convinced that vice was so much a fact of city life that it menaced the national destiny.[16] They managed to persuade provincial and municipal authorities to pass laws to stamp out immorality, to regulate the behaviour of the wealthy as well as the poor and the immigrants, and to protect the youth of Canada.[17] They sponsored a variety of moral clean-up campaigns in each city to enforce these laws, a task which was not always easy or successful. In Winnipeg, after an initial assault on prostitution, the chief of police contacted the leading madam of the day, Minnie Woods, and re-established a segregated red-light district, where the police could at least control the activities of prostitutes.[18] In Halifax war-time prohibition closed down legal bars but left the city to "blind pigs" (illegal saloons), generally in league with brothels, which expanded to meet the needs of thousands of soldiers and sailors.[19] Still it is little wonder that these reformers were despised by many — C. S. Clarke, an opinionated Torontonian, denounced them as a small group of pious fanatics who bothered the respectable and terrorized the weak.[20] Moral reform was an experiment in social engineering, an attempt to force the city dweller to conform to the public mores of the church-going middle class.

In attitude and in personnel, moral reform was closely connected with social welfare. Howland, for example, throughout his civic career, was devoted to the cause of the underprivileged. Traditionally the care of the urban poor was the task of the churches and private charities with some relief services supplied by the municipalities and the provincial government.[21] As with so many other institutions, this welfare system collapsed under the impact of urban growth. In both his books, *My Neighbor* and *Strangers at Our Gates,* J. S. Woodsworth drew upon his own experiences and those of others to paint what to contemporaries must have been an incredible picture of spiritual and physical degradation in Canada's big cities. Some humanitarian reformers like J. J. Kelso of Toronto, who had been active since the 1880s, concentrated upon child welfare. They reasoned that by saving the young, they could ultimately save the future, an idea which particularly appealed to middle-class Canadians These people saw the child as tomorrow's hope for a better society and invested heavily in education as an instrument of social and moral improvement. Thus the concern for a special children's charter, boys' camp, parks and recreational centres, and new schools, all to protect the innocence of the child and to mold his character according to the rational ethic.[22]

But other reformers, notably J. S. Woodsworth, refused to forget the adult generation of poor. Woodsworth rejected the notion that the majority of the poor were undeserving, that they had failed because of some weakness in their make-up. Rather, social and economic conditions, perhaps the very structure of society, had prevented the poor from achieving any kind of success. Surely the fruits of progress could be more evenly distributed? Woodsworth called upon the well-off to recognize their responsibility to the underprivileged — thus the title *My Neighbor*. In fact, civic authorities did respond to the misery of the poor. Speaking to an Ottawa audience in 1914, Mayor Hocken of Toronto claimed that his city had taken up a wide variety of "human services" — public recreation, the care of the feeble-minded, food inspection, unemployment relief, and the like.[23] This "new spirit", as Hocken called it, was laying the foundations of the welfare state.

In 1902, in his classic survey of city government, S. Morley Wickett concluded that the "corporation question" in all its manifold aspects was of overshadowing importance to urban reform. By the "corporation question" he meant utility regulation and ownership, issues which had became more and more pressing towards the end of the nineteenth century. Waterworks, street railways, electric power, and the telephone systems, all constituted the physical plant of the city and the basis for continued urban expansion. The "utility base" of the cities had been largely developed by the efforts of private capital, usually on extremely generous terms to the entrepreneurs. Even though most utility companies performed with reasonable efficiency, there seemed an inherent conflict between civic requirements and business profits.[24]

It was this assumption which gave rise to the long controversy over municipal ownership. Drawing upon American and British experience, reformers like Wickett concluded that civic authorities must take control of the utility base. They argued that utility development was very different from other kinds of business endeavor. The utilities were in fact natural monopolies since any competition was both wasteful and expensive. Companies were able to exploit this captive market with little regard for the interests of the city. Because of their wealth, they could thwart any efforts to regulate their activities. Municipal ownership would allow the city to extend utilities into suburban areas, reduce service rates, and increase civic revenues.[25] Of course, not all Canadians agreed with this appraisal. However argued, municipal ownership was an assualt upon the national ethic of individual enter-

prise. Theoretical questions aside, one noted economist, James Mavor of the University of Toronto, warned that public ownership everywhere had failed. Because they were essentially political bodies, subject to the changing impulses of the public mind, governments simply could not manage a business enterprise. Efficient, cheap service was lost in a welter of bureaucratic red-tape and noisy rhetoric.[26]

Whatever the merit of his conclusions, Mavor had taken up a losing cause. True, the campaign for municipal ownership was not immediately victorious. In Montreal between 1904 and 1909, the utility companies easily overcame a threat of municipalization and remained largely untouched for the next thirty years.[27] In 1910, after running its power and transport utilities for fifteen years, Moncton returned these facilities to a private company, apparently to save money.[28] But these were exceptions. As early as 1893 Guelph had purchased its gas works and electric light and power plants.[29] In 1901 delegates from Quebec and Ontario, led by O. A. Howland, mayor of Toronto, founded the Union of Canadian Municipalities specifically to combat the machinations of utility companies.[30] In 1905 the new Whitney Government in Ontario organized the Public Hydro Commission to provide cheap power for industries and cities.[31] In 1907 the Manitoba government purchased the young provincial telephone system and expanded it across the province.[32] By 1920 the idea of municipal control, if not always municipal ownership, had won numerous converts in cities and towns.

After 1900 urban reformers, inspired by the town planning craze, became aware of their ability to mold the physical character of Canadian cities. The concept of town planning originated in the so-called City Beautiful and Garden City movements common to Europe, Britain, and the United States and popular ever since the Chicago Exposition of 1893 and the Letchworth experiment in England in 1903.[33] The City Beautiful movement updated the old ideal of civic improvement — the elimination of unsightly civic architecture and its replacement by attractive buildings, widened streets, promenades, parks, and trees. G.-A. Nantel wished to turn Montreal into this kind of City Beautiful. The Garden City and Garden suburb ideas were more drastic attempts to create communities separate from existing urban centres and without their problems. These schemes were an extension and a rationalization of the movement to the suburbs and an attempt to revive the ideal of the village community.[34] In 1912 at the Canadian Club of Montreal, Adam Shortt unveiled a fantastic scheme of urban depopula-

tion to redeem the life of the city dweller throughout Canada. Envisaging a network of rapid transit systems, he imagined the movement of city workers out to country homes where they could enjoy the benefits of rural life and perhaps indulge in a little farming to supplement their incomes.[35] In essence, he was proposing the ruralization of the city. Such nostalgia for country life was implicit in all these schemes.

Many town planning experts, like the influential Thomas Adams, a Scotchman attached to the Commission of Conservation, were very conscious of the need to disassociate their projects from this kind of nostalgia. Their sensibility was injured by the disjointed civic topography left in the wake of the early developers, who in their rush to accommodate new industry, the rural migrant, and the foreign immigrant cared little whether they created a livable environment.[36] These town planners emphasized that they were not merely concerned with the aesthetic but with pressing economic and health problems. Town planning, noted Clifford Sifton, was "a rational scheme of supervising the conditions in which the people of our great cities live."[37] It was practical and economical, involving the doctor, the engineer, and the businessman as well as the artist and the architect. Just prior to World War I, more and more municipal and provincial authorities became converts of the movement and an incredible number of town plans were initiated throughout Canada — for example, the proliferation of special zoning by-laws to protect residential areas, the Halifax reconstruction scheme after the disasterous explosion of 1917, and the new steel town of Ojibway projected for Southwestern Ontario.[38]

Perhaps the most publicized scheme was that put forward by the Toronto Harbor Commission. At an estimated cost of twenty-five million dollars, using civic and federal capital, the Commission proposed to redevelop the Toronto waterfront as a multiple-use site with improved warehousing and commercial facilities, room for industrial growth, better housing for workers, and a recreational area, all tied to the rest of the city by means of an expanded rapid transit system. Although controlled by the Commission, the project was in fact an alliance of private and public interests — the all-important railway companies had early given their approval — so that all might profit. It was an expensive investment in the future, but the initial cost would soon be recouped by the attraction of new business to Toronto. Waste lands, then largely valueless, would become industrial areas. And Torontonians as a whole would benefit from the use of the waterfront as a public park.[39]

The Toronto harbor project, of course, stood in a long tradition of developmental schemes with which Canadians and businessmen were very familiar.[40] A more novel concern of town planners was urban congestion and the appearance of the slum and the immigrant ghetto. In the years after 1895 a series of studies by such people as Herbert Ames, J. J. Kelso, J. S. Woodsworth, and Bryce Stewart showed that all major cities, even small centres like Port Arthur and Fort William, housed an urban proletariat, in part foreign-born, generally poor and concentrated in crowded subdivisions, slums, or shanty-towns.[41] Like the United States, suggested Charles Hodgetts, we had "our Little Italys, our Little Londons, and our Chinatowns, devoid of the simplest of modern sanitary requirements."[42] These slums were "cancerous sores" on the body politic, "sources of bacteria" spreading disease, crime, and discontent throughout the city. They menaced the moral and physical character of Canadian manhood and thus the racial future of the whole nation. Some alarmists even feared a red revolution sparked by the disgruntled proletariat and the immigrants. But all reformers charged that slums were a reflection upon the nation; no civilized society could allow its citizens to suffer in this way.[43]

Yet, without tremendous expenditures, how could the nation end the slum problem? Clifford Sifton pointed out that the much-heralded suburban movement was no solution; it was actually a movement of the prosperous, not the poor, away from the urban core.[44] Some reformers tried to meet the problem with new housing laws to control tenements and to maintain minimum standards of hygene and health — in effect to check the further spread of the slum and to ameliorate conditions within it.[45] Others attempted to get business interests involved in cheap housing, a primitive form of urban renewal. Herbert Ames advocated such a plan of privately financed workers' homes and this was apparently carried out on a limited scale by G. Frank Beer in Toronto. During the post-war reconstruction clamour, there was a demand for direct state involvement in the housing business. In fact Thomas Adams did head a commission which co-ordinated a joint federal-provincial loan scheme for cheap housing, essentially to meet the needs of returned soldiers.[46] All of these reformers, it should be emphasized, were convinced of the moral and physical virtues of the single-family dwelling — they wanted a nation of homes, not of apartment houses.

The steadily expanding services expected of city governments resulted in mounting costs and an increased tax burden, neither of which were popular. In 1907 Wickett pointed out that "the annual expendi-

ture of Winnipeg clearly exceeds that of Manitoba; Montreal's that of the province of Quebec; and until the present year Toronto's that of the province of Ontario."[47] Reformers and municipal officials constantly searched for new methods of meeting tax requirements. Some of the impetus behind the campaign for municipal ownership was this desire for greater revenue. Most cities switched from the confused personal property tax system to a more specific and just business tax. Between 1890 and 1910, western cities experimented widely with variants of Henry George's single tax idea, exempting at least part of the value of improvements upon land.[48] Of course, all civic leaders paid at least lip-service to economy and retrenchment, but it was impossible to implement these axioms with any permanent success. Businessmen were particularly outraged by the casual attitude which civic authorities adopted towards new expenditures. Sir Frederick William-Taylor of the Bank of Montreal insisted that "the outstanding matter calling for municipal reform in this country is with regard to borrowing powers."[49] He believed that Canadian cities, especially in the west, had accumulated debts at a per capita rate out of all proportion to the rest of the world.

The success of the reform idea was heavily dependent upon the active support of municipal government. Only the state had sufficient authority to impose order on the chaos of city life. But even before 1880 it was clear that the existing councils of untrained aldermen were ill-equipped to deal with the multiplicity of new problems. Too often they were dominated by ward-heelers and partymen — individuals who were more concerned with private gain, local interests, and politics than with the city's welfare.[50] Worse, the expansion of civic responsibilities had vastly increased the opportunities for and the profits of municipal corruption. These evils seemed so pressing that for some time the urban reform movement was closely identified in the mind of the public at large with the reform of municipal government.

In 1885 W. H. Howland, a business leader and child welfare advocate in Toronto, and H. Beaugrand, editor of Montreal's Liberal paper *La Patrie,* won the mayoralty of their respective cities as declared reform candidates. But they and later reform mayors found it difficult to realize their promises. It was hard to overcome civic apathy, to maintain reform morale and cohesion, and to get rid of the "old guard" politicans. During the mid-1890s in Montreal, to meet these problems, Herbert Ames and like-minded English civic leaders constructed a political machine to combat the "old guard" at the ward

level.[51] Thus began a battle which lasted two decades between, on the one hand, a reform coalition, supported by many English voters, certain businessmen, and French-Canadian progressives like Bourassa and Asselin, and, on the other hand, a mixed bag of opportunists who had the backing of most French Canadians, especially the clerical and artisan classes. In 1914 this classic battle ended with the victory of Médéric Martin, a colourful and unscrupulous cigar-maker, who during his long rule crushed the reform-progressive coalition.[52] Elsewhere in Canada, the conflict was rarely so fierce or reform so decisively beaten. In fact, municipal politicians generally paid lip-service to reform, though their active support for the idea was offtimes sporadic and self-interested.[53] It was this hyprocrisy which Stephen Leacock brutally satirized in his account of "the great fight for clean government."

As the early reformers learned to their chagrin, the mere election of honest men did not ensure the ability of the council to handle the rapacious utility companies or to foster civic improvement. In the 1890s reformers began a search for new governmental structures. To ensure continuity, the ward system was rationalized and the length of term for altermen increased. To enlarge the powers of the executive, the Board of Control was instituted first in Toronto (1897) and later in several cities as a kind of municipal cabinet. Some enthusiasts, like the young Frank Underhill, supported the American idea of commission government, rule by a small body of elected or even appointed officials.[55] These measures were an attempt to divide legislative and executive functions and to fix responsibility, thereby reducing political influences. Of course, this emphasis upon structures produced its own reaction. Throughout, some reformers, especially those who were actually involved in municipal government, argued that "good men" were essential, no matter the structure. Ultimately, it was the quality of elected officials who would determine the character of municipal government.[56]

Whether concerned with structures or men, reformers agreed that city government must be more responsive to the interests of the whole community. They looked upon the city as a single entity. Urban society was founded upon interdependence: "City life," claimed J. S. Woodsworth, "is like a spider's web — pull one thread and you pull every thread."[57] Thus all urban problems, not merely those relating to utilities and town planning, had a general import. In the past, argued reformers, too much attention had been paid to particularist interests. Wealthy neighbourhoods had benefitted from local improvement schemes at the expense of slums and suburbs. Entrenched neighbourhood politicians

had hindered the implementation of general reform measures necessary to the city's welfare.[58] It was essential to subordinate the neighbourhood to the city. In future, the civic leadership must look to the whole electorate and not to its constituent elements.

Then as now, reformers were continually foiled by civic apathy. Even when they managed to win over municipal officials, they found it difficult to mobilize public support, especially if their suggestions required increased expenditures. Not surprisingly, frustrated reformers were inclined to blame such defeats upon a conspiracy of the cruder elements in municipal politics. There was a significant though muted fear of the urban proletariat and the immigrant vote, both of which could lead to the dominance of American-style city bosses. Some reformers, like Wickett, seemed to favour the restricted franchise which would give the respectable property-holder decisive power in civic affairs.[59] One of the reasons for proposals to rationalize the ward system, particularly by creating enlarged wards, was in the hope of undermining the strength of the lower-class vote.[60] On the whole, though, reformers placed greater emphasis upon popular involvement in municipal politics through civic organizations, a lowered franchise, and the plebiscite — in Regina and Edmonton, civic leaders even experimented with "direct democracy" incorporating the referendum system in their respective city charters.[61] Time after time, reformers called upon municipal leaders to educate the public, to make the electors aware of civic problems. Reformers seemed convinced, at least at the level of rhetoric, that a vigorous "civic patriotism" would eventually overcome particulariam and partisanship, freeing municipal government from the corrupting influence of special interests.[62] In reality "civic patriotism" meant a blanket commitment to the schemes of the reformers.

More and more, the reformers placed their final trust in the bureaucratic method, that essential handmaiden of modern collectivism. The bureaucratic method was a radically new approach to society and problem-solving. At the theoretical level, it was founded upon the burgeoning science of statistics. This science, in vogue since the last quarter of the nineteenth century, seemed able to rationalize the complex and mysterious world created by the new urban-industrial order. The statistician broke down situations into their constituent elements, transferred these results to paper, and thereby rendered understandable the "real world".[63] In his study of a particular area in Montreal, Herbert Ames analyzed the inhabitants as an economic class of varying income units, as ethnic groups, and as home-owners, piling category on top of

category, and eventually creating a composite picture of their physical needs. Although very ambitious, Ames' survey was only one of the innumerable municipal studies sponsored by reform organizations and individuals, dealing with relief cases, crime and disease, municipal finances, and so on. Such studies were essential as a means of educating the public and projecting sound reform programmes — without statistics, complete and standardized, there could be no effective planning, no slum clearance, no tax reform.[64]

At the institutional level, the bureaucratic method required the creation of an autonomous and trained administration dedicated to the twin ideals of economy and efficiency. To the reformers expert knowledge was a near panacea. This was the beginning of the age of the specialist and the professional. The reformers hoped to minimize the influence of the amateur in all departments of civic government, to take administration out of politics.[65] Wickett pointed to Germany where leading civic administrators were trained before they took office.[66] There were suggestions that Canadian academics become involved in municipal research and the training of municipal experts. Reformers demanded the multiplication of bureaucratic structures, special and permanent commissions, advisory posts and the like, to deal in detail with the community.[67] Responding to reform pleas, especially after 1900, municipal governments did create formidable civic bureaucracies to control police, public health, utilities, parks and recreation, and social welfare.[68] To a degree, this appeared to be a devolution of authority; in fact, it was a centralization of authority in the hands of professionals, well-nigh independent of the electorate, with a vested interest in the success of the reform movement. This latent authoritarianism was tempered by the assumption that the bureaucrat would move in accordance with a right-thinking public.

The reform idea had an import far beyond the immediate urban setting. Some reformers and municipal officials, it is true, did seem to favour the separation of the city and the wider provincial community. These "home rulers" argued that provincial assemblies were dominated by rural members and therefore the provincial governments were largely indifferent to municipal problems. W. D. Lighthall, secretary of the Union of Canadian Municipalities, believed that the cities must have complete control over all their utilities.[69] W. F. Maclean, owner of the Toronto *World,* argued that Toronto should extend its control over the surrounding countryside and regulate its own affairs without outside interference.[70] Similarly, G.-A. Nantel wished to consolidate all major

governmental functions on the island of Montreal under one general scheme of metropolitan federation. Such beliefs led to experimentation with existing incorporation and municipal acts — in Toronto a call for a special charter to meet the city's peculiar needs, in Edmonton a less specific grant of municipal powers to ensure flexibility and freedom.[71]

But "home rule" never secured as much support in Canada as in the United States. As most reformers recognized, it was hardly practicable to establish an inflexible division between civic and provincial affairs. Cities were legal creatures of the provinces and schemes for municipal reorganization, public health, or social welfare required provincial approval. Battles between the cities and utility companies, such as the public hydro controversy in Ontario, the campaign against corporate domination in Montreal, and the drive for provincialization of telephones in Manitoba and Alberta, all involved province-wide interests and consequently these battles were transferred to the legislative assemblies. Thus reformers pressured provincial governments to take an active hand in urban reform. In response, provinces passed special laws and gradually established a new bureaucracy to deal with municipal matters.[72]

Towards the end of the period, more and more reformers demanded a national response to urban problems. Most wanted a federal commission modelled on the British Local Government Board with extraordinary powers to co-ordinate schemes for civic improvement. To a degree, this desire was satisfied by that strange federal body, the Commission of Conservation, which existed between 1909 and 1921. Although in theory only advisory, under the energetic direction of Clifford Sifton the Commission delved into all kinds of issues, not the least being urban reform. It held a number of special hearings on housing and public health, sponsored conferences on town planning and civic improvement, and engineered the founding of the Civic Improvement League of Canada. Between 1914 and 1921, it published a quarterly magazine, *Conservation of Life,* to investigate town planning, housing and public health. It attempted to co-ordinate the plans of reformers and provincial and federal administrators and to establish national codes for housing and health. The range of activities included within the purview of the Commission was astonishing. It had tried to deal with all the problems of the new urban-industrial order. Unfortunately, it has also invaded the preserves of other government departments and even challenged the politicians — the result was its abolition in 1921.[73]

Urban reform should not be considered in isolation. It was part of a movement international in scope and general to Canadian society. Urban problems were common to all industrialized nations. The ties between Canadian reformers and American progressives are obvious. In a long discussion of American influences on Canadian government, delivered at the University of Toronto in 1929, the Harvard political scientist William Bennett Munro concluded that Canadian city government, if not the idea of municipal reform, was modelled upon the American system with its checks and balances, administrative profusion, and divided authority.[74] While there was some truth in this assertion, Canadian reformers had in fact imported ideas and techniques from everywhere. Much of the theory of town planning in Canada was inspired by the British experience, perhaps because of the influence of Thomas Adams. G.-A. Nantel praised Paris as the prototype for the City Beautiful in the Dominion. Morley Wickett looked upon German cities as a model of efficient government. The advocates of social purity looked to Britain and the United States for inspiration. The idea of reform in Canada, or for that matter anywhere, had only a limited nationalist content.

In his book *The Search for Order, 1877-1920,* Robert Weibe has argued that the challenge of social and economic change during the late nineteenth century led to the disruption of the loosely-knit American society based upon a network of "island communities". In the following decades, he maintains, it was reordered, more properly integrated, by the new urban middle class along collectivist lines. There is every reason to believe that a similar process, perhaps not so drastic, occured in Canada. To control a society both fluid and complex, Canadians searched for some new method of ensuring stability. The answer for many, whether radical or moderate, anglophone or francophone, business, labour, and farm, lay in collectivism. The rise of the professions, the proliferation of business combinations and associations, trade unionism and agarian organization, all were aspects of the same collectivist urge.[75] Urban reform was only one of many phenomena like civil service reform, the social gospel, and conservation, which together constitute the progressive tradition in Canada.[76] By 1920 organization and bureaucracy flourished at all levels.

Although the idea of urban reform appealed to an ever-widening constituency, it drew its leadership from the spokesmen of the new middle class concentrated in Canada's, especially central Canada's big cities. Speaking very generally, this class was itself a collection of at

least three elements: old and new professionals proud of their particular expertise; businessmen, committed to the efficient exploitation of the nation's resources; and women, in many cases the wives of professionals and businessmen, determined to carve out their own place in society. Each group saw the ideal city in a somewhat different light. Much of the early initiative came from journalists like Hugh Graham of the Montreal *Star,* John Ross Robertson of the Toronto *Telegram,* and W. F. Maclean of the Toronto *World.* These self-proclaimed tribunes of the people were most conscious of political corruption and vaguely distressed by the squalor of urban life. Businessmen, like Herbert Ames and S. Morley Wickett, and particularly their fellows in the Boards of Trade, desired an attractive community, run on principles of economy and efficiency. Women's organizations, clergymen, and humanitarians concentrated their efforts upon the moral and social uplift of the underprivileged. And the ultimate victors, the bureaucrats like Thomas Adams, Charles Hastings, and Charles Hodgetts pictured the city as a poorly-functioning mechanism which had to be streamlined and regulated.

Still these people held much in common. The distinction between, say, humanitarian and town planner or sanitary and municipal reformer was always blurred, especially in the heat of battle. They were all motivated by a generalized sense of crisis, founded on a variety of fears, such as the spread of moral decay, the threat of class hatreds, and the growth of vested interests. They were inspired by the possibilities of improvement, by a belief in their ability to mold the urban environment and to create a humane, rational society. Though this was an essentially secular goal, their values, moral, humanitarian, political, and economic — in a phrase, their cultural baggage — was defined within a Christian context and jumbled together in the drive for social reconstruction. They fostered a concept of the public interest based upon the primacy of the civic community, social justice and social order, and good government. They tried to impose this concept upon all city dwellers, rich and poor. Most significant, they institutionalized reform at the three levels of government, thereby creating a bureaucracy which systematically carried forward their work.

The story of urban reform does not end here. It would be unwise to assume that reform doctrine was wholly accepted by the urban middle class, nevermind by other groups within Canadian society. The rural myth, more especially the image of the "evil city", retained a strong hold upon the Canadian mentality. Moreover, some critics feared that

reform would subvert the individualistic ethos which underlay Victorian Canada, while others warned that it would solidify the class domination of city life. Such attitudes have not died. In fact, the very success of the urban reform movement has inspired new anxieties. For the price of order was a reduction in the freedom of the individual and the neighbourhood. Since 1960 centralization, bureaucracy, even expertise have become the targets of a new dissenting movement based upon radically different propositions. Ironically, we are now witnessing a general reaction against collectivism which threatens to undo the work of the urban reformers.

## NOTES

1 M. C. Urquhart, *Historical Statistics of Canada* (Toronto: 1965), pp. 14-15.

2 J. S. Woodsworth, *My Neighbor* (Toronto: 1911), p. 37.

3 A good example of this ambivalent approach to the city can be found in the speech of Martin Burrill, minister of agriculture, to the sixth national conference on town planning: "But we have all got to remember that the cities of the past and many of the cities of the present have been responsible for the building up of the greater forces of our modern and our past civilization, that the impact of mind on mind and the interplay of moral and intellectual forces which are associated closely together in our great centers are responsible for the advance that civilization has made in all ages. It is perfectly true that there is a darker side to our city life, and it is not without some poignancy of regret to every man who believes that from the great country homes of the land the streaming forces that uplift the whole of the national life must and do mainly come, [*sic*] it must be a matter of regret that in Canada, essentially an agricultural country today, there are 45 per cent of our people living in urban homes. In speaking of that, one cannot forget that the great cities of the world are characterized too often by squalor and by a dismal poverty that must rob man of his manhood and point to nothing but dismay." *Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on City Planning* (Boston: 1914), pp. 315-316.

4 See Thomas Conant, *Life in Canada* (Toronto: 1903), pp. 227-243 and W. G. Good, "Canada's Rural Problem", *Empire Club Speeches,* Toronto, 1915-16/1916-17, pp. 299-302.

5 C. C. Berger, *The Sense of Power* (Toronto: 1970), pp. 177-198.

6 C. S. Clarke's scurrilous account of Toronto in 1898 contains an excellent description of this "dark side". Clarke was particularly intrigued by the extent of the social evil, prostitution and the like in Toronto. C. S. Clarke, *Of Toronto the Good,* Toronto: Coles reprint, 1970.

7 For critical comments on this movement see "The Back-to-the-land Movement", *Conservation of Life,* Toronto, October, 1914, pp. 30-31 and John A. Cormis, "Back to the Land", *University Magazine,* April, 1918, pp. 197-203.

8 These papers were the Montreal *Star,* the Toronto *Telegram,* the Toronto *World,* the Toronto *News,* The Ottawa *Journal,* the Vancouver *News-Advertiser,* and to a lesser extent the Winnipeg *Sun.* They were less partisan, more sensationalist, more chauvinist, and much cruder than the regular party journals. These people's papers set a new tone in journalism which eventually effected the whole of the urban press. It should be added that regular journals did not neglect municipal affairs, but their concern was rarely so continuous.

[9] For example, in 1910 the Canadian Club of Ottawa was addressed by Charles J. Bonaparte, ex-attorney general of the United States, on the purification of city politics and by Henry Vivian, a British m.p., on city planning.

[10] Canadian Political Science Association, *Papers and Proceedings,* vol. 1, 1913.

[11] This had first been championed by the civic booster, the spokesman for local business interests, who was committed to the material growth of his community. But by the late 1870s and early 1880s, when the public library issue arose in Montreal and Toronto, there was a much more obvious reform tone to civic improvement, a concern with popular culture as well as prestige.

[12] J. E. Middleton, *The Municipality of Toronto: A History,* vol. 1 (Toronto and New York: 1923), pp. 301-302.

[13] For a chronological account of the advance of public health in the city of Toronto, see *Events and Factors in the Advance of Public Health Measures in Toronto, 1866-,* a special report, Department of the City Clerk, September 18, 1968.

[14] The English papers in Montreal were the most vociferous advocates of vaccination — the Montreal *Herald* was the target of a riot for its "advanced" views. But so-called respectable francophone opinion, represented by Mayor Beaugrand, was equally committed. Vaccination was as much a class issue as a race issue, involving the physical imposition of the wishes of the educated upon the lower orders.

[15] Charles J. Hastings, "The Modern Conception of Public Health Administration", *Conservation of Life,* October, 1917, p. 88.

[16] For an elaboration of the ideas of these moral reformers see G. A. Warburton, "The Moral Conditions of Toronto", Canadian Club, Toronto, *Proceedings,* 1915-16, pp. 17-25 and "Commercialized Vice and the White Slave Traffic" and "Temperance", Social Service Congress, *Report of Addresses and Proceedings,* (Toronto: 1914), pp. 199-237 and 303-326. Another valuable source are the yearbooks of the National Council of Women, especially with regard to the social purity movement. These yearbooks indicate the wide variety of interests involved in moral reform, especially its concern with the immigrants, the underprivileged, and social welfare.

[17] These laws related to prostitution and seduction, liquor and prohibition, gambling, night curfew, pernicious literature, tobacco and narcotic sales, sabbatarianism, and the police. The moral reform movement had a national import: the anti-gambling legislation of Blake, Charlton's campaign against seduction, the Dominion Lord's Day Act, and of course prohibition. "Blue Laws" won considerable support in cities, towns, and farming districts — more often from English Canada than Quebec. The moral reform campaigns in the cities were only a part of a movement general throughout English Canada.

[18] James H. Gray, *The Boy from Winnipeg* (Toronto: 1970), pp. 5-8.

[19] Thomas H. Raddall, *Halifax, Warden of the North* (Toronto: 1948), pp. 260-261.

[20] C. Clarke, *Of Toronto the Good,* pp. 86-131.

[21] Richard B. Splane, *Social Welfare in Ontario, 1791-1893,* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

[22] See the comment of W. J. Hanna, an Ontario cabinet minister to the new Civic Improvement League of Canada: "The nation is the individual in the aggregate. Surround the irndividual with the proper conditions and most of the real problems, the social problems, will cease to exist. Before the individual is born, make such labour laws and establish such conditions as will ensure him a healthy mother. . . . Suitable town-planning and enforced housing laws will give him a home with sunshine and fresh air on all sides. . . . We must also give him supervised playgrounds. Failing playgrounds and open spaces, he should have a quiet street with now and then a hurdy-gurdy. . . . Where he goes to school he should be put in his proper class; he should not have to sit beside a consumptive or a defective. Manual training should be part of his school course. His sister should be taught mothercraft, cooking and sewing; at the same time she ought to

be given some practical education that would enable her to become a skilled wage-earner. Give the boy a school bank if you can, that he may learn the first principle of thrift. Introduce him to the public library with its Saturday afternoon story talks and moving pictures and get his parents in to read the magazines. Censor his movies so that he will not choose the wrong hero. Give him compulsory military training. If you launch him with this equipment, he is not likely to prove a serious civic problem. Launch a generation of him and your civic problems are largely solved." Civic Improvement League of Canada, *Report of Conference,* 1916, pp. 31-32. See also J. J. Kelso, "Neglected and Friendless Children", *Canadian Magazine,* vol. 2, 1893-94, pp. 213-216; C. J. Atkinson, "The Boy Problem", Canadian Club, Toronto, *Addresses,* 1909-10, pp. 52-60: and "Child Welfare", Social Service Congress, *Report of Addresses and Proceedings,* (Toronto: 1914), pp. 89-115.

[23] H. C. Hocken, "The New Spirit in Municipal Government", Canadian Club, Ottawa, *Addresses,* 1914-15, pp. 85-97.

[24] S. Morley Wickett, "City Government in Canada", *Municipal Government in Canada,* ed. S. Morley Wickett (Toronto: 1907), p. 23. This article was first written in 1902. See also A. C. Thompson, "The Taxation of Franchises", *Canadian Magazine,* vol 24, 1904-05, pp. 463-465.

[25] S. Morley Wickett, "Present Conditions", *Municipal Government in Canada,* pp. 157-162; W. F. Maclean, "A Greater Toronto", *Empire Club Speeches,* Toronto, 1907-08, pp. 84-89; and F. S. Spence, "Some Suggestions as to Toronto Street Railway Problems", Canadian Club, Toronto, *Addresses,* 1908-09, pp. 37-40.

[26] James Mavor, "Municipal Ownership of Public Utilities", reprint, a paper read at the joint meeting of the Michigan Political Science Association and the League of Michigan Municipalities (Ann Arbor: 1904); James Mavor, *Government Telephones: The Experience of Manitoba, Canada,* New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1916; and Edward Harris, "A Review of Civic Ownership", Toronto: William Briggs, 1908.

[27] For a fuller description of the abortive campaign against corporate dominance in Montreal, see J. I. Cooper, *Montreal: A Brief History* (Montreal and London: 1969), pp. 120-121 and Joseph Levitt, *Henri Bourassa and the Golden Calf* (Ottawa: 1969), pp. 47-56.

[28] Lloyd A. Machum, *A History of Moncton, Town and City 1855-1965* (Moncton: 1965), p. 218 and 222.

[29] W. J. Bell, a local civic booster, claimed that Guelph was "the first Canadian Municipality to own and successfully operate all of its public utilities." W. J. Bell, "Municipal Ownership and Civic Government" (Guelph: 1909), p. 3.

[30] J. E. Middleton, *The Municipality of Toronto,* p. 364 and W. D. Lighthall, "Valedictory of W. D. Lighthall, K.C., On Retiring from the Honorary Secretaryship of the Union of Canadian Municipalities, August, 1919".

[31] Even before this, Ontario town had been purchasing their electric power utilities. According to R. N. Beattie, twenty towns and cities between 1899 and 1902 had commenced operation of their own facilities. R. N. Beattie, "The Impact of Hydro on Ontario", *Profiles of a Province* (Toronto: 1967), pp. 167-168.

[32] The telephone question was a problem unto itself. Bell Telephone had a Dominion charter which could not be touched by the provinces. Furthermore, Bell controlled the trunk lines between cities, upon which an efficient and extensive telephone system depended. It seemed almost impossible for cities to handle Bell on their own, thus the interest in provincial and national control.

[33] For a discussion of the significance of these movements see Charles N. Glaab and A. Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (New York and London: 1967), pp. 260-263 and 289-291. Jane Jacobs, the noted urban philosopher, argues that the town planners, in fact urban reform generally, never overcame the myths created by the City Beautiful and Garden City ideas. Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities,* Random House, 1961, pp. 16-25.

[34] Henry Vivian, "Garden Suburbs and Town Planning", Canadian Club, Toronto, *Addresses,* 1910-11, pp. 35-40 and G. Trafford Hewitt, "Canada and the

United States as a Field for the Garden City Movement", *Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on City Planning* (Boston: 1914), pp. 180-189. Hewitt was the president of the Province of Nova Scotia Land Corporation, Limited and he claimed that he planned to build a Garden City in Canada. Purportedly, Lindenlea, outside Ottawa, was a garden suburb. See B. Evan Parry, "Ottawa Garden Suburb", *Town Planning and Conservation of Life,* July-September, 1920, p. 68.

35 Adam Shortt, "The Social and Economic Significance of the Movement from the Country to the City", Canadian Club, Montreal, *Addresses,* 1912-13, pp. 70-71.

36 James Gray gives an amusing description of the chaos left by the developers in Winnipeg after the boom in the early twentieth century. James H. Gray, *The Boy from Winnipeg,* pp. 1-5.

37 Clifford Sifton, "Address of Welcome", *Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on City Planning* (Boston: 1914), p. 12. One writer argued that Canadians were following the broader scheme of town planning along the British model rather than the American, which tended more towards the aesthetic. "The Meaning and Practical Application of Town Planning", *Conservation of Life,* July, 1915, pp. 74-76.

38 As an appendix, the magazine *Conservation of Life* carried a summary of town planning exploits throughout the nation.

39 R. S. Gourlay, "Some Aspects of Commercial Value to the City of Toronto of the Proposed Harbor Improvements", *Empire Club Speeches,* Toronto, 1912-13/1913-14, pp. 129-145; R. S. Gourlay, "Basic Principles of Water Front Development as Illustrated by the Plans of the Toronto Harbor Commission", *Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on City Planning* (Boston: 1914), pp. 17-31; and L. H. Clarke, "Putting a New Front on Toronto", *Canadian Magazine,* vol. 42, 1913-14, pp. 205-215.

40 The CPR and the Grand Trunk had sponsored development schemes in Moncton, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, though these railway companies had not been especially concerned with the idea of town planning.

41 For a short but effective description of the problem of immigrant ghettoes see Bryce Stewart, "The Housing of Our Immigrant Workers", Canadian Political Science Association, *Proceedings and Papers,* vol. 1, 1913, pp. 98-111.

42 Charles Hodgetts, "Unsanitary Housing", Commission of Conservation, *Addresses, 1911,* p. 33. See also G. F. Chipman, "Winnipeg: The Melting Pot" and "The Refining Process", *Canadian Magazine,* vol. 33, 1909, pp. 409-416 and 548-554.

43 P. H. Bryce, "Civic Responsibility and the Increase of Immigration", *Empire Club Speeches,* Toronto, 1906-7, pp. 186-197; W. D. Lighthall, "Toronto and Town Planning", *Empire Club Speeches, 1910-11,* pp. 233-234; and J. W. Macmillan, "Problems of Population", *Empire Club Speeches,* 1911-12, pp. 75-79. It seems that the prosperous urbanites who attended Empire Club proceedings were interested in the slum problem. Comment after Bryce's paper, however, revealed that at least three members were more concerned with keeping out undesirable immigration than with solving the existing problem.

44 Clifford Sifton, "Address of Welcome", *Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on City Planning* (Boston: 1914), p. 8. The suburban movement had been a feature of Canadian life for some years by 1914. Developers had been quick to realize the possibilities of exploiting the dissatisfaction of prosperous urbanites with their cities. But in terms of urban reform, the suburban movement further fragmented the city into poor and rich districts and did not solve the problem of congestion within the poor districts.

45 Charles Hodgetts discussed the character of housing laws in Canadian provinces. They usually established regulations with regard to space, ventilation, and sanitation and they made provision for some kind of permanent inspectorate. Hodgetts noted that where applied these acts had the desired effect, but unfortunately many boards of health had not exercised their powers to the fullest extent. Charles Hodgetts, "Unsanitary Housing", *Addresses, 1911,* Commission of Conservation, pp. 43-51. For a more general discussion of town planning and slum reform see G. Frank Beer, "A Plea for City Organization", *Addresses, 1914,* Commission of Conservation.

[46] Thomas Adams, "The Housing Problem", Canadian Club, Montreal, *Addresses,* 1918-19, pp. 178-187 and C. B. Sissons, "A Housing Policy for Ontario", *Canadian Magazine,* vol. 53, 1919, pp. 241-248.

[47] S. Morley Wickett, "Present Conditions", *Municipal Government in Canada,* p. 343.

[48] For a long discussion of the conversion to business taxes and the single tax experiment, see J. H. Perry, *Taxes, Tariffs, and Subsidies; A History of Canadian Fiscal Development* (Toronto: 1955), pp. 124-136. The western variant of single tax was not in fact a true application of Henry George's principles and it was based upon an extravagant land boom which constantly raised the value of land. There were many absentee landowners and speculators in the west, not the least being the Canadian Pacific Railway. When the land boom ended after 1910, western towns soon turned to the business tax and other more regular taxation systems. There was some discussion of the western variant in Ontario, especially in Toronto where it received approval in principle in a plebiscite, but the provincial government refused to allow its adoption. Perry indicates, however, that in practice improvements were under-assessed in many municipalities.

[49] Civic Improvement League of Canada, *Report of Preliminary Conference at Ottawa, 1915,* p. 8.

[50] For example, municipal politics in Toronto in the 1880s seems to have been based upon a network of localist influences, religious and ethnic factions like the Orange Order, and sporadic business interest, all overlayed by the partisan loyalty of civic leaders and the press to the Conservatives or Liberals.

[51] H. B. Ames, "The Machine in Honest Hands", *Canadian Magazine,* vol. 3, 1894, pp. 101-109.

[52] See W. H. Atherton, *Montreal, 1535-1914* (Montreal: 1914), vol. 2, pp. 184-191; Leslie Roberts, *Montreal: From Mission Colony to World City* (Toronto: 1969), pp. 263-270 and 304-316; and J. I. Cooper, *Montreal,* pp. 96-103, 119-121, and 130-144.

[53] E. A. Macdonald, mayor of Toronto in 1900, is an excellent example of this kind of "reform" politician. Throughout the 1880s he constantly sniffed out scandal among his opponents in a finally successful campaign to secure the mayoralty. An account of his chequered career, albeit inadequate, can be found in J. E. Middleton, *The Municipality of Toronto,* vol. 1, pp. 339-357.

[54] This innovation was peculiar to Canadian cities. It spread from Toronto to Hamilton and Ottawa and was temporarily adopted by Montreal, Winnipeg, and London. S. Morley Wickett, "City Government in Canada", *Municipal Government in Canada,* pp. 12-13 and H. L. Brittain, *Local Government in Canada* (Toronto: 1951), pp. 52-53.

[55] F. H. Underhill, "Commission Government in Cities", *The Arbor* (University of Toronto), vol. 1-2, 1910-11, pp. 284-294; W. J. Bell, "Municipal Ownership and Civic Government by Commission"; Oliver Asselin, "Le Problème Municipal" (Montreal: 1909); and Goldwin Smith "Municipal Government: A Letter to the World", reprint, 1905(?).

[56] During the 1880s, when certain reformers were trying to change the structure of city government, the Toronto *Telegram* constantly argued the case for "good men" over reformed institutions. Toronto *Telegram,* January 12, 1893, p. 4; February 27, 1896, p. 4; and March 28, 1896, p. 5. Mayor R. D. Waugh of Winnipeg told the Civic Improvement League of Canada in 1916 much the same thing: "The citizen does not, as a rule, take any of the blame or responsibility for mismanagement himself. It is almost invariably "the system" or "the Council" that is wrong. But you hear it in Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, everywhere, that old story, "The city government is no good." There is always a clamour more or less loud for a change. We all know that there is room for great improvement, but when we get down to the question of "How?" one says one thing, one another, but it is just threshing out the same old straw. We try new schemes, elect new men, but still the main result is the same.

No, the system is not altogether to blame for the result. It matters little about the system after all — the man is the main consideration. Poor men with a good system will not insure good government, but good man may, no matter what

the system." Civic Improvement League of Canada, *Report of Conference,* 1916, p. 22.

57 Woodsworth, *My Neighbor,* p. 26.

58 Underhill, "Commission Government in Cities", pp. 286-287.

59 Wickett, "City Government in Canada", *Municipal Government in Canada,* pp. 9-11.

60 In Toronto, there was a proposal that all wards be drawn from the harbour to the northern city limits. Such would create "heterogeneous" wards and break down the influence of lower-class neighbourhoods.

61 Wickett, "Present Conditions", *Municipal Government in Canada,* p. 351.

62 This point was continually raised at the two conferences on civic improvement; Civic Improvement League of Canada, *Report of Preliminary Conference at Ottawa,* 1915, p. 12 (Thomas Adams) and pp. 35-36 (S. Morley Wickett); and Civic Improvement League of Canada, *Report of Conference,* 1916, pp. 24-25 (R. D. Waugh, mayor of Winnipeg) and pp. 35-36 (W. J. Hanna).

63 See "Community Engineering", The Citizen's Research Institute of Canada, Ottawa, 1920. This was a pamphlet put out by the Institute to attract interest in statistical research into municipal problems. For a price the Institute was willing to carry out studies of particular communities.

64 S. Morley Wickett, "Municipal Publicity Through Uniformity in Municipal Statistics", Eighth Annual Convention of the Union of Canadian Municipalities, Montreal, 1908 and J. A. Cooper, "The Municipal Survey", *Canadian Political Science Association,* vol. 1, 1913, pp. 124-131.

65 Mrs. Adam Shortt: "But I think none of us will disagree in this, that in almost all municipal councils, at least, so far as we have known, from Halifax to Vancouver, there is an element of politics which enters into municipal administration and sometimes ties up the machinery, which, at its best and without politics, might be more efficient. Moreover, this entrance of politics into the municipal situation frequently leads to the appointment of men for outstanding positions which affects our morality, our beauty and our efficiency — not because they are men fitted for the positions, but because they are men who, for some reason or other, it is thought must have a job. It is, in many cases, as has been said, not the man's fitness for the occupation, but there is an occupation to which they may fit the man who needs a job." Civic Improvement League of Canada, *Report of Preliminary Conference at Ottawa,* 1915, p. 2.

66 S. Morley Wickett, "The Problems of City Government", *Empire Club Speeches,* Toronto, 1907-08, p. 113.

67 Initially this demand was only for a special post like City Engineer and Medical Officer or a commission for police or waterworks. But after 1900 reformers were concerned with the development of a complete municipal civil service. See J. O. Miller, "The Better Government of Our Cities", in *The New Era in Canada,* ed. J. O. Miller (Toronto; 1917), pp. 368-370.

68 For example, in 1919 a handbook on Ottawa listed 10 permanent officials — city clerk, commissioner of works, city collector, city treasurer, city auditor, fire chief, assessment commissioner, city solicitor, charity officer, and market inspector. J. H. Putnam, "City Government Ottawa", Ottawa: James Hope & Sons, Limited, 1919.

69 W. D. Lighthall, "Valedictory. . . .", 1919.

70 W. F. Maclean, "A Greater Toronto", *Empire Club Speeches,* Toronto, 1907-08, pp. 81-90.

71 S. Morley Wickett, "Civic Charters: The Question of a Charter for Toronto and of Civic Charters in General", *The Municipal World,* January, 1905, pp. 8-10. Wickett claims that the act incorporating Edmonton was written by the editor of *The Municipal Manual,* a former city solicitor of Toronto — Wickett, "Present Conditions", *Municipal Government in Canada,* pp. 151-152.

72 These included liquor licensing and prohibition, public health, municipal financing, utilities and highways, town planning and housing.

73 J. W. Dafoe, *Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times* (Toronto: 1971), pp. 444-445. Dafoe deals mainly with the involvement of the commission in

resource development.

[74] W. B. Munro, *American Influence on Canadian Government* (Toronto: 1929), pp. 99-142.

[75] For a discussion of the collectivist urge and economic groups see J. M. Bliss, "The Protective Impulse: An Approach to the Social History of Mowat's Ontario", a paper delivered at the Mowat Seminar, Kingston, November, 1970.

[76] Recently historians have begun to investigate this progressive tradition. R. Craig Brown has pointed out that Robert Borden expressed the ideals of bureaucratic reform in national politics. R. C. Brown, "The Political Ideas of Robert Borden", *The Political Ideas of the Prime Ministers of Canada,* ed. M. Hamelin (Ottawa: 1969), pp. 87-97. Joseph Levitt has argued that one can find a progressive response to social and economic problems in French Canada in the writings of Bourassa and the *nationalistes*. J. Levitt, *Henri Bourassa and the Golden Calf,* Ottawa: Les Editions de L'Université d'Ottawa, 1969. And of course, Richard Allen has discussed in some detail the rise and decline of the social gospel in Canada. R Allen, "The Social Gospel and the Reform Tradition in Canada, 1890-1928", *Canadian Historical Review,* vol. 59, Dec., 1968, pp. 381-399.