

**URBAN CHANGE**

**IN THE 1990s**

An Address by  
Douglas A. Stewart  
Executive Director - Research and Development  
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation

This was the Keynote Address  
at the Workshop to Review  
"The Changing Canadian Metropolis"  
York University                      October 18, 1990

## URBAN CHANGE IN THE 1990s

I HAVE BEEN LOOKING FORWARD TO THIS EVENING. THIS IS THE BEGINNING OF AN IMPORTANT STAGE IN THE EXAMINATION OF URBAN CANADA IN THE LAST DECADE OF THIS CENTURY. CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION IS PLEASED TO HAVE SPONSORED THIS STUDY OF METROPOLITAN CHANGE, SO NATURALLY, I FIND IT GRATIFYING TO SEE SO MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE INVOLVED IN THIS PROJECT GATHERED HERE. I THINK THIS WILL BE A MEETING ON WHICH WE SHALL ALL LOOK BACK WITH A FEELING OF APPRECIATION AND ACCOMPLISHMENT.

IT IS A DIFFICULT TIME TO SPEAK ABOUT -- OR TO STUDY -- THE FUTURE OF URBAN CANADA, BECAUSE SO MANY ISSUES ARE EMERGING ON THE AGENDA OF CANADA'S LARGER CITIES. WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO TONIGHT IS SCAN THE CHANGING URBAN HORIZON AS IT APPEARS FROM WHERE WE AT CMHC SIT. THAT HORIZON WILL BE SEEN DIFFERENTLY BY CIVIC LEADERS, BY POLITICIANS, BY THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY, AND BY THE HOUSING INDUSTRY. BUT I THINK THE PICTURE WE, AT CMHC SEE, REFLECTS MANY OF THESE VARIED VIEWPOINTS.

AS I PROGRESS THROUGH THIS ASSESSMENT I WILL KEEP RETURNING TO THREE CENTRAL THEMES.

1. THE NEED FOR A FUNDAMENTAL REASSESSMENT OF THE WAY WE DO THINGS - THE NEED TO CHANGE OUR URBAN INSTITUTIONS - THE NEED FOR LONGER AND BROADER VISIONS.
2. THE NEED FOR GREATER SOCIAL EQUITY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR CITIES IF THEY ARE TO BE SUSTAINABLE IN THE 21ST CENTURY.
3. THE NEED FOR PEOPLE LIKE US TO ENSURE THAT IMPORTANT POLICY ISSUES ARE KEPT IN FRONT OF THE PUBLIC AND THAT THE DEBATE BENEFITS FROM UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION AND CLEAR ANALYSIS.

AS WE LOOK TOWARD THE FUTURE, WE CANNOT HELP BUT NOTICE THE INCREASING SPEED OF CHANGE. EVEN THOUGH WE ARE ALREADY INTO THE DECADE, IT IS MORE DIFFICULT THAN EVER TO DEFINE THE ISSUES AND THE PROBLEMS OUR CITIES WILL FACE IN THE NEXT NINE YEARS. IN THE VERY FIRST YEAR OF THE 1990S THE WORLD HAS WITNESSED EVENTS AND DEVELOPMENTS OF SUCH PROFOUND IMPORTANCE THAT ONE WONDERS WHAT IS YET TO COME.

I SUSPECT, HOWEVER, THAT WE MAY BE ABLE TO AGREE THERE IS AT LEAST ONE SUBJECT WHICH WILL COMMAND MUCH OF OUR ATTENTION

FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE. THAT IS THE ADAPTATION OF OUR CITIES TO MORE SUSTAINABLE FORMS OF SETTLEMENT. WE CAN NO LONGER RESPOND TO THE NEEDS OF THE PRESENT WITHOUT CONSIDERING THE NEEDS OF THE FUTURE. WE MUST ENSURE THAT TODAY'S SOLUTIONS DO NOT DIMINISH FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES. WE MUST BEGIN TO TURN FROM THE WASTEFUL USE OF RESOURCES TO MUCH MORE RATIONAL APPROACHES.

LET'S TAKE AN EXAMPLE WITH WHICH I AM SURE YOU ARE ALL FAMILIAR - THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT. THE FOSSIL FUELS WE ARE CURRENTLY BURNING ADD 20 BILLION TONS OF CARBON DIOXIDE TO THE ATMOSPHERE EACH YEAR. THIS DANGEROUS POLLUTION IS GROWING AT A RATE OF 4 PER CENT A YEAR, AND 85 PER CENT OF THIS COMES FROM THE INDUSTRIAL NATIONS OF THE NORTHERN HEMISPHERE. ABOUT 20 OTHER GASES, TAKEN TOGETHER, ARE ALMOST AS DAMAGING TO THE FUTURE OF THE GLOBE AS CO<sub>2</sub>. THE CONSEQUENCE OF ALL OF THESE EMISSIONS, IS PREDICTED TO BE AN INCREASE IN AVERAGE WORLD TEMPERATURES FROM 1.5 TO 4.5 DEGREES C IN THE NEXT HALF CENTURY.

THIS COULD HAVE ENORMOUS IMPACTS ON URBAN CANADA. OVER THE NEXT 50 YEARS THE PROJECTED RISE IN MEAN SEA LEVEL OF BETWEEN 20 AND 240 CENTIMETRES WOULD AFFECT ALL COASTAL AREAS. BUT IF THE CLIMATE CHANGE WERE SUFFICIENT TO BEGIN MELTING THE POLAR ICE CAPS, AND THIS HAS ALSO BEEN FORECAST, OCEANS COULD RISE BETWEEN 5 AND 7 METRES - ENOUGH TO TURN P.E.I. INTO AN ARCHIPELAGO. ALSO, ACROSS THE COUNTRY, LESS

SURFACE WATER WOULD REDUCE LEVELS OF LAKES AND RIVERS, AFFECTING TRANSPORTATION, FISHERIES, RECREATION AND HYDRO POWER. PEOPLE WOULD MOVE, FROM PLACE TO PLACE IN CANADA, AND FROM THREATENED PLACES ABROAD TO CANADA.

WHY IS IT THAT WE ARE NOT DOING MORE TO PREPARE FOR THESE SCENARIOS? I SUSPECT THAT A GOOD PART OF THE PROBLEM IS THAT THE WARNING SIGNS ARE TOO SUBTLE FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE PUBLIC TO PERCEIVE. A CONSENSUS STILL HAS NOT BEEN REACHED ON THE SEVERITY OR TIMING OF THE EFFECTS. ALSO, OUR EXISTING INSTITUTIONS ARE NOT WELL EQUIPPED TO DEAL WITH THE LONG TERM EFFECTS OF FIRMLY ENTRENCHED HABITS - NO MATTER HOW APOCALYPTIC THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES.

OUR POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS FOR EXAMPLE. IS IT REASONABLE TO EXPECT POLITICIANS TO ACCEPT THE IMMEDIATE CERTAIN WRATH OF A PUBLIC FORCED TO RADICALLY CHANGE ITS CONSUMPTION PATTERNS IN RETURN FOR UNCERTAIN POSTHUMOUS PRAISE (FROM A POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE AT LEAST)! THE ANSWER OF COURSE IS "NO".

THEN WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IS IT TO BRING THESE ISSUES FORWARD? I SUGGEST THAT IT'S OURS! WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR NOT, WE ARE MEMBERS OF A PRIVILEGED ELITE THAT SOCIETY HAS A RIGHT TO DEPEND ON. WE HAVE THE CAPACITY TO EXAMINE OUR WORLD. WE HAVE THE INTELLECTUAL AND SCIENTIFIC TOOLS. WE HAVE THE TIME TO DO IT AND WE HAVE A POSITION IN SOCIETY

WHICH ENSURES THAT OUR VOICES WILL BE HEARD IF ONLY WE WILL RAISE THEM.

IT'S OUR JOB TO KEEP THESE ISSUES IN FRONT OF THE PUBLIC'S EYES, TO PUT THE DEBATE IN TERMS THAT ALL CAN UNDERSTAND, AND TO SERIOUSLY LOOK AT MEANS OF AVOIDING THESE EFFECTS IF POSSIBLE OR AT WHAT WE NEED TO DO TO SURVIVE THE CONSEQUENCES IF TIME HAS INDEED RUN OUT.

IN THE URBAN CONTEXT, THEN, WHAT SHOULD WE BE LOOKING AT?

TRANSPORTATION IS A GOOD PLACE TO START.

IN CITIES, 90 PER CENT OF TRANSPORTATION ENERGY IS DEVOTED TO THE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE. IN CANADA, WE USE TWO AND A HALF TIMES AS MUCH GASOLINE PER CAPITA AS EUROPEAN CITIES DO. IF THESE FIGURES ARE TO BE CHANGED, IT IS NOT ENOUGH TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF MORE EFFICIENT CARS. WE NEED MORE PEOPLE TRAVELLING ON PUBLIC TRANSIT. IT IS SMALL COMFORT THAT WE IN CANADA USE PUBLIC TRANSIT MORE THAN OUR SOUTHERLY NEIGHBOURS DO, BECAUSE STILL ONLY 15 PER CENT OF US RELY ON THIS MOST EFFICIENT WAY OF MOVING URBAN PEOPLE.

WE ALSO MAY BE FORCED TO QUESTION ONE OF THE PRINCIPAL ICONS OF CANADIAN SOCIETY - THE SINGLE DETACHED HOME. ABOUT 60 PER CENT OF CANADIANS LIVE IN SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING THAT ACCOUNTS FOR A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE NATIONAL ENERGY

DEMAND. DESPITE THE EMPHASIS ON TIGHTER BUILDINGS, DETACHED DWELLINGS MAY CONSUME NEARLY 40 PER CENT MORE ENERGY THAN THE ALTERNATIVES. THEY ALSO MAKE IT DIFFICULT TO RUN ENERGY EFFICIENT OPERATIONS SUCH AS DISTRICT HEATING.

THE CANADIAN HABIT, WELL ENTRENCHED OVER THE PAST 50 YEARS, OF LOW DENSITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS PUTS ADDITIONAL STRAIN ON SUSTAINABILITY. MOST OF THAT HOUSING IS ON RELATIVELY LARGE LOTS WHICH REQUIRE LARGE INVESTMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE. MOREOVER, THESE HOUSES MAY NOW SEND TWO OR EVEN THREE CARS EACH INTO THE CLOGGED METROPOLITAN STREETS WITH ADDED WASTE OF ENERGY AND A FURTHER CONTRIBUTION TO THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT.

LET ME TURN FROM THESE PHYSICAL IMPLICATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE TO ANOTHER ASPECT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT WHICH IS OFTEN OVERLOOKED. THAT IS THE SOCIAL DIMENSION.

THE ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT MUST BE TO IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF PEOPLE, BOTH TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE. IN ORDER TO BE TRULY SUSTAINABLE, WE BELIEVE THAT POLICIES CONCERNING THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ECONOMY MUST INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATE SOCIAL DIMENSION. EFFECTIVE POLICIES MUST ADDRESS FUNDAMENTAL SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS OF EQUITY AND OPPORTUNITY.

FOR EXAMPLE, AT PRESENT A SIZABLE PROPORTION OF OUR POPULATION SEEMS TO REGARD HIGHLY CONSUMPTIVE BEHAVIOR AS PART OF THEIR "QUALITY OF LIFE" AND "LIFESTYLE". THE TREND TOWARD LARGER AND LARGER HOMES IS JUST ONE ILLUSTRATION OF THIS VIEW. THE PATTERNS OF CONSUMPTION RESULTING FROM THESE ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS HAVE A COST AND TO THE EXTENT THEY ARE NOT PAID BY THEIR BENEFICIARIES THEY ARE PAID BY SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. EVEN IF THESE LIFESTYLES COULD BE SUSTAINED FROM A PHYSICAL OR ECONOMIC VIEWPOINT (WHICH I DOUBT), THEY RAISE DISTURBING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SOCIAL EQUITY OF CANADIAN SOCIETY.

THE BRUNDTLAND REPORT HAD ITS OWN PERSPECTIVE FROM WHICH LESSONS RELATIVE TO CANADA CAN BE DRAWN. IT WAS CONCERNED WITH THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AMONG NATIONS, AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF CONTINUING FAILURE TO ACHIEVE SUCH A DISTRIBUTION. EXACTLY THE SAME THING CAN BE SAID ABOUT THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AMONG GROUPS WITHIN URBAN AREAS.

WE HAVE ALLOWED SITUATIONS OF NEED AND DEPENDENCY TO DEVELOP. SCARCE PUBLIC BUDGETS ARE STRAINED TO ASSIST LESS-FORTUNATE, LOWER-INCOME GROUPS IN DEALING WITH CHRONIC PROBLEMS IN EMPLOYMENT, HOUSING, HEALTH CARE AND OTHER BASIC NEEDS. I THINK MORE STRATEGIC APPROACHES ARE NEEDED - APPROACHES WHICH CHANNEL SUPPORT TO PROGRAMS WHICH ENABLE PEOPLE TO HELP THEMSELVES, PROGRAMS WHICH HELP TO CREATE MORE SUSTAINABLE LIVES.



OUR FAILURE TO MEET SOCIAL NEEDS CAN ONLY JEOPARDIZE OUR HOPES FOR DECENT CITIES IN THE 1990S AND BEYOND. THIS SUMMER WE SAW, DRAMATICALLY, THE RESULTS OF SOCIETY'S INABILITY TO REACH A CONSENSUS WITH GROUPS OF NATIVE CANADIANS. SERIOUS URBAN UNREST AND VIOLENCE HAVE BECOME AN INCREASING THREAT BENEATH THE SURFACE OF THE MODERN CITY. THE DEGREE AND IMMEDIACY OF THE THREAT OBVIOUSLY VARIES FROM CITY TO CITY, WITH NO RULES YET FOUND TO RELATE ITS EXTENT TO URBAN SIZE, AGE, RACIAL COMPOSITION, ETCETERA. IN SHORT, WE NEVER KNOW WHEN WE MAY BE FACED WITH A SERIOUS LAPSE INTO VIOLENCE STEMMING FROM ACUTE HUMAN DISCONTENT, HOPELESSNESS AND ALIENATION FROM WHAT WERE THOUGHT TO HAVE BEEN COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES.

I AM PROUD TO SAY THAT CMHC HAS PLAYED A ROLE IN PROMOTING THE RECOGNITION OF SOCIAL FACTORS AS A BASIC ELEMENT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. THE CORPORATION'S ADVOCACY HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN DEVELOPING THIS CONCEPT IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD), WHERE THE SOCIAL DIMENSION IS NOW A CENTRAL PART OF THE CURRENT WORK PLAN OF THE GROUP ON URBAN AFFAIRS. WE HAVE ALSO ENCOURAGED ENVIRONMENT CANADA TO INCORPORATE THIS APPROACH IN THE FORTHCOMING FEDERAL "GREEN PLAN".

WHEN WE LOOK TOGETHER AT CANADIAN CITIES IN THE 1990s, I THINK WE INEVITABLY FIND THAT WHAT CONFRONTS US IS MORE THAN A SERIES OF PROBLEMS. IT IS OUR WHOLE WAY OF MAKING

DECISIONS. FRANKLY, ALL OF US HAVE BEEN SHORT SIGHTED. I SAY "ALL OF US", DELIBERATELY BECAUSE I DO NOT MEAN TO LAY THE BLAME ON MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS. COLLECTIVELY WE HAVE FOCUSSED ON THE SHORT TERM. WE HAVE NOT PUSHED OUR GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE THE TOUGH DECISIONS THAT PAY-OFF ONLY IN THE LONG TERM. NOT SURPRISINGLY, GOVERNMENT DECISION-MAKERS UNDER ENORMOUS IMMEDIATE PRESSURES TO RESPOND TO THE CURRENT NEEDS AND WANTS OF THEIR CONSTITUENTS HAVE RESPONDED ACCORDINGLY.

FREQUENTLY OUR SHORTCOMINGS HAVE BEEN ATTRIBUTED TO BUDGETARY PRESSURE. IN THE PAST I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY THAT IN MANY RESPECTS WE TRIED TO SPEND OUR WAY TO A SOLUTION; BUT PROBLEMS REMAINED OR NEW ONES SPRANG UP. IT SEEMS IT WAS EASIER TO SPEND MONEY THEN TO TAKE A HARD LOOK AT OUR INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND VALUE SYSTEM. IT'S GETTING MORE DIFFICULT TO SPEND MONEY. MAYBE THIS WILL BE THE IMPETUS THAT WILL PUSH US TO THE ROOT OF OUR PROBLEMS - OUR VALUES, OUR WAYS OF DOING THINGS.

I THINK WE HAVE ALSO SUFFERED FROM OUR PROPENSITY TO MAKE DECISIONS WITH SEVERELY TRUNCATED VISION. WE LOOK NEITHER FORWARD NOR TO THE SIDE TO SEE WHAT IS HAPPENING OUTSIDE WHAT WE PERCEIVE TO BE OUR LIMITED SPHERE OF INFLUENCE. IF WE DID WE WOULD QUICKLY SEE THAT WE ARE PART OF AN INTIMATELY INTERCONNECTED URBAN SYSTEM WHERE NO ACTIONS ARE ISOLATED IN THEIR EFFECT.

THE EVIDENCE IS ALL AROUND US. WELL-INTENTIONED OFFICIALS AT ONE LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT WHO WERE CONCERNED WITH THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN INSTITUTIONS FOR THE MENTALLY OR SOCIALLY DISABLED TURNED THEM OUT INTO AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE ANOTHER LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT WAS NEITHER PREPARED NOR CAPABLE OF PROVIDING THE NECESSARY SUPPORT SYSTEM THESE PEOPLE REQUIRED. NEED FOR SOCIAL ASSISTANCE OUTSTRIPPED THE SUPPLY AND FOOD BANKS EMERGED. THEY WERE TO BE A TEMPORARY AND TRANSITIONAL SOLUTION. NOW CANADA HAS 1,200 OF THEM, MORE THAN IT HAS MCDONALD'S RESTAURANTS. WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE "COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING" THAT WAS THE WATCHWORD OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS OF THE SIXTIES AND SEVENTIES?

A MONUMENTAL ILLUSTRATION OF OUR SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS IS OUR FAILURE TO BUDGET FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF OUR URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE. ASK ANY ACCOUNTANT, ANY PROPERTY MANAGER, AND THEY WILL TELL YOU IT IS STANDARD PRACTICE TO SET ASIDE A RESERVE IN CURRENT BUDGETS, TO PAY FOR THE PERIODIC UPKEEP AND REPLACEMENT OF CAPITAL INVESTMENTS THAT ARE EXPECTED TO DETERIORATE. BUT MANY OF OUR CITIES HAVE NOT PROVIDED A REPLACEMENT RESERVE FOR THEIR EXPENSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE, PERHAPS ASSUMING THAT WHEN THIS GENERATION OF ROADS AND BRIDGES, PIPES AND TREATMENT PLANTS WEARS OUT, SOMEONE IN THE FUTURE WOULD HAPPILY REPLACE THEM. WELL THIS IS THE FUTURE, AND I HAVE YET TO SEE A HAPPY TAXPAYER.

CANADIAN CITIES HAVE NEVER HAD TO ADJUST COMPLETELY TO A PAY-AS-YOU-GO POLICY. OUR CITIES GREW TO THEIR PRESENT DIMENSIONS LARGELY IN TIMES WHEN PROSPERITY WAS THE NORM. THIS PROSPERITY HAS TENDED TO OBSCURE THE NECESSITY OF DEALING WITH THE QUESTION OF MUNICIPAL REVENUE SOURCES WHICH ESSENTIALLY, HAVE NOT CHANGED SINCE CONFEDERATION, DESPITE THE RADICALLY DIFFERENT ROLE CITY GOVERNMENTS NOW PLAY.

BUT THE INFRASTRUCTURE QUESTION HAS IMPLICATIONS THAT GO FAR BEYOND MUNICIPAL BUDGETING. ECONOMIC THEORY TELLS US THAT WHEN THE DEMAND FOR SERVICED LAND OUTPACES THE SUPPLY, THE VALUE OF DEVELOPABLE LAND WILL INCREASE. IN RECENT YEARS WE HAVE ALL SEEN PROPERTY VALUES SOARING IN THE SO-CALLED "BOOMS" THAT HAVE BESET SOME OF OUR LARGEST CITIES. THIS MAY HAVE BEEN A WELCOMED WINDFALL FOR EXISTING PROPERTY OWNERS WHO HAVE SEEN THE VALUE OF THEIR INVESTMENTS RISE EXTRAORDINARILY. BUT IT HAS NOT BEEN GOOD NEWS FOR YOUNG FAMILIES SEARCHING FOR A PLACE TO CALL HOME. EVER SINCE THE GREAT DEPRESSION EACH GENERATION HAS ASPIRED TO BE BETTER OFF THAN THE LAST. WITH A NEW SENSE OF REALITY, MANY YOUNG EMPLOYED PEOPLE OF MODERATE INCOME NOW WONDER WHETHER THE UPWARD CLIMB HAS STOPPED, AND WHETHER THEY WILL EVER BE ABLE TO ENJOY THE BENEFITS OF PROPERTY OWNERSHIP THE WAY THEIR PARENTS DID, THIS BECAUSE WE DIDN'T MAKE ADEQUATE PROVISION FOR GROWTH.

TO MY MIND, THE CONCLUSION TO DRAW FROM THIS SITUATION IS STARKLY SIMPLE. WE NEED TO RE-THINK THE PROBLEMS THAT NOW CONFRONT US. WE NEED TO GO BACK TO FUNDAMENTALS. IF WE DO, I'M SURE WE WILL DISCOVER WE NEED NEW APPROACHES TO DEALING WITH THE SEEMINGLY INSURMOUNTABLE FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS.

ONE POSSIBLE APPROACH IS USER-PAY. FOR EXAMPLE, IT IS OFTEN POINTED OUT THAT CANADIAN URBAN DWELLERS ARE ACCUSTOMED TO RECEIVING SOME OF THE CHEAPEST DRINKING WATER IN THE WORLD. IT WOULD SURELY MAKE ENVIRONMENTAL AND AS WELL AS FINANCIAL SENSE TO REQUIRE USERS TO PAY SOMETHING APPROACHING THE TRUE COST OF RECEIVING AND DISPOSING OF THEIR WATER. THE ENDING OF ALL FLAT CHARGES FOR WATER CONSUMERS WOULD ALSO SERVE TO MAKE MANY CLIENTS MORE CONSCIOUS OF THE NEED TO HUSBAND THIS RESOURCE, EVEN IF THE SHORT-TERM COST OF UNIVERSAL WATER METERING IS HIGH.

USER FEES CAN BE EXTENDED TO MANY SERVICES. SOME, LIKE WATER FEES, HAVE THE PARALLEL ADVANTAGES OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION. OTHERS, LIKE FEES TO CONSULT A CITY OFFICE FOR ADVICE, PROBABLY DO NOT. POLICY IN IMPOSING FEES FOR REVENUE SHOULD, THEREFORE, BE BASED NOT WHOLLY ON FISCAL REASONS, BUT ON THEIR OVERALL EFFECT, PARTICULARLY THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR LOW AND FIXED INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

A NO LESS DIFFICULT, BUT PERHAPS MORE CONTROVERSIAL, MEANS OF INCREASING FINANCIAL RESOURCES IS TO RECAPTURE THE

APPRECIATION THAT HAS RESULTED FROM PUBLIC INVESTMENT. I HAVE ALREADY MENTIONED THE FORTUNES MADE IN THE APPRECIATION OF PROPERTY THROUGH THE EXPLOSIVE DEMAND FOR IT IN CITIES SUCH AS TORONTO. THE INEQUITY OF CAPITAL APPRECIATION STEMMING FROM NORMAL PUBLIC INVESTMENT (OR IN THIS CASE THE LACK OF PUBLIC INVESTMENT) IS AN ISSUE WHICH OUR SOCIETY HAS TENDED TO IGNORE, BUT IT IS ONE THAT CITIES ARE LIKELY TO EXAMINE MORE CLOSELY IN LIGHT OF INCREASING DEMANDS FOR REVENUE AND LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES FOR RAISING IT.

AS INTENSIFICATION OF OUR CITIES WILL BE THE WAY OF THE FUTURE, WE MAY WANT TO LOOK AT TAX SYSTEMS WHICH ACTIVELY ENCOURAGE REDEVELOPMENT. SOME PLACES HAVE EMPLOYED A SPLIT RATE TAX SYSTEM TO PUT A GREATER RELATIVE TAX BURDEN ON THE LAND THUS ENCOURAGING REDEVELOPMENT TO ITS FULL POTENTIAL.

MORE FAR REACHING IS THE IDEA OF REQUIRING THOSE WHO BENEFIT FROM REZONING, WHICH THEY HAVE REQUESTED, TO RETURN A PORTION OF THE PUBLICLY-GENERATED PROFIT THAT REZONING AFFORDS THEM.

IT IS ALSO POSSIBLE THAT IN THE CITIES OF THE 90'S WE WILL SEE MUCH MORE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LAND DEVELOPMENT. AS CITIES MUST BE REBUILT, PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS MAY WELL BE TAKING A GREATER SHARE IN DEVELOPMENT EITHER ON THEIR OWN OR AS PARTNERS IN JOINT VENTURES. MUCH OF THE NEEDED CAPITAL

COULD COME FROM THE VALUE CREATED BY PLANNING APPROVALS OR LAND APPRECIATION.

SOME OF THE CHANGES THAT CITIES MUST SERIOUSLY CONSIDER ARE INSTITUTIONAL. ARE WE SATISFIED WITH THE BALANCE OF COLLECTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS UNDER OUR PRESENT SYSTEMS OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL? OR ARE THE SCALES TIPPED IN FAVOR OF POWERFUL OR VOCAL MINORITIES?

IT IS NECESSARY TO OVERCOME PAROCHIALISM IN LOCAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, AND ESPECIALLY TO COUNTER THE PRESSURES OF "NIMBY" WHICH ARE A SERIOUS THREAT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY AS A VIABLE WHOLE. AGAIN THIS IS AN AREA WHERE WE MUST OFFER OUR SUPPORT TO ENSURE THE BROADER ISSUES ARE PUT BEFORE THE PUBLIC AND I DON'T MEAN ONLY THE BIG PROJECTS. WE MUST HELP TO ENSURE THAT THE SOCIETAL CONSEQUENCES OF A STREAM OF INCREMENTAL DECISIONS ARE KNOWN.

THE TREND FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS MUST BE ENCOURAGED. WE HAVE NOW SEEN EXAMPLES OF PRIVATE PROPOSALS FOR MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE. THESE MAY PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE TO LETTING CITIES CHOKE THROUGH SHORTAGES OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR THE CAPITAL COSTS OF NEW PROJECTS.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL CO-OPERATION TO USE SCARCE RESOURCES MORE EFFECTIVELY, WHICH HAS BECOME MORE COMMON IN THE LAST TWO

DECADES, MUST CONTINUE TO BE FOSTERED. THESE ARE JUST A FEW IDEAS.

YOU MAY BE SAYING TO YOURSELF, THIS IS ALL WELL AND GOOD BUT HOW ARE THESE IDEAS TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE REAL WORLD. I'M SURE THERE ARE A NUMBER OF EXAMPLES THAT COULD BE MENTIONED BUT TONIGHT I WOULD LIKE TO CLOSE BY DRAWING YOUR ATTENTION TO A PARTICULARLY PROMISING INITIATIVE WHICH INCORPORATES MANY OF THE PRINCIPLES I HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT AND WHICH I BELIEVE WILL BE INFLUENCING ALL OF US IN URBAN CANADA. THIS IS THE "MAIN STREETS" PROGRAM HERE IN TORONTO. DESIGNED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOLUTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND HOUSING PROBLEMS BY ENCOURAGING MORE PEOPLE TO LIVE DOWNTOWN, IT PROPOSES TO REDEVELOP PROPERTIES ALONG THE MAIN TRANSPORTATION ARTERIES. ON AVERAGE, THEY WOULD BE INCREASED FROM THREE STORIES TO FIVE STORIES. THIS IS A BOLD PLAN WHICH INVOLVES PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INVESTMENT TO INTEGRATE BUSINESS, HOUSING AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS. ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT INCLUDE ZONING, PLANNING CONTROLS, TAX POLICY, UPGRADING OF INFRASTRUCTURE, SOCIAL HOUSING AND PUBLIC/PRIVATE JOINT VENTURES. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, A VITAL PART OF THE PLANNING IS TO ENSURE THAT THE SOLUTION OF ONE PROBLEM LIKE TRANSPORTATION DOES NOT CONTRIBUTE TO ANOTHER, LIKE SOCIAL DISPLACEMENT. BEING CONSTANTLY AWARE OF THE POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS OF WHAT WE ARE DOING IS HALF THE BATTLE.



IF WE REALLY BEGIN TO MAKE COMPREHENSIVE DECISIONS BASED ON THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE AS WELL AS THE PRESENT AND INTEGRATE OUR APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS, WE CAN BEGIN TO CLAIM WE ARE HONOURING THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ARE BUILDING BETTER CITIES.

I HOPE THAT AS A RESULT OF YOUR DELIBERATIONS OVER THE NEXT FEW DAYS, YOU WILL AGREE WITH ME THAT THE CITIES OF THE NINETIES ARE BEING BUILT, NOT ONLY IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND BOARDROOMS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, BUT RIGHT HERE IN THIS ROOM. THE SHARING OF EXPERIENCE, WISDOM AND IDEAS HAS NEVER BEEN MORE NEEDED IN CANADIAN URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

I THANK YOU FOR CONTRIBUTING TO THAT SHARING. I AM CONFIDENT THAT THE FUTURE WILL BE BETTER FOR IT.