16532

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR.....^{J.}Donald H. Higgins.....
TITLE OF THESIS....Community and Local Government:.....
.....Boundary Determination.....
.....
UNIVERSITY.....Carleton.....
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED....Ph.D.....
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED.....1973.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY
OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be
printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.

*(Signed) *Donald J. H. Higgins*

* PERMANENT ADDRESS:

~~.....Political Science Department.....~~
.....103 Johnstone Avenue,
.....Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.....

DATED...August 7.....1973

NL-91 (10-68)

COMMUNITY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT:
BOUNDARY DETERMINATION

by

Donald J. H. Higgins

A thesis submitted to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies, Carleton
University, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of doctor of philosophy

Department of Political Science
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
June 1973

Donald J. H. Higgins

1973

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis

COMMUNITY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT:

BOUNDARY DETERMINATION

submitted by Donald J.H. Higgins, M.A.,
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Thesis Supervisor

Chairman, Department
of Political Science

Carleton University

October 16, 1973

(ii)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	111
INTRODUCTION	1
Organization of the thesis	7
Methodology	8
PART ONE: THE LITERATURE ON COMMUNITY AND ITS RELEVANCE TO BOUNDARY DETERMINATION	13
Introduction to Part One	
Definition	14
Hillery's conceptual analysis	15
Approaches to the study of community	16
Chapter One: Concepts of community	19
Community as common life	20
Community as social system	26
Community as human ecological system	33
Indicators of community	40
Conclusion to Part One	
Community and local government boundaries	46
PART TWO: RECENT STUDIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION IN CANADA: BOUNDARY DETERMINATION	51
Introduction to Part Two	52
Chapter Two: Recent studies in Ontario	55
The studies	56
Conclusion	93
Chapter Three: Recent studies elsewhere	95
Alberta	96
British Columbia	100
Manitoba	103
New Brunswick	118
Newfoundland	126
Nova Scotia	127
Prince Edward Island	131
Quebec	131
Saskatchewan	143
Yukon and Northwest territories	147
Conclusion	148
Conclusion to Part Two	149
PART THREE: AN OPERATIONAL CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY AND ITS APPLICATION	154
Introduction to Part Three	155
Other boundary determinants	158
Chapter Four: An operational concept of community	160
Definition	161
Indicators of community in the subjective sense	175
Indicators of community in the objective sense	181
Relating indicators of objective and subjective community	193
Independent variables	196

	page
Place	198
Research method	199
Summary of data desired	200
Chapter Five: The test case - subjective community	202
The test case	203
Burlington, Ontario	204
Method of data collection	209
Questionnaire	210
Subjective community	212
Scales	212
Perceptions of community	215
Effects of independent variables	224
Summary of findings	232
Chapter Six: The test case - objective community	234
Patterns of interaction	235
Relationship between subjective community and indicators of objective community	258
Effects of independent variables on patterns of interaction	261
Conclusion to Part Three	266
The sample	266
The questionnaire	268
Data analysis	272
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	273
Concepts of community	274
Problems and recommendations	277
Future research	284
Implications for policy-making	285
Appendix A - Tables	287
Appendix B - Questionnaire	302
Bibliography	305

ABSTRACT

The subject of the thesis is the determination of boundaries of units of government, specifically units of local (including regional and metropolitan) government. It is argued that a community criterion is important for determining governmental boundaries, but neglected in studies that have dealt with boundary determination in the Canadian provinces.

To aid in developing a new concept of community that is capable of being used as a boundary determinant, a review is made of some of the theoretical literature on community. Three important schools of thought on community are reviewed. Also to aid in developing the new concept of community, especially to aid in selecting indicators of community, a review is made of forty-seven studies and reports relating to local government reform in Canada since 1953.

A new concept of community is then developed. Indicators are proposed, and techniques of analysis suggested. The final part of the thesis reports on a test application of the concept, indicators, and techniques of analysis. The locale of the test application is Burlington, Ontario. A critique of the test application and of the concept and indicators is offered, and directions for further research suggested.

The new electronic interdependence recreates the world in the image of a global village.

(Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, The Medium is the Massage, New York: Bantam Books, 1967, p. 67)

...the community without propinquity [is] a myth...

(Colin Bell and Howard Newby, Community Studies, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1971, p. 19)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Those to whom I am indebted are many - my fellow students and faculty members at Carleton University, and a great many people in Burlington, Ontario. Financial support has been received from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Ontario Queen Elizabeth II Scholarship Committee, and the Canada Council. Special thanks are due to Dr. K. A. Mozersky of the Department of Sociology at Carleton University, Dr. R. J. Van Loon of the Department of Political Science at Carleton University, and my wife. Above all, I am indebted to Dr. D. C. Rowat, whose supervision has been of the highest order.

INTRODUCTION

The development of municipal government in Canada has not been characterized by a high degree of innovation, with the exception of the establishment in 1953 of metropolitan government in Toronto. In 1954, Professor K.G. Crawford wrote that Ontario's Baldwin Act of 1849 set the basis of the municipal system in Ontario and in most other Canadian provinces, and that this system persisted for over a century without substantial alteration of its basic features.¹ The past decade, however, has witnessed considerable activity directed to overhauling the organization of local government in many of the provinces. Considerable excitement and discussion has been occasioned by the reorganization of Greater Winnipeg, a development that can be viewed as being as innovative in 1972 as was Metro Toronto two decades earlier.

The causes of this recent activity are usually attributed in a general way to three factors: population growth, urbanization, and technological change (such as improvements in communication).² Simple increase in numbers, from a Canadian population of about 5.4 million in 1901³ to more than twenty-two million now, has increased the magnitude of problems encountered by all levels of government, and has forced the three levels of government to undertake new functions which a small and scattered population did not require. The population growth has been unevenly distributed, most of the growth being concentrated in relatively small geograph-

¹Kenneth G. Crawford, Canadian Municipal Government (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954), p.32.

²See for example, Stewart Fyfe, "Local Government Reform: Some Canadian Experiences"; (presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1971), p.3.

³Statistics Canada, Canada Year Book (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971), p.210.

ical areas, with a stable or declining population in many rural areas. L. O. Stone traced urban population growth back to 1851, using the Dominion Bureau of Statistics' 1961 definition of an urban area, and calculated that Upper Canada, Lower Canada, and the Maritimes were about thirteen per cent urbanized in 1851, and that Canada in 1961 was seventy per cent urbanized.⁴ The Economic Council of Canada has stated that amongst the most industrially advanced countries, Canada experienced the highest rate of increase in urban population - 4.1 per cent annually over the period 1951 to 1961.⁵ The concentration of a growing population in urban areas intensifies the problems faced by governments in performing their functions and in dealing with other governments both horizontally (municipality with municipality, for example) and vertically (for example, province with municipality). Technological change, such as improvements in communication, strongly influences the structural functioning of local governments, whether urban or non-urban; not only are opportunities for increased communication between governments and between government and citizenry made available, but problems are caused by technological change. The Economic Council of Canada estimates that over a period of about forty years following the introduction of the automobile, the average distance covered in travelling one hour from place of residence to place of work increased from three to about fourteen miles, and that this distance today

⁴Leroy O. Stone, Urban Development in Canada (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), pp. 19-25.

⁵Economic Council of Canada, Fourth Annual Review (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), pp. 174-178.

is in the order of thirty miles.⁶ The technological change giving rise to such opportunities for faster communication over wider areas has also given rise to problems of intergovernmental relations, over the provision of transportation facilities, for example.

From these three general causes of the recent activity in overhauling the organization of local government in Canada, more specific reasons can be derived. The boundaries of local government have become blurred, especially in urban areas, in that the political boundaries often do not reflect the optimal area for the provision of many local services. In urban areas composed of multiple units of local government, crime, pollution, fire and transportation needs often do not coincide with the political boundaries. Thus problems of inter-municipal planning and co-ordination arise, problems which have in the past frequently resulted in the formation of ad hoc bodies and authorities. Such authorities are increasingly in disrepute. Henry B. Mayo's witty limerick is particularly biting:

The councillors up at Pitlochry
Believed in the creed of Ad Hockery;
They farmed all decisions
To boards and commissions,
And so made their council a mockery.⁷

The extent of the historical flowering of ad hoc authorities is indicated by the fact that in 1968 there were in Ontario more than three thousand such authorities or special districts.⁸

⁶Ibid., pp. 174-178. For further discussion of the urban phenomenon in Canada, see N. Harvey Lithwick, Urban Canada: Problems and Prospects (Ottawa: Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 1970)

⁷Ontario. Niagara Region Local Government Review, Report (Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1966), p. 67.

⁸Bureau of Municipal Research, "Regional Government -- the Key to Genuine Local Autonomy," Civic Affairs (May, 1968), p. 9.

As well, provincial departments and agencies are involved in the provision of local services in Ontario, in addition to some 921 multi-purpose municipalities in Ontario as of January 1, 1972.⁹ In the Province of Quebec, aside from ad hoc bodies, there were more than 1700 multi-purpose municipalities in 1970, presenting what must be monumental problems of inter-municipal co-ordination. Since 1965 the provincial government in Quebec has embarked upon a campaign of consolidation of municipalities. The presence of large numbers of small municipalities in most provinces (see Tables 1 to 11 in Appendix A) often has the additional consequence of increasing the costs involved in providing services - regardless how small the area or population of a municipality, the mandatory services require a certain minimum of overhead expense for plant, equipment, and personnel.

The now-common solution to the problems is to establish larger region- or area-wide political units at the sub-provincial level. There are several variations on this general theme that have been employed-- amalgamation of two or more neighbouring municipalities, annexation of parts or all of one or more municipalities to another municipality, and the federation of existing or redefined municipalities. The first two variations imply a unitary form of local government, while the last variation requires a second tier.¹⁰

⁹Ontario. Department of Municipal Affairs, 1972 Municipal Directory (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1972), plate D, p. viii.

¹⁰To avoid confusion, it should be stated that the term local government as used in this thesis refers to all forms of sub-provincial government that are multi-purpose and that involve the election of representatives, whether directly or indirectly. Metropolitan, regional and county governments are considered to be local governments along with lower tiers.

In view of the limited justification often presented for the recommended boundaries of new area-wide units of local government (and of any lower-tier units), one encounters considerable difficulty in gauging the adequacy of present or proposed local government boundaries. A variety of criteria have at various times been used -- minimum population size, minimum financial base, and so on. But what can be termed a community criterion has been largely ignored in many studies which have proposed piece-meal or whole-sale reorganization of local government in Canada. Chapters 2 and 3 examine boundary determinants that have been used, looking particularly for instances in which a community criterion has been used. It is contended in this thesis that a community criterion should be an important and valuable gauge against which to judge the adequacy of present or proposed boundaries of local government. A community criterion emphasizes the behaviour and feelings of individuals as distinct from financial and administrative requisites. This is the central concern of the thesis, and the reasoning is developed in the Conclusion to Part One.

Several points require clarification. First, it is only the political boundaries with which the thesis is concerned. The requisites, in terms of geographical boundaries, of services are not examined here, though a method for taking them into account is suggested. Boundary determinants other than a community criterion are mentioned when they have been used by the various studies and developments reviewed in Part Two. It is not the intention to deny the appropriateness of boundary determinants other than a community criteria. The relative importance of all possible criteria is left to others to examine. While the thesis

is concerned exclusively with the use of a community criterion in regard to local government boundaries, it is thought that a community criterion has applicability to other levels of government as well. That is, a community criterion could be used as a boundary determinant at the levels of sub-national provinces and states, nations, and even international regions. The decision to limit consideration at this time to the level of local government is based mainly on the relative ease with which local government boundaries can be changed, since local governments are the creatures of higher levels of government. The geographic boundaries of local government are rather more malleable than are those of higher levels of government. Therefore the need for rational criteria for determining boundaries is more immediate at the local level. Finally, this thesis accepts the premises a) that local government must have a geographical context - unlike spiritual government, emanating from the Vatican for example, local government must be rooted in an identifiable physical area --, and b) that local government is normatively desirable and administratively necessary.¹¹

Organization of the thesis

The thesis is organized into this Introduction, three Parts, and a

¹¹It is beyond the scope of this thesis to consider the question 'Why local government?'. See for example Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1945), I; John Stuart Mill, Considerations on Representative Government (London: George Routledge, 1904), Chapter XV; Leo Moulin, "Local Self-Government as a Basis for Democracy," Public Administration, 32 (Winter, 1954), pp. 433-437; and Keith Panter-Brick, "Local Self-Government as a Basis for Democracy," Public Administration, 32 (Winter, 1954), pp. 438-440.

Summary and Conclusion. Part One reviews some of the theoretical literature on community, focusing in Chapter 1 on three schools of thought and on indicators of community. The Conclusion to Part One focuses on the importance of a community criterion for delineating boundaries of local government units.

Part Two constitutes a review of recent (since 1953) studies of local government reorganization in Canada, focusing on the extent to which the forty-seven studies may have utilized a concept of community as a boundary determinant. Other delineating criteria used are noted. A large number of studies have been done in Ontario. The review is therefore divided into two chapters, Chapter 2 dealing with Ontario, and Chapter 3 with the rest of Canada.

In the light of the discussion, in Part One, of some concepts of community, and in light of the review, in Part Two, of boundary determinants (including community) used in recent Canadian studies, Part Three is directed to an attempt to effect an advance in the use of a community criterion. A new concept of community is developed for this purpose, along with ideas for indicators of community so that the concept can be used in specific situations. Chapters 5 and 6 report on and analyze the results of a test application of the concept and indicators in a specific locale.

In light of the results of the test case, the Summary and Conclusion of the thesis reconsiders the concept of community, noting problem areas and avenues for further research.

Methodology

The approach taken in the thesis is eclectic. Community is a

subject traditionally associated with sociology, and some of the indicators and analytical techniques used are borrowed from geography and social psychology. The contributions from these disciplines are used to shed light on an interest of political science -- the determination of boundaries of units of government.

The location chosen for the test application of the concept, indicators and analytical techniques was Burlington, Ontario. Aside from being sufficiently accessible, the town was thought to be fairly typical in terms of being geographically situated between other urban areas which could be expected to exert pulls away from the town. Further, Burlington was included in the study areas of two local government reviews sponsored by the provincial government.¹² The two studies arrived at different conclusions about the inclusion of the town in proposed regional governments, though both reports expressed some hesitancy and reservations in the recommendations made.¹³

Data collection for the test application of the concept and indicators was based on a mailed questionnaire survey rather than the generally preferable method of personal interviews. It was desired to have the larger sample size that the former method permits, and time was short

¹²Ontario. Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review, Report and Recommendations (Toronto: Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs, 1969); Ontario. Peel-Halton Local Government Review, Report (Toronto: Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs, 1966). The former report is known as the Steele report, named after the review commissioner, and the latter is known as the Plunkett report for the same reason.

¹³Plunkett Report, pp. 83-84; Steele Report, pp. 28-54.

because the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs indicated that a provincial policy statement about regional government affecting Burlington could be expected before personal interviews could be completed. To have a policy statement announced in the midst of interviewing could have had serious consequences for the nature of responses given.

The sample for the mailed questionnaire survey included 1,036 names selected from the unrevised 1972 federal electoral rolls of the voting population within the Town's limits. The first name selected for the sample was chosen at random from amongst the first fifty names, and every fifty-first name after that was selected. The sample size aimed for was 1,100, on the basis of there being an adult population of 56,501 according to the municipal enumeration of October, 1972. At the time the population of Burlington was 90,242. The final sample size fell short of the desired 1,100 because there were evidently about 3,200 adults ineligible to vote or missed in the federal enumeration. The electoral rolls used were the most up-to-date and complete then available.

One problem often associated with the mailed questionnaire technique of data collection is that the rate of response tends to be rather low. For whatever reasons, this particular survey had the respectable response rate of 43.8 per cent, there having been 446 completed questionnaires returned, and seventeen questionnaires and reminder notices being returned by the Post Office as undeliverable. The questionnaires, with a covering letter and return-postage-guaranteed envelopes, were mailed October 27, 1972. Reminder/thank you cards were mailed November 16 and 17, 1972.

In addition to this survey, a second survey was conducted simultaneously of people that could be called members of the local elite. Thirty-six questionnaires, similar to the main survey instrument, were mailed to all members of the Town Council, all Burlington members of the Halton County Board of Education, the commissioners of the Burlington Public Utilities Commission, and the directors of the Burlington Chamber of Commerce. Seventeen completed questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 47.2 per cent. Because of the low number of respondents on this survey, no reference is made in the thesis to the results.

The application of the concept, reported on and analyzed in Part Three, cannot be considered a thorough test, because only one geographic area was involved. A thorough test would clearly require a number of locales in a variety of geographic areas. The purposes of the test case were not to 'prove out' the concept and indicators, but to help point out any gross deficiencies and problem areas in the concept developed and in the indicators and techniques of analysis; to illustrate how further research on this subject might proceed; and to try to show what value and usefulness such research may have in determining the boundaries of units of government.

Before explaining why it is thought that community is an important though neglected criteria for determining the boundaries of units of government, it is necessary to explore the meaning(or meanings) of the word. Community is a word of a high level of abstraction, and, like other words of a similar level of abstraction, is therefore subject to a wide variety of meanings. It is for the purposes of examining some of these that a portion of the theoretical literature dealing with community is

examined now.

PART ONE

THE LITERATURE ON COMMUNITY AND ITS
RELEVANCE TO BOUNDARY DETERMINATION

INTRODUCTION TO PART ONE

Definition

The word community, being of a high level of abstraction, is extremely difficult to subject to conceptual analysis. Nor is such analysis more easily handled by selecting from the literature on community only works in which a connection is specifically posited between community and the delineation of geographic boundaries of government, for the connection is very rarely made. A search of the theoretical literature has found only a very few works in which a link is made between community and boundary determination. However, an examination of proposals for the redefinition of local government boundaries indicates that the word community is used frequently. These proposals are reviewed in Part Two.

The high level of abstraction accounts for the multiplicity of definitions. The conclusion one reaches after a review of the literature is that there is not a single concept of community. Rather, there are almost as many concepts of community as there are definitions of the word. In short, there does not appear to be a concept of community in the sense of a Weldonian essence requiring only discovery. A parallel can perhaps be drawn between the community and the word justice, which Weldon says has no single nuclear meaning: there is no precise criterion for its correct employment and the word justice is useful largely because it lacks such precision. One can give justice a precise meaning, but how is one to know whether that meaning is the 'true' or 'correct' one?¹

¹Thomas Dewey Weldon, The Vocabulary of Politics (London: Penguin Books, 1953), p. 23.

Hillery's conceptual analysis

It is not especially helpful to examine a host of instances in which the word community is used, thereby hoping to clear up its logical function. A noble attempt to do just this was reported in Hillery's article, "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement".² The notable result of his review of ninety-four definitions of community, classified by content and subjected to qualitative and quantitative analysis, was the extraction of sixteen different concepts of community. The 'areas of agreement' found by Hillery were few indeed. As he understates, the ninety-four definitions examined were not exhaustive of all the extant definitions of community.³ Almost two decades have passed since his conceptual analysis was done, no doubt adding a host of new definitions and new concepts to an already lengthy list.

The only element for which Hillery found universal agreement was that community somehow involves people. Even the necessity of social interaction was specifically denied to be an essential feature of community in three of the works reviewed by Hillery.⁴ Only seventy of the ninety-four definitions referred to geographic area as an essential

²George A. Hillery, "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement," Rural Sociology, 20 (March, 1955), pp. 111-123.

³Ibid., p. 112.

⁴These were R.D. McKenzie, "The Scope of Human Ecology," in Ernest W. Burgess, ed., The Urban Community (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925); E.C. Hughes, "Institutions", in Robert E. Park, ed., An Outline of the Principles of Sociology (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1939); and August B. Hollingshead, "Human Ecology", in Robert E. Park, ed., An Outline of the Principles of Sociology (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1939).

feature of community. Aside from people, there were only three features considered by a majority of the definitions to be important elements of community. In order of increasing agreement, these were geographic area, common ties, and social interaction. It is not possible that all ninety-four definitions are 'true' definitions of community for some of the definitions are contradictory, as shown by the denial of three writers that social interaction is an essential feature. In the face of this evidence, one can only conclude that there is not a single concept of community. The presence of people is not, in any of the definitions, a sufficient condition for community - each definition posits that at least one other element is necessary.

Approaches to the study of communities

In spite of the difficulty of subjecting community to conceptual analysis, Warren cautions against the despair of some sociologists who, when encountering these difficulties, "...throw up their hands and urge that the whole concept of the community be discarded as a sort of useless theoretical will-o'-the-wisp. Yet the term remains, and community analysis goes forward."⁵ On this optimistic note, Warren reviews six different ways of approaching communities as objects of study.

The first of these is community as space, which is really two approaches, in that Warren carefully distinguishes rural community studies from urban community studies, saying that the two are each studied by a different type of sociologist, with a consequent isolation

⁵Roland L. Warren, The Community in America (2nd ed.; Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), p. 9.

of the two approaches. This urban-rural dichotomy echoes Hillery's analysis, in which he suggested that "...the rural sociologists have somehow been closer [than have urban sociologists] to the actual core of the community concept, and that community is perhaps a phenomenon more easily recognized in rural areas."⁶ The community-as-space approach gave rise to the two spatial concepts of the natural area and concentric urban zones, both of which are considered to result from an ecological distribution of people and services in which the spatial location of each unit is determined by its relation to all other units.⁷

The second of the six approaches identified by Warren is community as people, an approach that relies on census demographic data analyzed over time and projected into the future to enable the categorization of communities according to demographic variations.

Third is community as shared institutions and values, an approach which holds that geographic area and people are necessary but not sufficient conditions of community; also necessary are commonly shared institutions and values held by a local population.

Community as interaction is the fourth approach Warren identifies. This approach concentrates on analysis of behaviour associated either with major institutions such as the family, government, and economy, or with social processes such as conflict and competition.

⁶George A. Hillery, "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement," Rural Sociology, 20 (March, 1955), p. 119.

⁷Roland L. Warren, The Community in America (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), p. 26. (quoting R.D. McKenzie).

The fifth approach is community as distribution of power; that is, analysis of community power structure. Examples of this approach are Floyd Hunter's Community Power Structure,⁸ and Robert Dahl's Who Governs?.⁹

The last way of approaching communities as objects of study that Warren identifies is community as a social system. This approach applies to the community phenomenon social system analysis, based on the idea of structured interaction, enduring through time, between two or more units, whether the units are persons or groups.

The six approaches identified by Warren appear to resemble more closely six research methodologies than six concepts of community, though it is not always a simple matter to distinguish a concept from its methodology. As six methodologies, they would seem to imply that there is a single 'true' or 'correct' definition of the word community, an assumption which Hillery's article suggests is ill-founded. Warren's six approaches, while useful for highlighting methodological differences, do not seem to constitute an entirely satisfactory alternative to conceptual analysis.

Though a full-scale conceptual analysis is not done in Chapter 1, some of the theoretical literature on community is examined, to aid in the development of a new concept of the word in Chapter 4.

⁸Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

⁹Robert Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

CHAPTER ONE

CONCEPTS OF COMMUNITY

The strategy followed below is to briefly sketch what can be termed three main themes or schools of thought about community, the three being labelled for convenience community as common life, community as social system, and community as human ecological system. These themes by no means exhaust all possible concepts of community, but a fairly wide-ranging reading of the literature indicated that the three are representative and illustrative of a large and important body of work in this field. They also appeared to have been influential in directing and stimulating more recent writing on community. Hopefully, they enable one to identify the most important aspects of community and to choose or develop indicators that can facilitate empirical research into the identification of boundaries of communities.

Community as Common Life

This theme of community reflects primarily the work of MacIver¹ and Tönnies.² MacIver defines community as:

...any area of common life, village, or town, or district, or country, or even wider area. To deserve the name community, the area must be somehow distinguished from further areas, the common life may have some characteristic of its own such that the frontiers of the area have some meaning. ...Whenever men live together they develop in some kind and degree distinctive common characteristics - manners, traditions, modes of speech, and so on. These are the signs and consequences of an effective common life.³

¹R. M. MacIver, Community: A Sociological Study (2nd. ed.; London: Macmillan, 1920), esp. Book I, Chapter II; Book II, Chapters I - IV; and Book III, Chapter IV, Section 3.

²Ferdinand Tönnies, Community and Association, trans. by C.P. Loomis (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955).

³Robert M. MacIver, Community: A Sociological Study, (3rd. edition; London: Macmillan, 1924), pp. 22-23.

Also,

Community is the common life of beings who are guided essentially from within, actively, spontaneously, and freely ... relating themselves to one another, weaving for themselves the complex web of social unity.⁴

A fundamental point in MacIver's concept of community is the requisite of a plurality of interactions; that is, the necessity of multiple distinctive common characteristics. A geographical area apparently is not a necessary condition of community, for the second quotation could include non-territorial spiritual and ethnic communities. He holds, however, that community is most readily determined by territorial boundaries:

For local contiguity not only permits the conversion of pre-existent like interests into common interests, but itself ensures the operation of biological and psychical laws which constantly weave new common interests.⁵

MacIver's concept of community involves a network of social interaction among the people constituting the community. Also, community is not an absolute, in the sense that either there is or there is not a community; it is a relative term dependent upon the kind and degree of distinctive common characteristics. Allied to this aspect of MacIver's concept is the notion of levels of community; that is, a community may be part of a wider community. A community centred geographically on a village may be also a part of ~~wider~~ communities based on a region, a country, and a

⁴Ibid., p. 34.

⁵Ibid., p. 110.

group of countries. But,

...the unity which the larger community attains is not the unity which the smaller community had previously attained. The former pays a price for its greater universality and efficiency. If needs essentially universal find their purer form in the large community, there are more intimate needs, needs more deeply rooted in the emotional nature, which it cannot satisfy. It cannot take the place of the nearer community, but can only supplement it.

Clearly MacIver sees normative value in wider communities:

But where the near community is all community, its exclusiveness rests on ignorance and narrowness of thought... . Its members become the slaves of its traditions... . Without the widening of gates...there is no progress. Here is the service of the wider community, not only of a complete 'civilisation', but also the freedom of a broader culture.

There appears to be, in MacIver's view, a relentless process of expansion of community, by which he seems to refer to the geographical sense rather than the intensity sense. He refers to an:

...endless social process wherein like calls to like across the barriers which have isolated them, abolishing irrelevant oppositions, making their like interests a common interest... .⁸

He acknowledges that this process sometimes occasions conflict, but he remains optimistic about the results, for the interests realizable in community outweigh the dissociating or conflicting interests. Thus is assured not only the inevitable geographic expansion of community, but also its permanence.⁹

It is useful to review briefly what in MacIver's view community is

⁶Ibid., p. 260.

⁷Ibid., p. 260.

⁸Ibid., p. 259

⁹Ibid., p. 102.

not. First, community is not an organism, because 1) an organism has a single centre, a unity of life, whereas community consists of a host of centres of life and consciousness; 2) individuals in communities have purposes whereas cells in an organism do not; and 3) an organism is a closed system whereas community is a matter of degree, with no set bounds.¹⁰ Nor is community a greater 'mind' or 'soul'; rather, community is a unity of minds. Community is not greater than the sum of its parts, either in a chemical (alloys) sense or in an organic sense, for, he asks, how can one sum things if part of individuals' being consists in their relationships to one another?¹¹ Finally, community is not an association like the State; rather, associations are organs of community which is prior to all associations.

The distinction between community and association is critical to Tönnies' concept of community.¹² Indeed Tönnies views the two being polar opposites of a continuum, Gemeinschaft usually being translated as community, and Gesellschaft being translated variously as association and society. Tönnies' Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft was first published in 1887, establishing him as the founding father of the theory of community. His work, especially the dichotomy between community and

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 72-76.

¹¹Ibid., p. 91.

¹²This consideration of Tönnies' work owes much to Colin Bell and Howard Newby, Community Studies: An Introduction to the Sociology of Community (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971); and Talcott Parsons, Structure of Social Action (2nd. ed.; New York: Free Press, 1949), pp. 687-694.

association (or society), parallels the later dichotomy between organic solidarity and mechanical solidarity of Durkheim,¹³ Weber's dichotomy of Vergemeinschaftung (communal relationships) and Vergesellschaftung (associative relationships),¹⁴ and Herbert Spencer's distinction between indefinite, incoherent homogeneity and definite, coherent heterogeneity.¹⁵

Gemeinschaft (community) has three central aspects; blood (kinship), place or land (neighbourhood), and mind (friendship). Human relations in a community are characterized by intimacy, endurance, and a clear understanding of where each person stands in society. Status is ascriptive rather than achieved; roles are specific and consonant - one's multiple roles do not involve conflicting duties. There is little mobility either in the geographic sense or in the sense of movement up or down the social hierarchy. The culture is relatively autonomous, and intimate human relations foster close and enduring loyalty to place and people. Gesellschaft (association or society) is everything community is not. It is characterized by largeness of scale, rationality, and impersonal contractual ties.

Based on Parsons' interpretation of Tönnies,¹⁶ Mann compiled a list of the corresponding characteristics of the polar opposites:

¹³Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labour in Society, trans. by G. Simpson, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1947), pp. 70 - 233, passim.

¹⁴Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1947), p. 136.

¹⁵Herbert Spencer, The Principles of Sociology (London: Williams and Norgate, 1877), I, pp. 489 - 493.

¹⁶Talcott Parsons, Structure of Social Action, (2nd. ed.; New York: Free Press, 1949), pp. 687 - 694

Gemeinschaft

Natural will

Self

Profession

Land

Family law

Organic

Private life

Individuals united in spite
of all separating factors

(Hierarchy)

1. Family-household economy

2. Rural agricultural
village economy3. Town as area of intellect-
ual proximity - religion
and art

Inherited status

General indefinite purpose,
largely undefinedObligations unspecified and
unlimited, or only generalBurden of proof on person
evading obligationEvocation of higher Gemein-
schaft obligations to evade
lower onesActs important only as ex-
pressions of deeper atti-
tudesGesellschaft

Rational will

Person

Wealth

Money

Law of contracts

Mechanical

Public life

Individuals separated in spite
of all uniting factors

(Hierarchy)

1. Trade (City)

2. Industry (State)

3. Cosmopolitan life. Science be-
coming basis of public opinion.

Achieved status

Specific limited purpose

Obligations limited by contract

Burden of proof on person requiring
performance of obligationNo hierarchy of obligation - only
terms of the contract are importantAttitudes are irrelevant - acts are
the only important factors ¹⁷

It is easy to infer that Tönnies meant Gemeinschaft to describe
past or primitive human relations - some pre-existing rural utopia - and
that there has been an historical development away from Gemeinschaft to

¹⁷Peter H. Mann, An Approach to Urban Sociology, (London: Routledge
and Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 197. Durkheim reversed the organic-mechanical
labels but also reversed the meaning of the two labels.

society characterized by increase of scale, disorganization, and impersonal and discordant human relations. It is, however, not at all certain that Tönnies did intend Gemeinschaft to refer primarily to a pastoral past, which through the passage of time has irrevocably been transformed into Gesellschaft. The tendency to assume such historical development from one end of the continuum toward the other is similar to the rural-urban dichotomy now so popular and pervasive. It is to be remembered that Hillery, for example, in his analysis of ninety-four definitions of community, found it convenient if not necessary to make a distinction between generic community and rural community, commenting that rural sociologists have somehow been closer to the actual core of the community concept.¹⁸ It may be, of course, that since rural social groups are smaller and less complex than urban ones, it is simply easier to 'find' a rural community than an urban one.

MacIver and Tönnies seem to be agreed on a number of elements associated with 'common life', chiefly the emphasis on close physical proximity (MacIver seems less certain than Tönnies about this), and on generally harmonious social interaction. The two writers agree that community is a relative term, that community is distinct from association, and that there are hierarchies or levels of communities.

Community as Social System

This theme of community reflects mainly the work of Roland Warren¹⁹

¹⁸George A. Hillery, "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement," Rural Sociology, 20 (March, 1955), p. 119.

¹⁹Roland L. Warren, The Community in America (2nd. ed.; Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972), esp. Chapters 1 and 5.

and Talcott Parsons.²⁰ Before taking up the social system approach, Warren offers a short critique of it.²¹ The question he considers crucial is whether communities can be analyzed as social systems. He notes that there are at least three ways in which communities tend to differ from other social entities (such as a family, a sports team, and an industrial company) designated as social systems:

1) the community is a system of social systems, including as it does a great many different institutions, organizations, and formal and informal sub-groups.

2) the community is not structurally and functionally centralized in the same sense as a formal organization, which can also be a system of social systems. In a community, the range and diversity of needs, interests, goals, and activities are met through a variety of uncentralized separate institutions and groups.

3) the community as a social system is implicit in nature as compared with the explicitness of formal organizations,²² though what is meant by 'implicit in nature' is not clarified.

Despite these differences between community and other social systems, Warren is of the view that the application of social system analysis to community is a most promising development in community studies.

²⁰Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960), Chapter 8, "The Principal Structures of Community".

²¹Roland L. Warren, The Community in America, (2nd. ed.; Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972), pp. 46-51.

²²Ibid., pp. 48-49. Warren credits Edward O. Moe in citing the three differences. ("Consulting with a Community System: A Case Study," Journal of Social Issues, XV, No. 2 (1959), p. 29).

Warren defines a social system as:

...a structural organization of the interaction of units which endures through time. It has both external and internal aspects relating the system to its environment and its units to each other. It can be distinguished from its surrounding environment, performing a function called boundary maintenance. It tends to maintain an equilibrium in the sense that it adapts to changes from outside the system in such a way as to minimize the impact of the change on the organizational structure and to regularize the subsequent relationships.²³

He defines community as "...that combination of social units and systems which perform the major social functions having locality relevance." ²⁴
The five major functions which have locality relevance, but which are not necessarily performed exclusively from within the locality, are:

1) production-distribution-consumption of those goods and services which are a part of daily living, and access to which is desirable in the immediate locality.

2) socialization - the transmission of prevailing knowledge, behaviour patterns and social values to society's individual members.

3) social control - the process through which a group influences the behaviour of its members toward conformity with the group's norms.

4) social participation - through voluntary organizations, business, government, family, and so on.

5) mutual support, provided by the same wide variety of groups and organizations that can perform the other major community functions.

Defining the community social system in terms of the performance of

²³Ibid., p. 136.

²⁴Ibid., p. 9.

major social locality relevant functions leads Warren to emphasize community functions rather than community institutions. He considers that there is only a loose relationship between institutions and locality relevant functions, since each function can be performed by multiple and various institutions. Also, the performance of these functions can shift from one set of institutions to another set, either within or outside the community.

Warren's view of community as a social system has both geographic and psychological aspects. The former is likely to be strong when the service areas of such local units as stores, churches, and schools closely coincide. It might be expected that such communities would be strong on the psychological aspect as well, there being a strong sense of local identification. However, it is possible for members to view their community as an important reference group even when there is not a close coincidence of geographic service areas. When subsystems which can perform the locality relevant functions are not themselves based in the locality, or when their service areas lack coincidence, it becomes difficult to distinguish a community from its surrounding environment and to locate communities geographically.

The external and internal aspects of community social system units - that is, the relationships which relate the community's subsystems to its environment on the one hand and which relate a community's subsystems to each other - tend to correspond to what Warren calls a community's vertical and horizontal patterns. Community subsystems are often parts of social systems that extend beyond the community. Examples are branch plants, and local offices of the federal government. A community's

vertical pattern is the structural and functional relations which the various social units and subsystems have with extracommunity systems. Relationships across the different units and subsystems which operate on the community level are the horizontal pattern.

The last point to be noted regarding Warren's concept of community as a social system is the problem of making general statements about communities despite characteristics that differentiate one community from another. Warren considers four dimensions on which communities differ. These enable one to locate a particular community or type of community along each of the four continua:

1) autonomy dimension - the extent to which a community is dependent on or independent of extracommunity units in the performance of the five functions.

2) coincidence of service areas - the extent to which a community has a geographic centre of activities and services.

3) psychological identification with locality - the strength of a sense of local identification.

4) horizontal pattern - the extent to which there is a strong or weak structural and functional relation of the various local units to each other.²⁵

Talcott Parsons defines community

...as that aspect of the structure of social systems which is referable to the territorial location of persons (i.e., human individuals as organisms) and their activities. When I say 'referable to' I do not mean determined exclusively or predominantly by, but rather observable and analyzable with reference to

²⁵Ibid., p. 13.

location as a focus of attention (and of course a partial determinant). ...Though the territorial reference is central, it should also be pointed out that there is another term to the relation. The full formula, that is, comprises persons acting in territorial locations, and since the reference is to social relations, persons acting in relation to other persons in respect to the territorial locations of both parties. The population, then, is just as much a focus of the study of community as is the territorial location.²⁶ (emphasis his)

All social collectivities, according to Parsons, have a community aspect, and the structure of all social systems is capable of analysis in terms of the relation of structural forms to four functional 'system problems' which confront every social system:

1) goal attainment - the gratification of units of the system (the unit of the social system being role, either in terms of individuals, or of collectivities of individuals).

2) adaptation - the manipulation of the environment in the interests of goal attainment.

3) integration - the attachment of individuals to each other, and of groups to other groups.

4) pattern-maintenance - the managing of tension amongst units (individuals and groups) of the system.

It is Parsons' view that an individual's actions tend to be organized around a given territorial place - the individual's residence. Residence necessitates the playing of certain roles, and these roles are usually of a type not restricted to that single residence but tend to be shared as a style of life amongst residences in close contiguity. Another

²⁶Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960), pp. 250-251.

territorial reference of individuals' actions is place of occupation or work. When work is performed in an organization independent of any household, there is both organizational and physical separation between place of residence and place of work. Similarly with other geographic references - place of formal education, religious worship, entertainment, and the like, all of which involve some degree of social organization and interaction.

Parsons imputes importance also to the frequency of geographically-centred activity, and the related factors of distance travelled, means of transportation, and the time-cost factor. Transportation between place of residence and place of other activity is one aspect of what Parsons terms the communicative complex, communication involving both the physical media by which messages and objects are transferred from one location to another, and the movement of persons themselves. Social interaction through communication involves not only the content of messages, but also intent or expectation, and response. Communication always implies, says Parsons, a common culture, at least in terms of common language. The level of technological development of communication media determines the effective range of communication, including transportation. Importance is attached to the kind of media - whether it is one-way only, such as radio, or two-way, especially of the face-to-face variety. For Parsons, the essential point of all communication is that it patterns and generalizes commitments and expectations.

Geographic place also determines obligations, in that place falls within jurisdictions - for voting purposes, residence is within the jurisdiction of a municipality, state or province, and country. Obligations are imposed on persons by some process of decision-making

whereby the particular organization is held to have legitimate authority and therefore means of enforcement.

In his emphasis on geographic place as a focus of attention and as a determinant of activity, Parsons is in accord with the human ecological school of community reviewed next. But Parsons emphasizes that place is but a partial determinant of action, and that population is just as much a focus of the study of community as its territorial location.

Community as Human Ecological System

This theme of community reflects the work of Hawley,²⁷ McKenzie,²⁸ and Park.²⁹ The feature which most readily distinguishes the ecologists' concept of community is that the solidarity and shared interests of community members are a function of their common residence. Emphasis is placed more on the physical nature of the geographical area in which the residents live than on social interaction, though Duncan and Schnore point out that the ecological view is easily but wrongly deflected into exercises in formal demography, viewing environment in strictly geographic terms.³⁰ Allied to this feature is stress on the spatial consequences of social organization.

²⁷Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), Parts III and IV, chapters 10 - 20.

²⁸R.D. McKenzie, The Metropolitan Community (New York: Russell and Russell, 1933), Part II, chapters VI - VIII.

_____, On Human Ecology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), Part II, chapters 4 - 6.

²⁹Robert E. Park, Human Communities (New York: Free Press, 1952), Chapter 12, "Human Ecology".

³⁰Otis Dudley Duncan and Leo F. Schnore, "Cultural, Behavioural, and ecological perspectives in the study of social organization," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (Sept., 1959), p. 135.

Hawley writes,

For our purposes community has essentially the same meaning as ecological organization, the one difference being that the former is applied to a relatively small unit of territory whereas the latter may extend over an area of indefinite scope. Formally defined, community refers to the structure of relationships through which a localized population provides its daily requirements.³¹

Ecological organization is defined by Hawley as the complex of functional interrelations by which men live.³²

Though the study of human ecology concentrates on the spatial organization of functional requirements, emphasizing above all, though not exclusively, economic interrelationships, this theme of community omits from its consideration attitudes, sentiments, motivations, and the like. These are omitted not because they are unimportant, but "...because the assumptions and point of view of human ecology are not adapted to their treatment."³³ This omission is a vital one. Further, the human ecological viewpoint fails to provide an explanation of the relationships of men to one another aside from the provision of the localized population's daily physical requirements. The point is that people do interact not only to provide for their daily physical requirements in the limited sense in which human ecologists employ the term 'requirements'. They interact out of loyalty and selflessness, for example, in ways which may in fact hinder the provision of personal immediate requirements.

³¹Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 180.

³²Ibid., p. 178.

³³Ibid., p. 180

Reference was made earlier to MacIver's view that community is not analogous to an organism. Hawley stresses the biological analogy:

...the community has often been likened to an individual organism. So intimate and so necessary are the interrelations of its parts ... that any influence felt at one point is almost immediately transmitted throughout. Further, not only is the community a more or less self-sufficient entity, having inherent in it the principle of its own life process, it has also a growth or natural history with well-defined stages of youth, maturity, senescence. It is therefore a whole which is something different from the sum of its parts, possessing powers and potentialities not present in any of its components. If not an organism, it is at least a super-organism.³⁴

This statement of the human ecological view clearly differs from the community-as-common-life theme on more than the analogy of the organism. The former view holds that community is something different from the sum of its parts, whereas the latter holds that this is a fallacy. The former holds that community becomes senescent, the logical end of which is decay, whereas the latter holds that community is inherently expansionist and permanent. Both are agreed, however, that the individual is not the unit of community. Ecologists hold that the unit of community is 'some combination of individuals',³⁵ but MacIver is not explicit what the unit of community is, except that it is neither the individual nor associations.³⁶ Holding a view similar to MacIver's notion of levels of community, Park

³⁴Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 50.

³⁵Ibid., p. 207. Duncan and Schnore state instead that the elementary unit of analysis of the ecological school is the 'pattern of activities'. (op. cit., p. 136).

³⁶R. M. MacIver, Community: A Sociological Study (3rd. ed.; London: Macmillan, 1924), p. 131.

writes,

There is always a larger community. Every single community is always part of some larger and more inclusive one. There are not longer any communities wholly detached and isolated; all are interdependent economically and politically upon one another. The ultimate community is the wide world.³⁷

Hawley uses the terms symbiotic and commensalistic relations, and corporate and categoric groups. Symbiotic relations denote the interdependence of unlike (corporate) groups, that is, groups that have dissimilar functions. Corporate groups are internally differentiated, therefore heterogeneous, and symbiotically integrated, examples being family, business enterprise, and labour unions. Symbiotic relations dominate the day-to-day dynamics of a community, and change in response to altered conditions. Commensalistic relations characterize the co-actions of like forms (categoric groups), that is, units of similar function. Categoric groups are associations of functionally homogeneous individuals, often formed on occupational lines, such as professional associations. Such groups are capable of only the simplest kind of collective activity - they tend only to react, preserve and protect rather than initiate. They are responsible, says Hawley, for whatever rigidity a community possesses.³⁸ The two types of groups are not mutually exclusive, in that corporate groups are combinations of portions of different categoric groups. Communities in the human ecological sense cannot be

³⁷Robert E. Park, Human Communities (New York: Free Press, 1952), p. 66.

³⁸Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 211.

composed of only a single categoric group because communities are characterized by functional interdependence and are therefore internally differentiated. A community is a corporate group, composed of a number of both categoric and corporate groups.

According to Hawley, communities can be placed along an independence-dependence continuum. Communities at or near the independence pole are associated with geographic isolation, small population, simple technology, and marked stability.³⁹ Dependent communities are not self-sufficient in terms of producing the goods and services required, have intensive specialization, are not isolated, and are more susceptible to change. Unlike Tönnies, who does not postulate an historical process of development from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, Hawley suggests that a developmental process changes the character of communities from a condition of independence to dependence. McKenzie attributes the evolution from a number of independent communities to a regional community of territorially differentiated but interdependent communities to the revolutionary effect of motor transportation upon spatial relations.⁴⁰ To the effects of transportation Hawley adds communication as a factor of critical importance in overcoming what he calls the 'friction of space'.

'Friction of space' refers to the costs in time and energy involved in overcoming space.⁴¹ It can be reduced but never completely

³⁹Ibid., p. 223.

⁴⁰ R.D. McKenzie, The Metropolitan Community (New York: Russell and Russell, 1967), p. 69.

⁴¹ Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 237.

eliminated by improvements in transportation and communication. Such costs in overcoming space are what, in the ecological view, account for a geographic area and its population being in one community's hinterland rather than in that of another community. Thus the geographic extent of a community is determined by facilities for movement.⁴² It is of some importance that Hawley tends to emphasize physical movement rather than communication, therefore judging facility for movement to be the critical variable which determines the geographic extent of communities:

In principle, however, the boundary of every community is determined in the same manner. It is fixed by the maximum radius of routine daily movement to and from a centre. Thus the community includes the area the population of which, however widely distributed, regularly turns to a common centre for the satisfaction of all or a major part of its needs. That distance may differ considerably, depending on the kind of transportation facility in use. Where human locomotion or animal carriage is the prevailing mode of transportation and communication, the distance from centre to periphery seldom exceeds five miles, but the use of mechanically powered agencies of movement enlarges the radial distance to twenty or more miles.⁴³

This view is in sharp contrast to that of McLuhan, for example, who holds that since messages can now travel much faster (and farther) than messengers, the geographic extent of community is virtually limitless, the end result being a global village.⁴⁴

⁴²Ibid., p. 238.

⁴³Ibid., p. 246.

⁴⁴Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man (New York: New American Library, 1964), pp. 93 and 95. Another book argues that the whole of Canada can be regarded as a single city, in view of transportation and communication networks. See James Simmons, and Robert Simmons, Urban Canada (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969), p. 66.

An earlier expression of the view that space determines social activity is to be found in Charles Galpin's work.⁴⁵ His method of determining the boundaries of a community's territorial sphere of influence has come to be known as the 'ruts in the road' method, by which one quite simply travelled round the countryside noting in which direction wagon wheel ruts from farmyards turned. More refined versions of Galpin's method rely on a variety of indices of transportation and communication networks, such as telephone services, directional traffic flow, and newspaper circulation. The difficulty of using multiple indices of this type is that each may yield a different description of community boundaries.

The geographic extent of community depends, says Hawley, not only on the kind of activity but also on the frequency of movement of people, goods, and ideas. The boundary of daily movement determines what he calls the primary community; special less-frequent movement determines the secondary community area. Sometimes, when one city dominates a function, such as New York and London for finance and Paris for fashion, there may be a tertiary community area.⁴⁶ Hawley concentrates his attention on the primary localized area.

Bell and Newby pass this judgment on the human ecological theme of community:

Ecology at its finest provides sharp and accurate descriptions of the spatial aspects of community. ...What ecology so often fails

⁴⁵Charles Galpin, The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community, Research Bulletin 34 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, 1915).

⁴⁶Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 255.

to do, however, is to provide explanations of these relationships. Ecology, then, renders itself only a fruitful source of hypotheses concerning the community rather than a testing of them.⁴⁷

Some similarities and differences among the three themes of community reviewed have already been noted, and need not be recounted. The purpose of reviewing the three was not only to illustrate the considerable range of concepts of community in the theoretical literature, but to see what help they can offer for the development of a concept that can be of utility for the determination of governmental boundaries. An important consideration in this regard is the extent to which the three themes are capable of operationalization for empirical research. Therefore, prior to developing a new concept of community, attention is directed to consideration of the kinds of indicators of community that the three themes employ or suggest.

Indicators of Community

Of the three themes of community sketched above, the human ecological concept is the most suggestive of answers to the question of how one can locate a community - that is, what indicators can be used to determine where community is, and where its boundaries are.

It was noted that the human ecology viewpoint omits from its consideration whatever sentiments, motivations and feelings individuals may have. It appears useful to make a distinction between indicators of the objective aspect of community corresponding to the concerns of the human ecologists, and the indicators of the subjective aspect of

⁴⁷Colin Bell and Howard Newby, Community Studies (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971), p. 34.

community, which is omitted from the human ecology concept. This kind of distinction seems to have been first actually employed in the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government in England, known popularly as the Redcliffe-Maud Report.⁴⁸ The objective aspect of community refers to people's actual behaviour as measured by particular interactions that are performed more or less regularly over an extended period of time. The subjective aspect of community refers to people's sentiments, attitudes, motivations, and the like. However, it is possible to make a linkage between the two aspects, in that frequent and regular interaction may give rise to sentiment, emotion, and motivation. These in turn may have some effect on future interaction.

What kinds of interaction are most relevant to the objective aspect of community? MacIver, as an example of the community-as-common-life theme, has very little to say in this regard, concerning himself more with what might be called pre-conditions of community, such as common modes of speech, and common traditions. MacIver does state that community is a network of social interrelations and he attributes importance to communication in a general sense, but the sorts of interaction on which one should focus attention are not made explicit. It appears that MacIver is of the view that any and all interactions and communications somehow foster a sense of community. The question still remains, however, of what is a minimum level of interaction, below which there is not community. Tönnies is no more explicit than MacIver in this regard.

⁴⁸ Royal Commission on Local Government in England, Report (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969), I, p. 60.

Thus all we know from this theme of community is that interaction is requisite, particularly communication in the broad sense.

The two advocates reflecting the community-as-social-system theme, Warren and Parsons, are little more specific than MacIver and Tönnies in specifying interactions that are especially important. Both Warren and Parsons list broad categories of interaction. Warren's five, it will be recalled, are production-distribution-consumption, socialization, social control, social participation, and mutual support. Parsons' four even broader categories are goal attainment, adaptation, integration, and pattern maintenance.

Proponents of the human ecology school are much more explicit about the kinds of interaction that are important. They put heavy though not exclusive emphasis on economic interrelationships for the satisfaction of personal daily requirements. Thus importance is attached to interactivity required for the production and consumption of goods and services. Interactivity in terms of communication, including transportation, is also mentioned. Further, Hawley emphasizes that frequency of movement is an important factor. He notes some indicators that have been used, including traffic flow, telephone services, electric power service areas, wholesale and retail distribution areas, radio listening, and newspaper circulation.⁴⁹ The use of multiple indices has sometimes had inconclusive results, in that each index may yield a different description of a community's boundaries. To avoid this difficulty, some studies

⁴⁹Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 248.

have relied entirely on a single indicator. Park and Newcomb, for example, relied on newspaper circulation, which they claim correlates highly with trade area, to determine the geographic boundaries of communities around Chicago.⁵⁰

It is to be remembered that Hawley posits three levels of community. The geographic area in which there are interrelationships for the satisfaction of daily requirements is the primary community area, while the satisfaction of less frequent requirements - buying durable goods, and special services - delineate the secondary community area. Park holds the view that it is institutions rather than people that are decisive in distinguishing the community from other social constellations, and presumably from other communities. The institutions he mentions as locators of community are (aside from homes) churches, schools, playgrounds, a communal hall, a local theatre, and business and industrial enterprises.⁵¹ His view, stressing institutions, is a variation on Hawley's human ecological theme which stresses individuals' interactions. McKenzie used as indices of the boundaries of communities the daily free delivery service area of central stores, and the local territory covered by the trucks of city warehouses.⁵²

Looking now at possible indicators of the subjective aspect of community, MacIver (as an advocate of the community-as-common-life theme)

⁵⁰ Robert E. Park and C. Newcomb, "Newspaper Circulation and Metropolitan Region," R.D. McKenzie, The Metropolitan Community (New York: McGraw Hill, 1933), pp 98 - 110.

⁵¹ Robert E. Park, Human Communities (New York: Free Press, 1952), p.66.

⁵² R.D. McKenzie, The Metropolitan Community (New York: Russell and Russell, 1933), pp. 90 - 92.

refers to needs "...deeply rooted in the emotional nature..."⁵³ and motivated psychical relations.⁵⁴ Tönnies' concept involves close and enduring loyalties to place and people, and sentimental attachments.⁵⁵ How one might operationalize these indicators is not made explicit. Since the human ecological concept of community excludes from its consideration attitudes, sentiments, motivations, and the like, its proponents have nothing to offer on the subjective aspect of community.⁵⁶ One of Warren's four dimensions for characterizing communities is psychological identification with locality, that is a sense of local identification - a sense of 'belonging'.⁵⁷ This dimension is not unlike one of Parsons' four functional problems faced by every social system, that is integration, or the attachment of the system's member units to each other. And Parsons holds that one aspect of social interaction through communication is expectation and commitment.

The availability of indicators of community in the objective sense is clear, but the problem of which indicators best serve to identify and

⁵³R. M. MacIver, Community: A Sociological Study (3rd. ed.; London: Macmillan, 1924), p. 260.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 102.

⁵⁵Colin Bell and Howard Newby, Community Studies (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971), p. 24.

⁵⁶Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 180.

⁵⁷Roland L. Warren, The Community in America (2nd. ed.; Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972), p. 13.

locate communities remains. Also remaining is the matter of the relative importance of the indicators. In regard to the subjective sense of community, no specific indicators have been suggested, though the attitudes and feelings that one might consider are mentioned. Part Two of the thesis explores the use of particular indicators in Canadian studies.

CONCLUSION TO PART ONE

Community and Local Government Boundaries

It was stated earlier that a connection is very rarely made between a concept of community and the matter of delineating the geographic boundaries of units of local government. Sociological writers on community have generally not concerned themselves in this regard, while political scientists have shied away from fully exploring the meaning of community. In two of four scholarly works in which such a linkage was found at all, reference is made to the connection so fleetingly or so obscurely as to be of little use:

It is not proposed to enter here into the argument as to what degree of community interest is desirable in a local government unit, but it would be fairly generally accepted that there is a minimum level which is practically essential to ensure.⁵⁸

Our political system is founded on the presumption that the local community is the local political unit.⁵⁹

Hawley is more explicit:

There is evidence that in the original layout of an administrative area some attempt is made to shape it to the functionally delineated or community area. But expedients of various sorts are allowed to enter into the plotting of the area, and not without justification. Since it is in most instances established for a specific purpose, the requirements of that purpose necessarily take precedence over other considerations. In other words, it is not always practicable to adjust the limits of the administrative area to the margins of the community. The very instability of the community's boundary makes this difficult. But what the community boundary lacks in stability the administrative area boundary possesses in excessive degree. This applies with special weight

⁵⁸F.H.W. Green, "Community of Interest and Local Government Areas," Royal Institute of Public Administration, Public Administration, 34 (Spring, 1956), p. 47.

⁵⁹Robert E. Park, Human Communities (New York: Free Press, 1952), p. 65.

to political units. In the passage of time sentiment and vested interest ... accumulate around political boundaries to make them well-nigh immutable. Hence the community as it grows and develops overreaches them and merges segments of and often entire political units in a single functional entity, the political boundaries remaining, however, as sources of friction to the smooth functioning of the community.⁶⁰

In a rather similar vein, Rowat writes that the basis for political boundaries throughout history has been those geographic areas which encompass people who have a feeling of common interest: "Obviously, there is little that is 'natural' about the boundaries of many nation-states [and other political units such as city and county] other than an emotionally based 'feeling of community' among the population within those boundaries."⁶¹ According to this view, community of interest is the closest thing that approaches a 'natural' political region, and "The area chosen [for governmental areas in a democracy] must encompass people who have a feeling of common interest."⁶² Rowat assumes that communities of interest ought not to go unexpressed in a democracy.⁶³ The problem, he states, is to locate geographically communities of interest.

There is little in these four works to indicate that community, however defined, ought to be a consideration in the determination of

⁶⁰ Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 259.

⁶¹ Donald C. Rowat, "The Concept of Regional Government," Donald C. Rowat, The Canadian Municipal System (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1969), p. 148.

⁶² Ibid., p. 151.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 152.

boundaries of units of government. Hawley does suggest that if community and the boundaries of political units are not coterminous, friction arises, inhibiting the smooth functioning of community. Rowat indicates that in a democracy communities of interest ought to be given political expression through governmental units, presumably either because such is a requisite of democracy, or because it is democratic to do so.

It seems self-evident that if the boundaries of community and units of government are co-terminous, the individual members of a community can more easily identify themselves with that government than if the boundaries are not co-terminous. The consequences of identification with the governmental unit also seem largely self-evident: it is likely to increase the level of knowledge of, interest in, and participation in the affairs of governmental units. Such consequences are, of course, empirical propositions rather than statements of fact, but they are general pre-conditions of democracy and therefore normatively valued. Further, when individual members of a community are readily able to identify with a governmental unit and to participate in the affairs of that unit, it seems likely that the governmental unit's elected representatives will be more conscious of their accountability and obligations to the electorate, and therefore more responsive to the wishes of that populace.

A different kind of rationale for having governmental boundaries reflect community boundaries can be offered. In situations where a governmental unit's boundaries are so large as to include more than one community, severe friction can arise if the two or more communities are unfriendly rivals or merely different, yet lumped together in the one

governmental unit. Community is not necessarily geographically limitless. Contact, whether by travel or other communication, can have the effect of heightening the perceptions individual members of a community have of their uniqueness and distinctiveness from non-members of that community and therefore also from other communities.⁶⁴ The perceived difference between 'we' and 'they' can therefore become intensified. It is false to assume that interaction is always integrative, leading to an inevitable and limitless geographic expansion of community. The fallacy of such a view is borne out, in extreme form, in some incidences of civil war. It is clear, for example, that large numbers of people in Northern Ireland, even after three hundred years of contact, are not integrated with Great Britain to the extent that they feel they belong to a community of which Britons are members. There is therefore little to be gained and perhaps much to be lost by forcing hostile or clearly distinct communities into a single governmental unit at whatever level.

Finally, if large numbers of people perceive that community is an important boundary determinant, then community ought to be a consideration in the determination of geographic boundaries of units of local government, for it is they who are to be governed.

Several official studies on the reorganization of local government in Canada have used or proposed the use of a community criterion for delineating geographic boundaries of units of local government. It is

⁶⁴One eminent theorist of international integration who holds that communication is not necessarily integrative is Karl Deutsch, "Security Communities," James N. Rosenau, ed., International Politics and Foreign Policy (New York: Free Press, 1961), pp. 98 - 104.

to an examination of these uses and proposals that attention is directed
in Part Two.

PART TWO

RECENT STUDIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION IN CANADA:
BOUNDARY DETERMINATION

INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO

In the following two chapters, recent Canadian studies on local government reorganization are reviewed. By 'recent studies' is meant studies completed in 1953 or later, this cut-off point having been chosen because in that year the Cumming Report on metropolitan Toronto was presented by the Ontario Municipal Board. The report, which resulted in the creation of metropolitan government in Toronto, was a bench-mark in the development of local government in Canada, signalling the beginning of widespread efforts to overhaul the organization of local government. Only provincial government reports are reviewed, including reports of departments of municipal affairs, royal commissions, committees of legislatures, study committees sponsored wholly or jointly by a province, and white papers. Excluded from consideration are reports and submissions by municipalities and private bodies, but where such reports are known, they are footnoted.

Part Two is divided into two chapters. More studies have been done in Ontario than in any other province in Canada, and these are reviewed in Chapter 2. Recent studies in the other provinces are reviewed in Chapter 3.

The review of studies and reports has three purposes. First, it is desired to ascertain which of the Canadian studies utilized or proposed the use of some concept of community as boundary determinant. Second, where a community criterion has been proposed or used, the nature of that criterion is examined, in terms of definition and operationalization. Finally, other criteria used by each study to delineate boundaries of local government units are briefly noted. This last is

designed to show the extent to which administrative and financial considerations may have dominated the determination of geographical boundaries at the expense of a community criterion. It is hoped to be able to select out operational indicators of community that appear to be of particular utility.

A cursory and preliminary reading of some of the studies resulted in the impression that administrative and financial considerations appeared to dominate boundary recommendations. Administratively, the coordination, planning and provision of services at the local level was often thought to require larger geographic areas than encompassed in most existing municipal units. These concerns seem to have been most prominent in studies having to do with heavily urbanized areas, where the provision of municipal services has been made difficult by the presence of political boundaries of neighbouring municipal jurisdictions. Financially, the three factors of population growth, urbanization, and a changing and more expensive technology are often viewed as placing considerable restraint on the capacity of existing municipalities to provide the requisite or desirable range and level of services. The accuracy of this initial impression is tested in the two chapters.

In many of the studies reviewed below, no concept of community is expressly used or proposed as a boundary determinant. It is nevertheless possible that the authors of some of the studies had some concept of community in mind, and that this may have had some influence on their recommendations. It is quite possible, for example, that reluctance to alter existing boundaries is influenced by the view that the existing units of local government do indeed contain single whole communities. Thus to

alter the boundaries would be to disturb or carve up existing communities. However, the extent to which existing units of local government reflect communities is an empirical question. It is of special interest to the review in the two chapters that follow to examine the extent to which attention was directed to this empirical question. If no attention was thus directed, it is concluded that no concept of community was used or proposed as a boundary determinant.

Both chapters proceed in chronological order for each province separately, the provinces reviewed in Chapter 3 being in alphabetical order. Brief reference is made in Chapter 3 to local government in the northern territories, an area rarely included in studies of local government in Canada. Legislative action and debates on the studies are not reviewed because it is often the case that a full-scale recitation of the criteria on which boundary determination is based is not to be found either in the bill itself or in debate on the bill. For reference purposes, the numbers of units of local government by type are given for each province and the territories in Tables 1 to 11 in Appendix A, the tables extending back to 1952.

CHAPTER TWO

RECENT STUDIES IN ONTARIO

Ontario is one of the provinces that has embarked on a large-scale extensive reform of local government. The establishment of regional government was preceded by reform of local educational structures, which involved the consolidation of smaller educational units into larger ones. Reform of local educational structures, which is beyond the scope of the review that follows, began as early as 1938, but was concentrated mainly in the years 1964 to 1968. The creation of regional units of local government began in 1969, but was preceded by the establishment of metropolitan government in Toronto in 1954. Table 1 in Appendix A reflects these developments.¹

Cumming Report

In January, 1953, the Ontario Municipal Board, chaired by Mr. Lorne R. Cumming, released its report dealing with an application from the city of Toronto for amalgamation of the city with twelve other municipalities.² Leading to the creation of Metro Toronto, the report represents a benchmark in local government reorganization in Canada.

Reading the report does not give one the impression that the Municipal Board considered the question of boundary determination at any great length. The thirteen municipalities involved were all parties in the city of Toronto's amalgamation application that was turned down by

¹For a general review of regional government in Ontario see J.L.A. Hill, "Regional Government for Ontario: Challenge and Response" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, 1971). See also Bureau of Municipal Research, "Reorganizing local government -- a brief look at four provinces," Civic Affairs, 1972, no. 1, pp. 19-26.

²Ontario Municipal Board Decisions and Recommendations of the Board (Toronto: Queen's Printer, January 20, 1953). The Ontario Government established metropolitan government in Toronto effective January 1, 1954.

the Board. Nowhere in the report is there a list of the boundary determinants that were used.

The word community appears frequently, usually in the sense of people in any geographic area, but is never defined. Nor are any data presented in the report to substantiate the Board's claim that the residents of the twelve municipalities around the city of Toronto "... for the most part were Toronto people who chose or were forced to live outside the city limits although economically and socially they were members of the metropolitan community."³ In the same vein, the Board appears to have accepted the city of Toronto's claim that the entire area of the thirteen municipalities "... had become a single community in every respect except its form of local government"⁴ In other places, the report refers to the 'underlying social and economic unity of the area',⁵ the absence of open spaces and physical barriers separating the area municipalities,⁶ and the large number of inter-municipal agreements of various kinds among the area municipalities.⁷ All these factors supposedly illustrate inter-dependence of the municipalities and their residents.

³Ibid., p. 14.

⁴Ibid., p. 26.

⁵Ibid., p. 43.

⁶Ibid., p. 15.

⁷Ibid., pp. 20-21.

In recommending the second, metropolitan, tier of government, considerations relating to the provision of services seem to have been uppermost in the minds of the Board's members, particularly having to do with the financing, administering and planning of services, though such considerations do not appear to have been viewed as boundary determinants.

Regarding future territorial changes to the Board's proposed metropolitan federation, the report states that any changes ought to involve entire municipalities rather than parts. The reasoning was that the proposed metropolitan council would need to deal only with local municipal councils having independent local taxing powers.⁸

In sum, the question of boundary determination receives almost no attention, and criteria are therefore not specified.

Committee on the Municipal Act

In March, 1965, the Ontario legislature's Select Committee on the Municipal Act and Related Acts presented its fourth and final report.⁹ In it, the Committee recommended the creation of larger units of local government throughout the province "... to restore responsibility to the elected representatives and increase the possibility of economical and efficient administration of municipal services"¹⁰ The report was an influential one in that by recommending that the county be the basic unit of two-tiered regional government, it set the pattern for regional

⁸Ibid., p. 87.

⁹Ontario. Select Committee on the Municipal Act and Related Acts Fourth and Final Report (March, 1965). Mr. Hollis E. Beckett was chairman. The report has become known as the Beckett Report.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 168.

governments subsequently established in Ontario.

Community was not defined, not posited as an objective of local government reform, and was not specifically proposed as a boundary determinant. The report did state that "Geographical and topographical features, as well as, economic factors determine in part the physical limits of a community."¹¹ but this thought was not pursued.

Regarding boundary determination for units of regional government, the report stated:

Regions must be studied individually in terms of population, logical planning areas, watersheds, economic and social conditions and other relevant factors in order to define suitable boundaries for larger units of local government.

As a practical start the Committee recommends the adoption of the county, in whole or in part or with additions thereto, as the basic unit of regional government. ...

Cities and separated¹² towns should be included in the larger unit of government ...

Later on in the report, assessment was added to the list of criteria.

The Select Committee's report therefore sheds no light on how community can be used as a boundary determinant.

Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto

Dr. H. Carl Goldenberg's name appears frequently in this review of recent developments in local government reorganization in Canada. In June, 1963, he was commissioned by the Ontario government to inquire into the outer and internal boundaries of Metro Toronto

¹¹Ibid., p. 170.

¹²Ibid., p. 173.

... in the light of the experience gained through the operations of the metropolitan government, with due regard to probable future urban growth within or beyond the present metropolitan limits and future service requirements.¹³

In regard to the outer boundary, Dr. Goldenberg recommended no change, even though some data were presented to indicate the interdependence of bordering areas with Metro, particularly in terms of place-of-residence - place-of-work travel patterns. Also noted was the assertion that Metro Toronto and the area west to, and including, Hamilton constituted a continuous urban belt. Nevertheless, the report recommended no change in Metro Toronto's outer boundary primarily because of the effect any changes would have on the level of assessment in the parts of municipalities remaining outside an expanded Metro Toronto.¹⁴ In the report it was stated that "An important test for the delimitation of urban boundaries is the need for the provision of integrated urban services."¹⁵

Regarding internal boundaries, the report recommended consolidation of the thirteen existing municipalities into four cities, although it was stated that Metro Toronto was 'one geographic, social and economic unit'.¹⁶ A number of justifications, which may be viewed as determinants, were offered for the boundaries of the four proposed cities: links of

¹³Ontario. Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto Report (June, 1965), p. xi. As of January 1, 1967, the thirteen municipalities were consolidated into six.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 166 - 171.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 170

¹⁶Ibid., p. 180.

geography and 'common interests', common problems of renewal and redevelopment, similar levels of 'maturity', interdependence in terms of sources of manpower, size, population, resources, scale of operations, and administrative efficiency.¹⁷ The existing municipal boundaries would be strictly followed in creating the four cities. In terms of land area, population, net debt per capita, and taxable assessment, the four cities would not be balanced, though the range of differences would be much less marked than under the then-existing situation.

The proposed consolidation seems very much to have been a compromise. None of the parties involved advocated the status quo, nor a return to the pre-Metro situation. On the other hand, the city of Toronto received little support for total amalgamation.¹⁸ Dr. Goldenberg apparently saw some merit in the city's total amalgamation proposal, but recommended the four-city solution. Therefore the justifications seem to have been after-the-fact rationales rather than before-the-fact determinants. A concept of community was not used, though 'common interests' was given as a justification for the recommended internal boundaries.

Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton County Local Government Review

The first in a series of local government reviews in Ontario was the report on the Ottawa area.¹⁹ Established in May, 1964, the review

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 181-182.

¹⁸City of Toronto Submission to Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto (March, 1964). Submission prepared by Eric Hardy Consulting Limited.

¹⁹Ontario. Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton County Local Government Review Final Report and Recommendations (Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, June, 1965). Mr. Murray V. Jones was commissioner and Mr. Donald M. Paterson was research director. The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton came into existence on January 1, 1969.

was requested by sixteen municipalities, one more later requesting inclusion in the review area. This method of initiation became the practice for later local government reviews. The report indicated some doubt that the review area itself constituted the best area for the proposed regional government. Further study was recommended.

Rather than a unitary or a federated structure of government for the region, a form of two-tier structure was recommended in which the lower tier would consist of three categories of districts to replace the existing municipalities. A unitary regional government was considered unacceptable because of fears of higher taxes and loss of local autonomy. A federated structure was also considered unacceptable because the Ottawa area was only in the 'early stages' of a metropolitan settlement pattern and because the existing municipalities were too unequal in population and resources.²⁰

The number and size of districts required is related to two considerations: first, they should consist of distinct geographic units, if at all possible, and contain community 'identities', and second, they should have a size of population which can provide a high ratio of representatives to electors but with a relatively small council in order to obtain responsiveness and attempt to obtain a consensus of objectives for the district. If given the responsibility of providing important municipal services, they would have to be quite large if they are to obtain an adequate tax base and be capable of operating efficient administrative departments. On the other hand, if they are to be 'close to the people' and responsive to local feeling, providing an effective channel for citizen participation in local government, they should be considerably smaller.²¹

²⁰Ibid., pp. 26-28.

²¹Ibid., p. 29.

In the above quotation are found at least five boundary determinants: population size, geographic distinctiveness, community identity, tax base, and efficient administration.

Just as the outer boundary was not delineated, pending further study, the internal district boundaries were not precisely defined - such was to be a stage of implementation of the report's proposals. No definition of community identity was provided, and how or whether it was operationalized is not clear.

Niagara Region Local Government Review

The Niagara review was an extension of a locally-sponsored study of Lincoln and Welland counties and the twenty-six area municipalities.²² The report recommended a two-tier regional government with the outer boundaries corresponding to those of the two counties. Three sides were bounded by physical barriers - lakes and a river. Some consideration seems to have been given to altering the western boundary but because it was desired to minimize dislocation, no change in this boundary was recommended.

Though stating that the region was a 'closely-knit entity', the Commission did not propose complete consolidation. It recommended instead consolidating the twenty-six area municipalities into twelve new ones. The boundaries of the cities were to be enlarged so as "... to

²² Ontario. Niagara Region Local Government Review Report (Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, August, 1966). Professor Henry B. Mayo was chief commissioner. Regional government, encompassing the two countries, came into effect January 1, 1970.

take in present and anticipated built-up areas. The cities are better equipped to provide certain services to those areas, when they should be required."²³ The other eight new municipalities were each to contain an urban centre and were designed to make for equity in taxation and services.²⁴ Other factors considered included tax base per capita, existing intermunicipal agreements, planning considerations, and reducing an urban-rural split.²⁵

Community was not defined and not utilized as a criterion for defining boundaries, either external or internal. The dominating determinants appear to have been tax base, service requirements, and planning requirements.

Peel-Halton Local Government Review

In July, 1965, Mr. Thomas J. Plunkett was appointed special commissioner to broadly study Peel and Halton counties and their seventeen municipalities.²⁶ The Commission recommended that the two counties, divided on a north-south axis, be reconstituted as two new unitary counties divided on an east-west axis. The southern unit would also take in some territory further to the west. The primary reason for this recommended reorganization appears to have been to separate the urban southern area

²³Ibid., p. 62.

²⁴Ibid., p. 62.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 82-85.

²⁶Ontario. Peel-Halton Local Government Review Report (September, 1966). No legislative action has been taken regarding the two counties.

of rapid growth from the rural, agricultural northern area.²⁷ It was suggested that the two existing counties did not constitute a single entity, there not being a central core city, but that the centres in the southern area were increasingly interdependent, especially in terms of work-residence travel patterns and in terms of lines of communication.²⁸

Six criteria that a new municipal structure was to meet were stated. Two of them have a bearing on boundaries:

- (1) Recognize the development pattern and character of the Area and establish municipal boundaries which are coterminous with effective planning areas; ...
- (6) Establish municipal jurisdictions of sufficient area and resources as to have a reasonable capacity to provide the required levels of services and deal effectively with existing and emerging problems.²⁹

It appears, however, that it was primarily on the bases of separating rural from urban, and recognizing interdependence in terms of lines of communication and residence-work travel patterns that the boundary between the two proposed counties was determined.

The review explicitly did not use a community criterion; "... the local community in the sense of what it once was no longer really exists in the Area."³⁰ Further,

Despite its nostalgic appeal a theory of local government which emphasizes the virtues of smallness and immediacy and based on an idea of community that belongs to the past is at variance with the requirements of contemporary life. Thus, an argument that seeks to retain the smaller governments in the Area can only do so by ignoring the forces which have been the underlying cause

²⁷Ibid., p. 51.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 4-11.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 57-58.

³⁰Ibid., p. 108.

of population expansion and the means of creating the kind of wider community which now exists.³¹

The inclusion of the town of Burlington in the new urban southern county was not a clear-cut matter because it was thought that Burlington might more properly belong in the Hamilton area. The town, in its submission to the study, suggested that its position could be better ascertained when a review was made of the Hamilton and County of Wentworth area. However, Mr. Plunkett recommended the inclusion of the town in the proposed urban county for two reasons:

1) Burlington's 'substantial orientation' towards the other municipalities to the east in terms of traffic movements from home to place of employment in 1964 and projected for 1985, and

2) Burlington's independence from Hamilton and Wentworth County for such physical services as water and sewerage. Burlington is in a separate drainage area.³²

Ontario Committee on Taxation

In 1967 the Ontario Committee on Taxation presented its report in which a scheme of regional government for Ontario was suggested.³³ Though the Committee's interest in regional government arose from a taxation

³¹Ibid., p. 109.

³²Ibid., p. 83. In 1964 39.3% of working residents of Burlington worked west of the review area whereas 55.5% worked in the southern part of the review area. (p. 8.) It was projected that in 1985 the figures would be 23.1% and 74.3% respectively. (p. 11.)

³³Ontario Committee on Taxation Report (3 vols.; Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1967). It is in volume 2, chapter 23, that the scheme of regional government for Ontario is suggested. Mr. Lancelot J. Smith was chairman, and the report is known as the Smith Report.

revenue perspective, the report was careful to note that the Committee dealt with the matter on a broader basis.

The Committee based its proposals for regional government on two broad principles - access and service. By access was meant,

... the most widespread participation possible on the part of all or virtually all individual citizens. Access to government, in terms of capacity to influence public policy decisions and to enforce responsive and responsible administration is, of course, fundamental to any democratic government.³⁴

The capacity to promote access was viewed as being inversely related to size. That is, smaller local governments were considered capable of realizing the access value more than are larger ones. By service was meant "... not only the economical discharge of public functions, but the achievement of technical adequacy in due alignment with public needs and desires."³⁵ For service purposes, a larger size of local government was considered generally preferable. The two values were therefore in potential conflict in terms of the optimum size of units. Unless resort was to be made to ad hoc authorities to provide services, it was necessary to strike a balance between the two values. One way of achieving such balance is to establish two-tiered government, and this the Committee generally favoured.

The Committee felt that size determination, and therefore boundary determination, of regions, should be based on five criteria derived from the twin objectives of access and service. The criteria were community, balance, finance, function, and co-operation:

³⁴Ibid., II, p. 503.

³⁵Ibid., II, p. 503.

- (1) A governmental region should possess to a reasonable degree a combination of historical, geographical, economic and sociological characteristics such that some sense of community already exists and shows promise of further development subsequent to the creation of the region. ...
- (2) A region should be so structured that diverse interests within its boundaries are reasonably balanced and give promise of remaining so in the foreseeable future. ...
- (3) Every region should possess an adequate tax base, such that it will have the capacity to achieve substantial service equalization through its own tax resources, thereby reducing and simplifying the provincial task of evening out local fiscal disparities. ...
- (4) Every region should be so constituted that it has the capacity to perform those functions that confer region-wide benefits with the greatest possible efficiency, efficiency being understood in terms of economies of scale, specialization and the application of modern technology. ...
- (5) Regions should be so delineated and their governments so organized that the co-operative discharge of certain functions can readily become an integral part of their over-all responsibility.³⁶

The Ontario government accepted these five criteria for regional government, adopting them in its Design for Development: Phase Two statement, reviewed below.

Community was defined as a sense of shared interest, arising from such 'elusive factors' as history, geography, economic relations and sociological traits:

[Community] plays a concrete and essential role in making a governmental unit viable. Popular participation in government, then, demands the existence of a sense of community. When a new unit of government is to be created, such as a region, it is of course more than likely that a full-blown sense of community will not immediately be achieved. This is because there exists a reciprocal relation between popular participation and community. Participation cannot exist without community, but it serves to develop community.³⁷

Without suggesting how the five criteria might be operationalized,

³⁶ Ibid., II, pp. 515-516.

³⁷ Ibid., II, p. 507.

the Committee proposed the creation of twenty-seven regions, which would cover all the population areas of Ontario. They would not be based on existing counties. The boundaries of the proposed regions were not intended by the Committee to be final, being subject to alternation after more intensive study and in light of major shifts in growth patterns.³⁸

In sum, community was defined and listed as a boundary determinant at least for the external boundaries of regions. It would appear that the community criterion was intended to be applicable to the determination of any internal boundaries as well. Whether significance is to be attributed to the placing of the community criterion at the top of the list is not clear.

Lakehead Local Government Review

Commissioned in September, 1965, to inquire broadly into the cities of Fort William and Port Arthur, and three other area municipalities, the Lakehead Local Government Review's report was submitted in March, 1968.³⁹ In recommending boundaries for a new merged and substantially enlarged city, the report gave no list of criteria. The question of internal boundaries was not raised because the Commissioner concluded that the population of the area was insufficient to warrant a two-tier structure. Determination of the city's external boundary appears to

³⁸Ibid., II, pp. 510-513.

³⁹Ontario. Lakehead Local Government Review Report and Recommendations (March 11, 1968). Mr. Eric Hardy was special commissioner and Mr. Donald M. Paterson was research director. The two cities were amalgamated, with surrounding territory, as of January 1, 1970. The city is now known as Thunder Bay.

have been based on including all the existing urban area and further territory for which urban use was likely to take place within a 'reasonable span of years', the need to maintain adequate land use control to prevent substandard development on the outer fringes, planning, the area's uncertain growth prospects, and some physical boundaries such as creeks.⁴⁰

A district region for those parts of north-western Ontario outside the proposed city was also recommended. The report referred to the success of municipal associations in north-western Ontario in maintaining continuing activities among municipalities and stated that this reflected a 'strong sense of community' extending throughout the whole territory.⁴¹ Since no other evidence of community was presented in the report, his conclusion seems to have been highly impressionistic. 'Sense of community' was not defined. The reasons for the choice of a boundary for the proposed very large district region are obscure. It was stated that the pattern of settlement in northern Ontario made it difficult to determine the best boundaries.

At one point in the report, two of the five criteria put forward by the Ontario Committee on Taxation were quoted - the community and balance criteria. It is not clear how, or if, these were taken into account in the Lakehead study. Certainly no evidence was given to indicate that the two proposed new municipal units would meet these criteria. The community criterion appears to have been used only to the extent that a) it was expected an amalgamated city would be acceptable to most area citizens,

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 84-89.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 91.

and b) some sense of community was thought to be reflected in the existence since 1917 of an organization known as the Thunder Bay Municipal League, composed of representatives from area municipalities and unorganized townships. This use of the community criterion seems far from what the Committee on Taxation had in mind.⁴²

Design for Development: Phase Two

Though not proposing specific regional governments or boundaries, statements made in 1968 to the Ontario legislature by the Premier and the Minister of Municipal Affairs deserve notation.⁴³ In the two statements, the Ontario government's acceptance of the Ontario Committee on Taxation's five criteria for regional government was made explicit. Three other criteria were added:

1) community participation in discussions leading to the formation of a regional government and, where possible, community acceptability.

2) new regional government boundaries should be usable by other institutions such as provincial departments and agencies. In particular, co-terminous boundaries with school authorities are desired.

3) in cases where there are to be two tiers of government within a region, both tiers should be designed with the same criteria.⁴⁴

⁴²Mr. Hardy was involved in the preparation of the Committee on Taxation's report.

⁴³Ontario. Design for Development: Phase Two, statements to the Ontario legislature by Premier John Robarts, November 28, 1968, and Municipal Affairs Minister D. McKeough, December 2, 1968.

⁴⁴Ibid., statement by Mr. McKeough, pp. 2-3.

In addition to these three general criteria, several specific requirements were stated. To form a regional government there was to be a minimum area population of from 150,000 to 200,000; regions were to be urban-centred, that is include both major urban centres and their surrounding territory; and lower-tier units, if any, were to have a minimum population of from 8,000 to 10,000.⁴⁵ Finally, the decision whether a region should be unitary or two-tier was to be based on five factors: geographical size of the proposed region, population distribution/concentration, distribution of financial resources, physical and social geography, and local attitudes.

The two statements of official policy are important in terms of their influence on subsequent local government reviews and other reports.

Muskoka District Local Government Review

With the now usual broad terms of reference, a local government review of the District of Muskoka was commissioned in May, 1967, and reported in June, 1969.⁴⁶ The review area covered twenty-five municipalities and some municipally unorganized territory, with a quite widely dispersed and small population.

The report echoed the Ontario Committee on Taxation's sentiments about striking a balance between service and access, and about the utility of a two-tier structure to optimize the two criteria. Also noted were the five specific criteria proposed by the Taxation Committee and

⁴⁵Ibid., statement by Mr. McKeough, pp. 3-4.

⁴⁶Ontario. Muskoka District Local Government Review Final Report and Recommendations (June 25, 1969). Mr. Donald M. Paterson was commissioner. The District of Muskoka came into being as of January 1, 1971.

accepted by the Ontario government, plus the additional three criteria and assorted conditions specified in Design for Development: Phase Two.

The report suggested that a region larger than the review area would be desirable in view of the limited population and tax base of the review area. Though the Commissioner considered that his terms of reference did not allow him to recommend arrangements for a region larger than the review area, several possible wider boundaries were explored in the light of the stated criteria. Nevertheless the recommended initial outer boundary of the proposed region coincided almost exactly with that of the review area, even though the population fell far short of the Ontario government's desired minimum. No evidence was presented in the report to indicate that the area met the community criterion.

In regard to the internal boundaries of the lower-tier units, it was stated that the same criteria should apply as used for outer boundary determination. Additional considerations were the elimination of any foreseeable need for future annexations, and the possibility that the proposed region might later form a part of a larger region. In the end, it was recommended that the existing twenty-five municipalities and three unorganized areas form six lower-tier municipalities. To propose fewer than six units would, according to submissions received, not meet the community criterion. In the Commissioner's view, it would meet the balance criterion. The two criteria were therefore not compatible. It appears that the community and public acceptability criteria were given highest priority, but the measurement of sense of community and public acceptability, being based only on formal submissions received, is open to question.⁴⁷

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 149-152.

Northern Ontario

An inter-departmental committee, chaired by Mr. John Pearson of the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs, presented a report on government at the district level in July, 1969.⁴⁸ The report was mainly an evaluation of the 'district municipality' proposed by the Lakehead Local Government Review for the area outside the recommended enlarged city based on Fort William and Port Arthur. Almost all the very large territory of the district was still unorganized for municipal services, and had a small and scattered population. An unstable economic base further hindered provision of services.

Though some provincial departments indicated preference for a system of two-tier governments covering most of northern Ontario, other departments preferred strengthening and extending the existing municipal structures. There was unanimous support for revising some existing municipal boundaries through consolidation and extension to include adjacent settled areas and enough undeveloped land to ensure orderly future growth. However, the Committee could not reach unanimity on a proposal for organization of the area. It put forward three alternatives which need not be reviewed here. All three involved changes in municipal boundaries, though no specific boundaries were proposed. The report did state that

Thorough studies involving local participation should precede any revision of boundaries. These factors should be included in the studies:

⁴⁸ Ontario Inter-departmental Committee on Government at the District Level in Northern Ontario Report and Recommendations (July 31, 1969). Mr. John Pearson was chairman.

- (1) the proximity of neighbouring municipalities;
- (2) the concentration and size of population;
- (3) the expected population growth;
- (4) the community of identity;
- (5) the need for development controls in adjacent areas;
- (6) the location and nature of present and anticipated commercial and industrial development;
- (7) the viability of the municipality.⁴⁹

Later, in discussing one of the three alternatives, the report stated:

As a general rule, however, the boundaries of the regional municipality should correspond to the extent of the functional 'region' in terms of population distribution, economic activity, and social and cultural interaction. The regional municipalities should be urban centred, but the boundaries should not extend beyond the area in which most of the occupants have frequent contact with the urban centre for employment, for physical services such as water and sewers, for shopping, for recreation, and for professional services. A sense of identity and community is also important between the urban centre and the rest of the region. These regional boundaries should also take into account the location of economic activity and recreational resources and facilities associated with the region.

The boundaries of both single-tier and two-tier municipalities should be cast broadly enough to embrace the existing settled area plus an appropriate amount of adjoining undeveloped area.⁵⁰

Community was not defined, and it is unclear what the Committee had in mind when referring to 'community of identity' and 'a sense of identity and community'. The apparent distinction between community on the one hand and economic activity, social and cultural interaction on the other obscures the intended meaning of community. Finally, it should be noted that no reference was made to the criteria adopted as policy in the Design for Development: Phase Two statement, except in quoting the

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 9.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 22.

report of the Lakehead Local Government Review.

Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review

In August, 1967, a Commission was appointed with the usual broad terms of reference to study the area included in the city of Hamilton, the town of Burlington, and Wentworth County. The Commission's report was presented in November, 1969.⁵¹

Regarding the outer boundary for the proposed two-tier regional government, the Commission attempted to define the area using three criteria: a discernable community of interest, an area appropriate for planning and for the effective provision of major services, and a strong financial base.⁵² The existing municipal structure was a criterion added later.

The report stated that though it was difficult to define community of interest, "... it is one of the most important criteria for devising government boundaries for a metropolitan area."⁵³ Attempting to define community of interest, the report stated that

The concept of community of interest requires considerable elaboration. To the extent that it involves defining the sphere of influence of the City of Hamilton, a number of widely accepted measures can be documented. For example, such factors as the pattern of telephone calls, newspaper circulation, the extent of 'comparison shopping' and the provision of various specialized services (financial, commercial and cultural) are generally used to measure the hinterland of a large centre. However, Hamilton's sphere of influence is but one aspect of the community of interest.

⁵¹Ontario. Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review Report and Recommendations (November, 1969). Mr. Donald R. Steele was chief commissioner. No legislation has been enacted in reference to the review area.

⁵²Ibid., p. 22.

⁵³Ibid., p. 23.

What is important for this study is not the largest sphere of influence, nor the most concentrated (which may be the area considered for local services in annexation matters) but that which embraces an area most appropriate for the exercise of overall municipal responsibilities.⁵⁴

To the list of indicators was later added the area within which the bulk of the population work, shop, pursue leisure activities, and participate in public and social life.⁵⁵ Economic interdependence in terms of travel and shopping patterns was mentioned as being of particular importance.

On the basis of these stated criteria, the outer boundary recommended was to include almost all of the fourteen municipalities in the review area (except for the north-western part of the town of Burlington) plus two municipalities to the south-east of the city of Hamilton.

The report dealt at some length with the position of the town of Burlington. It noted that the Peel-Halton Local Government Review stated that its recommended inclusion of Burlington in an urban county was not conclusive. Considerable opposition was expressed by people in Burlington to the town's inclusion in a regional government that would include Hamilton. The Commission held, however, that Burlington was part of the Hamilton metropolitan area and was socially and economically interdependent with Hamilton. Specific indicators of interdependence noted were:

- membership in various clubs and organizations, and use of social and recreational facilities,

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 23, 25-26.

- the residence in Burlington of 'community leaders' of the area,
 - use of Hamilton's social welfare agencies by residents of Burlington,
 - newspaper circulation and telephone calls,
 - travel patterns for social, shopping and employment purposes,
- both in 1964 and projected for 1985.⁵⁶

Further, the Commission argued that the ties Burlington had to the east were relatively weak and were more to Metro Toronto rather than to neighbouring Oakville. The ties eastward were therefore considered to be of little consequence for the purposes of governmental structures. It was found also that the north-western part of Burlington was substantially oriented to the north rather than to the southern part of the town, and therefore should not be included in a regional government including Hamilton and Burlington.

While holding that the area included in the recommended outer boundary was interdependent, the report found that the area had internal differences - land use and growth prospects - which might justify lower-tier units. Additional considerations thought to justify a lower tier included diverse servicing problems, intensity of local feelings, the desirability of political balance (to reduce the dominant influence of Hamilton), and the large area involved. The upper-tier would be designed to provide greater efficiency while the lower-tier units would enhance access in terms of citizen interest and participation. In proposing the boundaries for the lower-tier units, the Commission found itself unable to

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 35.

abide by one of the conditions apparently expressed in the Design for Development: Phase Two statement; that is, the inclusion within any unit of both urban and rural territory. It is not entirely clear, however, whether the statement intended that this principle apply to lower tier units as well. In any case, the Commission found that the pattern of settlement in the proposed region did not easily lend itself to this condition for the six lower-tier units recommended. Instead, the Commission's recommendations were guided by two considerations, the creation of strong units able to effectively provide services, and the desire to disrupt historic ties as little as possible.⁵⁷

A concept of community seems to have been an important consideration in the recommendation of boundaries, at least of the region's outer boundary. The concept is akin to the human ecology school of thought (Hawley's view rather than Park's), lacking consideration of subjective community. While the Commission noted the criteria laid down as official policy in the Design for Development: Phase Two statement, it seems not to have felt obligated to abide by those criteria.

Waterloo Area Local Government Review

The report of the Waterloo Area Local Government Review was presented in February, 1970, by Professor Stewart Fyfe, the Special Commissioner.⁵⁸ The review area consisted of sixteen municipalities, including

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 76-79.

⁵⁸Ontario. Waterloo Area Local Government Review Report of Findings and Recommendations (Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, February 27, 1970). Regional government was instituted for the area as of January 1, 1973.

the cities of Waterloo, Galt, and Kitchener, and Waterloo County. The report recommended that the area be consolidated into two cities and a county, with the county having five member municipalities.

The Commissioner stated that as he contemplated changes in local government for the review area,

... the principle that there should be a community of interest, or if one prefers, problems, has been uppermost. If a local government is to have an identity, it should represent and act on behalf of the residents of ⁵⁹an area who have many social and economic interests in common.

A fairly wide range of indicators was used to examine the relationships among the various parts of the area, these relationships relating to the objective aspect of community. Considerable emphasis was put on the analysis of place-of-work - place-of-residence travel patterns. Other indicators used included newspaper circulation; population distribution and concentration; telephone calls; physical boundaries; travel patterns for business, social-recreational, shopping, and medical-dental purposes; work force characteristics; land use; and ethnicity. A very complicated pattern of relationships was found. The review area was found to be, in many respects, an economic and social unit, but it was also found that there were substantial differences among the area's various parts. Two urban complexes were identified, one centred on the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, and the other centred on Galt. It was found also that there were 'significant differences' within the study area. It seems to have been primarily on the identification of these three principal divisions in terms of the concept of community used

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 7.

that the Commission recommended the restructuring of the area into two cities and a county.⁶⁰

Though reference was made in the report to the Design for Development: Phase Two statement, the Commission did not see fit to abide by all of that statement's criteria. Particularly to be noted is the Commission's recommendation that a rural county be established separate from two urban cities. This conflicts with the principle stated in the policy statement that regions should be urban centred, to include both urban and rural territory. In making his boundary recommendations, the Commissioner appears to have relied almost entirely on his concept of community. In the report itself no other criteria were listed, though there was a list in an appendix to the report. The appendix, quoting from a statement issued by the Commission in 1967, listed nine criteria, the first being community of interest. Others were: present and expected development, economic and industrial characteristics, financial resources, physical features, population, and wishes of the inhabitants.⁶¹ Some of these seem to have been encompassed in the Commission's concept of community, (though why 'wishes of the inhabitants' was made a separate criterion is not clear) but it appears the others did not figure prominently in boundary determination.

Sudbury Area

Mr. J. A. Kennedy, then chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board,

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 15-37. The 'significant differences' referred to are between urban and rural areas, between the various urban municipalities in the two complexes, between the two complexes, and between the Waterloo area and the surrounding municipalities.

⁶¹Ibid., Appendix A, p. 191.

was appointed in February, 1969, to broadly study an area of some 1,200 square miles around and including Sudbury. Twenty-two municipalities and sixty-two unorganized townships were included. His report was submitted in May, 1970.⁶² The review area was narrowed down by the Commission for reasons unspecified, and a two-tier structure was proposed. The lower tier would be comprised of an enlarged city of Sudbury and five new townships. At least twice reference was made to planning as the touch-stone to local government.⁶³ Planning, plus the principle stated in Design for Development: Phase Two that lower-tier municipalities, if any, should have a minimum population of 8,000 - 10,000, seem to have been the primary, if not the only, criteria for deciding the recommended boundaries. It does not appear that any of the other Design for Development: Phase Two criteria were used at all. The word community was used several times, but without definition or precision. In one place the phrase 'community of services' was used, the meaning of this not being clarified.

In sum, how the outer boundary of the proposed region was determined was not explained. Internal boundaries seem to have been based on planning needs and minimum population level. No concept of community seems to have been employed.

Sudbury Local Government Reform Proposals

In March, 1971, the Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs presented

⁶²Ontario. Sudbury Area Study Report (May, 1970). Regional government for the Sudbury area came into effect on January 1, 1973.

⁶³Ibid., pp. 12, 24.

a proposal for local government reform in the Sudbury area.⁶⁴ The proposal drew on the Kennedy report and reactions to it from area organizations, municipalities, and individuals. Regarding boundaries, Mr. Bales' proposal involved a region with a somewhat different outer boundary from Mr. Kennedy's recommendation. A number of unorganized townships included in Mr. Kennedy's scheme were to be excluded because they would add an unnecessary burden to the new region in terms of providing services. Other unorganized townships excluded in Mr. Kennedy's plan were to be included because they may require municipal servicing.

Internal boundaries were also to be altered. Rather than Mr. Kennedy's scheme of one city and five townships, there would be eight new municipalities consolidating fifteen existing municipalities. Criteria used for determining boundaries, or at least for altering Mr. Kennedy's recommended boundaries, bear some resemblance to the criteria and conditions laid down in the Design for Development: Phase Two policy - tax base, geography, community servicing, geographic separation, and urban centres. There was, however, no indication of what sort of community criterion was used, nor how it was used.

Waterloo Local Government Reform Proposals

The Minister of Municipal Affairs in March, 1971, also presented a proposal for local government reform in the Waterloo area, in reaction to Professor Fyfe's report and to comments on it from area organizations

⁶⁴Ontario. Department of Municipal Affairs Sudbury Local Government Reform Proposals (March 15, 1971).

and municipalities.⁶⁵ Whereas the Fyfe report recommended the creation of two enlarged cities and a new county, in preference to a discarded alternative plan involving a two-tier regional government with eight member municipalities, Mr. Bales' proposal resembled the rejected alternative. The new proposal involved a smaller area and there would be seven member municipalities. In Mr. Bales' proposal, the outer boundary would be basically that of the existing county, with the addition of a small part of Wentworth County.

It will be recalled that Dr. Fyfe recommended the separation of rural areas from urban areas. Mr. Bales reaffirmed that they should be united, and his two-tier proposal envisaged this. Nevertheless, Mr. Bales recognized a diversity (of unspecified nature) in the area, which two-tier regional government would foster. Therefore total amalgamation was not considered to be a serious alternative. It was also seen to lack public support. In regard to the internal boundaries for the seven proposed constituent municipalities, they were merely described with no reasons presented for their determination.

Oshawa Area Planning and Development Study

In September, 1969, a study of the Oshawa area was officially started, one of its concerns being regional government. The study, initiated locally, was partially funded by the provincial government. No special commissioner was appointed. Instead a consortium of consulting companies was formed to conduct the study. Several reports were issued

⁶⁵Ontario. Department of Municipal Affairs Waterloo Local Government Reform Proposals (March 16, 1971).

prior to the termination of the study in May, 1971. The report considered here was issued in June, 1971.⁶⁶

The basic study area covered ten municipalities, but since this area included parts of two counties, the regional government study area included a larger expanse. This was to enable consideration of effects of any changes on the remaining portion of the counties.

A two-tier structure was proposed for the region. The southern outer boundary was easy to define - Lake Ontario. The western outer boundary would follow a river and then a county boundary, abutting Metro Toronto and York County. This boundary was recommended because of future urban development, which it was thought could best receive most of its services from the Oshawa area to the south and east. It would also strengthen the Oshawa region in relation to Metro Toronto to somehow 'better balance' the regional pattern.⁶⁷ The eastern outer boundary would follow a present township boundary, and was recommended in light of the orientation of an area to the east and the expectation that that area would grow to a sufficient population size to form the centre of a region on its own.⁶⁸ The northern outer boundary would follow the boundaries of the county and of one township in a neighbouring county because of economic and social orientation, because of a lake being a

⁶⁶Oshawa Area Planning and Development Study Regional Government Report (June, 1971). Most of this report was written by Mr. Donald M. Paterson. No legislation has been enacted affecting local/regional government in the area.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 13.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 14-17.

physical barrier, and because of the prospects for the formation of other regional governments.⁶⁹

The decision to recommend a two-tier federation rather than a unitary structure was based on the large territory involved with its consequences in terms of access to local government, elected representatives' knowledge of each locality, and the provision of local services. The recommended internal boundaries appear to have been based on population and territorial size with their ramifications for accessibility; a balance of power amongst member municipalities; ease of administration and provision of services; 'orientations'; and balance in assessment. The result was a proposal to create five urban-oriented member municipalities and four mainly rural member municipalities.

No concept of community was stated nor used as a boundary determinant, but the word 'orientation' was frequently used. Two studies of orientations were carried out for the Oshawa Study. Both involved interviews of samples of the area population to determine the direction and strength of ties from locality to locality. One study, involving 289 respondents, was done in the town of Lindsay. Questions about the number and purpose of trips to Oshawa and Peterborough were asked and responses analyzed to determine whether Lindsay's orientation was stronger toward Oshawa or Peterborough. Non-survey data were acquired relating to telephone calls from Lindsay, to newspaper readership in Lindsay, and to the geographic origin of businessmen's clientele. A second survey of area residents was conducted in rural areas and in smaller urban centres by

⁶⁹ Ibid., pp. 18-20.

students from eleven high schools. Close to three thousand residents were interviewed about the destination and purpose of trips, and each area or centre was then characterized as heavily, moderately or lightly influenced by one or several of the larger urban centres.⁷⁰ This sort of analysis resembles the methods used by some human ecologists, but the studies were very limited in terms of the types of questions asked. No questions were asked relating to the subjective aspect of community.

Haldimand-Norfolk Study

In March, 1969, the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs began a unique study of Haldimand and Norfolk counties in which local government reorganization was to be considered. The study is unique in being conducted by staff in the Department, and in its research methods. Why the Department itself embarked on this one study is not at all clear. To date, no report recommending local government reorganization in the area has been made public. Thus the criteria that might be used to determine boundaries and the type of structure are not yet known. Nevertheless, the study is noted here because of a most interesting survey conducted for it in the two counties.⁷¹

Though there was no explanation of the theoretical basis of the Local Orientation and Identification Study (LOIS), a concept of community involving both the objective and subjective aspects clearly underlies

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 97-108.

⁷¹The study is described in Earl Berger Limited Local Orientation and Identification Study (3 vols.; Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, November, 1971).

the research. The survey, using a technique of group interviews with questionnaires, involved a pre-test of one hundred people, and a full survey of 1,500 people in the two counties. The objectives of the study were

- (i) to determine the orientation of the present population of the Haldimand Norfolk Study area in terms of community of interest, local identification and the use of services (medical, educational, shopping, etc.); and
- (ii) to determine the extent and strength of their identification⁷² with their own counties, municipalities or other localities.

It is not intended to review here the very detailed findings, but the kinds of questions asked on the questionnaire are of interest. The usual demographic questions were posed (age, education, sex, occupation, and so on) along with questions on length of residence in the area, location of various activities, number of visits to places, communication, and memberships. A series of attitudinal questions was asked as well, relating to political efficacy, and to localism-cosmopolitanism. The data were collected to facilitate the geographic identification of communities, the strength of feelings of community, and inter-relationships in the study area.

Not until recommendations are made regarding local government re-organization in the study area will it be possible to determine to what extent a concept of community is used as a boundary determinant.

Local Government Reform East of Metro Toronto

In December, 1972, the Ontario government presented a proposal for

⁷²Ibid., I, p. 1.

local government reform in the Oshawa area.⁷³ The proposal constituted a radical departure from the Paterson report's recommendations of June, 1971. Rather than a north-south axis, as the Paterson report recommended, the new proposed region would have an east-west axis. The lower part of the western boundary would be similar to the earlier proposal, except that the boundary would be altered to include the recently announced Pickering airport development. The region would be less than half the distance north to south as the Paterson proposal, but the distance from east to west would be about twice that proposed in the earlier report.

Cutting the north-south distance by more than half was based on several criteria. First mentioned was community - by 'almost any measure of community' the northern part involved in the earlier proposal was considered to be oriented other than toward Oshawa. Specifically mentioned were differences in type of economy, travel direction, rate of future growth and development, and 'local opinion'.⁷⁴ The statement is remarkable when one considers the conclusions reached, in the earlier study, about the 'orientations' of people in the area.

The greatly extended eastern boundary was proposed for several reasons: reduce the domination by Oshawa on a regional council, ensure a 'balance of interests', take account of anticipated future growth and 'emerging community of interest', which was not explained.⁷⁵ It is

⁷³ Ontario. Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs Proposal for Local Government Reform in an Area East of Metro (December, 1972).

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

interesting that in proposing the separation of the urban south from the rural north, the new scheme conflicts with the Design for Development: Phase Two policy statement.

As in the earlier proposal, a two-tier structure was recommended. There would be nine lower-tier municipalities, varying greatly in present population size. The rationales for the internal boundaries included rate of physical development, planning, local wishes, retaining the rural character of some areas, interdependence in terms of shopping and work, ease of providing services, existing communities of interest, and the location of the proposed airport.⁷⁶ It is not clear that the criteria adopted in the Design for Development: Phase Two statement were all used as boundary determinants.

The word community was frequently used, though not defined. It seems clear that planning requisites in light of anticipated development and growth were the predominating criteria.

Local Government Reform West of Metro Toronto

In January, 1973, the Ontario government presented a proposal for the reform of the existing thirty-one units of local government in an area west of Metro Toronto. Included in the area are the study areas of the Plunkett and Steele reports reviewed earlier.⁷⁷ The province recommended that there be a two-tier region for Peel County, with almost exactly the same outer boundary as the existing one. One minor change in the

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 38-43.

⁷⁷Ontario. Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs Proposal for Local Government Reform in the Area West of Metropolitan Toronto (Toronto: Queen's Printer, January, 1973).

outer boundary would make it follow the watershed of a river. The outer boundary seems to have been chosen primarily because of local preferences, and because the county could provide an 'adequate base' for a regional government in view of its current population and assessment.⁷⁸ The Peel region would have three lower-tier municipalities, as recommended by Peel County Council, though the boundaries would differ from the County's proposal. Little rationale was offered for choosing the boundaries, but the location of major roads and service areas seems to have been the deciding factor.

A two-tier regional government was also proposed for Halton County. The County's present boundary would be adjusted on the east to follow the watershed of a river (as in the proposal for Peel County), and on the west to take in a portion of Wentworth County. This latter adjustment was proposed in light of a 'community of interest' (that is not explained), of that portion of Wentworth County with Burlington, and because the additional area received water from Burlington. Four lower-tier municipalities were proposed. Halton County Council had recommended three, but a fourth was added because a particular area was thought to have a 'separate community of interest'. Again, little rationale was given for choosing the proposed internal boundaries, but anticipated roads and future urban development appear to have been the deciding factors.⁷⁹

The third proposal concerns Hamilton and Wentworth County. Rather than make a single proposal for the area, two alternatives were put

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 15.

⁷⁹Ibid., pp. 21-25.

forward - a two-tier regional government, and a somewhat smaller unitary regional municipality. The boundary of the latter would exclude most of the rural parts of the county, while the former would encompass Hamilton and the entire county, aside from that part that was to be included in the proposed Halton regional government. No criteria were listed for the outer boundary of the unitary alternative. In regard to the outer boundary of the two-tier alternative, the proposal was that there must be a 'community of interest' between urban and related rural areas, that the region must have an adequate tax base to achieve economies of scale, and there must be a minimum population of 150,000 to 200,000.⁸⁰ Under the two-tier plan, the nine existing municipalities would be consolidated into five area municipalities but no reasons were given for proposing the five.

In conclusion, community was not defined in the proposal, and almost no explanation was given for the proposed boundaries.

Other areas

Several other areas of Ontario have been municipally reorganized, but without prior reports having been issued. Included are the Regional Municipality of York, which became operational on January 1, 1971, and the Timmins-Porcupine area, amalgamated as of January 1, 1973. Several other studies are in progress, including the Haldimand-Norfolk Study referred to above, and the Brant area. Some studies have been done, or are underway, entirely under municipal sponsorship. Included are the Wellington-Guelph area, the Northumberland-Durham area, the Midland-

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 40.

Penetanguishene area, and Oxford County.

Conclusion

While the reform of local government in Ontario has been large-scale and extensive, it cannot be described as having been a comprehensive program. No plan, with a statement of criteria for the determination of boundaries, seems to have guided subsequent developments and studies. The local government reviews more frequently than not were established at the request of councils of municipalities in a particular area. It is fair to say, however, that the municipalities were encouraged by the provincial government to do so, and the impetus for general reform of local government came from Queen's Park rather than the local councils.

It was frequently found that no, or only minor, changes in the outer boundaries of the review areas were recommended. A possible explanation for this can be found in the fact that it was the local municipal councils that requested the reviews, and that the study areas often consisted entirely of those municipalities. The fact that a group of municipalities requested a review could have been taken as evidence that the review area constituted a community. To a certain extent, therefore, the outer boundaries of proposed regions may have been virtually settled at the outset of the reviews. At least one review commissioner (Mr. Paterson re: Muskoka) was of the opinion that his terms of reference precluded consideration of a region larger than the study area.

The practice of conducting local government reviews appears to have come to an end. The provincial government's process of regionalization seems to be almost complete, there being only a few proposals left requiring legislation. The concern now seems to be the consolidation of

lower-tier units. One cannot but wonder whether conducting separate local government reviews for each particular area was worth the time and effort involved, for a fair number of the proposals resulting from the reviews were shelved, abandoned, or drastically altered in the legislation passed. It has not been a purpose of this chapter to examine legislation regarding local government reorganization, but those who are familiar with regions that have been established will be aware of differences between the recommendations and later developments.

CHAPTER THREE

RECENT STUDIES ELSEWHERE

Alberta

The organization of local government in Alberta has been subject to general comprehensive reform.¹ Municipal reform was preceded by reorganization of local school units beginning in the late 1930's, by which small units were consolidated into large school divisions. In the 1940's, rural municipalities were also consolidated into larger units.

Passage of the County Act in 1950 signalled the beginning of a new phase of rural municipal reform, by which educational and municipal administrative units were to be combined voluntarily into counties but only after the passage of plebiscites in each area. Because of the date of the County Act, it is not reviewed here. Table 2 of Appendix A gives data on local government in Alberta since 1952.

Co-terminous Boundaries Commission

The Commission was appointed by the Alberta government in 1953, to establish coterminous boundaries wherever possible for school divisions and large municipal districts which did not choose to unite as counties. The Commission presented its interim report, in which its boundary-determining criteria are set out, the same year.² The seven criteria are:

- a) the nature of the physical features - topography,
- b) the nature of the production area,
- c) the ability to pay for the services required - combine 'wealthy' and 'poor' areas in terms of assessment,

¹For a brief review of local government reorganization in Alberta see Bureau of Municipal Research, "Reorganizing local government -- a brief look at four provinces," Civic Affairs, 1972, No. 1, pp. 14-18.

²Alberta. Co-terminous Boundaries Commission Interim Report (Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1953).

- d) the size in relation to administration,
- e) the inclusion of as many non-divisional schools as possible in the co-terminous areas,
- f) the existing centralization of schools should not be disturbed,
- g) factors such as provincial highways, railroads, district roads and market centres were studied.³

Hanson suggests that criteria g and c were the most important criteria, and that they were probably most often given prior consideration.⁴ No community criterion was specified.

Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Development of Calgary and Edmonton

The Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Development of Calgary and Edmonton was established in July, 1954, and the first of its three terms of reference was "[t]o recommend the boundaries and the form of local government which will most adequately and equitably provide for the orderly development of school and municipal services."⁵

Being directed to examine the two cities and their respective but unspecified surrounding areas, the Commission had to define the two areas for study before being able to recommend new boundaries. To define the two areas of study, the Commission used a concept of 'metropolitan area', defined as that area which

³Ibid., pp. 15-26.

⁴Eric Hanson, Local Government in Alberta (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1956), p. 74.

⁵Alberta. Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Development of Calgary and Edmonton Report (Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1956), p. IV. Dr. G. G. McNally was chairman, and Professor Henry B. Mayo was economic consultant. Professor Mayo was credited with writing much of the initial draft of the report.

... contains a large number of people, is mainly urban in character, with considerable economic and social interdependence of the parts making up the area; it may be, and usually is, fragmented so far as government is concerned, and is commonly composed of a central city in close contiguity with other units of municipal government. These other units of government may be cities, towns, villages, or rural municipalities. ...

For our purposes and unless otherwise specified, we shall take metropolitan area to mean the central city, together with the built-up 'fringe communities', whether separately incorporated or not, and including also the rural or small-holding territory within a few miles of the built-up⁶ fringes: the whole forming, in many ways, a closely-knit community.

Relating 'metropolitan area' to 'community', the Report goes on:

Yet, despite the political and administrative fragmentation, a metropolitan area is in many ways one community. There is a community of economic interest: people living in any part of the area may work in any other part, the area as a whole is affected when industries move in or out, the city is the commercial and financial centre of the area, and a network of roads binds the whole together. The area is bound together also by its utilities, as when the fringe communities obtain from the city their telephone service and water supply; or when the company which serves the city with natural gas or electricity may extend outside the city limits.

There are also many social ties; for example, the outlying parts make use of the city schools, hospital and medical services; and cultural and recreational ties, as when the concert halls, theatres or sports stadia serve the entire hinterland.

Nor is the influence all one way, radiating outward from the city. The city is dependent upon the trading area, upon its 'milk shed', upon parks and other outdoor recreational facilities beyond its borders.

The unity of the area is also often taken for granted in the daily thinking of the people. Thus when he is away from home, amid the alien corn of Eastern Canada, the resident of Jasper Place or Bowness,⁷ for example, will say that he comes from Edmonton or Calgary.

It appears to be at least partly on the basis of holding that a metropolitan area constitutes a single community that the Commission concluded that amalgamation of existing municipalities in the Calgary and

⁶Ibid., ch. 1, p. 1.

⁷Ibid., ch. 5, pp. 1-2.

Edmonton areas was feasible and desirable.

The Commission explicitly stated its boundary-drawing criteria:

Local government boundary lines should ... pay due attention to a variety of factors, such as economic unity, topography, population density, transport and communication lines, taxable capacity, a sense of community, land requirements and many others. Since all these factors seldom indicate the same boundaries, in the end the exact line is usually settled pragmatically, so that it becomes a matter of degree, of striking a balance, of saying 'on the whole' this or that piece of land should be included or excluded.

In order to reduce the arbitrary element as much as possible in drawing the boundary lines of the enlarged cities we must look for guidance to certain general principles.

Those general principles are:

- a) Each metropolitan area is an economic and social unity, resting upon the same economic base. This underlying fact was recognized in Chapter 13 where the recommendation was made that such an economic and social unity should be brought under one government. ...
- b) Each of the cities should be provided with sufficient space for planned expansion for a period of 15 years or so. ...
- c) The direction of expansion should take account of utility extension and the 'trend of development'. ...
- d) Local tax revenues from industry should go to the municipal authority which bears the public or social costs of industry and its employees. ...
- e) School and municipal boundaries should coincide wherever possible. ...
- f) Industrial growth adjoining the city properly belongs within the city for purposes of administration and government. ...
- g) Urbanized areas adjoining the city should be brought within the city for planning purposes. ...
- h) It would be a metropolitan tragedy for an independent city to grow up on Edmonton's east boundary, thus creating in the area the problems which have plagued the older and larger metropolitan areas of the world.⁹

Having specified the principles, the Commission then defined geographic boundaries for two amalgamated areas, one for each city. It is

⁸Ibid., ch. 14, p. 1.

⁹Ibid., ch. 14, pp. 1-3.

difficult, however, to see how the Commission utilized all the stated principles, or the relative importance attached to each. One is left with the impression that the criteria most relied on were topography and the needs of future growth.¹⁰

To summarize, the Commission did define community in a way similar to Park's version of the human ecology school of thought. Further, it assumed that any metropolitan area constitutes a single community. Thus, the Commission did not find it necessary to determine the geographic boundaries of community - it was considered necessary only to determine the geographic boundary of the metropolitan area (presumably an easier task) because the area would by definition encompass a single community in its entirety. The other criteria which the Commission stated were important are listed, but the extent to which each was used is unclear. It does appear that the Commission collected no data bearing on the subjective aspect of community.

British Columbia

Beginning in 1965, the provincial government in British Columbia set about implementing a comprehensive scheme of multi-functional regional governments covering the province. Table 3 of Appendix A shows a steady rise in the number of incorporated municipalities in British Columbia generally, and reflects the creation of regional districts,

¹⁰Ibid., ch. 14, pp. 10-16, 25-30.

as the regional governments are called.¹¹

Vancouver Metropolitan Joint Committee

The Metropolitan Joint Committee was commissioned by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in December, 1957, and reported in December, 1960.¹² Its term of reference was to study the feasibility and practicability of placing under the jurisdiction of a single metropolitan board a list of functions. The geographic extent of the metropolitan area was defined for the Committee by the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board, on the basis of the Lower Mainland region being an economic unit, characterized by economic interdependence, and on the basis that the region would soon be completely urbanized.¹³ The defined area is some seventy miles long by twenty miles wide. The Committee stated that the area was characterized by interdependence in terms of commuting patterns for trips to work, shopping habits of suburban residents, local transit coverage, and the extent of local telephone service. However, no data supporting these statements were presented in the report.

¹¹ A report was not reviewed because it was presented before 1953 is: British Columbia. Royal Commission on Provincial-Municipal Relations Report (Victoria: King's Printer, 1947). H. Carl Goldenberg was the Commissioner. Also not reviewed is Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board The Greater Vancouver Metropolitan Community (Vancouver, 1954). For a brief review of local government reform in British Columbia see Bureau of Municipal Research, "Reorganizing local government -- a brief look at four provinces," Civic Affairs, 1972, No. 1, pp. 9-14.

¹² Metropolitan Joint Committee Final Report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, British Columbia (Vancouver, December, 1960). Mr. Hugo Ray was chairman. The committee was composed mainly of local mayors, reeves and aldermen.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

The word 'community' appears frequently in the report, but without definition. The usage appears to refer only to people residing in any given geographic area. Definition of the area's geographic extent seems to have been based only on the kinds of interdependence noted above. The matter of internal boundaries was not raised.

Regional Districts

Regional districts were created in British Columbia beginning in 1965. Almost all of the province is now organized into twenty-eight regional districts, which are additional to existing municipalities. Little has yet been written on the regional districts, and what little there is gives almost no indication of the criteria used for drawing boundaries. Reference is made to the fractionalization of communities by restricted municipal boundaries which make it difficult and inefficient to provide services on the scale required by the community as a whole, and to the absence of a "... general agency to reflect what might be termed the regional community of interest."¹⁴ But the regional districts are still not officially viewed as a new level of government. They are supposed to be viewed as functional rather than political amalgamation. It may be supposed, therefore, that it is the requisites of the specific service functions to be performed that mainly determined the geographic boundaries of the regional districts rather than some conception of community. However, no list of boundary-drawing criteria is to be found. Mr. Dan Campbell, then Minister of Municipal Affairs

¹⁴British Columbia. Department of Municipal Affairs Regional Districts in British Columbia, 1971: General Review (Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1972) p. 5.

in British Columbia, wrote "At this time regional districts merely provide a locally based institution which democratically represents a metropolitan area or a trading area."¹⁵ When asked about the size of the regional districts, and the determinants of size, Mr. Campbell said,

Well, they vary. What we try to do is follow a pattern that only two plus the metropolitan areas don't follow this plan. Roughly, the population is 30,000 and that's more particularly applied to areas outside the metropolitan areas. Roughly 30,000 population and roughly 40 million in assessed values. Generally, there has been an attempt to look at transportation arteries and their relationship one with the other and generally follow the school district boundaries and a combination of two or more school districts. [sic]¹⁶

Thus it is not quite clear what criteria have been used; population and assessment appear to have been used, trading area and the requisites of service functions may have been used, but there is no evidence that a concept of community was used, at least not one including the subjective sense of community.¹⁷

Manitoba

The only clue that Table 4 of Appendix A gives to the considerable

¹⁵Hon. Dan Campbell, The Changing Face of Local Government, 1967 (Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1967), pp. 2-3. (emphasis his).

¹⁶Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board Regional Districts: Proceedings of the Discussion on Bill 83, Regional Districts Legislation, as it Might Apply in the Lower Mainland Planning Area (Vancouver, June, 1965), pp. 10-11.

¹⁷For a discussion of the concept of community underlying the work of the B.C. Department of Municipal Affairs see Paul Tennant and Dave Zirnheld, "The Emergence of Metropolitan Government in Greater Vancouver", Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, St. John's, Newfoundland, June, 1971, (mimeo) pp. 6-10.

activity in studying local government reorganization in Manitoba is the emergence of one metropolitan corporation in 1960. Widespread interest is being shown in what is called the 'Winnipeg experiment', a development that can be viewed as innovative now as was the 'Toronto experiment' two decades ago.

Manitoba Provincial-Municipal Committee

The Government of Manitoba appointed a committee in May, 1951, to consider very broadly provincial-municipal relations. The committee reported in 1953.¹⁸ Two sub-committees were formed to consider local government organization, one for the area outside Greater Winnipeg, and the other for Greater Winnipeg.¹⁹ The report notes that the Committee fully endorsed the sub-committees' reports.

The Rural Sub-committee recommended the enlargement of some municipalities,

... so that all are of a size that would measure up, approximately to the following standards:

- (1) Taxable assessment: three to five million dollars.
- (2) Maximum population: to be in the vicinity of 6,000.
- (3) Size: ¹⁵ to 18 townships or 300,000 to 400,000 taxable acres.²⁰

Even though the Metropolitan Sub-committee stated that the entire Winnipeg area constituted a single economic unit, the sub-committee

¹⁸ Manitoba. Provincial-Municipal Committee Report and Memorandum of Recommendations (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, February, 1953). The chairman was Premier D.L. Campbell.

¹⁹ The sub-committees' reports are included in Appendices B and C of the Committee's report.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 71.

recommended against total amalgamation of the city of Winnipeg and the fifteen adjacent municipalities. It was thought total amalgamation would result in a sharp increase in costs without a commensurate increase in benefits received. Instead, the sub-committee recommended creation of a single multi-functional Metropolitan Board to be responsible for all inter-municipal concerns, and suggested that some areas in Greater Winnipeg might be amalgamated if:

- 1) a small suburban municipality has a tax base inadequate to provide the full complement of urban services,
- 2) there is a great disparity in the wealth and tax revenues of several small municipalities,
- 3) one municipality benefits from services provided by an adjoining one without adequately contributing to the cost of providing such services, and
- 4) a very large firm (or firms) establishes itself in a small municipality with the consequence that its employees live in adjoining municipalities where adequate residential, school, shopping and other facilities are available.²¹

Neither sub-committee specified use of a community criterion, except possibly an allusion in item 4 above, but the Committee as a whole stated,

... new and more vigorous steps should now be taken toward a reorganization of local government using areas and boundaries which are more consistent with modern transportation and communication facilities and with modern living habits.

On the other hand, we have been impressed by the fact that once the area served by a local government body extends beyond a certain size, the benefits of local knowledge and control disappear and sharp increases in cost together with important new administrative

²¹Ibid., p. 96.

problems appear. The size at which the benefits of local knowledge and control disappear cannot be determined with any definiteness, and, of course, local attitudes, local customs, local geography, and a great variety of other factors will determine the most desirable size in a particular community. It does seem worthy of comment, however, that there is a real danger that plans for larger local government areas may envisage areas which are too large for maximum efficiency and which embrace people spread over such a wide radius that there is no real community of interest and hence no possibility of a real effort at co-operation.²²

In summary, the report did not explicitly define 'community', no data were collected on community, and community does not appear to have been used or recommended as a criterion for defining boundaries (other than size, as explained above) of units of local government. The criteria which appear to have been uppermost are tax base, population size, and services provided or not provided.

Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission

The study which resulted in the creation of metropolitan government in Winnipeg was done by the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, appointed by the Manitoba government in 1955.²³

Regarding community, the Commission wrote,

The people of Greater Winnipeg, who today number well over four hundred thousand, constitute a single community. Their homes and their places of work form one single, unbroken urban mass. They are mutually interdependent; each citizen is able to work and live in the Greater Winnipeg area only because the remainder of the community is here as well. Wherever he may work, his firm or government office is able to operate here only because of the services provided by the remainder of the community. In whatever part of Greater Winnipeg he may live, he depends upon goods and

²²Ibid., p. 122.

²³Manitoba. Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission Report and Recommendations (4 vols.; Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1959). Mr. J. L. Brodie was chairman. This review is based on Vol I. Two-tier metropolitan government was established in Winnipeg in 1960.

services furnished by the other members of the community to maintain his home and his family. Collectively the entire population is dependent upon a number of key facilities which communally serve all - the public transit system, the water supply and sewage disposal systems, the streets and bridges, are a few.²⁴

... the area as a whole remains one social and economic unit with all the industry, commerce, cultural and sports events, and the people who operate or participate in these activities [are] interdependent and dependent on each other²⁵

Without apparently utilizing other criteria, the Commission defined the Greater Winnipeg area as being composed of seventeen municipalities. These municipalities, it was recommended, would be divided into six districts on the bases of population and existing municipal boundaries. Some municipalities were to be amalgamated, so that each municipality contained within the metropolitan area could "... provide within and by itself, as a minimum, the average standard available in the area in both municipal and educational services, in order to justify its existence as a separate entity with that area."²⁶

While the Commission analyzed demographic data, and commissioned a survey of reasons why house buyers chose to buy a house in particular areas, the statement quoted above suggests that requisites for the provision of services were of at least equal importance to a community criterion, if not of greater importance. It is to be noted that the Commission's concept of community reflects the human ecology school of thought (a combination of both Hawley's and Park's views), excluding as it does

²⁴Ibid., I, p. 17.

²⁵Ibid., I, p. 20.

²⁶Ibid., I. p. 251.

the subjective aspect of community.

Greater Winnipeg Review Commission

The Manitoba government in October, 1962, appointed a review commission to enquire into, among other things, the boundaries of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg established in 1960 and of the area municipalities, examining the suitability of the boundaries in light of the services required.²⁷

At the time, the Metropolitan Corporation consisted of nineteen municipalities, of which only nine were wholly within the boundaries of the Corporation. For reasons not made clear, the Commission refrained from recommending any extensive re-division of the constituent municipalities. Instead, attention was concentrated on the outer boundary of the Corporation, and of an 'additional zone' over which the Corporation exercised control for planning, zoning, and building purposes.

Five rural municipalities partly included in the Metropolitan Corporation asked the Commission to exclude them from the Corporation on two grounds: 1) their predominantly agricultural nature meant that metropolitan services would probably not be available to them for a very long time, and 2) the limited number of electors in the portions of the five municipalities within the Corporation could hardly hope to have any influence in the election of members to the council. The Commission agreed to the request on these grounds, adding a third ground - that municipalities

²⁷Manitoba. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg Review Commission Report and Recommendations (February, 1964), Appendix A, p. 3.

should, if possible, be wholly excluded or wholly included.²⁸

Also, the Commission recommended that two other municipalities, parts of which were included in the Corporation, become wholly included within the Corporation, but the reasons for which the Commission viewed this as 'amply justified' are not mentioned. It was stated that changes affecting the seven municipalities would 'greatly simplify administrative problems of all kinds'.²⁹

Finally, regarding the boundary of the 'additional zone', the Commission found little to justify its existing size, and recommended narrowing it to conform to existing municipal boundaries, and to a new floodway then under construction, the floodway interposing a wide physical barrier to urban or suburban development.

The Commission seems not to have used a concept of community as a boundary determinant. Boundaries were to be based almost entirely on those of existing municipalities.

Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance

The Manitoba government in February, 1963, set up a Royal Commission to inquire into, among other things, the forms of organization and areas of jurisdiction of various classes of local government and their suitability to current and developing conditions, having regard to changes in population and economic development. Reporting in 1964, the Commission recommended the enlargement of rural municipalities by annexation or

²⁸Ibid., p. 30.

²⁹Ibid., p. 30.

amalgamation of the 106 existing rural municipalities into forty or fifty larger ones.³⁰ Each larger unit would lie entirely within one of the proposed eleven regions. The new regions and enlarged municipalities were to have their size and boundaries based on the three criteria of assessment, geographical area, and population, the objective being to make all approximately equal on these three criteria. For the enlarged rural municipalities, the Commission suggested as minimum requirements a municipal assessment of \$5 million, an area of twelve townships, and a population of 3,500.³¹ Justifying larger municipal units, the Commission stated that these would conform to the 'larger business, social and community interests' prevailing throughout the province.

In regard to metropolitan Winnipeg, the Commission recommended that the outer boundary be adjusted so that no municipalities would be partly in and partly out of Metropolitan Winnipeg. Also, any areas purely rural in character, and which would seem likely to remain so for many years, should be detached from urban municipalities and from Metropolitan Winnipeg, being added to adjoining rural municipalities.

Though the word community recurs periodically in the report, it is never defined, nor does it appear that data on either subjective or objective aspects were collected. Population, geographic size, and assessment were the criteria used for determining the size and boundaries of

³⁰Manitoba. Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance Report (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, April, 1964). Mr. Roland Michener was chairman.

³¹Ibid., p. 220.

units of local government.

Local Government Boundaries Commission

The Commission was established by Act of the Manitoba legislature in August, 1966, to consider boundaries of local government units. Two reports were issued, aside from a report on school divisions. One dealt with the Greater Winnipeg area, and the other dealt with the rest of the province. The Act specified that the Commission, in preparing its plans and reports, was to take into consideration:

- (a) the established transportation, communication, economic, social and community patterns in the province;
- (b) the natural geographic features in the province;
- (c) the territory included in and the boundaries of presently existing local government units in the province;
- (d) number, size, assessment, total population, pre-school and school age population, of any existing or proposed local government unit;
- (e) the recommendations from time to time made by the Manitoba Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance and by the Municipal Enquiry Commission in Manitoba; and
- (f) such other matters as the Commission deems relevant to the establishment of viable local government units in the province; and shall as far as is practicable make the boundaries of the various classes of the proposed local government units co-terminous.³²

A. Greater Winnipeg Area

The Commission stated in its report on the Metropolitan Winnipeg area that,

... in determining boundaries and structures, priority must be given to the accessibility and accountability between the elected representatives and the electorate, and to the ability of the electorate to influence local government decisions, ahead of the questionable economies that may flow from a larger scale administration.³³

³²The Local Government Boundaries Commission Act, Statutes of Manitoba, 1966, ch. 36, s. 7. Mr. R.G. Smellie was chairman, and was formerly Minister of Municipal Affairs in Manitoba.

³³Manitoba. Local Government Boundaries Commission Provisional Plan for Local Government Units in the Greater Winnipeg Area (Winnipeg: September, 1970), p. 26.

and that,

[The Commission] should then recommend those realignments of boundaries of local government units and reassignment of functions that are deemed to be in the best interest of long term development and viability of the area, having regard to emerging and indicated patterns of social, economic, political, financial and physical development.³⁴

The criteria which the Commission explicitly stated were to govern its recommended boundary changes were:

- 1) the facilitation of citizen influence on the making of decisions by local government units.
- 2) size should be related to the functions performed.
- 3) minimum disturbance of such established institutions as schools and community clubs, around and on which people centre their activities, for these institutions were seen as assisting group action, defining realistic limits, and delineating neighbourhood boundaries.
- 4) the 'prime importance' of cost of service and the citizen's ability and willingness to pay.
- 5) the containment of urban development within the Metropolitan Winnipeg area.³⁵

In the end, the Commission recommended against total amalgamation of the twelve area municipalities, and also against an alternative involving consolidation of the twelve into three cities plus a regional government. It did recommend consolidation of the twelve into nine cities, plus a second tier. The single reason for choosing nine, and the boundaries of the nine, was that those boundaries were those of the school

³⁴Ibid., p. 45.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 45-46.

divisions in the metropolitan area.³⁶ (In fact, there were ten school divisions, but two were in St. Boniface, and one new city would cover the area of the two.)

Thus, while the word community appears frequently in the report, the main operation criterion seems to have been a desire to make school and municipal boundaries co-terminous.

B. Area outside Metropolitan Winnipeg

The Commission's other local government report dealt with the area outside Greater Winnipeg.³⁷ The terms of reference were the same as for the report on the Greater Winnipeg area. Though community is not explicitly defined in this report, the Committee did state,

... there has been developing over the last decade, an increasing area of co-operation between the rural municipality and the towns or villages within its limits. This apparently reflects the pattern of a larger area of community interest wherein rural people are able to communicate and travel to and from the town or village with some ease and to make use of the facilities offered by the town or village particularly libraries, recreation facilities and certain commercial outlets. There would appear to be an increasing awareness that the community is no longer only those lands contained within the legal limits of a town or village but rather a much larger area encompassing the rural areas within a reasonable travelling time of that central community.³⁸

The Commission therefore concluded that urban and rural populations are becoming part of the same community. In terms of data collection and

³⁶ Ibid., p. 68.

³⁷ Manitoba. Local Government Boundaries Commission A Provisional Plan for the Structure of Units of Local Government Outside the Limits of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg (Winnipeg: December, 1970).

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

analysis, the Commission made use of demographic data, but did not investigate or consider the subjective aspect of community.

For defining boundaries of local governments, the report proposed seven criteria or guidelines:

1. Any structure of local government should be based upon some community of interest.
2. The area of community of interest must be of a scale large enough to encompass the resources necessary to provide for the present and future needs of its people.
3. As many functions of local government as possible should be combined under the responsibility of a single authority.
4. Local government districts in the portion [sic] of Manitoba should be eliminated south of the 53rd parallel.
5. All lands in the southern portion of Manitoba should be included in the boundaries of some local municipal authority.
6. In order to develop and expand the larger community of interest, urban communities should be encouraged to amalgamate with the rural communities surrounding them.
7. A formal mechanism should be developed to permit local authorities within a given region to achieve common objectives beyond the capacity of the local authorities acting independently.³⁹

The Commission then recommended that the about 109 local government units outside the Greater Winnipeg area be consolidated into some thirty-three new units, grouped into eleven regional governments, one of the eleven being Northern Manitoba. This region would itself cover about two-thirds of the total area of the province.

As in the case of the report on the Greater Winnipeg area, the Commission appears to have settled on the some thirty-three new municipalities on the sole basis of area of school divisions, which were unified in 1967 on the recommendation of this same Commission.

... the Commission concludes that the Provisional Plan for the Structure of Units of Local Government must contain major and perhaps unpopular massive reorganization of local government units,

³⁹Ibid., p. 39.

the basis of which will be the areas of common interest which have evolved since the development of the unified school division.⁴⁰

This statement seems to assume that people within any political-legal jurisdiction will develop a sense of common interest, regardless of where or how the boundaries of those jurisdictions are drawn.

White Paper on Metro Winnipeg

Within two months of the Local Government Boundaries Commission's report on the Greater Winnipeg area, the provincial government issued a White Paper in which a radical reorganization of the metropolitan area was proposed.⁴¹ The White Paper repeatedly emphasized the need of strengthening the identification of citizens with local government and of having political structures associated with communities within the metropolitan area. Though community was not explicitly defined, it is clear that the concept used involved both objective and subjective aspects:

It cannot be emphasized too strongly at this point that no effort would be spared in making the boundaries of these [forty-eight] wards - which would be subject to review at regular intervals by an independent review commission - as accurately as possible a reflection, not merely of existing municipal boundaries, but of the established local, historical, traditional - that is, natural and familiar - community groupings.

The object of this adherence to the familiar is, obviously, to strengthen local character and identity, rather than to have them obliterated in the process of unification. It is the view of Government that the proposed urban reforms afford a unique opportunity to call forth and to put to best community use the tremendous integral (but now latent and dormant) strength which lies in true community identification.⁴²

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 40.

⁴¹Manitoba. Proposals for Urban Reorganization in the Greater Winnipeg Area (Winnipeg: December, 1970).

⁴²Ibid., p. 13.

Reference is made also to interdependence of the metropolitan region, in terms of the area from which industries draw their work forces, and regional use of cultural, recreational and entertainment facilities.⁴³

Without presenting data on any aspects of community, the White Paper proposed the unification of all major services, but decentralization of local government through the creation of forty-eight wards which would be grouped into Community Committees. It is of interest to note, however, that the geographic boundaries of the Community Committees were to correspond to the existing municipal boundaries, though there were to be three consolidations involving seven municipalities.⁴⁴ The three consolidations were viewed as necessary not because each of the seven constituted only parts of larger communities, but because the municipalities "... had an insufficient population base to yield three members [elected to the metropolitan council] and therefore would not lend themselves to being treated as separate entities able to cope with the responsibilities retained at the local level."⁴⁵ For reasons unspecified, no overhaul of the outer boundary of metropolitan Winnipeg was proposed.

It was indicated that the inspiration for the idea of Community Committees came from the Redcliffe-Maud report on local government in England. This report advocated local councils, not to provide main services, "... but to promote and watch over the particular interests of

⁴³Ibid., p. 5.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 18.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 11

communities in city, town and village"⁴⁶ The Manitoba White Paper expressed regret that this concept had been considered but rejected by Manitoba's Local Government Boundaries Commission as being futuristic and premature.

In sum, the White Paper implied a concept of community that involved both objective and subjective aspects. However, because it was proposed that the boundaries of the Community Committees were to follow the boundaries of the existing municipalities, because no examination seems to have been made of the extent to which existing municipalities constituted separate communities, and because little consideration seems to have been given to reviewing the outer boundary of the metropolitan region, one wonders whether a concept of community was actually used as a boundary determinant.

Brandon

The fourth report within a period of eight months on municipal reorganization in Manitoba dealt with Brandon.⁴⁷ Beginning work in December, 1970, the Royal Commissioner, Dr. Dulmage, defined the area both for study purposes and for some of his recommendations, as consisting of ten municipalities: the city of Brandon, six rural municipalities, two towns and one village. It was stated that the city of Brandon is an urban service centre in a large rural area, in terms of educational, recreational,

⁴⁶ Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in England Report (3 vols.; London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, June, 1969), I, p. 5. (quoted on p. 7. of the Manitoba White Paper).

⁴⁷ Manitoba. Royal Commission on Brandon Boundaries Report (Brandon: April, 1971). The Commissioner was Dr. A.L. Dulmage, President of Brandon University.

cultural and certain types of health and welfare services.⁴⁸

Community was neither defined nor apparently used as a boundary determinant. Regarding determinants, the report states,

For some years, however, boundary determination has been attached to the concept of including within urban areas those real properties which are tax levied for the urban services which are provided to them. ...

It would seem reasonable to return to earlier boundary determination rationales based on services delivered to and paid for by real property, topography, population distribution and transportation and communication, creating units which reflect human functions in such areas as these and expressing concern for the economic function in other ways, perhaps throughout other jurisdictions.⁴⁹

The Commissioner recommended enlarging the city of Brandon by adding to it what was called the entire urban fringe surrounding the city. This would almost double the area of Brandon to twenty-one square miles but increase the population by only about 1,700 people.⁵⁰

Thus no concept of community seems to have been used as a boundary determinant. The five stated criteria are noted above.

New Brunswick

New Brunswick is another province that embarked on large-scale comprehensive reform of local government. Table 5 in Appendix A reflects this. Counties and incorporated local improvement districts disappeared

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 23.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 49.

⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 88, 94. It is interesting to calculate that the ten square miles 'urban fringe' has an average population density of .27 per acre!

in 1966, and villages emerged as an almost entirely new municipal phenomenon in the province. At the same time as the municipalities were reorganized, local education units were dramatically reformed.

Metropolitan Saint John

The first in the recent series of studies dealing with municipal reorganization in New Brunswick was Dr. Goldenberg's report on Metropolitan Saint John in 1963.⁵¹ The Commission was established in May, 1962, and was directed to inquire into the feasibility of amalgamation in the area and of altering boundaries.

Though community was not defined in the report, it was stated several times that the cities of Saint John and Lancaster and the urban portion of a neighbouring parish constituted a 'single urban community'.⁵² Reflecting this, the report stated, was the provision of municipal services. It was further stated that the people of the area shared the same heritage, and that the municipalities in the area had been closely interrelated for 180 years. Dr. Goldenberg was convinced that his proposed amalgamation would be acceptable to the large majority of the area's citizens.⁵³

⁵¹New Brunswick. Royal Commission on Metropolitan Saint John Report (July 10, 1963). Mr. H. Carl Goldenberg was commissioner, and Mr. Eric Hardy was secretary and research director. For a brief review of local government reorganization in the province see Bureau of Municipal Research, "Reorganizing local government - a brief look at four provinces," Civic Affairs, 1972, No. 1, pp. 26-30. Amalgamation affecting Saint John took effect in January, 1967.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 8, 11, 12, 15, and 17.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 18-19.

The report stated that in fixing boundaries for an enlarged city, consideration must normally be given to the inclusion of enough territory to take care of reasonable future growth. However, a rather narrow boundary was recommended, in the expectation that the future relationships between the enlarged city and its outskirts would facilitate the retermination of boundaries from time to time. The recommended boundary of the enlarged city was to follow the boundary of the existing city of Lancaster to the west, and the boundary of a highway district in the parish to the east. The existing city of Saint John would be in the middle.

It is not clear that Dr. Goldenberg equated community with existing municipal structures, but the fact that his proposed boundary would largely follow existing municipal boundaries suggests he might have equated the two. It is clear that he viewed the municipalities as constituting only parts of one community, but no data on this were presented in the report, and community was not defined except in terms of provision of services.

Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation

The reorganization reflected in Table 5 of Appendix A resulted from the report of the Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation in New Brunswick in 1963.⁵⁴ In its report, the Commission did define community: "We should emphasize here that by referring to the 'community'

⁵⁴New Brunswick. Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation Report (Fredericton, 1963). Mr. E.G. Byrne was chairman. On March 4, 1965 the New Brunswick Premier tabled a White Paper on the Responsibilities of Government which, because it embodied the Byrne Commission's recommendations, is not reviewed here.

we mean the entire concentration of population in a metropolitan area and not the separately incorporated municipalities."⁵⁵ The Commission did not, however, define metropolitan area, so its concept of community is unclear, except that concentration of people in a geographic place is involved.

Eventhough specifying that by community the Commission did not refer to a metropolitan area's separately incorporated municipalities, elsewhere in its report it appears to have equated community and existing municipality. For example,

This is as far as we are prepared to go in recommending mandatory municipal consolidations. We see no reason why municipalities must always surrender their historic identities nor lose their feeling of community by being swallowed by a larger whole.⁵⁶

The Commission exhibited great unwillingness to alter municipal boundaries at all, and, despite frequent references to the 'radical' nature of its proposals, manifested a rather strong orientation to the status quo in that it proposed no amalgamations or annexations.⁵⁷ It proposed that a Municipal Affairs Commission be required to publish a report on all the financial consequences and other aspects of any future proposals regarding municipal reorganization, and that amalgamation or annexation should be allowed only with the approval of at least sixty

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 18.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 18.

⁵⁷For an incisive critique of the Commission's proposals see Thomas J. Plunkett, "Report of the Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation in New Brunswick: A Review and Commentary", Canadian Public Administration, VIII, (March, 1965), pp.17-23. See also Ralph R. Krueger, "The Provincial-Municipal Government Revolution in New Brunswick", Canadian Public Administration, XIII (Spring, 1970), pp. 51-99.

per cent of those ratepayers who vote in a plebiscite in the affected area.

Recommending the abolition of all counties and their replacement by new villages and unincorporated local service districts, the Commission stated that its proposed Municipal Affairs Commission

... should define the boundaries of new villages and be empowered to revise boundaries when the municipal services desired by residents of contiguous areas can be most economically administered by the village. Boundaries should be closely drawn around the settlement to be provided with local services and should not include adjoining farm or forest areas.⁵⁸

Considering the title of the Commission, it is perhaps no surprise to find that its report heavily emphasizes (Plunkett calls it an 'obsessive concern') the cost factor as the criterion to be considered in municipal reorganization. Though the Commission defined community as being distinct from existing structures, it reverted to the notion (without presenting evidence) that at least most existing municipalities constitute communities. Yet the Commission recommended abolition of counties.

Greater Fredericton Area

The indefatigable Dr. Goldenberg was Commissioner for two more New Brunswick royal commissions, one dealing with the Greater Moncton area, and the other with the Greater Fredericton area. The two commissions were established at the same time (January, 1970) and the reports presented simultaneously in June, 1971. The terms of reference for the two were the same as for the Saint John study.

The Greater Fredericton study area consisted of one city, two towns,

⁵⁸New Brunswick. Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation Report, op. cit., p. 171.

three villages, and all or parts of nine unincorporated local service districts. Dr. Goldenberg stated that, excluding one of the two towns, the study area's municipalities

... constitute one social, economic and geographic unit. But the limits of the area do not stop at the outside boundaries of the municipalities. Although connected mainly by ribbon development along main roads, the area extends in varying degree into [seven former parishes].⁵⁹

Boundary determinants were explicitly stated:

To determine what portions of these areas should properly be included in a Greater Fredericton area for purposes of municipal reorganization requires consideration of such factors as distance from the City of Fredericton, the centre of the area; population and the pattern of settlement; community identity; economic interdependence; and service requirements and their financing. These criteria will be applied as far as possible in this report to delineate the boundaries of the area proper.⁶⁰

The town of Oromocto was considered by the Commissioner not to be a part of the social and economic entity that constituted Greater Fredericton. Its distance from the centre of Fredericton, the airport between it and Fredericton being a physical barrier, the inability of extending at reasonable cost water and sewer services, and the 'special type' of community in Oromocto (it is a town of armed services personnel and their families, thus a relatively homogeneous and transient population) were thought to set it apart from the rest of the area.⁶¹ Evidently Dr. Goldenberg considered the other parts of the study area to meet all or

⁵⁹New Brunswick. Royal Commission on the Greater Fredericton Area Report (June 15, 1971), p. 8. Mr. Eric Hardy was secretary and research director.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 8.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 30-31.

most of the above criteria, for he recommended they all be amalgamated to form an enlarged city of Fredericton: "The inter-relationship of these areas is clear and such physical separations as exist do not make the overall area any less a single community."⁶² He also considered the population of the area to be too small to warrant division into lower-tier municipal units.⁶³

It is of interest to compare the list of stated boundary determinants with that section of the report dealing with the actual determination of the boundary. It was stated that forty or forty-five per cent of the population resided on the north side of the river, but that the major sources of employment, the key commercial areas, and the main cultural and recreational facilities were located on the south side. Therefore there was a large daily shuttle movement of people across the river. Accessibility to the central core, suitability of land for residential construction, existing sewage collector systems, locale of shopping centres, and a ring road were used as other determinants.⁶⁴ Community identity does not appear to have been actually used as a boundary determinant except in so far as it might be reflected in the criteria used.

Greater Moncton Area

The study area was defined as consisting of one city, one town, seven villages, and parts of four former parishes.⁶⁵ It was stated that

⁶²Ibid., p. 31.

⁶³Ibid., p. 11.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 31-33.

⁶⁵New Brunswick. Royal Commission on the Greater Moncton Area Report (June 15, 1971), p. 3. Mr. Eric Hardy was secretary and research director.

the city of Moncton was the prime urban focus for the Acadian culture, and has concentrated in it commercial and industrial development making the city of growing importance as a distribution centre.

It is clear from this that the Greater Moncton area is considered a single geographic and economic unit. ... There are also social interrelationships that tend to bind the area together notwithstanding particular concentrations of people⁶⁶ of Acadian origin and of those whose mother tongue is English.

The Commissioner recommended the amalgamation of the city of Moncton and the seven suburban municipalities to form an enlarged city, but, unlike the report on the Greater Fredericton area, did not provide a specific list of boundary determinants. It was stated that the 1970 estimate of population did not in itself warrant the existing structural fragmentation.⁶⁷ From the description of the proposed enlarged city boundary, the following criteria seem to have been used: the inclusion of sufficient land to facilitate a stimulated rate of urban growth, the exclusion of areas characterized by ribbon development on the grounds that their inclusion would add unduly to the administrative and financial responsibilities of the enlarged city, the costs involved in the extension of services, the location of the airport and of the Trans-Canada Highway, the direction of settlement growth, and distance from the centre of Moncton.⁶⁸ Community identity appears not to have been used as a criterion, nor was community defined, but the Commission insisted that

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 10.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 36-38.

the area as a whole constituted a single community.

Newfoundland

The province of Newfoundland has not yet embarked on a general scheme of local government reform, but a study is now underway which may lead to it. Table 6 of Appendix A, however, indicates that there has been a marked and steady increase in the number of incorporated local government units in Newfoundland, especially since 1965.

St. John's Urban Region

A study of the St. John's Urban Region has recently been completed, co-sponsored by the Canada Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the Newfoundland Department of Community and Social Development.⁶⁹ One of the objectives of the many-faceted study was the development of recommendations concerning the most suitable form of local government for the area. The study area covered the northern part of the Avalon Peninsula, an area of 463 square miles, a population in 1971 of 141,000, and thirteen incorporated settlements.⁷⁰ Parts of the study area have not in the past been municipally organized.

No single recommendation was made for local government reform in the area. Three alternative schemes were put forward instead. Scheme A, proposing a city-county system, was based on a principle of separating urban from rural areas. St. John's would be enlarged to include its

⁶⁹St. John's Urban Region Study An Outline (St. John's: 1973).

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 4-5.

urbanized fringe, and the county would consist of fifteen new towns and substantial unorganized territory. Scheme B, proposing a two-tier regional government structure, was based on a principle of integrating the urban and rural areas of the region, and would have six lower-tier municipalities covering the whole region. Scheme C proposed a regional city system in which the whole region would form a single municipality, though split into 'communities' or wards for representational purposes. The outer boundary would be the same for all three schemes and would correspond exactly to the boundary of the study area. Financial considerations, equalization of level of services provided, and the achievement of economies of scale in administrative and capital works appear to have been the main criteria used for boundary determination.

Whalen Commission

Presently underway is a Commission, chaired by Professor Hugh Whalen, to study all matters, including boundaries, pertaining to the structure of local government throughout the province. The report is expected by the end of 1973.⁷¹

Nova Scotia

Local government in Nova Scotia has been marked by exceptional stability, as Table 7 in Appendix A suggests.⁷² There have been, however,

⁷¹Letter from the Hon. Harold A. Collins, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, St. John's, Newfoundland, April 2, 1973.

⁷²A study too early to be reviewed here is Donald C. Rowat, The Reorganization of Provincial Municipal Relations in Nova Scotia (Halifax: Institute of Public Affairs of Dalhousie University, 1949).

several studies sponsored wholly or jointly by the provincial government which have recommended municipal reorganization in specific areas.

Pictou County

Under the joint sponsorship of four towns, the Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research, and the Nova Scotia Department of Municipal Affairs, a study was made of Pictou County, and the recommendations were published in 1969.⁷³

In light of the Phase 1 survey of factual data of the physical, financial and administrative aspects of municipal services provided to the urban areas of the county, the Phase 2 report stated:

Phase 1 of the Pictou County Municipal Coordination Study provides abundant evidence that urban and rural Pictou County is in a very real sense one economic community. The pattern of industry is shown as becoming more and more integrated so that the inhabitants of each of the six Pictou County municipal units share common goals and are linked by the same economic destiny.

The Phase 1 Study shows that considerably more than half of the people working for business and industrial establishments with ten or more employees in the five Pictou County towns live in one town and work in another. ...

... 61.5 per cent [of urban and rural Pictou County's 1966 population of 44,490] live in the five towns. Approximately another 6,000, or 13.5 per cent, live within eight to ten miles of the five towns. Thus, three-quarters of Pictou County's population resides in or near the county's urban core.⁷⁴

No survey data of any kind on the subjective aspect of community were presented in the Phase 1 report. Thus the comment quoted above - that the citizens of the area share common goals - appears to be a speculative

⁷³Pictou County Municipal Coordination Study Phase 2: Recommendations (Halifax: Institute of Public Affairs of Dalhousie University, 1969). Mr. Lawrence E. Sandford was director of research.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 15.

proposition.

The study's main criterion for boundary-determination seems to have been the economical provision of municipal services.

The case for two-tier as opposed to one-tier government for a regional area of relatively small population rests primarily on an assessment of local attitudes in favour of the continued existence of existing municipal institutions. If local feeling is very strongly opposed to the loss of long-established local institutions, two-tier government may at first sight appear to offer an attractive compromise. In Pictou County however the essence of the problem is to determine what form of democratic self-government offers a reasonably effective and economical structure for providing municipal services. In this respect, two-tier government appears to have few, if any, real advantages.⁷⁵

No examination was made of local attitudes to the existing municipal units nor to the recommended amalgamation of the five towns and the county to form a Pictou Regional County. The cost of providing municipal services was the main, if not the only, operating criterion.⁷⁶

Canso Local Government Review

In 1969, a Steering Committee, composed of the Minister and Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, local councillors, local clerk-treasurers, and local MLAs, was established by the provincial government to recommend reorganization of municipal structures on both sides of the Strait of Canso.⁷⁷

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 21-22.

⁷⁶The report lists seven conditions that would make 'municipal co-ordination' advantageous, but the seven conditions do not appear to have been viewed as boundary determinants. pp. 34-37.

⁷⁷Nova Scotia. Strait of Canso Local Government Review Steering Committee Report (Halifax: Department of Municipal Affairs, May 31, 1971). Mr. Thomas J. Plunkett was consultant. His report is credited as forming the basis for much of the Steering Committee Report.

The Committee recommended that there be two new municipal units, one on each side of the Strait of Canso. These would involve the amalgamation of the eight existing municipalities into the two new units.

Selection of this alternative was based on an important consideration: what we, as representatives of the people in this area, felt to be a community of interest. This feeling was not unanimous; some of the members of the Committee would have preferred a new municipality that took in both sides of the Strait. That may, in fact, be the long-term solution.⁷⁸

As well as consideration of their own views of community of interest, the Committee stated that,

In examining the finally selected alternative, the Committee had to take account of four special needs:

1. Need to resolve rural-urban differences. ...
2. Need for sound, comprehensive planning. ...
3. Need for effective administration. ...
4. Need to communicate effectively with the people.⁷⁹

Each of the two new recommended municipalities was to include both urban and rural areas, but for the purposes of taxation, the urban areas in each were to be designated as Urban Service Areas, the boundaries of which would be re-defined from time to time as services are extended.

Community was not defined in the report, and it is difficult to determine how 'community of interest' was used as a boundary determinant. It seems to have been impressionistic rather than empirically based.

Royal Commission on Education, Public Services and Provincial-Municipal Relations

A royal commission, chaired by Dr. John F. Graham, was appointed in 1971 to conduct a very broad study, part of which has to do with

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 3.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 3. (emphasis their's)

provincial-municipal relations in the province. Though the Commission has not yet reported, it may be expected to propose a general reform of local government in Nova Scotia.

Prince Edward Island

Table 8 of Appendix A reflects considerable stability in the municipal organization of the province, though the number of villages has increased substantially. There has been no major reorganization of local government in Prince Edward Island in the past twenty years, nor any amalgamations of two or more municipalities. No particular major reorganization of units of local government is presently envisaged for the near future.⁸⁰

Quebec

The province of Quebec has begun a major reorganization of local government throughout the province. Table 9 of Appendix A reflects this in the trend, since 1965, to reduction in the number of municipal units, and the establishment of metropolitan and regional governments.

Commission on the Metropolitan Problems of Montreal

In January, 1952, the Quebec legislature passed a bill authorizing the creation by the city of Montreal of a commission to study the administrative problems resulting from the existence of multiple municipalities

⁸⁰Letter from Mr. C. H. Stewart, Deputy Minister of Community Services, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, January 25, 1973.

on the Island of Montreal. The city of Montreal created the Study Commission in November, 1952, and the final report was presented in January, 1955.⁸¹ Though the Commission was the creature of the city of Montreal, it's report is reviewed here because it was specifically authorized by the Quebec legislature, and because its report resulted in the creation of the Montreal Metropolitan Corporation in 1960. There were in 1955 thirty-six municipalities on the Island of Montreal. Less than half of them were included within the territory of the weak Montreal Metropolitan Commission established in 1921.

The word community recurs often in the report, but was used only in the sense of people in geographic locations. At times, community appears to refer to individual municipalities, while at other times, it seems to refer to the whole of the Island. The metropolitan area refers only to the Island as a whole. One fleeting reference is made to the view that the Island is a 'closely knit economic and inter-dependent area'.⁸²

The Commission appears not to have entertained the thought of inclusion of non-Island municipalities when it recommended a structure to deal with inter-municipal services. Thus the outer boundary for the proposed structure was envisaged as including all of, but not more than, the Island of Montreal.

⁸¹ Montreal. Commission for the Study of the Metropolitan Problems of Montreal General and Final Report (January, 1955). Judge Roland Paquette was chairman. The other members were mayors and councillors from the Island's municipalities.

⁸² Ibid., p. 51.

Redefinition of the boundaries of the Island's municipalities appears also to have not been considered seriously by the commission:

The existence of many separate and autonomous municipalities in the area does not, in itself, present a problem. It is desirable in a community as vast and heterogeneous as Montreal to preserve the principle and practice of local self-government and thereby leave to each separate municipality the right to determine for itself the scope and standard of its own local municipal requirements and to impose and collect such taxes as may be necessary to cover the costs of its own local budget.⁸³

The sole apparent reason for proposing an inter-municipal structure for the Island was the facilitation of inter-municipal co-ordination to "... obtain the maximum efficiency possible and, at the same time, ... avoid useless and costly duplication."⁸⁴

No notion of community seems to have been used to justify the existing boundaries. Indeed the question of redefining boundaries was scarcely raised in the report. It seems to have been assumed that all municipalities on the Island, and only those municipalities, should be involved in an inter-municipal organization.⁸⁵

Study Commission of Intermunicipal Problems on the Island of Montreal

A commission chaired by M. Camille Blier, assistant deputy minister of municipal affairs, was appointed by the provincial government in February, 1964, to consider (among other things) the possibility of

⁸³Ibid., p. 51.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 13.

⁸⁵A report not reviewed here is City of Westmount Local Government in the Montreal Metropolitan Area (January, 1971).

regrouping the twenty-nine municipalities on the Island of Montreal.⁸⁶

The Commission referred to "... the 'Montreal community' as the entire population of the Island of Montreal despite the fact that in some respects the people residing in the western portion of the Island may have different interests."⁸⁷ In support of this statement, the report cited the facts that two-thirds of the Island's population resided in the city of Montreal; that the greater part of the suburban population was made up of former residents of the city (no relevant data were presented); that some municipalities were wholly or partly surrounded by the city; that the daily movement of people for work, shopping, recreation and study was toward the centre; that there were no administrative or tax limitations on this movement of people; and that several large-scale projects initiated by the city of Montreal, such as the subway and arts centre, served all the citizens of the Island.⁸⁸

The Commission recommended against total amalgamation of the Island's municipalities. Instead it recommended a structure very much like the then existing Montreal Metropolitan Corporation. There was not to be any change in the boundaries of the twenty-nine municipalities, but they were to be grouped into four sectors for the purposes of representation on the regional council.

⁸⁶Quebec. Study Commission of Intermunicipal Problems on the Island of Montreal Report (Quebec: Queen's Printer, December, 1964). The metropolitan Montreal Urban Community came into existence as of January 1, 1970.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 2.

⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 1-2.

The purpose of the recommendations we are submitting for the solution of the problems analyzed in the preceding chapters is twofold: efficiency of public services and equity in taxation. ... The complete amalgamation of all municipal services and administrative structures is the most direct means of achieving this twofold objective and of putting an end to all the intermunicipal problems described in this report. For the Island of Montreal, however, this involves practical difficulties which could result in delays.⁸⁹

How the Commission decided on the grouping of municipalities into four sectors for the purposes of representation is not made clear. The sectors would have greatly varying population sizes and greatly varying taxable valuation.⁹⁰

In sum, the Commission concluded that the Island as a whole constituted a community, but proposed no change in boundaries, either external or internal. It justified its proposed second-tier metropolitan government only in terms of efficiency of public services and equity in taxation.

Ile Jesus

Ile Jesus, an island beside Montreal Island, was the subject of a report also presented in 1964.⁹¹ Among other things, the Sylvestre Commission was directed to study the possibility of regrouping the island's fourteen municipalities.

Without defining community, the Commission stated that the citizens ... forment une espèce de bloc humain, une communauté compacte

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 66.

⁹⁰Ibid., Table A, p. 77.

⁹¹Quebec. Commission d'étude sur les problèmes intermunicipaux de l'Ile Jésus Rapport (2 vols.; December, 1964). Judge Armand Sylvestre was chairman.

animée des mêmes sentiments d'appartenance et d'allégeance.

Ils présentent simultanément des besoins identiques sur le plan de l'appareil administratif et de l'équipement municipal. C'est alors que, les frontières des municipalités qui se confondent en une étroite juxtaposition pour composer l'agglomération, perdent toute signification. Du moins, et en fait, les unités⁹² municipales perdent-elles leur identité devant l'entassement.

However, later on in its report, the Commission expressed some support for a federated form of regional government for the island, as proposed by one of the municipalities, whereby the Island would be divided into six new towns. The Commission concluded that this was an 'ideal' (in the sense of futuristic) solution which could not be applied immediately. The Commission recommended instead that the island become a single municipality, but divided into six districts for purposes of representation on the council, according to 'des normes socio-économiques' and to obtain some equilibrium, though evidently not in terms of present population, projected population, or geographic area.⁹³

The ties of Ile Jesus with the rest of the Montreal area did not escape the Commission's attention. A large proportion of house-buyers on the island were found to be from Montreal, bridges physically connected the island to Montreal, and some eighty-three per cent of the island's labour force worked in Montreal.⁹⁴ Nevertheless the Commission did not recommend that Ile Jesus become part of some metropolitan government covering the whole of the Montreal area.

⁹²Ibid., pp. 15-16 (emphasis their's)

⁹³Ibid., pp. 212-216.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 24.

The overriding concern of the Commission seems not to have been some concept of community, but efficiency and economy in providing services in quality and quantity to the citizens.⁹⁵

Montreal South Shore

To consider the possibility of regrouping twelve municipalities on the south shore of the St. Lawrence River across from Montreal Island, the Lemay Commission was appointed by the provincial government in March, 1966. Its report was released in January, 1967.⁹⁶ The study area was limited to the twelve municipalities because they were the members of the Intermunicipal Commission of the South Shore, and it was that Commission that requested the study. However, the report states that the geographic, urban, and economic region of the South Shore extended beyond the twelve, and also that they form part of the Montreal metropolitan zone by virtue of physical, human, and economic geography.⁹⁷

After examining land use, transportation networks, and such demographic variables as income, occupation, age, ethnicity, language, and religion, the Commission wrote that

Nous avons montré ... que dans une zone urbaine comme la Rive Sud l'interdépendence des hommes, des événements et de l'économie est la règle. Chaque ville est partie d'un tout, au sein d'une région qui forme une entité géographique, économique et sociale.⁹⁸

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 15.

⁹⁶Quebec. Commission d'étude des problèmes intermunicipaux sur la rive sud Rapport (January, 1967). M. Henri-Paul Lemay was president.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 1.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 215.

The Commission recommended regrouping the twelve municipalities into three new towns rather than complete amalgamation. It appears to have decided that one of the three proposed towns was different from the rest of the area in that it was on the urban fringe, but why the remainder of the territory was to be split into two new towns is unclear. It appears that the Commission attempted to define the area of the two on the basis of balancing them in terms of geographic area, population, growth potential, financial resources, and ethnicity.⁹⁹

In general terms, the Commission favoured a second-tier government for the region, but said that the details of this would have to await further study which it had not the time to do.

In sum, though the Commission found that the twelve municipalities constituted a geographic, social and economic entity, it evidently considered criteria of balance and the lessening of assorted inequities to be of greater importance.

Quebec Urban Community

In 1968 the first two in a series (there have been three so far) of urban community studies were published. The studies were done by personnel of the provincial Department of Municipal Affairs. How the studies came about and what specific purposes they were to serve is not clear, but they seem to have been designed at least in part to aid in the boundary determination of future units of regional government. Attention was concentrated on the outer boundaries rather than internal divisions.

⁹⁹Ibid., pp. 220-222.

One of the studies dealt with the urban area centred on Quebec City.¹⁰⁰ A number of indicators were used to determine the geographic areas which were parts of the 'metropolitan zone' of the city. The indicators included:

1) areas delimited by organizations for such purposes as gathering census data, and for toll-free telephone service.

2) land use - concentration of population, location of governmental and commercial institutions, and road networks.

3) zones of primary and secondary influence - where the population of municipalities goes for such activities as buying food and clothing, education, medical treatment, legal advice, leisure, and financial transactions.

4) demography - spatial distribution of population, population growth 1961-1966, and projected population for 1986.

5) commuting zones - for areas up to fifteen miles from the centre of the city. This figure was considered an optimum one, being the maximum distance that could be covered in 20-25 minutes of travelling.

6) physical characteristics - topographical limits to urbanization.

In determining primary and secondary zones of influence, the study relied on data from questionnaires completed by a few 'key informants' in each municipality with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants. (Why this cut-off point was used was not explained.) The technique used for collecting

¹⁰⁰ Québec. Etudes sur les Communautés au Québec Délimitation du Territoire: Zone Métropolitaine de Québec (Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1968), (green series). The metropolitan Quebec Urban Community came into effect in 1970.

and analyzing the data so obtained is explained in the comparable volume for the Hull area.¹⁰¹

The study area covered a total of sixty-nine municipalities, on both sides of the St. Lawrence River. After applying the above indicators of the metropolitan zone, the area was narrowed down to thirty-nine of these municipalities, on both sides of the river. Thus, to determine the outer boundary of a possible regrouped region, the concept of metropolitan zone was used exclusively. The question of internal boundaries, if any, was not raised in the report. No attitudinal data were collected.¹⁰²

Hull-Outaouais Area

The second in the series was a study of the Hull area, using the same guiding concept of metropolitan area and most of the indicators as were used in the Quebec study.¹⁰³ Additional variables included the geographic range of the media, and analysis of such transportation factors as volume of car traffic, area served by Hull's city buses, and number of trips for car passengers and drivers and for users of public

¹⁰¹ Québec. Etudes sur les Communautés urbaines au Québec Délimitation du Territoire (Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1968), (blue series), p. 19

¹⁰² A study which examined a limited range of attitudes is Louise Quesnel-Ouellet, "Changement dans les structures municipales: étude de la région de Québec", Annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Montreal, Quebec, June, 1972.

¹⁰³ Québec. Etudes sur les Communautés urbaines au Québec Délimitation du Territoire (Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1968), (blue series). The Outaouais Regional Community came into being in January, 1970.

transportation. Some twenty-eight municipalities were included in the study area, but no regional boundary was proposed. Again, internal boundaries, if any, were not considered. The study has the appearance of being only preliminary, in that no recommendations were made affecting regional government.

Saguenay Region

Also in the series is the study of the area centred on Chicoutimi.¹⁰⁴ The list of seventeen delineating criteria, grouped under the headings of physical aspects, demography, and intermunicipal relations is very similar to that used in the Hull and Quebec City studies. Additionally, however, this study examined the places of residence of hospital employees and of employees of the aluminum plant, the areas covered by postmen's routes and newspaper boys' delivery routes, and the places of residence of travellers using the local airport. As in the studies on Hull and Quebec City, the question of internal boundaries, if any, was not raised. Only the outer boundary was examined using metropolitan zone as the guiding conception, and no recommendation was made in regard to it. It is of interest to note that in none of the three studies were such criteria as assessment base and the costs of providing services used to delineate geographic boundaries.

White Paper on the Reform of Municipal Structures

In March, 1971, Quebec's Minister of Municipal Affairs released a White Paper on the reform of municipal structures throughout the

¹⁰⁴Québec. Etudes sur les Communautés Urbaines au Québec Délimitation du Territoire: Zone Métropolitaine du Saguenay (Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1969).

province.¹⁰⁵ M. Maurice Tessier, the Minister, stated that the intent of the White Paper was to regroup the province's more than 1,600 municipalities into 131 municipal communities in nine regions.¹⁰⁶ The stated purposes of the proposed reforms were to bolster the autonomy of municipalities by making them less dependent on the provincial government and to enable the municipalities to provide better public services.

To determine the geographical area of regrouped municipalities, six general criteria were listed:

- délimitation de l'espace urbanisé ainsi que de l'espace susceptible d'être urbanisé à court et à moyen terme;
- présence d'un centre de services important, d'un village-centre ou d'un petit centre de services ainsi que de la présence de services communautaires plus particulièrement en ce qui concerne l'éducation;
- zone d'influence prépondérante de façon à intégrer les municipalités rurales et les municipalités urbaines dans une même unité politico-administrative;
- types d'activités économiques;
- la population en prenant en considération la masse démographique totale, la population urbaine et rurale, la répartition de la population, la densité de population et l'évolution de la population depuis 1961 jusqu'à aujourd'hui;
- l'organisation de l'espace et le milieu naturel plus précisément en ce qui a trait à l'armature urbaine, aux obstacles physiques, aux bassins de drainage et à l'accessibilité.¹⁰⁷

It was expected that some exceptional cases would not meet all six

¹⁰⁵ Québec. Ministre des Affaires Municipales Proposition de Réforme des Structures municipales (Québec: L'Editeur officiel du Québec, March, 1971). Bill 276, 'An Act to Promote the Regroupment of Municipalities', was adopted December 20, 1971. It is under this Act that current reorganization of local government in Quebec is taking place.

¹⁰⁶ reported in the Globe and Mail, Thursday, March 11, 1971, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ Québec. Ministre des Affaires Municipales Proposition de Réforme des Structures municipales, op.cit., pp. 13-14.

criteria, perhaps especially so considering that voluntary regrouping was to be encouraged.

No concept of community was defined or proposed as a delineating criterion, though some of the criteria seem to relate to objective aspects of community.

Saskatchewan

While proposals for large-scale reform of local government in Saskatchewan have been made, no extensive reorganization has come about. The considerable stability in the organization of local government in the province is reflected in Table 10 of Appendix A.¹⁰⁸ No new types of municipal units have been created, and the total number of municipalities in 1971 was nearly the same as in 1952.

Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life

In October, 1952, the provincial government appointed a Royal Commission to examine rural municipal government, among other things, in the province. The Commission's main report on local government was presented in 1955,¹⁰⁹ and a series of additional reports, each on a particular aspect of the Commission's work, was published.

The main report on local government listed nineteen specific requirements, grouped under five headings, that a workable system of

¹⁰⁸ A report too early to be reviewed here is: Saskatchewan. Committee on Provincial-Municipal Relations Report (Regina: King's Printer, 1951.). Committee members were Dr. G. E. Britnell, Mr. Louis Jacobs, and Dr. F. C. Cronkite.

¹⁰⁹ Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life Alternative Forms of Local Government (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1955).

local government was to meet. Some of these requirements have a direct bearing on boundary determination. The first requirement stated:

The area of the local government unit should correspond with the communities being developed by farm people for trade and social life to ensure integration of local government with non-governmental aspects of rural life.¹¹⁰

Other specified requirements concerned the performance of services, planning, employment of highly qualified personnel and use of efficient equipment, economy and efficiency of administration, and so on.

Specifically concerning boundaries, the Commission wrote:

The boundaries should be determined by optimum conditions of the following criteria: functional trading areas, assessment, farm population, existing boundaries, administrative and local political requirements, and the utilization of provincial financial and technical resources.¹¹¹

Though the word community was not defined, it is clear that the Commission viewed community to be synonymous with the concept of trading area, and that areas of administration, including units of local government, should have boundaries that coincide with the trading areas.

The trading community is the natural area of administration. Almost all modern services are best provided on the basis of the area in which people are already associating to meet shopping and social needs. The [existing] nine-township municipality with rigid and uniform boundaries has never been related to the community area. The responsibilities of modern municipal government cannot be artificially separated from the normal life of the community without excessive cost and inconvenience to citizens. If the area of municipal government were to coincide with the present large trade-centred community, well-planned road systems would become possible and do much to stimulate necessary unity in community living.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹¹ Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life Report 4: Rural Roads and Local Government (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1955), p. 269.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 254. (emphasis their's)

The trading area of service centres was seen to be based on the notion of economic interconnections. Thus, locating available services would be one method of defining the extent of trading areas. The second method would be to locate the trading area's boundaries using questionnaire survey data. Individuals would be asked where they go to obtain specific services. The Commission used both methods, and found they yielded similar results.¹¹³

Trading centres, the Commission found, can be ranked according to a hierarchy, for example, hamlet ➤ village ➤ town ➤ city. The Commission stated that there could therefore be a hierarchy of administrative units corresponding to the hierarchy of trading areas and therefore of communities.

The Commission emphasized the economic basis of trading areas and therefore of communities. It did not conduct attitudinal research, for it assumed "... that the motives, circumstances, and relationships underlying service center development are basically economic in character."¹¹⁴

Local Government Continuing Committee

A committee was established by the provincial government in 1957 to study municipal reorganization and boundaries, among other things.¹¹⁵ In its report, the Committee defined community:

¹¹³Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life Report 12: Service Centres (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1957), p. 6.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 6.

¹¹⁵Saskatchewan. Local Government Continuing Committee Local Government in Saskatchewan (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1961), p. vi. Mr. J. McAskill was chairman.

'Local community' is not a precise term. The idea involves both a place or area and its residents who share some common relationship. An early example of a local community in Saskatchewan was the collection of neighbours in a small rural area who found one of their common interests in the one-room school. In that day, a somewhat larger community centered on the hamlet with its post office, store and grain elevator. For some purposes, a group of hamlet communities merged into a still larger association of people centered on a large village or town. ... The first fact about 'community', then, is that people live in not one but a variety of communities, nested one within the other.¹¹⁶

Like the Royal Commission which preceded it, the Committee accepted that the way to define the geographic area of community was to define the geographic extent of trading area: "The [service] center's trading area delineates the natural community in which people associate to meet their economic and social needs."¹¹⁷

This concept of community was the basis used by the Committee for the scheme of reorganization of local government it proposed, and the Committee cited a number of advantages for basing local government boundaries on trading areas. Six standards, or criteria, derived from the service centre principle, were to be applied to the definition of local government boundaries:

- 1) The area should have at least one urban center providing a reasonable level of services and a reasonably central location. This could be at the level of (a) cities, (b) cities and larger towns, (c) towns, (d) smaller towns and villages, depending on the number of units desired.
- 2) The area should have a concentration of population within the boundaries. Where possible, boundaries should be located in portions with sparse populations.
- 3) There should be a network or a proposed network of road communication linking all parts of the area with its leading urban center.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 15. (emphasis their's)

- 4) The area preferably should not be separated internally by topographical barriers.
- 5) The boundaries in the vicinity of smaller centers should be adjusted so as to include or exclude their entire tributary area as far as practical; boundaries should also respect ethnic groupings as far as possible.
- 6) The boundaries should be adjusted to follow present municipal boundaries where this can be done without violating principles 1 to 5 above.¹¹⁸

Once arriving at tentative community boundaries, the Committee made adjustments on the basis of their suitability for school units. Finally, though it is unclear the extent to which the Committee viewed them as boundary determinants, considerations of desirable size - in terms of local functions and services, taxable assessment, technical efficiency, citizen participation, and minimizing provincial controls - were examined.¹¹⁹ But the overall impression gained from a reading of the report is that the Committee's concept of community, in terms of trading area, was the predominant basis for boundary determination.

Yukon and Northwest Territories

Table 11 of Appendix A indicates that there have been several changes in local government in the northern territories since 1952. Incorporated local administrative districts were renamed municipal districts in 1960, and villages and hamlets were incorporated in 1964 and 1969 respectively.¹²⁰ None of these changes resulted from published

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 18.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 24-33.

¹²⁰ Interview with Mr. A. D. Dunning, Head, Municipal Affairs Section, Canada Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, March 27, 1973, Ottawa. For a history of local government in the Northwest Territories see: Canada. Advisory Commission on the Development of Government in the Northwest Territories Report (2 vols.; Ottawa: August, 1966).

studies or reports. In 1970, the boundaries of the city of Yellowknife were substantially reduced, and in 1971 those of the city of Whitehorse were greatly enlarged, both without prior published studies or reports.¹²¹ Neither of the two territorial governments has to date formulated a policy on boundary determination of municipalities.

Conclusion

This chapter bears witness to the flurry of activity centred on local government reform in Canada. Only Prince Edward Island and the northern territories have neither gone through a program of municipal reform nor undertaken studies that could lead to such a program. The provinces of Quebec and Manitoba have undertaken a considerable number of studies, but it is New Brunswick and British Columbia that have implemented the most large-scale comprehensive reorganizations. Since the province of Ontario has been considered in a separate chapter, general comments about local government reform in Canada follow in the Conclusion to Part Two.

¹²¹ A report not reviewed here is City of Whitehorse Financial and Related Consequences for the City of Whitehorse of City Enlargement and the New Municipal Aid Ordinance (Eric Hardy Consulting Limited, October, 1972). This report was commissioned solely by the City.

CONCLUSION TO PART TWO

In chapters 2 and 3, some forty-seven studies and other documents have been reviewed. It will be recalled that the purposes of the review were to see whether concepts of community have been much used or proposed as boundary determinants, what kinds of concepts (and indicators) of community may have been used, and the importance that has been attributed to any community criteria relative to other boundary determinants such as financial and administrative considerations.

It is sometimes simply not possible to answer these questions for each study or document reviewed. Sometimes no statement was made in the documents about the kind of boundary determinants to be used. In such instances it was necessary to try to infer what the criterion (or criteria) were. Sometimes a list of criteria was specifically stated in the documents, but it was not clear whether they had all been used or not, and rarely was there a reference in the documents to the relative importance to be attached to the criteria listed.

Statistically, it appears that at least eighteen and possibly as many as twenty-three of the forty-seven documents used or proposed the use of a community criterion that went beyond an assumption that existing units of local government reflect communities. It appears further that only four of the documents used (or proposed the use of) a community criterion that went beyond the objective aspect to include consideration of the subjective aspect of community. The four are the Manitoba government's White Paper on Metro Winnipeg (1970), the report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation (1967), the Ontario government's Design for Development: Phase Two statement (1968), and the study of

Haldimand and Norfolk counties in Ontario (1971).

Though fewer than half of the documents reviewed appear to have used or proposed the use of a community criterion (that went beyond the assumption that existing units of local government are communities), the frequent use of the word community in almost all the documents indicates a widespread belief that it is somehow important to local government. The frequent use of the word may in some cases be little more than window dressing, and it may in fact be of little consequence, in that the word is of a high level of abstraction with little precision in meaning and use. If one takes the charitable view that the use of the word was not a matter of window dressing, then one can conclude that the authors of many of the reports considered that community is an important consideration to local government, but impossible to use as a boundary determinant. They may have done what Warren said some sociologists do -- "... throw up their hands and urge that the whole concept of community be discarded as a sort of useless theoretical will-'o-the-wisp."¹

When one considers that only four of the forty-seven documents adopted a concept of community that included both the objective and subjective aspects, and that only one of those four (the Haldimand-Norfolk study) seems to have actually tried to use such a concept in empirical research, one concludes that the Canadian studies have not much help to offer to this thesis. Nevertheless, some of the studies did try some interesting techniques for data collection. More importantly perhaps,

¹Roland Warren, The Community in America (2nd. ed.; Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), p. 9.

a few gave reasons why it was thought that community is important to local government.

The Ontario Committee on Taxation related participation in government to community:

Beginning with [the objective of promoting] access, which by nature involves widespread popular participation in government, it is reasonable to deduce that a regional unit should possess that attribute which political philosophers have long recognized as a bulwark of government: community. ... Popular participation in government, then, demands the existence of a sense of community. ... Participation cannot exist without community, but it serves to develop community.²

In his review of the Waterloo area in Ontario, Professor Fyfe seems to make a connection between community and government's responsiveness and responsibility. He indicates that government is better able to be responsive and responsible if there is a community of interest.³ The Manitoba government, in its White Paper on Metro Winnipeg, pursued a similar line of thought, emphasizing participation, involvement, responsiveness, and accountability. The White Paper went beyond this, however, to indicate that community identification is an end in itself which can be promoted by government, though how this is done is not made clear.⁴

The Saskatchewan Royal Commission's views were less philosophical. It stated the belief that the area of municipal government should

²Ontario. Committee on Taxation Report (3 vols.; Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1967), II, p. 507.

³Ontario. Waterloo Area Local Government Review Report (Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, February, 1970), p. 7.

⁴Manitoba. Proposals for Urban Reorganization in the Greater Winnipeg Area (Winnipeg: December, 1970), pp. 9-10, 13.

coincide with area of community because "The responsibilities of modern municipal government cannot be artificially separated from the normal life of the community without excessive cost and inconvenience to citizens."⁵ This view was echoed in the report of the Saskatchewan Local Government Continuing Committee.⁶

The authors of many of the documents reviewed in chapters 2 and 3 seemed to assume that existing municipalities were, or reflected, communities. The expression of this assumption was not considered to be an indication (for the purposes of the review) that a concept of community was used as a boundary determinant. There are two reasons for this: a) units of government (i.e. municipal corporations) cannot feel a sense of community; it is people rather than political structures that can have a sense of belonging, and b) to hold that units of government reflect communities is an empirical proposition which can be tested for its accuracy. If it is not tested at all, or is tested by examining only the views of elected local representatives, it remains an empirical proposition. There is another point too; the theorists whose work was examined in Chapter 1 seemed to be in agreement that community is a matter of degree, not an absolute condition. Therefore, if by empirical research the population of a unit of local government is found to feel a sense of community, the questions must then be asked what is the degree

⁵Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life Report 4: Rural Roads and Local Government (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1955), p. 254.

⁶Saskatchewan. Local Government Continuing Committee Local Government in Saskatchewan (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1961), p. 13.

of felt community, and does it vary within and between municipalities?

The ability of political units to heighten a sense of community felt by the inhabitants is open to question. The Manitoba government's White Paper held that community identification can be fostered by government, but the processes which might be involved in this are not clear.

No one of the documents reviewed is entirely satisfactory in terms of demonstrating how a concept of community can be used as a boundary determinant. Indeed most of them have little or no help to offer. By far the most interesting study for this purpose is that done in Haldimand and Norfolk counties in Ontario. However, the report of that study offered no theoretical explanation at all, or even a definition of community. It is to effect an advance over the documents reviewed that attention is directed in Part Three.

PART THREE

AN OPERATIONAL CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY
AND ITS APPLICATION

INTRODUCTION TO PART THREE

In Part One above, the existence of a great number and variety of concepts of community was noted. The number and variety make conceptual analysis a difficult matter indeed. The three themes of community reviewed make it clear that there is not a concept of community. Rather there seem to be almost as many concepts as there are definitions. Aside from the necessity of people, there seems to be no universal agreement on what are necessary conditions or elements of community. Social interaction is almost always considered necessary, and reference to geographical area or focus is often considered necessary for community. Whether community in a rural setting is of a different order from community in an urban setting is another matter on which there seems to be some disagreement.

Among the fundamental differences apparent among the three themes of community reviewed earlier is emphasis on the spatial aspect of community. The community-as-common-life theme tends to emphasize the effect of close physical proximity. So does the human ecology school of thought, but this theme seems to assume that geographical place is by far the most important, if not the only, determinant of action. The community-as-social-system theme more closely resembles the former than the latter theme, in that Parsons, for example, holds that geographic place is but a partial determinant of action. Action and interaction are therefore viewed as arising out of needs of people rather than just out of physical proximity. Thus there are needs of people which result in action-interaction more or less independently of geographic location of those people.

The other fundamental difference among the three themes is the treatment of what has been termed subjective community. The human ecology school, it will be recalled, omits from consideration attitudes, sentiments and motivations. The other two themes do take into account a sense of feeling or belonging: that is, community in the subjective sense.

In terms of locating geographically a community, the human ecology theme is the most explicit and productive of the three, in that this theme emphasizes movements of several types that are viewed as defining a community's area. These types of movement are not too difficult to subject to observation and measurement. In this respect, then, this theme is the most useful for the purposes of geographically locating communities.

None of the three themes is entirely satisfactory, however, for the purpose of defining areas for units of local government. Unless one is prepared to argue either that a sense or feeling of belonging is of little or no importance to local government, or that such a sense is accurately reflected in the interactions of people, the human ecological view of community is inadequate. It was argued earlier that a sense or feeling of belonging is of importance to units of government. The extent to which interactions of people accurately reflect the subjective aspect of community is an empirical proposition. If empirical research does indeed indicate that interaction accurately reflects subjective community, it may be appropriate to rely on objective indicators alone, and this would no doubt make the geographical locating of communities a simpler and easier task. But the testing of the correlation between objective

and subjective aspects of community should logically precede using a research methodology that does equate the two. The assumption that interaction accurately reflects subjective community appears to be quite widely accepted. The few studies and reports reviewed, in chapters two and three, that attempted to collect or analyze data on community relied almost always on indicators of objective community, implicitly accepting the assumption.

The other two themes of community reviewed are likewise inadequate for the purpose of defining areas for units of local government, but for a different reason. While taking into account subjective community as distinct from objective community, the two concepts are of such a high level of abstraction that they are not very suggestive of research methodologies that would enable one to geographically locate communities.

None of the forty-seven reports and studies reviewed above is entirely adequate either. The rarity of concern with subjective community has already been mentioned. In the very few studies and reports that even made a distinction between subjective and objective community, with one exception no data were collected and analyzed on subjective community. Only the study done in Haldimand and Norfolk counties in Ontario collected data on this aspect, but the reports of this study unfortunately lacked a statement of theoretical orientation.

It must be concluded, therefore, that no present concept of community is entirely adequate for the purpose of geographically delineating units of local government. It seems further that while methodological procedures for collecting data on objective aspects of community are reasonably well developed, the same cannot be said for the measurement of the subjective sense of community. It becomes necessary, therefore,

to develop yet another concept of community, and a stipulative definition, and to develop a methodological procedure for locating communities and determining their strength. The purpose of Chapter 4 is to meet these two objectives. Thus a stipulative definition, in terms of indicators, is to be proposed, along with methodological procedures for operationalizing the indicators and for interpreting the data.

Other boundary determinants

Given that this thesis is concerned with only one boundary determinant - a community criterion, one encounters the problem of its importance relative to other criteria that may be used as boundary determinants. This thesis is written from the point of view that a community criterion is of considerable importance. It might be expected that this boundary determinant should be considered pre-eminent. However, if one were to postulate this, the problem of the relative importance of each of any other criteria must then be faced, forcing one to produce a list of criteria and their order of importance. To do so is clearly beyond the scope of this thesis. It is proposed only that in defining the geographic area of units of local government, one should start by determining the geographic boundaries of communities using the procedures developed in Chapter 4, or an improved version of those procedures. The boundaries of communities would then be viewed as tentative boundaries for units of local government, subject to alteration if necessary according to the suitability of each area and its boundaries for other criteria. Is the population enclosed within those boundaries an appropriate size? If not, the boundaries can be altered. Is the tax base enclosed in the boundaries adequate? If not, the boundaries can be altered. And so on for each other consideration. Thus the boundaries of communities would be

the starting point and the continual reference against which the requirements of other considerations can be gauged. The end result, hopefully, would be that the governmental boundaries finally arrived at would bear some reasonable resemblance to the geographic location and extent of communities. After this procedure was formulated, it was found that it is not an original one - the Saskatchewan Local Government Continuing Committee proposed a similar procedure in 1961.¹

After the development in Chapter 4 of a new operational concept of community, Chapter 5 describes the location of the test case and the data collection procedure used, and analyzes the data relating to subjective community. Chapter 6 continues the data analysis, focusing first on indicators of objective community, and then on the relationships between subjective and objective community.

¹Saskatchewan Local Government Continuing Committee Local Government in Saskatchewan (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1961), p. 19

CHAPTER FOUR

AN OPERATIONAL CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY

Definition

Because of the multiplicity of concepts and definitions of community, and because of the inadequacy of the reviewed concepts and definitions for locating communities, it becomes necessary to develop yet another concept and stipulative definition of community. It must be a stipulative definition because there appears to be a lack of unanimity on essential characteristics of community. The definition must be put in terms of indicators if it is to provide reasonable guidelines for empirical research.

Before positing a new concept and stipulative definition of community, it is worthwhile to consider two recent studies proposing local government in Great Britain because of their specific use of a community criterion. In June, 1966, the British government appointed two royal commissions on local government, one for England and the other for Scotland. Aside from specification of the territory to be considered, the two commissions were appointed with the same terms of reference, being directed to

... make recommendations for authorities and boundaries, and for functions and their division, having regard to the size and character of areas in which those can be most effectively exercised,¹ and the need to sustain a viable system of local democracy... .¹

Royal Commission on Local Government in England

The Commission for England, chaired by Lord Redcliffe-Maud, submitted its report in 1969² and published as well ten research studies.

¹Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in England Report (3 vols.; London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, June, 1969), I, p. iii.

²Ibid.

'City region' was considered at first to be an appropriate concept to guide the setting of boundaries of units of local government, but for a number of reasons was discarded as unsatisfactory.

Meanwhile we had become increasingly convinced by those who emphasized the need for an organ of community at grass-roots level. Our conclusion was that any new pattern of democratic government must include elected local councils, not to provide main services, but to promote and watch over the particular interests of communities in city, town and village throughout England.³

The Commission defined community in two ways; 1) as a socio-geographic exercise of measuring people's actual behaviour in terms of such activities as journey to work, travel for shopping purposes, and migration - that is, indicators of objective community, and 2) what people feel is community in terms of belonging to an area - that is, community in a subjective sense. The distinction between the two senses was made because the Commission considered it possible for people scattered over a wide area embracing towns and countryside to be economically interdependent to a strong degree yet not necessarily be conscious of belonging to a single community.⁴

The Commission sponsored a research study of community attitudes.⁵ The study involved a sample of 2,199 electors selected from one hundred local authority areas throughout England. A structured interview

³Ibid., I, p. 5.

⁴Ibid., I, p. 60.

⁵Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in England, Research Studies 9: Community Attitudes Survey: England (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, February, 1969).

technique was used, examining the geographic area of perceived community areas, knowledge of and attitudes toward the administration of local government services, degree of accessibility to elected representatives and local government officials, and the nature of community life in terms of leisure activities, family relationships, patterns of acquaintance, shopping habits, employment, and so on. The report of findings lacks a copy of the interview schedule used, but most of the questions appear in the text, making it possible to reconstruct most of the interview schedule.

Focusing on the subjective sense of community, the Commission seems to have neglected the relationship between area and location of subjective community on the one hand and area and location of community according to the indicators of objective community, though the data enabling such comparison was available.⁶

The Commission's most important contribution, for the purposes of this thesis, is its distinction between the objective sense and the subjective sense of community, and its recognition that the interaction of people in an area does not necessarily result in their acquiring a feeling of belonging in that area. Conversely, it recognizes that interaction does not necessarily or always result from feelings of belonging. Indeed, interaction may even be disintegrative in that interaction can reinforce people's dislike of others, and thus reinforce perceptions of differences between 'they' and 'us'. People can interact with others for all sorts of motives, aside from feelings of community. It may be a matter of

⁶ some analysis is given in Ibid., pp. 80-81.

necessity - the 'home area' may lack facilities for shopping or whatever, making it necessary to interact with people outside the 'home area'. Thus to assume either that interaction necessarily results in feelings of community or that interaction necessarily results from feelings of community is to disregard possible disintegrative effects of interaction.

Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland

The Commission for Scotland, chaired by Lord Wheatley, submitted its report in 1969 also.⁷ The Commission stated that a local government unit is more than a unit for the administration of functions and the provision of services. It is also a geographical unit representing people of a particular area. Therefore,

The area ought to be so chosen that within it there is as much as possible in common - a convergence of interest, affinities and sentiments. This is what we have in mind when we use the term 'community'. ...

What we mean by a community is a grouping of the population on a geographical basis - large or small - which has social and economic coherence.⁸

The factors that were seen to have the greatest influence on giving coherence to a community were natural physical features, in that they can define a natural zone for human settlement and 'normally' constitute a unifying influence; communications, which by promoting free access between parts of a community serve to bind that community together; centre and hinterland, the centre providing a focus or core for a variety of

⁷Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland, Report (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, September, 1969).

⁸Ibid., I, p. 139.

purposes; economic inter-relationship, resulting in coherence in that what happens in one part of a community affects the rest; provision of services and facilities, in that a community should be to some extent self-contained as regards services; and traditional linkages, in that past associations, common problems or similarity of outlook lead the inhabitants of an area to regard themselves as forming a single community.⁹

Like the Commission on England, the Scottish Commission distinguished objective community from subjective community. Unlike the English Commission, however, it seems to have put somewhat less emphasis on the subjective aspect:

The questions put during the interviews included some designed to elicit what people thought of as their 'home' area. The aim of the survey was to get spontaneous, unreflected reactions. But, just for that reason, the findings from this part of the study were of limited usefulness to us in defining communities. They served only to give a vague generalized picture. Furthermore, almost everyone interviewed was able to think of his or her 'home' area only in very local terms indeed: very few could help in building up the picture of communities which exist for wider purposes.

The objective approach proved to be much more productive in the context of our inquiry.¹⁰

The reasons for the Scottish Commission's making the distinction between objective and subjective community are unclear. The Commission did not express the view of the English Commission that interaction and feelings of belonging to a community may be independent.

The Scottish Commission also sponsored a community survey, using an interview schedule almost identical to that used in the English

⁹Ibid., I, pp. 139-140.

¹⁰Ibid., I, pp. 140-141.

survey. The sample interviewed consisted of 1,446 electors in sixty-nine administrative areas throughout Scotland. The relationship between subjective and objective community was not thoroughly investigated.¹¹

A copy of the interview schedule was appended to the report of the study.

Both Commissions held that 'community', at least the subjective aspect, is a matter of degree - that community is a relative rather than an absolute characteristic of people in geographic places. Also, both Commissions recognized the variability of geographic areas of communities. Some communities may have a large geographic extent while others may be small. If units of local government are to have boundaries that reflect the territorial extent of communities, the size and other characteristics of those units will vary from unit to unit. Finally, both Commissions were of the view that there are levels of community, with smaller communities nested within larger ones. A question left unanswered, however, is how one differentiates one level from another. Presumably communities always have the same characteristics no matter what their level. How, therefore, does one distinguish a large lowest level community from a small second or upper level community? This seems to be a particularly difficult kind of question to answer.

The two studies, especially the one on England, provide some help in positing a stipulative definition. The Haldimand-Norfolk study, reviewed earlier, seems to have been based on an interesting concept of community, but the concept was never described or explained. The elements

¹¹ Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland, Research Studies 2: Community Survey: Scotland (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, September, 1969), p. 33.

of a useful concept of community for the present purposes have already been noted. In particular it is held that there is an analytical distinction between what has been called objective community and subjective community. The former has to do with patterns of behaviour of people. Only patterned behaviour, that is behaviour recurring with some regularity over some period of time, is of concern. There is no reason to believe that isolated acts contribute to a feeling of belonging to a group of people or to an area. Also, only acts that have a specific geographic focus are of concern, for units of government must have a territorial basis. Thus such acts as taking a holiday overseas are not of importance, except in so far as acts of this sort may have effects on one's general receptivity toward others not then in the 'we' group or the 'our' area. Also, it is not possible to conceive of a community of only one person. Community involves a number (the magnitude of which is variable and cannot be predetermined) of people. Thus acts involving one person alone are of no consequence - only acts involving two or more people - interactions - are of importance. For example, travel need involve no more than one person engaged in the act of moving from point A to point B. If the act of travelling results in or coincides with interaction of the actor with one or more other actors, the act of travelling results in interaction. There can, of course, be interaction without movement of people. Communication media such as the postal system, newspapers, telephone, radio, and television represent interaction no less than does the physical movement of people, and may have as much of a geographic focus as have interactions involving physical movement.

Subjective community involves not acts or interactions but

sentiments, loyalties and feelings of belonging to a group of other people. There need not be reciprocity in the feelings of one individual to another or others, because sentiments, loyalties and feelings are personal and therefore to some extent independent of particular other individuals. Reciprocity, however, would seem likely to reinforce one's sense of belonging. What matters are the feelings, loyalties and sentiments an individual has in relation to a group of people, for a group, if appropriately defined, could be considered a community. Again, only sentiments, loyalties and feelings that have reference to a group of others in a geographic place are of concern, given the assumption that units of government must have a territorial basis. The membership of the group need not be constant - it can grow, contract, or change over time, but there must be some degree of continuity of membership. It is conceivable that an individual can feel loyalty to place alone, aside from people - an individual may feel he or she 'belongs' to a particular piece of land. Of course individuals can also view place as a symbol of the people in the place, rather like a flag being a symbol of a nation. Whatever feelings, loyalties and sentiments an individual has must have at least some reference to other persons and must persist over time for there to be a community.

The relationship between interactions on the one hand and sentiments, loyalties and feelings of belonging on the other hand is not a simple and straightforward causal relationship. As the Redcliffe-Maud report suggested, interactions can be initiated and can recur for all sorts of reasons having nothing to do with sentiments, loyalties and feelings of belonging (though it is reasonable to expect that some or

perhaps even most interactions are initiated by or related to such feelings). Indeed, it is possible to conceive of interactions taking place and recurring even when the actor has feelings of antipathy toward the person or people with whom he or she is interacting, or toward the place of interaction. Also, interaction need not always result in the development of a predilection of an actor for those with whom he or she is interacting or to the place of interaction. Indeed it may reinforce an actor's antipathy toward those with whom he or she is interacting and the place of interaction. A person who is obliged to interact with people perceived to be his or her inferiors, for example, does not necessarily feel empathy for those people as a result of interaction. The interaction may merely reinforce one's feeling of superiority, and thus one's sense of distinctness from those people, rather than resulting in a feeling of affinity and belonging.

A related question that arises is the extent to which members of a community must be similar to each other. People can be similar in terms of demographic characteristics such as area of residence, age, ethnicity, language spoken, socio-economic status and so on. People can also be similar in terms of engaging in the same patterns of behaviour, in being joint parties in interaction. Finally, people can be similar in terms of their perceptions of belonging to a group (or groups). Is it necessary that members of a community be similar in all three senses? Certainly to be members of a community they must be similar in the last sense, that is mutual perceptions of belonging. Since community must have a geographic focus, similarity in terms of area of residence is also a necessary condition. Beyond this, the necessity of similarity is not clear.

None of the three themes of community reviewed earlier is particularly helpful in this respect. Hawley, for example, states that communities can be located on an independence-dependence continuum.¹² Independent communities are self-sufficient in that the membership can themselves satisfy all their requirements. This suggests that members can be dissimilar in terms of occupation, for example, for to be independent implies that the community's members have some division of labour or specialization. Communities, Hawley indicates, can also be more or less dependent, that is lacking in self-sufficiency, in which case the membership is likely to be more homogeneous and therefore similar at least in terms of occupation. In sum, Hawley seems to be of the view that the members of a community need not be similar in the demographic sense, aside from area of residence. Since dependence-independence relates to the satisfaction of needs, it appears that Hawley would deny that similarity in the second sense, that is, patterns of behaviour, is a necessary condition of community.

From our discussion so far, it would appear that the only necessary conditions of community are similarity of the members in terms of area of residence and of perceptions of belonging to a group. Other similarities may be expected to buttress perceptions of belonging, and some of these seem especially important. A common language in particular seems to be of importance, in that it is difficult for a person to have a perception of belonging if communication between that person and other people is not possible. In general, it would seem that the greater the similarity, both demographically and behaviourally, the stronger people's

¹²Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 223.

perceptions of belonging are likely to be. But clearly similarity other than perception of belonging and area of residence is not a sufficient condition of community. Left-handed people or people with large noses do not constitute communities by virtue of those particular similarities. Nor do all those people who shop at a particular store. Finally, communities need not be self-sufficient in the provision of all the physical and psychic needs of the members, for even an area as large and populous as a nation is economically self-sufficient only rarely.

The concept of community developed in the above few pages may contribute to a theory of community in terms of suggesting hypotheses about the relationship between actions and sentiments. It also permits the statement of a stipulative definition, albeit crude and preliminary, to aid in directing research. Community can now be defined as a psychological relationship existing amongst people in a geographic area, that relationship being characterized by the individuals having a sense or feeling of belonging to a group of other people who live in the area. This sense of belonging must be supported by patterns of interactive behaviour, but not all interactions need be supportive of the individuals' feelings of belonging. For present purposes, the definition of community is not applicable to relationships involving only two people or even to a family. But otherwise, the word can apply to groups ranging in size from a neighbourhood to the population of the entire world.

This concept of community is substantially different from the notions of community found in the reports and studies reviewed in chapters two and three. The only study that may have used a concept of community similar to the present one is the study of Haldimand and Norfolk

counties in Ontario, but that study lacked an explication of the concept of community on which the research was based.

It is possible to identify three main senses in which the word community was used in the studies and reports reviewed, aside from a frequent and untested assertion that people in any geographic location constitute a community. Some studies used the word community in multiple senses.

The first sense emphasizes consideration of the provision of municipal services, and usually involves an examination of physical features in that the provision of services is often contingent on the topographical features of an area. To a greater or lesser extent, therefore, a considerable number of studies viewed topography as a major delimiter of communities. Examples of reports and studies that used this sense of community are those on the Oshawa area in Ontario, and on Brandon, Manitoba.

The second sense involves analysis of demographic data. For example, Dr. Fyfe's study of the Waterloo area in Ontario considered data on population growth, rate of urbanization, ethnicity, and distribution of occupations. These data were used to help identify two urban complexes. The report of the Saskatchewan Local Government Continuing Committee recommended that local government boundaries should take into account ethnic groupings.

The third sense of community often used in the studies and reports reviewed involves analysis of data on interactive behaviour. By far the most often used were data on travel patterns between place of residence and place of work. Data on other kinds of interactive behav-

iour were less frequently used. The Steele report on Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth County, the Haldimand-Norfolk study, and the studies on the Hull, Quebec City and Saguenay areas all used data on other kinds of interactive behaviour.

The present concept of community differs from all these three senses primarily in its emphasis on what has been called the subjective aspect of community. None of the kinds of data that would be used in examining the three senses are of a sort that would enable one to reach conclusions about actual perceptions of community that people in a study area may have. Analysis of data relating to the third sense of community is germane to the concept of community that has been developed in the previous few pages, in that some kinds of interactive behaviour may be expected to have some bearing on people's perceptions of community.

There are, however, some kinds of interactive behaviour that would generally seem to involve little or no psychic impact. Interaction for such economic purposes as shopping and banking would seem somewhat less likely to have psychic impact than interactive behaviour for more personal purposes such as visiting friends and relatives, and attending church services. Still, one may engage in the former kind of interactive behaviour because one is well acquainted with people in a particular shop or office, and even when this is not so, such interactive behaviour may indeed give rise to personal relationships having a bearing on one's perception of community. Thus one should be cautious of eliminating from consideration kinds of frequent and regular interactive behaviour that seem to involve no or little psychic impact.

An important problem associated with analysis of data on interactive behaviour is their static rather than dynamic nature. That is, the collection of such data gives one a snapshot picture of interactive relationships at only one point in time. Even if one is able to acquire similar data for earlier time periods as a basis for comparison, analysis of such data over time does not enable one to satisfactorily project geographic patterns of interactive behaviour into the future. The locations of future interactive behaviour are susceptible to abrupt change for reasons unrelated to perceptions of community. Where one will go for weekly grocery shopping ten years hence is likely to depend more on the location of new shopping centres than on one's perception of community. In sum, indicators of objective community are likely to be static. Indicators of subjective community are more likely to be dynamic and to have some predictive value in that they are probably less susceptible to abrupt change over time than are patterns of interaction. Governmental boundaries based on a concept of community that emphasizes the subjective aspect are therefore likely to be less needful of periodic alteration than would boundaries based on analysis of locations of interactive behaviour.

It is now necessary to direct attention to ways of determining 1) whether particular individuals in particular areas do have a perception of belonging to one or more communities, 2) how strongly felt those perceptions are, and 3) the territorial reference of the perceptions; that is, the geographic location of perceived communities. Afterward, attention will be directed to consideration of interactions that may bolster people's perceptions of community.

Indicators of community in the subjective sense

Rather little research has been done on the three matters relating to perceptions of community. The two British studies and the study done in Ontario in Haldimand and Norfolk counties are the most helpful here, and their methods warrant further examination.

The questionnaire used in the study conducted for the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs of residents in Haldimand and Norfolk counties did not pose questions designed to show whether or not the respondents felt a sense of belonging to communities.¹³ Nor does it appear that the group discussions held in conjunction with the filling in of the questionnaires probed perceptions of belonging. The questionnaire did pose a set of five questions designed to determine whether a respondent perceives himself primarily a member of a local community rather than a member of larger social organizations. The attitudinal scale was developed by Thomas Dye and first used by him in a study of 445 people in suburbs of Philadelphia.¹⁴ The nature of the local-cosmopolitan scale seems to assume that a person does perceive himself to be a member of some group, and tests only whether the group (or groups) is a local one, or one organized on a larger geographical basis. It is not possible from the scale to determine the number of group memberships perceived. Each respondent is scored at some point along a continuum

¹³Earl Berger Limited, Local Orientation and Identification Study (3 vols.; Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1971), II, Appendix XI.

¹⁴Thomas R. Dye, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics", Social Forces, 41, number 3, (March, 1963), pp. 239-246.

of which localism is one pole and cosmopolitanism the other. Thus a respondent who perceives himself to be equally importantly a member of both one (or more) local communities and one (or more) social organizations with a wider geographic basis would be placed at the mid-point of the continuum. Except for the possibility of agreement response set (all five questions were worded positively), the scale is considered to be an appropriate one for the purpose for which it was designed.¹⁵ As noted, however, it appears to assume that the respondent does perceive himself to be a member of one or more groups, it does not allow one to determine how many such attachments are perceived, and one cannot determine the geographical location of the groups. The five items comprising the scale are:

- 1) The most rewarding organizations a person can belong to are local clubs and organizations rather than large, nation-wide organizations.
- 2) Despite all the newspaper and TV coverage, national and international happenings rarely seem as interesting as events that occur right in the local community where one lives.
- 3) No doubt many newcomers to the community are capable people; but when it comes to choosing a person for a responsible position in the community, I prefer a man who is well established in the community.
- 4) Big cities may have their place, but the local community is the backbone of America.
- 5) I have greater respect for a man who is well-established in his local

¹⁵John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan, 1968), pp. 397-398.

community than a man who is widely known in his field but who has no local roots.

The Haldimand-Norfolk study does not seem to have made a great deal of use of the scale. The study seems to have attached somewhat more importance to answers to a question that asked:

27(a). Please rank the following in order of importance to you, numbering from 1 (most important) to 4 (least important). If you live in a village or town, use list one. If you live on a farm or in the country, use list two.

<u>List One</u> (Village or Town)	<u>List Two</u> (Rural)
My village or town	My township
My county town (Simcoe for Norfolk; Cayuga for Haldimand)	My closest village
My county	My county
The province of Ontario	The province of Ontario ¹⁶

By employing a rather complex method of analysis by which the data were aggregated and analyzed by an urban-rural dichotomy within each county, it was attempted to derive a measure of preference which reflected the degree of polarization of choice.¹⁷ Several problems are associated with this. The report noted the methodological problem arising from the fact that the rankings are ordinal rather than interval data, thus making it impossible to determine very precisely the relative importance attached by the respondents to the four entities. Only the order of importance is determined. Secondly, and more important, the analysis of the data seems to have been based on an assumption that the four entities in each list were perceived by the respondents to be communities. As noted

¹⁶Earl Berger Limited, Local Orientation and Identification Study (3 vols.; Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1971), II, p. 202.

¹⁷Ibid., II, pp. 16-19, 47-49.

earlier, the concept of community was not described, but the analysis leads one to think that community may have been equated with the existence of political units.

In sum, the Haldimand-Norfolk study did not actually investigate whether or not people do perceive themselves to be members of one or several communities. The number of perceived memberships was not gauged either. Last, it seems that the four entities that the respondents were asked to rank in order of preference were assumed, for the purposes of analysis, to be communities. Nevertheless, credit is due to the study, for its efforts are unique in Canada so far. The other Canadian documents reviewed that proposed consideration of subjective community did not conduct empirical research or suggest indicators.

Dye's scale of localism-cosmopolitanism is of interest in spite of its assumption and the possibility of agreement response set, in that it can be viewed as measuring in a rather general way one's receptivity to those people who are not members of one's perceived community or communities. A highly cosmopolitan rating would seem to indicate that one does not view one's community or communities (if any are perceived) to be closed groups. A highly cosmopolitan rating might indicate a receptivity to enlargement of the area of units of local government.

Only the fourth item in the scale appears to be culture-bound, and it is easily altered. The Haldimand-Norfolk study substituted 'Ontario' for 'America'. To ensure equivalence of interpretation of the statement, 'Canada' might have been a better substitute. Respondents are asked to express their degree of agreement or disagreement with each item - strongly agree, somewhat agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree. Agreement to each item is interpreted as

a localistic response. The score for each response ranges from 1 (for strongly disagree) through to 6 (for strongly agree).¹⁷ Thus the score on the five-item scale ranges from 30 (most localistic) to 5 (least localistic).

The two British studies approached the problem of determining whether or not individuals perceived themselves members of one or more communities by asking the question "Is there an area around here, where you are now living, which you would say you belong to, and where you feel 'at home'?"¹⁸ Eighty-five percent of the people interviewed in the Scottish study and seventy-eight per cent of the people interviewed in the English study answered in the affirmative. The respondents were asked, in several ways, to describe the territorial extent of the 'home area'. The replies were classified within categories roughly equivalent to the size of local authority divisions, such as county, ward, polling district, and so on.¹⁹ The question on 'home area' certainly does get at the matter of perceptions of belonging. The way the question is worded, however, makes it impossible to record instances in which a person perceives himself to be a member of several 'home areas' of varying geographic extent, for example a street or a neighbourhood, and a city, and a county. The question presumes that a 'home' area is a community

¹⁸ Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland, Research Studies 2: Community Survey: Scotland (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, September, 1969), p. 93. The same question was asked in the English study.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 12-15, 93-94. Of the urban respondents in the English study, more than 75% described their 'home area' in terms equivalent to a ward or smaller. About 45% described the 'home area' as a group of streets or smaller.

area, which seems reasonable. But the wording of the question might be such as to make the respondent think in terms of especially small areas. The intensity of individuals' perceptions of belonging was not examined.

Several compendia of scales of attitudes have been published. Compendia by Miller²⁰ and by Robinson, Rusk and Head²¹ have been searched. Both volumes contain references to a variety of 'community' scales, but aside from Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism, none of them seems particularly useful for determining whether people perceive themselves belonging to one or more communities, the intensity of any such perceptions, or the geographic extent of those communities. The journals Rural Sociology, Social Forces, and American Sociological Review contain a number of scales relating to community, but most of these have been discarded either because they are inappropriate for the present purposes, or contain far too many scale items to be included in an interview schedule or questionnaire which is to examine things other than just the subjective aspect of community.

One scale found to be of special interest is a subjective attachment scale, used by Alford and Scoble. The three scale items are:

In general, this is a very good community to live in.
 I can hardly imagine myself moving out of this community at any
 time in the future.
 I could be just about as satisfied with life in another community
 as I am here.²²

²⁰Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, (2nd ed.; New York: David McKay Company, 1970).

²¹John P. Robinson, Jerrold G. Rusk, and Kendra B. Head, Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research of the University of Michigan, 1968).

²²Robert R. Alford and Harry M. Scoble, "Sources of local political involvement", American Political Science Review, LXII, no. 4 (December,

The respondents are asked to respond 'agree' or 'disagree' to each statement. Agreement to the first two questions and disagreement to the third are each scored 1, producing an index ranging from 0 (low subjective attachment) to 3 (high subjective attachment). Though the word community is used loosely in all three items, the scale does enable one to determine whether or not people do perceive themselves belonging to a community, and the intensity of that perception. The scale obviously refers to only a single community, like the English and Scottish studies, and does not indicate the territorial extent of the community.

The above few pages indicate a rather low level of development of indicators of subjective community. The most interesting scales have some deficiency or other, yet it is often desirable to use existing scales in preference to devising one's own, particularly if it is desired to do comparative analysis. Existing scales have the advantage of having been applied and tested, giving other researchers some confidence that the items do constitute a scale. Because it may later be possible to do comparative analysis with the Haldimand-Norfolk study data, Dye's index of localism-cosmopolitanism was selected for use in the test case. Alford and Scoble's index of subjective attachment was also selected for use. The questions used in the two British studies were not selected because they clearly necessitate using the personal interview method of data collection whereas the resources available for the test case made a mailed questionnaire mandatory.

Indicators of community in the objective sense

In contrast to having to select from only a few not entirely satisfactory indicators of subjective community, one has the problem of choosing from a vast array of indicators of objective community.

Some of the studies reviewed in Part Two used indicators of objective community. There were two main approaches to objective community in the studies. One approach concentrates on facilities, while the other concentrates on actual behaviour. A few other studies relied wholly or partly on analysis of census-type demographic data. Unless one holds that a community must be composed of 'like' people demographically, or that there must be a 'balanced' mixture of people demographically, there seems no utility in trying using demographic data to locate communities. It may aid in distinguishing urban areas from other areas, but it does not help locate communities.

Many of the studies used or proposed use of data on the availability of such facilities as banks, schools, road networks, and stores. This approach resembles Robert Park's human ecological view of community. Reliance on location of available facilities is not an entirely satisfactory basis for determining community boundaries and local government boundaries, even though the Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life found that analysis of location of available facilities yielded results similar to those obtained by analysis of people's actual behaviour.²³ That Commission's data are now about twenty years old, and given that the facility for physical mobility is now somewhat more

²³Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, Report 12: Service Centres (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1957), p. 6.

developed, replication of that research might well yield different findings. Secondly, it may be that the two kinds of analysis yield similar results only in areas where the population is widely and sparsely scattered, where it may be very difficult for people to interact in locations other than at the service centre nearest their residence. In highly urbanized areas having both many locations where people can have a particular need met (e.g. shopping centres), and facilities that promote mobility, people need not interact in the service centre nearest their residence. Reliance on data on location of facilities may be risky in urbanized areas. Analysis of actual interaction (Amos Hawley's view of human ecology) is much to be preferred in urban areas. It seems no less appropriate for non-urbanized areas.

A few of the studies that used or proposed a community criterion based on analysis of behaviour actually collected and analyzed such data. The particular indicators used in these studies warrant further consideration here. The series of Quebec studies done in the Outouais, Quebec City and Saguenay areas used a number of indicators based on activities. The zones of primary and secondary influence were determined by analysis of travel patterns for buying food and clothing, schooling, receiving medical treatment and legal advice, conducting financial transactions, the journey to work, and leisure activities.²⁴ The data analyzed were obtained from questionnaires filled in by a few 'key informants' in the smaller municipalities in the three study areas. Unfortunately, the

²⁴Québec. Etudes sur les Communautés urbaines au Québec, Délimitation du Territoire (Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1968), blue series.

questionnaire used was not printed in any of the reports. Why the particular kinds of activity were chosen, and their relative importance, were not made clear. Most of the activities would be unlikely to recur for individuals on a daily basis. Some of the activities, such as seeking legal advice and medical treatment, would probably recur only very infrequently and irregularly for most people. Each type of activity seems to have been accorded equal importance in the analysis made of the data.

The Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life collected data by interviewing about 600 farmers, the data relating to where the respondents travelled to obtain goods and services, specifically banking, clothing, dental treatment, medical treatment, drugs and medicine, hospitalization, legal advice, lumber and building supplies, machinery, mail, oil and tractor fuel, repairs, and welding. An appendix to the report contains a copy of the interview schedule.²⁵ As in the Quebec studies, the reasons for choosing these particular activities were not given and the activities were not differentiated in importance. The interview schedule was designed specifically for farmers as respondents, and it is amusing to imagine asking questions of urban dwellers about some of the activities in the list. The Commission did not apply this kind of analysis to non-rural areas, and did not suggest what sorts of activities should be examined in an urban area.

²⁵Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, Report 12: Service Centres (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1957), Appendix I, pp. 141-143.

The report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto contained brief analysis of existing data on travel between place of residence and place of work, but did not conduct research into any other kinds of activity.²⁶ The report of the Peel-Halton local government review also presented some data only on origin and destination of movements from home to place of employment.²⁷ The data were used as one of two justifications given for recommending the inclusion of Burlington in a proposed urban county. The Steele report on Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth County used some of the same data on place-of-residence - place-of-work movements that were presented in the Peel-Halton report, and supplemented it with data from other sources on movements for employment purposes.²⁸ Another indicator of objective community used in this report was the place (town or city) of residence of members of service clubs in the area. Some analysis was done of aggregate data on newspaper circulation and on the number of telephone calls from Burlington to other parts of the area. These data were only aggregate, and related to the Town of Burlington as an undifferentiated whole. They do not constitute an entirely adequate substitute for analysis of individuals' newspaper reading habits and telephone communication. Given the considerable territory and population within the jurisdiction of the Town, it

²⁶ Ontario. Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, Report (June, 1965), p. 166.

²⁷ Ontario. Peel-Halton Local Government Review, Report (September, 1966), p. 83, and 8-11.

²⁸ Ontario. Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review, Report and Recommendations (November, 1969), pp. 34-45.

might be expected that people in different parts of the Town would exhibit different patterns of newspaper readership and use of telephone, as well as other kinds of interaction not examined in the report. The problem of dealing with the town as an undifferentiated whole applies equally to the data relating to movement from home to place of employment. The report indicated that other kinds of activity deserve attention, especially movements for shopping, leisure activities, and recreation, but presented no data on these. It is interesting to note that, while using some data that were the same, the Steele and Plunkett reports came to quite different conclusions about Burlington's orientation to the surrounding area.

Professor Fyfe's study of the Waterloo area also involved analysis of data on work-residence travel patterns to support his recommendations.²⁹ The Commission apparently also had available to it data on traffic movements for purposes other than employment, but they were not presented in the report. They apparently related to movement for purposes of business, social-recreational activity, medical-dental visits, and shopping. The data were collected for traffic origin and destination studies and did not involve sampling the population. The data dealt with municipalities of origin and destination as undifferentiated wholes, thus subject to the same deficiency as the data used in other reports noted above. Aggregate data on newspaper circulation and telephone calls were similarly analyzed. The report made no distinction in the relative importance of the several indicators, but did examine the extent to which the findings of

²⁹ Ontario. Waterloo Area Local Government Review, Report of Findings and Recommendations (Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, February, 1970), pp: 18-37, 200-202.

the several indicators coincided in territorial terms.

The two studies commissioned by the Oshawa Area Planning and Development Study were based on interviews of samples of the area population.³⁰ One of the studies was designed to determine the 'social and economic orientation' of people in one town in the study area toward urban centres. The respondents in this study were asked about the number and purposes of trips made to two cities over an eight-month period. Trips for employment purposes were not analyzed, apparently because these constituted a very small proportion of the total number of trips made. The major purposes of trips were for shopping, professional services, recreation, social activities, and business (exclusive of commuting). No distinction was made in the relative importance of the purposes. The regularity of trips was not examined, but may be reflected in the total frequency of trips. Analysis was also done of aggregate data on telephone calls from the town and on newspaper circulation. The second study, conducted by high school geography students, involved interviews of people in rural areas and small urban centres. The respondents were asked to which centres and other areas they had made trips during the two week period preceding the survey, and what the purposes of the trips were. However, the analysis ignored the purposes of the trips, for reasons not stated. It is again interesting to find that, after evidently considering the same data, the Ontario government came to a rather

³⁰Oshawa Area Planning and Development Study Regional Government Report (June, 1971), pp. 98-108.

different conclusion about the size and shape of community in the area.³¹

The study of people in Haldimand and Norfolk counties in Ontario collected data from the respondents on location of employment, of children's schooling, of church attendance, of shopping (daily and weekly separated), and of assorted organizations to which the respondents belonged. A large gridded map, with a unique number for each square, was presented to the respondents, who were asked to note the grid number in which each of the activities took place or in which the organizations were based. The respondents were also asked to give the number of trips (except for trips to work) they made in 1970 to each of eighteen cities and towns in the two counties and as far away as Toronto and Buffalo. The purposes of the trips were not asked. The respondents were also asked to indicate which of twenty listed newspapers they received.³² The use of a gridded map was an interesting innovation, made easier by the fact that the questionnaires were filled out in conjunction with group interviews. Thus it was possible to use a large map with a fine grid, and to have someone help any respondents having difficulty with the map. Aggregate data on telephone calls were also examined. Four of the activities studied were selected to indicate a level of orientation to a specified urban centre; weekly shopping, purchase of a

³¹ Ontario. Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, Proposal for Local Government Reform in an Area East of Metro (December, 1972), pp. 12-13.

³² Earl Berger Limited, Local Orientation and Identification Study (3 vols.; Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, November, 1971) II, pp. 193-203.

particular newspaper, visiting a particular town more than fifty times a year (for all purposes combined, except work), and work in a particular town. Two different sets of weightings were applied, so that the four activities were not accorded equal importance.³³ Unfortunately, no indication was given of the reasons for the different weights given each activity in either of the two weighting sets. The weights seem to bear no relation to the frequency of the actions. In the first set, weekly shopping was given the highest weight, followed in order by purchase of a newspaper, non-work visits, and work. In the second set of weightings, shopping and work were given the higher and equal weights, and purchase of a newspaper and visiting were given equal and lower weights. The report states that the results of the two weighting methods were very similar, but that the geographic areas of high orientation found were slightly larger by the first method.

The data collection done for the Haldimand-Norfolk study was by far the most extensive of any Canadian report bearing directly on local government, both in terms of the sample size, and in terms of scope of information. This is the only study reviewed that imputed differences in importance to different kinds of activity, but one wishes some explanation had been given.

The two British studies also involved collection of an enormous volume and range of data on activities. Using a map, the interviewer recorded whether activities that involved movement took place within or outside the local authority area, and within or outside the 'home

³³Ibid., II, pp. 20-24.

area' described by the respondent. The activities examined related to newspaper reading (by four separate classes of newspapers), work, having club and organization memberships, church attendance, drinking in a pub, children attending school, weekly shopping, use of telephone, and twelve kinds of entertainment/recreation, ranging from taking pleasure trips in the countryside to attending concerts. Questions were also asked regarding the proportion of all adult relatives and in-laws, and of all adult friends, living in the 'home area'.³⁴

An index of social attachment to the 'home area' was constructed on the Scottish data, based on the proportion of adult relatives living in the 'home area', the proportion of friends living in the 'home area', and respondent's length of residence in the 'home area'.³⁵ It appears that this Scottish index was derived from a factor analysis done for the English study on seventeen variables, including perception of 'home area' to which the respondents felt they belonged.³⁶ The factor analysis identified three factors of involvement in the community, all of which correlated significantly with perception of a 'home area'. This variable was considered to be one of the two best indicators of identification with a community, the other being how sorry or pleased the respondent

³⁴Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland, Research Studies 2: Community Survey: Scotland (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, September, 1969), pp. 93-119.

³⁵Ibid., p. 91.

³⁶Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in England, Research Studies 9: Community Attitudes Survey: England (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969), pp. 143-166, and 182-185.

might be to leave that area. One of the three factors identified was called 'social attachment', and was comprised of the three variables used for the Scottish index, plus three others asked in the English interviews, but not in the Scottish interviews. The three additional English variables were the number of adult relatives living within ten minutes' walk of the respondent's home, the number of people living in the 'home area' that the respondent knew, and the number of adult friends living within ten minutes' walk of the respondent's home. Of the total of twelve variables comprising the three factors, only two relate to actual activities, the two being employment within the home area, and visits to a pub in the home area. The social attachment factor was found to be the best of the three factors in terms of accounting for variation in ability of the respondents to perceive a 'home area' and in answers to the question on being sorry to leave the 'home area'. The factor that consisted only of the two action variables made the least contribution in terms of accounting for variation on these two variables, but it was still statistically significant. After using these rather sophisticated techniques of analysis, the English study was able to precisely gauge the relative importance of each indicator of community in a way not even approached in any other study reviewed. While one might expect somewhat different results were a similar analysis to be done of such data collected in Canada, the results of the English study are of great importance, for they indicate that one ought to place little reliance on objective indicators alone in trying to identify perceived communities.

The English study's analysis thus leads one to question the human

ecology school's reliance on objective indicators. This school of thought, it was noted earlier, has been the most productive of the three themes of community reviewed, in suggesting indicators of objective community. It was also noted that Hawley in particular seemed to attach greater importance to physical movement than to communication by media as the basis for determining the geographic extent of communities: "... the boundary of every community ... is fixed by the maximum radius of routine daily movement to and from a center."³⁷ Why physical movement was emphasized, relative to media communication, by Hawley is not clear. Certainly McLuhan seems to suggest that media communication is of supreme importance to community.³⁸ Nor is it clear why Hawley specified 'daily' movement in contrast to less frequent movement. It does seem reasonable, however, that more frequent physical movement would have more bearing on perceptions of community than would less frequent movement, but to neglect consideration of less than daily movement is to ignore a very substantial portion of people's interactions. Where one ought to draw the line in terms of frequency is difficult to tell, but movements recurring at least once a week seem worthy of consideration. Church attendance and shopping are examples of interactions that often recur only once a week but may have at least as much bearing on perceptions of community as the small handful of kinds of interactions that recur daily.

³⁷Amos Hawley, Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure (New York: Ronald Press, 1967), p. 246.

³⁸Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man (New York: New American Library, 1964), pp. 93 and 95.

Travelling to work is about the only physical movement that many adults do on a daily basis, yet many people, particularly women, do not have even that extent of daily movement.

Given the array of media of communication presently available to a large proportion of people, media communication may be expected to have considerable impact on people's perceptions of community, more so than would have been the case when Galpin conducted his research early in this century. The obvious difficulty with conducting research into communication flows or patterns is to determine the content of the messages. For example analysis of mail flows or of telephone calls from point to point, especially when based on available aggregate data, necessarily ignores consideration of content. Social survey research often encounters the same difficulty. Therefore communication flows must be considered less than ideal indicators of the geographic extent of community unless one can somehow gauge the perceived content of the messages to the recipient. One can use factor analysis to determine the contribution made by media communication generally and each medium to perceptions of community.

Also deserving of analysis is face-to-face communication people have with other people. People's memberships in more or less formal clubs and associations, and contacts with neighbours, friends, and relatives may be as important as transportation and communication in affecting perceptions of belonging to communities. Again, their importance can be gauged through the use of factor analysis.

Relating indicators of objective and subjective community

None of the Canadian studies that used or proposed the use of

indicators of both objective and subjective community attempted to relate the geographic extent of areas found for the various indicators of community. The English study did examine the degree to which many (twenty-five) of the indicators correlated as variables, but analysis was not made of the geographic extent and location of 'home area' relative to the geographic extent and location of other indicators of community, both in the subjective and objective senses. Had maps been prepared for each indicator and been compared, the degree to which the areas coincide with each other could have been examined, giving a clearer picture. The data presented in the report of the English study lead one to conclude that the areas of all the objective indicators are larger than the geographic area of the perceived communities as determined by the respondents' ability to perceive belonging to a 'home area'. However, the questions used to determine the geographic extent of 'home' areas seemed to imply that the respondents were to think in terms of small areas. Of those respondents in the English study who were employed, only 33 per cent were employed in the perceived 'home area' while 66 per cent were employed in the larger local authority area. Only 47 per cent of weekly shoppers shopped in the home area while 75 per cent shopped in the larger local authority area.³⁹ Though the size of the perceived 'home area' was usually somewhat smaller than the size of the local authority area, the difference varied according to the population size of the local authority area. 46 per cent of those respondents of local authorities having a

³⁹Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in England, Research Studies 9: Community Attitudes Survey: England (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969), p. 78, Table 87.

population of less than 30,000 perceived of their 'home area' being the same size or larger than the local authority area, while 53 per cent perceived their 'home area' being smaller than the local authority area. At the other end of the range, only five per cent of those residents of local authority areas having a population of more than 250,000 perceived their 'home area' being the same size or larger than the local authority area, while 95 per cent perceived their 'home area' being smaller.⁴⁰

The results of the English study indicate several things. First, one ought not to rely solely on indicators of objective community to locate perceived communities, their territorial extent, and the strength of attachment to them. Behaviour does not necessarily reflect felt attachment to communities. Second, the territorial location and size of units of local government do not coincide closely with the location and size of perceived 'home' areas. The latter tend to be somewhat smaller in area than units of local government. Third, the territorial location and size of units of local government do not coincide closely with people's patterned behaviour. If it is granted that perceived 'home' areas are communities, the last two points throw more doubt on the accuracy of the assumption that units of local government accurately reflect communities (whether in the subjective or the objective sense) and somehow tend to foster and develop people's perceptions of community.

Indicators of objective community can still be of utility, however, for the territorial locations of activities seem to bear some resemblance

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 15, Table 7.

to the size and location of perceived communities, or at least 'home' areas. In the absence of data relating to subjective community, data on some activities could be substituted, though with considerable reservation. Further, if the geographic areas of communities are, by the requirements of other boundary determinants, found to be too small for local government units, the larger areas mapped by indicators of objective community could provide some guidance to the direction and extent of additions to the area of perceived community. The English study's findings suggest that some activities are of more importance than others, in that they take place to a greater degree within the perceived 'home' area. The activities found to be most important in this respect relate to church attendance, weekly shopping, employment, club memberships, and use of public parks and gardens.⁴¹ However, the English study's results may not be particularly indicative of the relationships holding in other countries or areas between subjective community and indicators of objective community, or amongst indicators of objective community. Since this sort of analysis has not yet been done in Canada, it is worthwhile to explore the relationships and to collect data bearing on them. Factor analysis is an analytical technique of considerable utility for exploring the relationships.

Independent variables

There is a final class of data that should be collected in a social survey on community in addition to data on subjective community and on

⁴¹Ibid., p. 78, Table 87.

interactions. This class is independent variables which might be expected to have some explanatory power regarding responses to the other classes of data. The two British studies found that responses varied considerably according to length of residence in the perceived 'home area'. Attachment to the 'home area' was strongest among those respondents longest resident in the 'home area', and birth in the 'home area' was strongly related to attachment.⁴² Other independent variables found to be important were level of education, socio-economic status, sex and age.⁴³ The Haldimand-Norfolk study results showed that education, age, length of residence, and rural or urban residence were independent variables all having some degree of explanatory power. This study did not use socio-economic status or sex as independent variables.⁴⁴

Several other independent variables would also seem prima facie to warrant inclusion in a social survey. Having the use of a car may determine one's physical mobility. Having a television set and a telephone may influence one's range of communication contacts. Home ownership might be expected to promote attachment to an area, in that home owners may have a greater stake in the area than do tenants. The size of the household may determine in part the degree of attachment to the area - families with children attending school might be expected to have

⁴²Ibid., pp. 25-32, *passim*.

⁴³Ibid..

⁴⁴Earl Berger Limited, Local Orientation and Identification Study (3 vols.; Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1971), II, pp. 25-135, *passim*.

added ties, contacts and avenues for interaction than families without children, and than single-person households. Perceptions of community might be related also to the respondent's level of knowledge of the area; if someone knows little or nothing of an area and its people, it is difficult to conceive of that person feeling strongly attached to the area and its people.

Place

In order to locate communities and determine their strength and territorial extent, one is faced with choosing a study area. The choice of study area is important, for it must be at least as large in area as the community or communities within it. Because determining area of community is a main purpose of conducting the research, it is not possible to know in advance what that area is. Therefore the study area chosen should be as large as possible. Since it is presently for the purposes of delineating boundaries for units of local government that it is desired to determine the geographic extent of communities, and, since units of local government are the creatures of a senior level of government, the area under the jurisdiction of a senior level of government may appear to be most appropriate. The two British studies used the whole of England and the whole of Scotland as study areas. However, even an area this large may not be the most suitable study area, for it ought not be assumed that the boundaries of communities coincide with the boundaries of provinces, states, or nations any more than they coincide with the boundaries of existing units of local government. It is not impossible, for example, that people in Hull, Quebec strongly perceive themselves to be members of a community including people in

Ottawa, Ontario; or that people in Windsor, Ontario, strongly perceive themselves to be members of a community including people in Detroit, Michigan. Since the concept of community developed earlier makes it clear that one cannot use census data to identify communities and since survey research is clearly required, it is absurd and impracticable to suggest that the study area encompass a whole continent or the whole world. The best study area would, after all, seem to be the area of the senior level of government which has the power to create or alter the boundaries of units of local government within its jurisdiction, despite the deficiency noted above. Even such a study area as this may be impracticably large, depending on the resources available for research. In this event, one may be forced to choose a smaller study area. It might correspond to the boundaries of one or more existing units of local government, or of electoral ridings. This would facilitate obtaining enumeration lists from which a sample of people can be drawn for the survey. If it becomes necessary to use such a small study area, one must keep in mind that one may be looking at only incomplete communities, the other parts being on the other side of political or administrative fences.

Research Method

Once the study area is determined, one then needs to determine the total size and concentration of its population. These are determining factors in the choice of research method to be used. If the population is very small, it may be possible to interview the entire population, depending on the resources available to the researcher, though this would seem unnecessary. Limited resources, large population size, or a scattered population probably would necessitate drawing a sample either

for interviews or for filling out questionnaires. The interview method is generally more satisfactory than the questionnaire method, but the available resources may not allow interviewing a sufficient number of people.

Summary of data desired

This chapter has indicated that in order to collect the appropriate kinds of data, social survey research is required. The first class of variables relates to community in the subjective sense, to determine whether individuals perceive themselves to be members of one or more communities, how strong such perceptions are, and the location and territorial extent of those communities. The second class of variables relates to community in the objective sense - to interactive behaviour. The third class relates to independent variables that might be expected to have some degree of explanatory power regarding perceptions and interactions.

One is almost always forced to cut down the list of questions desired. If an interview technique of data collection is used, the interviews cannot be prolonged. If a mailed questionnaire is used, it must not be excessively long. Also, there are some kinds of questions which are difficult or impossible to put to people who are to complete a questionnaire in private. Questions requiring reference to a map fall into this category, as do questions that require some probing, or long and detailed answers. To some extent, therefore, the kind of data collection method used determines the kind of questions that can be posed.

Finally, the locale for the social research must be determined. As indicated earlier, this is not a simple matter to determine. To some

extent at least, the resources available for research will govern the selection of a locale and the size of it.

The two following chapters report on an attempt to operationalize the concept of community developed and the techniques proposed for analysis of the data. The purpose of the test application is not only to see what conclusions can be reached about the particular area, but also to show the utility of using this kind of research procedure, to point out deficiencies in the operational concept and techniques of analysis used, and to indicate how further research on this subject might proceed.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TEST CASE - SUBJECTIVE COMMUNITY

The Test Case

In the previous chapter, the importance of choice of place for study was emphasized. It was concluded that probably the most satisfactory study area would be the whole area over which a senior level of government has the power to alter boundaries of units of local government. However, the resources were not available to enable choosing a whole Canadian province as the location for the test case. Only royal commissions, it seems, are able to conduct research on such a scale. It was therefore necessary to select a study area considerably smaller than a province. For reasons of accessibility, an area within either Ontario or Quebec was required. The expense and time that would be required to conduct the research at least partly in French helped narrow the choice to some area in Ontario.

The Burlington area was finally selected because two Ontario local government reviews had included Burlington in their study areas, but had arrived at opposite (though not firm) conclusions about where Burlington 'properly' belonged for purposes of regional governments.¹ Was it part of a wider community centred on Hamilton to the west, or was it part of a wider community including Oakville and the fringes of Metropolitan Toronto to the east? Did Burlington 'properly' belong in either region? Might its residents not constitute a separate identifiable community? The data analyzed by the two local government reviews were incomplete in that only a few indicators of objective community were analyzed. It was also the case that no data regarding subjective community were examined. Further, the Burlington area did not seem to

¹Ontario. Peel-Halton Local Government Review Report (September, 1966); and Ontario. Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government

be especially unique.

It was with some regret that the study area was finally narrowed to coincide with the municipal boundaries of the Town of Burlington. This narrowing was considered necessary for the purpose of drawing a sample of the adult population. The regret arises from the possibility that the Town's boundaries may not coincide with the boundaries of perceived community or communities, and that one might therefore be looking at only a part of one or more communities. Thus the perceptions and interactions of people in the other parts of a possibly larger community cannot be taken into account in the analysis. Nevertheless, the results of the research in the study area should permit an examination of the relationship between perceptions of community and interactions, as well as the effects of a number of independent variables. The research and analysis may also have some immediate utility in suggesting which proposed regional government, if any, would most appropriately include the people in the Town of Burlington.

Burlington, Ontario

Though the concept of community developed in Chapter 4 is viewed to be independent of the history and demographic characteristics of geographic areas (except in so far as an area's history may be reflected in residents' feeling of belonging to a group of people in a place), it may be of interest to recount a few details about the Town.² It was

Review Report and Recommendations (November, 1969).

²For a history of Burlington see Burlington Confederation Centennial Committee, From Pathway to Skyway: A History of Burlington (Burlington: Corporation of the Town of Burlington, 1967). Most of the information that follows is from the Peel-Halton and Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth reports, and from the Data Book for the latter report.

first incorporated, as a village, in 1873, and incorporated as a town in 1914. There have been at least nine expansions in the area of the town, by far the largest being the annexation in 1958 of Nelson Township. The Town now has an area of close to 54,000 acres, of which the 1958 annexation accounted for more than 46,000. The population is in excess of 90,000 according to the municipal enumeration of October, 1972, making the Town the largest in Canada. This figure compares with a population in 1956 of only 30,500 (including Nelson Township). The percentage increase between 1956 and 1961 was 54%; between 1961 and 1966, 40.3%; and between 1966 and 1971, 32%.

For purposes of the analysis which follows in this and the next chapter, a map of Burlington was divided into seven sectors. How and why this was done is explained shortly, but it does enable one to analyze data for Burlington other than as a single unit. The town is, of course, not a homogeneous whole with a uniform geographic distribution of demographic characteristics. The only available census data to illustrate this, in terms approximate to the seven sectors, are from the 1961 census of Canada. The data for 1951 and earlier are not available by census tract, and the appropriate data for the 1971 census are not yet available. Even the 1961 data cannot be completely reconciled to the seven sectors in that the census tract boundaries do not coincide exactly with the boundaries of the seven sectors, and these data were collected twelve years ago. Keeping these two important caveats in mind, it is possible to give some indication of the demographic differences among the seven sectors. (See table 20 in Appendix A).

Sector 1, which covers the northern half of the Town, could be characterized as a sparsely populated, predominantly agricultural area. The residents of this sector were quite clearly of lower socio-economic status than were those in any of the other sectors, in terms of income, education, and occupation. The ethnic distribution differed little from that for Burlington as a whole. In regard to religion, however, Roman Catholics were less numerous and members of the United Church of Canada were more numerous in this sector than in the other sectors.

The residents of sector 5, in the south-west corner of the Town, were at the other socio-economic extreme. These people in 1961 had the highest average income, the highest education, and the highest proportions of the male labour force in the managerial and professional/technical occupations of any sector in Burlington. The residents of sector 5 were also the most homogeneous in terms of ethnicity, and almost as often Protestant as people in sector 1.

The people in sector 2 and in sectors 3 and 4 were similar in their average incomes and education, but the occupation distributions were quite different. Sector 2 had twice the percentage of males in the managerial category that sectors 3 and 4 had, while the latter sectors had a somewhat higher proportion of labour force males in the category of craftsmen and production process workers. There were only small differences in ethnicity and religion distributions.

Sector 6, in the middle of the southern part of the town, most closely mirrored the demographic characteristics of Burlington as a whole. Sector 7, to the east of sector 6, can be characterized as

having had the second highest (after sector 5) socio-economic status in terms of average income and occupation. Regarding ethnicity and religious affiliation, the residents of this sector were typical of the town as a whole.

Geographically, Burlington is a large town. The distance from north to south is almost fourteen miles, and from east to west almost ten miles. On the west, the Town limit abuts Hamilton's city limit for a short distance. Hamilton has a population of over 300,000. Burlington's southern boundary is Lake Ontario, and to the east is the Town of Oakville, with a population slightly less than Burlington's. Both towns are in Halton County. Burlington's eastern boundary is about seventeen miles from Metro Toronto's western boundary. Metro Toronto's population is over two million. The populated area of Burlington forms a narrow strip along the lakeshore, the northern part of the town being largely undeveloped agricultural land. The developed part of the town is largely residential, with small pockets of industrial and commercial development.

The whole town of Burlington was in 1961 much more similar demographically to the town of Oakville than to the city of Hamilton, as table 21 in Appendix A indicates. The data presented for Oakville include data for Trafalgar Township, which was amalgamated with Oakville in 1962. The average annual income of males in Oakville was very close to that of males in Burlington, the figure for Hamilton being considerably lower. The median education category was the same for the two towns, and again higher than the figure for Hamilton. Regarding occupation distributions, the two towns were again very similar, and distinguished from Hamilton by considerably higher percentages in the managerial and professional/technical categories, and very much lower percentages in the category of craftsmen and production process workers. Ethnically, Hamilton was again somewhat different from the two towns in having had a somewhat lower percentage of people of British ethnicity, and higher percentages of people of Italian, Polish, Ukrainian, and 'other European' ethnicity. Finally, though the two towns were not so consistently similar in their distributions of religious affiliation, they both were distinguished by markedly lower percentages of Roman Catholics relative to Hamilton. Though these data are twelve years old, they suggest that the town of Burlington is demographically much more like Oakville than Hamilton.

Method of data collection

The limited resources available for research made it necessary to rely on mailed questionnaires for the data collection. Though the personal interview method is generally to be preferred, the expense of it would not have permitted conducting a reasonably large number of interviews. Also, a visit to the offices of the Ontario Department of Municipal Affairs in Toronto in October, 1972, revealed that a policy statement on local government reorganization involving Burlington was imminent. To avoid the possibility of having the policy announced in the course of data collection, it was necessary either to postpone the data collection until after the statement, or to complete the data collection before the statement was announced. Using mailed questionnaires facilitated completion of the data collection in a short time. The size of the sample and the method of drawing it have already been described in the Introduction to this thesis.

The three-page questionnaire was quickly pre-tested and revised. With a covering letter on Carleton University stationery and a return-postage-guaranteed envelope, the questionnaires were mailed October 27, 1972.³ Reminder/thank you cards were mailed to the entire sample on November 16 and 17, 1972. All of the completed questionnaires were returned before the policy statement affecting Burlington was issued on January 23, 1973.⁴

³See Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire used.

⁴Ontario, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs Proposal for Local Government Reform in the Area West of Metropolitan Toronto (Toronto: Queen's Printer, January 23, 1973).

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed along the lines proposed in the previous chapter, and consisted of three parts. The first part posed questions relating mainly to independent variables, specifically sex, age, occupation, education, household income, length of residence in Burlington, home ownership, number of adults in the household, number of children in the household, the use of a car, and use of a telephone. The respondents were posed four cognitive questions in which they were asked to name the mayors of Burlington, Hamilton, and Oakville, and the county of which Burlington is part. These four questions were viewed as a minimum measure of cognition about the area. The respondents were also asked if they had heard of the Plunkett and Steele reports, and their thoughts on the two reports.

The second part of the questionnaire dealt mainly with community in the subjective sense. The five questions for Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism and the three questions for Alford and Scoble's index of subjective attachment were asked. The respondents were also asked to indicate the degree of importance they attach to the existing boundaries of the Town of Burlington and of Halton County; to rank the importance they attach to Canada, Ontario, Halton County, and Burlington; and to indicate whether they thought their interests and those of Burlington would best be served by a regional government including Burlington, Hamilton, and Wentworth County; a regional government including Burlington and Oakville; or the status quo.

The third part of the questionnaire posed a series of questions designed to examine interactions that involve transportation. After much thought about how this could best be done, a simplified map of

Burlington was divided into seven numbered sectors based on major thoroughfares. Four areas surrounding the Town were also numbered. The division of Burlington into the seven sectors was similar to one used by the Town's Planning Department, modified only to correspond more closely to major thoroughfares that would be well known to the respondents. The sectors are unequal both in population and in area.

The mapping technique was devised to overcome as much as possible the deficiency found in the way most previous studies have geographically analyzed activities; that is, using municipalities as undifferentiated wholes as the geographic reference points. Division of a map of Burlington into numbered sectors allows one to examine the study area in greater detail and with greater precision. The analysis can then be used as a basis for proposing political boundaries encompassing like sectors. It would have been desirable to divide a map of the town into a larger number of smaller sectors, but it was thought important not to present the respondents with too complex a map. How complex would be too complex was impossible to foretell, for no previous instances of questionnaire survey research having used such a mapping technique were found.

The map was printed on the page opposite the questions which required reference to it. The respondents were asked to note the sector number or numbers where they reside, where the respondent or husband works, where any children in the household (or the respondent, if applicable) go to school, where the respondents go to church, where they do most of their weekly grocery shopping, where they do most of their non-grocery shopping (e.g. appliances, furniture, and clothing), where they

go most often for entertainment, where they go most often for recreation and sports, and where most of their close friends live. The respondents were asked to indicate also their mode of transportation and travel time for each activity.

Other questions related to television viewing; radio listening; reading newspapers (both number and sources of newspapers); telephone calls to Toronto, Oakville, and Hamilton; percentage of friends living in Burlington, Oakville, Toronto, and Hamilton; memberships in organizations (both number and locations of organizations); number of neighbours known; adult relatives in Burlington; and the holding of elected positions.

Subjective community

The following analysis of the data on subjective community has three parts. First, it is necessary to examine the adequacy of the two indices used since they were developed in an American context. In other words, it is necessary to determine the extent to which the question-items constitute scales in the present study. Second, to determine whether the respondents perceive one or more communities and the strength of those perceptions, it is necessary to examine the data not only for all respondents together, but also according to the sector of residence. Finally, it is useful to examine variations in perceptions of community according to the independent variables.

Scales

The extent to which the eight question-items comprising the two indices used constitute scales was examined by factor analysis of the

responses.⁵

Using varimax (rotated) factor analysis of the eight question-items, two principal factors were identified, but it is clear that the two indices measure much the same thing.⁶ The first factor identified corresponds quite closely to Dye's index of localism-cosmopolitanism, the loads of the five question-items comprising the scale ranging between .0777 (for the first question-item) and .9559 (for the fourth question-item). The second of the three question-items for Alford and Scoble's index of subjective attachment ('I can hardly imagine myself moving out of Burlington at any time in the future.') had a load of -.0830, higher than the load for the first of the five question-items comprising Dye's scale. The second factor identified less closely corresponds to the other index, of subjective attachment. The first of the three question-items comprising this index ('In general, Burlington is a very good place to live in.') had a load of .0679, which is lower than the loads on this factor of three of the question-items comprising the other scale. The second and third of the question-items of the

⁵Factor analysis evaluates responses to a number of questions. Starting from a correlation matrix of the questions, it clusters together certain sets of variables and measures the contribution which each variable makes to each cluster (or factor) produced. This contribution is termed the loading, and it is by investigating the value of the loadings that one can give meaning to each factor. Each factor accounts for a certain proportion of the total variance in the data, so one can say how important that factor is. For a further description of factor analysis see Hubert M. Blalock, Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 383-389.

⁶There is a moderate correlation between score on the local-cosmopolitanism index and score on the subjective attachment index. The coefficient of correlation is -.361, and the relationship is significant beyond the .001 level.

subjective attachment index had loadings of .9507 and -.2552 respectively. The weak loading of the index's first question-item on this factor is of concern, making it questionable whether the item should be used any further in the index. The same applies to the first of the five question-items comprising the localism-cosmopolitanism index.

The matrix of intercorrelations of the five question-items of Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism is given in Table 1. The correlations are not especially high, but there is no coefficient of correlation less than .2036, and all correlations are positive, in the correct direction. Because of the low loading of the first item of the index on the factor, one has little assurance that these five items do constitute a reasonable scale. The factor analysis indicates that the most important of the five items is the fourth one.

Table 1
Intercorrelation matrix of Dye's five items

item	1*	2**	3***	4****	5*****
1		.2924	.3004	.2284	.2036
2	.2924		.2276	.2539	.3226
3	.3004	.2276		.3551	.3732
4	.2284	.2539	.3551		.4269
5	.2036	.3226	.3732	.4269	

*The most rewarding organizations a person can belong to are local clubs and organizations rather than large, nation-wide organizations.

**Despite all the newspaper and TV coverage, national and international happenings rarely seem as interesting as events that occur right in the local community where one lives.

***No doubt many newcomers to the community are capable people; but when it comes to choosing a person for a responsible position in the community, I prefer a man who is well established in the community.

****Big cities may have their place, but the local community is the backbone of Ontario.

*****I have greater respect for a man who is well-established in his local community than a man who is widely known in his field but who has no local roots.

The matrix of intercorrelations of the three question-items of the

Alford and Scoble index of subjective attachment is given in Table 2. It supports the factor analysis in indicating that the three items do not constitute a particularly good scale.

Table 2
Intercorrelation matrix of Alford and Scoble's three items

item	1*	2**	3***
1		.1769	-.0163
2	.1769		-.5017
3	-.0163	-.5017	

*In general, Burlington is a very good place to live in.

**I can hardly imagine myself moving out of Burlington at any time in the future.

***I could be just about as satisfied with life in another place as I am here in Burlington.

Though the positive-negative signs are all in the correct direction, the coefficients of correlation are weak except that between items two and three. This suggests that the first statement should perhaps be eliminated from the index. The second statement is clearly the most important of the three, and was identified as such by the factor analysis.

Perceptions of community

The answers (given in Table 3) to the local cosmopolitan question-items for the respondents of Burlington as an undifferentiated whole

Table 3
Responses to local-cosmopolitan items* (%)

	response							
	strongly disagree	disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	agree	strongly agree	all disagree	all agree
#1	2.1	14.7	8.6	18.6	49.2	6.8	25.4	74.6
#2	16.6	39.1	12.5	11.6	15.9	4.3	68.2	31.8
#3	4.3	19.4	5.9	16.6	40.3	13.4	29.6	70.3
#4	4.1	21.4	9.5	16.1	36.8	12.0	35.0	64.9
#5	11.5	36.9	13.5	13.8	18.3	6.0	61.9	38.1

N#1 - 429. N#2 - 440. N#3 - 439. N#4 - 440. N#5 - 436.

*see Table 1 for the list of items.

suggest that most of the respondents are likely to be somewhat but not

strongly localistic on the index. This expectation is suggested in Table 4. It has also been calculated that 43.2% of the 414 respondents

Table 4
Scale of local-cosmopolitanism (%)

cosmopolitan	5-10 points	11-15 points	16-20 points	21-25 points	26-30 points	local
	7.0	20.3	40.6	27.8	4.3	100.0
N	29	84	168	115	18	414

who could be placed on the scale were on the cosmopolitan side of the mid-point of 17.5, and that 56.8% were on the local side of the mid-point.

Turning now to analysis of the local-cosmopolitan scores by sector of residence in Burlington, it is found that there is not a significant difference (at the .05 level or better) in score across the seven sectors (Table 5).

Table 5
Score on local-cosmopolitan index by sector of residence (%)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
score	north	mid-west	middle	mid-east	south-west	mid-south	south-east
5-10	5.9	14.3	8.0	7.1	12.7	5.9	4.5
11-15	11.8	42.9	16.0	28.6	14.1	16.8	26.0
16-20	47.1	42.9	48.0	42.9	31.0	41.6	40.9
21-25	29.4	-	24.0	21.4	31.0	32.7	26.0
26-30	5.9	-	4.0	-	11.3	3.0	2.6
t	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0
n	17	7	50	14	71	101	154

*see the map on the questionnaire (Appendix B) for the relative location of the sectors.

Sector number five is particularly interesting in that the respondents residing there are the most highly localistic of any of the sectors. When this sector is compared to the other three populated sectors (3,6,7) combined, the difference between them is significant at the .01 level ($\chi^2 = 16.5507$). One can speculate that the fact that this sector is the closest to Hamilton has caused the residents of sector five to

somehow react in a particular way to Hamilton's proximity. The political boundary separating Hamilton from sector five may therefore take on symbolic importance to the residents of this sector. Their localism may indicate that they view any communities they perceive in Burlington to be closed rather than open to people in Hamilton. The respondents in sector seven, which abuts Oakville, do not appear to view any perceived communities in Burlington to be closed systems, in that the respondents in this sector are rather cosmopolitan. If one combines the two highest categories of cosmopolitanism in each of the four sectors having reasonable numbers of respondents, the respondents in sector seven are marginally the most cosmopolitan.

Given the very low number of respondents residing in three of the seven sectors of Burlington, it is not possible to determine the extent to which the residents of the three sectors view any perceived communities in Burlington to be closed or open systems. It is particularly unfortunate that the number of respondents in sector one, which covers the northern rural half of the town, is so low, for people in this sector might be expected to be the least cosmopolitan of any in Burlington, given the sector's sparse population, rurality, and its relatively recent (1958) annexation to Burlington.

Dye reported his findings according to the social rank of the municipalities he examined. The average score for respondents in upper-class municipalities was 16.3, in middle-class municipalities 17.2, and in lower-class municipalities 19.3.⁷ The Haldimand-Norfolk study's

⁷Thomas Dye, "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics", Social Forces, 41, (March, 1963), p. 243.

average score overall was about 20.0.⁸ These averages compare with a figure of about 18.5 on the present data, which is lower than the Haldimand-Norfolk figure, but toward the highest of Dye's three figures. This indicates that the Burlington respondents are neither particularly localistic nor cosmopolitan.

The answers from the respondents as a whole to the three item-questions comprising the Alford and Scoble index of subjective attachment are given in Table 6.

Table 6
Responses to subjective attachment items (%)

	agree	disagree
In general, Burlington is a very good place to live in.	97.3	2.7
I can hardly imagine myself moving out of Burlington at any time in the future.	45.7	54.3
I could be just about as satisfied with life in another place as I am here in Burlington.	64.2	35.8

The almost universal agreement with the first statement (only twelve people disagreed and four did not respond) is remarkable, and explains why this item fared so poorly on the factor analysis, for the responses to this item vary almost not at all by responses to the other two items. At least for the respondents in the present survey, the item seems to have been a motherhood type of statement. Alford and Scoble did not report on their findings on this item and no other data have been found for comparison. In the absence of comparable data, the utility of using the index is very questionable, for on the present data the items constitute a poor scale. In spite of the nearly universal agreement with the first of the three items, most of the responses to the other two

⁸Earl Berger Limited, Local Orientation and Identification Study (3 vols.; Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, November, 1971), II, p. 67.

items were not in the direction of strong subjective attachment. The influence of item one results in an overall average score on the index of 2.2, which is on the strong attachment side of the mid-point of 2.5. Score on the index can range from 1 (complete attachment - i.e. items one and two answered 'agree' and item three answered 'disagree') to 4 (complete lack of attachment - i.e. items one and two answered 'disagree', item three answered 'agree'). Of the 433 respondents who answered all three item-questions and who could therefore be scored, 30.7% scored 1, 19.6% scored 2, 46.9% scored 3, and 2.8% scored 4.

Broken down by sector of residence, the percentage scores are given in Table 7. There is not a significant difference (at the .05 level or better) in score on the index by sector of residence in Burlington. Nor is there a significant difference when sector five is compared to the other three sectors having reasonable Ns combined ($\chi^2 = 1.0065$). This suggests either that the index is not useful, or

Table 7
Score on subjective attachment index by sector of residence (%)

	sector						
	1 north	2 mid-west	3 middle	4 mid-east	5 south-west	6 mid-south	7 south-east
1	18.8	-	25.0	23.1	31.0	35.5	30.8
2	18.8	-	28.8	7.7	21.1	16.8	20.1
3	56.3	100.0	42.3	61.5	43.7	45.8	47.2
4	6.2	-	3.8	7.7	4.2	1.9	1.9
t	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	16	7	52	13	71	107	159
$\chi^2 = 18.589$ (significance level = .50) $r = -.090$							

that the respondents in the sectors perceive those sectors equally to be communities, or that the respondents in all the sectors perceive the town as a single community or as a part of one or more larger communities.

To this point, the data are not particularly helpful in identifying

the geographic area(s) of perceived communities. The analysis of data on subjective attachment, if it indicates anything at all, suggests that there might be a comparatively strong level of subjective attachment both of the respondents as a whole, and when broken down by sector of residence. Analysis of the data on local-cosmopolitanism indicates that as a whole, the respondents tend toward the localistic pole of the index, a tendency particularly noticeable in sector five, bordering Hamilton on the west, but not so noticeable in sector seven which borders Oakville to the east. From these findings it would appear that a perceived community (or communities) would less likely include people in Hamilton than people in Oakville.

Data on several other questions may aid in determining the geographic extent of perceived communities. The respondents were asked to indicate the degree of importance to them of the existing boundaries of the Town of Burlington, and of the County of Halton. The results are given in Table 8.

Table 8
Importance of existing boundaries by sector of residence (%)

	sector							
<u>Burlington</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	overall
not import- ant at all	11.8	28.6	15.4	21.4	16.0	12.1	14.7	14.4
not very important	11.8	28.6	21.2	42.9	9.3	20.6	27.6	22.1
slightly imp.	17.6	28.6	32.7	14.3	17.3	29.0	19.0	22.8
very import.	58.8	14.3	30.8	21.4	57.3	38.3	38.7	40.6
t	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9
n	17	7	52	14	75	107	163	443
<u>Halton</u>								
not import- ant at all	-	57.1	19.6	28.6	14.7	14.8	17.3	16.5
not very important	23.5	42.9	29.4	21.4	20.0	34.3	32.7	30.3
slightly imp.	29.4	-	23.5	35.7	29.3	27.8	21.0	24.7
very import.	47.1	-	27.5	14.3	36.0	23.1	29.0	28.5
t	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	17	7	51	14	75	108	162	442

There is a very weak relationship between sector of residence and importance attached to Burlington's boundaries ($r = -.017$, significant at the .05 level); similarly with Halton's boundaries ($r = .026$, significance level = .20). The respondents were not asked to indicate the importance to them of the boundaries of any other political units.

A number of interesting findings from this Table should be noted. Overall, there is a higher degree of importance attached to Burlington's boundaries than there is to Halton's boundaries, but the percentage of people who attach no importance at all to Burlington's boundaries (14.4%) is similar to those who attach no importance at all to Halton's boundaries (16.5%). When considering the responses in the four sectors for which the N s are reasonably high, there is some difference (significant at the .01 level) in percentages of people who view Burlington's existing boundaries as very important. Those in sector five more frequently than those in sectors 3, 6, and 7 combined attach importance to the boundaries ($\chi^2 = 13.7997$, significant at the .01 level). The tendency is much the same in regard to Halton's boundaries. However, the differences between sector five and the other three sectors, both separately and combined, are not significant at the .05 level or better. It will be recalled that sector five abuts Hamilton to the west and that it was found earlier that the respondents in this sector are somewhat more localistic than those in the other sectors. Some support is found for the speculation that residents of sector five are particularly sensitive to Hamilton's proximity, and may view the existing town and county boundaries as symbolic bulwarks closing any perceived communities to people in Hamilton. Finally, though the level of importance attached to Halton's boundaries is lower (both overall and by the four

sectors of residence having reasonable Ns) than the level of importance attached to Burlington's boundaries, the County boundaries are more frequently viewed as very important than not important at all. Since the County includes Oakville to the east of Burlington, it may be that the respondents do not generally view any perceived communities to be closed to residents of Oakville.

The respondents were also asked to indicate whether their interests and those of Burlington would best be served by 1) a regional government including Burlington, Hamilton, and Wentworth County, 2) a regional government including Burlington and Oakville, or 3) the existing town and county boundaries. The responses to the question are given in Table 9.

Table 9
Preferred option by sector of residence (%)

	sector							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	overall
option 1	-	80.0	17.6	15.4	6.7	10.3	12.2	12.1
option 2	23.5	20.0	15.7	30.8	18.7	26.2	21.2	21.3
option 3	76.5	-	66.7	53.8	74.7	63.6	66.7	66.6
t	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.1	100.0
n	17	5	51	13	75	107	156	431
r	.023 $\chi^2 = 32.737$ significance level = .02							

It is possible, though there is no evidence to support it, that some respondents interpreted option three to mean there would be regional government, but with existing units being lower-tier units. If there was no, or only slight, confusion over this, the figures strongly indicate that both overall and by sector of residence, the respondents much prefer the status quo to the other two options. Also, the figures indicate that almost twice as many respondents overall would prefer a regional government including Oakville to a regional government including Hamilton. Of the four sectors having reasonable Ns, it is again sector five, abutting Hamilton, that is least disposed to Hamilton and

most disposed to the status quo, but the difference between sector five and sectors three, six, and seven combined, is not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 2.8199$). These data, however, do not in themselves indicate whether or not the respondents are anti-pathetic toward Hamilton. An indication of their views toward Hamilton and toward Oakville can be found by examining reasons for choice of preference. The reasons were given in one of the few open-ended questions on the questionnaires. Therefore the answers given were not forced into pre-set categories. The coding allowed for up to two reasons to be given by each respondent.

Of the 331 respondents who gave at least one reason for choosing an option, 63 (19.0%) stated that they had no feeling of community with the people in Hamilton - that they were anti-Hamilton. This compares with 17 (5.1%) who were anti-Oakville. Further, 24 of the respondents (7.3%) specifically stated a dislike of Hamilton's city government, or referred to Hamilton's slums, pollution, or welfare problem. This sort of criticism compares with only two respondents (.6%) who felt that way about Oakville. Thus eighty of the 454 reasons given (17.6%) could be considered antipathetic of Hamilton compared to only twenty-six (5.7%) antipathetic of Oakville. There were very few responses that could be considered empathetic toward Hamilton and/or Oakville. These findings further support the impression that many of the respondents do not appear to perceive a community (or communities) including both themselves and people in Hamilton and Wentworth County, but are largely neutral in their views of Oakville.

On the other hand, only 32 of the 454 reasons given (7.0%) related more or less specifically to 'community' reasons for retaining the status quo. Seventeen responses were categorized 'fear loss of

local identity/pride', and fifteen were categorized 'fear loss of small community'. The most popular response favouring the status quo was 'dislike bigger/larger/more government units/bureaucracy', with 52 responses (11.5%). Next in popularity was this sort of response: 'What's wrong with the way things are now?' (47 responses, 10.4%). Third in popularity was fear of an increase in taxes if options one or two were to be implemented (43 responses, 9.5%). The other reasons given were of a wide variety.

From the reasons given, it appears that in choosing the status quo option, the respondents were more often reacting negatively to the other two options (particularly to regional government with Hamilton and Wentworth County) than positively to the status quo. This conclusion suggests, perhaps, a pervasive sense of conservatism in terms of resisting change of historical institutions and associations. If this is so, one would expect that those who have lived in Burlington longest would be most likely to prefer the status quo. The general effects of this and other independent variables are now examined.

Effects of independent variables

1) length of residence in Burlington. There is not a strong significant correlation between length of residence in Burlington and score on Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism, but there is a tendency for localism to increase with length of residence ($r = .114$, significance level = .70). Of the 236 respondents resident in Burlington for ten years or less who could be located on the index, 29.6% scored between five and fifteen points on the scale, which is the cosmopolitan end, and 27.1% scored between twenty-one and thirty points which is the localism end. Of the 55 respondents resident in Burlington for more than twenty years who

could be located on the index, 21.8% were toward the cosmopolitan end and 40.0% were toward the localism end. There were only small differences when the results were broken down by sector of residence, though only sectors three, five, six, and seven were examined separately since sectors one, two, and four had too few respondents.

There is a significant but not strong correlation between length of residence in Burlington and score on the Alford and Scoble index of subjective attachment. Strength of subjective attachment increases with length of residence, but not as strongly as one might expect (perhaps because the index is not a very satisfactory one).

Table 10
Subjective attachment by length of residence(%)

residence (years)	attachment				n
	complete	strong	strong lack	complete lack	
less than 5	19.6	16.9	61.5	2.0	148
5 to 10	32.7	21.4	42.9	3.1	98
11 to 15	29.7	32.8	34.4	3.1	64
16 to 20	40.3	16.1	38.7	4.8	62
21 to 25	41.7	8.3	50.0	-	24
more than 25	50.0	13.9	33.3	2.8	36
$\chi^2 = 35.743$, significance level is .01 $r = -.185$					432

The correlation between subjective attachment and length of residence was marginally stronger (-.306) in sector three than in the other sectors, but is not significant at the .05 level or better.

2) age. As age increases, localism increases ($r .175$, significant at .05 level) for all sectors combined, and strength of subjective attachment increases ($r -.182$, significant at .05 level), but the correlations are not strong for the sectors combined. The coefficient of correlation between age and subjective attachment for sector five is a bit stronger (-.336) than for the other sectors, but is not significant at the .05 level. There is little variation by sector in correlations

between age and localism.

3) occupation. There is a moderate correlation between occupational status and score on the local-cosmopolitanism index ($r = .241$, significant at the .05 level) for the sectors combined. Thus as status of occupation increases, localism decreases. Also, as status of occupation increases, the degree of strength of subjective attachment decreases ($r = .158$, significant at .05 level) for the sectors combined, but the relationship is quite weak. There is some variation in correlation between occupational status and subjective attachment among the four sectors, but none of the coefficient of correlation are significant at the .05 level. For sector three, $r = .013$; for sector five, $r = .236$; for sector six, $r = .252$; and for sector seven, $r = .148$.

4) education. As education increases, strength of subjective attachment decreases ($r = .217$, significant at .05 level), and degree of localism decreases ($r = -.181$, significant at .05 level) for the sectors combined, but again the relationships are quite weak. Sector six stands out, having a somewhat stronger coefficient of correlation ($r = -.400$, significant at .05 level) between education and localism than the other three sectors have, especially sector three, where r equals $-.034$ (not significant at .05 level). There are only small variations among the four sectors' correlations between education and subjective attachment.

5) income. Not surprisingly, the effects of income on scores on the two indices are similar in strength and direction to the effects of occupation and education (for subjective attachment, $r = .120$, significant at .05 level; for local-cosmopolitanism $r = -.231$, significant at

.05 level) for the seven sectors combined. Sector three has a lower correlation ($r = -.050$, not significant at .05 level) between income and localism than the other three sectors have. It also contrasts with sector five in correlation between income and subjective attachment, though neither correlation ($r = -.086$ for sector three, and $r = .206$ for sector five) is strong or significant at the .05 level.

No attempt has been made to combine these three independent variables into a single measure of socio-economic status for it seems likely that the effects of a socio-economic status variable would be similar to the effects of each of the three variables separately, unless there are some rather unusual relationships between income, education and occupational status for the respondents. It does not appear from examination of the effects of these three variables separately that class distinctions play a particularly important role in the respondents' perceptions of community, for the strongest coefficient of correlation between any of the three independent variables and the dependent variables is $-.241$.

6) place of previous residence. It is most interesting to find that of the 439 respondents who indicated where they had come from (if not born in Burlington), almost two in five (39.2%) came from Hamilton or its immediate area. A comparison of former Hamilton residents with the others indicates that they tend to be more localistic than the others.

Table 11
Local-cosmopolitanism by previous residence(%)
score

	cosmopolitan				local		
	5-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	t	n
former Hamilton residents	7.0	11.4	44.3	31.6	5.7	100.0	158
non-former Hamilton residents	7.1	25.5	38.4	25.5	3.5	100.0	255

χ^2 is 12.8540, significance level is .02

The same comparison indicates that the former Hamilton residents have a stronger subjective attachment to Burlington than others.

Table 12
Subjective attachment by previous residence(%)
strength

	complete	strong	strong lack	complete lack	t	n
former Hamilton residents	40.5	18.4	38.7	2.5	100.1	163
non-former Hamilton residents	24.3	20.9	51.7	3.0	99.9	263

χ^2 is 12.7223, significance level is .01

The former Hamilton residents also tend to be more localistic and to have a higher level of subjective attachment to Burlington than the thirty respondents who were born in Burlington. These findings indicate that the former residents of Hamilton are the least likely of any of the respondents to perceive a community that includes people outside Burlington, particularly people in Hamilton.

7) home ownership. There is a tendency for home owners to have a higher level of subjective attachment to Burlington than those who rent, but the relationship for all seven sectors combined is weak (r .122, significant at .05 level). There is virtually no relationship between score on the local-cosmopolitan index and home ownership for all sectors combined. Nor are any strong differences revealed when sector of residence is controlled.

8) number of neighbours known. The respondents were asked to indicate how many of their individual neighbours they felt they knew well. It was expected that an increase in the number of neighbours known well would be an indication of the strength of ties to the locality, which would be reflected in the strength of subjective attachment. While it is true that the more neighbours known well the higher is the degree of subjective attachment, the coefficient of correlation for the seven sectors combined is low ($r = -.179$, significant at .05 level). None of the coefficients of correlation between number of neighbours known well and subjective attachment are significant when sector of residence is controlled, and none are strong. The strongest is for sector five ($r = -.280$) and the weakest is for sector three ($r = .042$). The more neighbours known well the more localistic the respondent is likely to be (for all sectors combined, r is $.156$, significant at the .05 level). This is particularly so in sector five, where r equals $.350$, and least so in sector three, where r equals $-.036$.

9) percentage of friends in Burlington. One might expect that those people who have most of their close friends living in their locality would have stronger ties to the locality than would those whose close friends live mainly outside that locality. The data bear out the expectation - the higher the percentage of close friends living in Burlington the stronger the subjective attachment ($r = -.214$ for all sectors combined, significant at the .001 level). It is not the case, however, that those respondents with higher percentages of close friends living in Burlington are more strongly localistic. There is almost no cor-

relation between these two variables for all sectors combined.

10) relatives in Burlington. Those respondents who have adult relatives living in Burlington, other than in their own household, tend to be more localistic and to have a stronger level of subjective attachment than do the respondents without relatives in the town, but the coefficients of correlation are weak.

No other independent variables that have been examined are at all strongly correlated with score on the two scales.

Earlier, reference was made to differences among the four sectors in the degree of importance attached to Burlington's existing boundaries. The effects of seven independent variables (age, occupation, education, income, length of residence in Burlington, home ownership, and number of neighbours known well) on degree of importance attached to Burlington's existing boundaries have been examined for the four sectors separately, and there are a few variations worth noting. Occupational status has the most effect in sector five ($r = -.342$, not significant at .05 level), the coefficient of correlation for all seven sectors combined being $-.176$ (significant at .05 level). As occupational status increases, the level of importance attached to the existing boundaries decreases. Level of education has the most effect in sector six ($r = -.320$, significant at .05 level), the coefficient of correlation for all seven sectors combined being $-.108$ (significant at .05 level). Thus as level of education increases, the importance attached to the existing boundaries decreases. These two independent variables are the only ones of the seven that produce variations of much interest when sector of residence is controlled.

Analysis of the effects on the three dependent variables of those seven independent variables for which sector of residence was controlled indicates that all of them have some effect, in that all seven independent variables are significantly (at the .05 level) correlated with at least two of the three dependent variables. Occupational status and home ownership are significantly (at the .05 level) correlated with all three dependent variables. However, only a total of nine out of 105 coefficients of correlation exceed plus or minus .300, and only three of those nine are significant at the .05 level.

Sector five seems from the above analysis to be rather different from the other sectors in terms of the effects of the independent variables on the three dependent variables. Sector five is demographically somewhat different from the other sectors, and it is perhaps the confluence of the demographic variations that account for some of the differences in the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables in this sector. For example, the correlation between localism and age varies little from sector to sector but is significantly (at the .05 level) and positively correlated with localism. The respondents in sector five were earlier found to be somewhat more localistic than people in the other sectors. Yet it was also found that the three socio-economic independent variables were negatively (and significantly at the .05 level) correlated with localism. It happens that the respondents in sector five tend to be of higher socio-economic status than are the respondents in the other sectors. On the basis of sector five's socio-economic status, one would expect that the respondents here would tend to be more cosmopolitan rather than more local-

istic than people in the other sectors. One might expect that if sector five's age distribution is skewed toward the high end relative to the other sectors, this could 'explain' the higher localism in this sector. But sector five's age distribution is not especially skewed toward the high end. One is therefore drawn back to the speculation that it is sector five's geographic proximity to Hamilton that accounts for the localism of the sector's residents.

Summary of findings

The data indicate generally that the respondents as a whole do perceive themselves to be members of at least one community in the town of Burlington. The number of perceived communities cannot be deduced from the data - that is, whether the respondents perceive people in the whole town as a single community, or whether the respondents perceive multiple communities within the town. The importance attached to the town and county boundaries suggests that the respondents perceive communities based in these two areas. The low number of respondents in three of the seven sectors exacerbates the problem of determining the number of communities perceived and their location. There are indications that the respondents in sector five, abutting Hamilton to the west, have a rather particular perception of community. These people may therefore constitute a separate community, while perhaps perceiving a second level of community based in the town as a whole, and a third level based on the county. The data are quite conclusive in indicating that people in Hamilton are not members of communities perceived by the respondents. While the majority of

respondents prefer the existing town and county boundaries, a sizable number of the respondents would seem to be either favourably inclined or at least not disinclined to a regional government that would include Oakville. This suggests either that a community is perceived that geographically extends to include Oakville, or that a community of this extent and location could develop in the future.

Because there is a lack of comparable data from other studies, the strength of perceptions cannot adequately be determined. Also, of course, the index of subjective attachment seems faulty. As a whole, the respondents are more localistic than most of Dye's suburban residents, but not as localistic as the people studied in Haldimand and Norfolk counties. The Burlington respondents tend toward the subjective attachment pole's strong end, but are not so near that pole that it would seem impossible for a perception of community to develop that would include people in Oakville.

In the following chapter, interactions of the respondents are to be examined. The behavioural patterns may shed some light on the territorial extent of perceived community or communities.

CHAPTER SIX

THE TEST CASE - OBJECTIVE COMMUNITY

This chapter has two main parts. The first part deals with analysis of data relating to the behavioural patterns of the respondents, examining the territorial locations of a range of interactions, and examining the strength of the interactive patterns among the seven demarcated sectors of Burlington and of these sectors with the areas surrounding the town. The second part involves an analysis of the relationships between indicators of subjective community on the one hand and indicators of objective community on the other hand.

Patterns of interaction

In Chapter 4, it was suggested that analysis of recurring interactions may facilitate the geographic locating of communities. Initially, it was thought that interactions might cluster into three groups - those involving transportation, those involving media communication, and those involving face-to-face social contacts. There are, however, several problems with this trichotomy.

The distinction between the three kinds of interaction networks is not analytically clear-cut. It was emphasized earlier that the physical movement of individuals in itself is not a reflection of, nor contributes to, perceived community; it is only those movements that are initiated by or result in interaction with other people that are of concern. It follows from this that transportation networks per se are not of much interest. Therefore, it would seem that the analysis to follow might more properly proceed on the basis of a two-way distinction, between media communication and social contacts. However, here too one runs into difficulties, for the distinction is really rather a false one in that communication is, at least partly, a manifestation of

social contacts. It is difficult, moreover, to distinguish between communication for social reasons from communication for other reasons - business, for example. The difficulty lies in determining the purpose or result of communication, a problem general to analyses of mail flow, where the content and purpose and reaction cannot easily be determined.

Evidence that a distinction between transportation, communication, and social networks is not analytically helpful is found in the results of a factor analysis of twenty indicators of objective community used in the present research.¹ Of the twenty, it was thought originally that seven could be related primarily to non-transportative communication; ten to social contacts primarily; and one, a composite index of eight place-of-interaction variables, to transportation primarily. The two other indicators could not reasonably be placed under any of these headings, and the categorization of the other eighteen was sometimes unsatisfactorily arbitrary. In any case, the results of the factor analysis (varimax rotation) indicate that using such a tri-chotomy is not fruitful. There was of course only the one primarily transportation variable, so there could not have been a transportation factor identified, but the other nineteen variables did not cluster into two groups at all well, as table 22 in Appendix A indicates. None

¹the twenty are number of newspapers read; source of newspapers; origin of television broadcasts; origin of radio broadcasts; number of neighbours known well; respondent's holding an elected office; other person in the household holding an elected office; percentages of close friends in Burlington, Oakville, Toronto, and Hamilton; adult relatives in Burlington; telephone calls per week to Toronto, Oakville, and Hamilton; number of organizational memberships; location of memberships; frequency of church attendance; home ownership; and percentage of activities that take place in the respondent's sector of residence.

of the seven factors identified consisted entirely of more than two variables in the communication or social networks categories.

No second factor run was done after eliminating variables having little discriminatory value, for each of the twenty variables had at least one varimax loading of at least plus or minus .3500 on the seven factors.

In light of these findings, it appears impracticable on the present data to proceed with analysis according to three networks of interaction. Instead, the analysis relates sector of residence to kinds of interaction, in particular to determine the extent to which eight kinds of interaction are based in one or another of the seven sectors in Burlington, or in one or another of the four areas outside the town. The eight interactions relate to work, schooling, attending church, weekly grocery shopping, other shopping (e.g. appliances, furniture, clothing), entertainment, recreation, and close friends. It is only for these eight that the data are available according to the sector in Burlington (or area outside) where they are based. The last one is not quite like the other seven in that the question did not ask where the respondent most often goes to visit close friends, but asked instead where most of the respondent's close friends live. It seems reasonable to expect that there is movement, or at least communication, between friends' residences and respondents' residences, and this variable is therefore treated like the other seven.

For the respondents as a whole, Table 13 indicates where each

interactivity takes place, either exclusively or partly (some respondents indicated that an interaction was based in more than one sector or area).

Table 13
Location of activities (%)

	entirely within one sector							west north east south				
activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	other
work	1.2	.7	2.9	4.2	3.9	12.7	9.3	36.0	1.2	23.0	1.7	3.0
school	5.3	2.4	13.9	1.2	14.3	12.7	36.7	4.1	1.2	2.9	-	5.2
church	2.4	.4	10.2	1.6	13.9	29.0	31.8	5.3	1.6	2.4	-	1.2
grocery shopping	.5	.3	3.6	2.8	13.0	23.2	50.1	1.3	.3	1.5	-	3.6
other shopping	.3	-	.8	3.5	.3	18.0	44.8	9.9	.3	7.3	.8	14.2
entertainment	-	.3	1.4	1.4	.8	14.8	15.6	25.8	.5	24.9	1.4	13.2
recreation	6.5	.6	5.0	.9	4.7	19.5	13.6	20.4	3.0	12.4	2.1	11.3
friends	1.5	-	5.1	1.5	5.4	13.8	20.9	13.5	1.5	12.5	.8	23.5

work n= 408 school n=245 church n= 245 grocery shopping n= 393
other shopping n= 395 entertainment n= 365 recreation n= 338
friends n= 392

In the 'other' area category is included answers that the activity took place entirely in two or more sectors within Burlington. When these are added to the figures for the seven sectors combined, one finds as follows:

activity	Location of activities (%)				t	n
	entirely in Burlington	Hamilton	Oakville/ Toronto	other		
work	35.9	36.0	23.0	4.9	99.8	408
schooling	88.5	4.1	2.9	4.4	99.9	245
attending church	89.3	5.3	2.4	2.8	99.8	245
grocery shopping	95.8	1.3	1.5	1.6	100.2	393
other shopping	71.5	9.9	7.3	11.5	100.2	395
entertainment	37.6	25.8	24.9	11.8	100.1	365
recreation	54.9	20.4	12.4	12.3	100.0	338
friends	59.7	13.5	12.5	14.3	100.0	392

It is of interest to compare the work location percentages for the respondents with data collected in 1969 by the Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth local government review. The review reported that 37.9%

of Burlington's labour force was employed in Burlington, 41.9% in the Hamilton area, and 20.2% elsewhere, presumably referring mainly to Oakville and Toronto.² These figures seem to be the most directly comparable to the present data, and it appears from the comparison that a decreasing proportion of Burlington's work force is employed in the Hamilton area (5.9% decrease) and an increasing proportion is employed eastward (2.8% increase). The percentage employed in Burlington decreased by two per cent. No comparable data are available for the other kinds of interaction. For seven of the eight kinds of interaction, a larger percentage have reference to the Hamilton area than to the Oakville/Toronto area. The exception is weekly grocery shopping, where the percentage difference in Oakville/Toronto's favour is only .2%.

No radio or television stations broadcast from Burlington or Oakville. Of the 407 respondents who answered the question on television viewing, 11.8% watch Hamilton television exclusively or mainly, 4.7% watch both Hamilton and Toronto stations, and 35.4% watch Toronto television exclusively or mainly. The figures for radio listening are: 36.7% listen to Hamilton stations mainly or exclusively, 6.3% listen to both Hamilton and Toronto stations, and 55.3% listen to Toronto stations mainly or exclusively. Two weekly and no daily newspapers are published in Burlington. Only .7% of the 433 respondents read only Burlington newspapers; 28.4% read only Hamilton papers; 28.9% read newspapers from both Burlington and Hamilton; 14.3% read newspapers from Burlington, Hamilton and Toronto; 19.4% read newspapers from Toronto and

² Ontario. Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review Report and Recommendations (November, 1969), p. 44.

Hamilton; 3.0% read newspapers from both Burlington and Toronto; and 5.3% read only Toronto newspapers. Data on the three media of communication are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15
Origin of media of communication (%)

<u>media</u>	<u>origin</u>		
	<u>at least partly</u> <u>Burlington</u>	<u>at least partly</u> <u>Hamilton</u>	<u>at least partly</u> <u>Toronto</u>
television	-	16.5	40.1
radio	-	43.0	61.6
newspapers	46.9	91.0	42.0

The predominance of Toronto's non-print media is clear, but Hamilton dominates the newspaper medium to a greater extent than Toronto's domination of the non-print media.

The respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of close friends living in the Town of Burlington, and in each of Oakville, Toronto, and Hamilton. It is clear from Table 16 that the respondents are, on the basis of this indicator, more closely tied to Hamilton than to Oakville. It is interesting to note also that the social ties eastward are stronger toward Toronto than toward Oakville. Thus there is a leap-frog effect.

Table 16
Residence of close friends (%)

<u>% of close friends</u>	<u>Burlington</u>	<u>Oakville</u>	<u>Toronto</u>	<u>Hamilton</u>
none	5.6	61.4	29.6	29.1
1 to 24%	38.1	34.5	53.4	44.2
25 to 50%	24.3	3.4	10.7	16.5
51 to 75%	17.3	.5	4.7	7.4
more than 75%	14.6	.2	1.6	2.8

Questions regarding the number of telephone calls per week made by the respondents to Toronto, Oakville, and Hamilton were asked, and the results are given in Table 17. Since the respondents were not asked to differentiate telephone calls for business purposes from calls for

other purposes, it is presumed that the answers are for all purposes combined.

Table 17
Telephone calls per week (%)

<u>number of calls</u>	<u>Toronto</u>	<u>Oakville</u>	<u>Hamilton</u>
none, or fewer			
than 1 per week	52.7	75.2	22.2
1 to 3	40.7	20.7	38.4
4 to 6	4.0	2.6	15.0
7 to 9	-	.3	3.4
10 to 12	1.6	.9	12.1
13 to 15	.5	.3	2.2
16 or more	.5	-	6.6
t	100.0	100.0	99.9
n	376	347	406

These data are similar to the data on residence of close friends in that a stronger tie to Hamilton than to Oakville is shown, and also a tie to Toronto that by-passes Oakville.

Data are available also on the number of organizations the respondents or other members of their household belong to, and where the organizations are based (some or all in Burlington, some or all in Oakville, some or all in Hamilton, and some or all in other places). Seventy-five of the respondents (16.8% of the 446) indicated that neither they nor other members of their household belong to organizations, and an additional 24 respondents (5.4%) did not answer the question. Of the remaining 360 respondents who both indicated that they belong to organizations and the location base of those organizations, 81.9% belong to organizations based in Burlington, 9.2% based in Oakville, 40.6% based in Hamilton, and 27.8% based in 'other' places. It seems probable that a large proportion of the 'other' places refer to Toronto. If this is the case, then again a pattern is seen of strong tie to Hamilton, weak tie to Oakville, and a stronger tie to Toronto than to Oak-

ville.

There are no other interaction variables for which data are available according to place outside the town of Burlington. However, consideration of the answers to the four cognitive questions is appropriate here. In summary form, the data are given in Table 18.

question	Table 18 Cognition (%)			t	n
	do not know name	wrong name or no name	correct name given		
mayor of Burlington	6.7	1.8	91.5	100.0	433
Burlington's county	.7	2.5	96.8	100.0	440
mayor of Hamilton	7.1	1.6	91.3	100.0	439
mayor of Oakville	75.4	2.1	22.4	99.9	419

In coding the answers, categories were established for specific wrong names, in the expectation that there may be some confusion. No respondents, in answering the question regarding the mayor of Burlington, wrote in the name of a mayor of Hamilton, Oakville, Toronto, or the chairman of Metro Toronto. Four respondents thought Burlington is in Wentworth County rather than Halton County, and none wrote down Peel County. No respondents, in answering the question regarding the mayor of Hamilton, supplied the name of a mayor of Burlington, Oakville, Toronto, or the chairman of Metro Toronto. There was similarly no confusion about the name of the mayor of Oakville. The four questions were considered to be only minimal measures of cognition. The difficulty with asking such questions on a mailed questionnaire is that it is not possible to prevent the respondent, if he or she does not know the answer, from asking someone else. It was for this reason that so few questions on cognition were posed on the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the difference in percentage of correct answers to the names of the mayors of Hamilton and Oakville is startling, the former being correctly

identified almost exactly as frequently as the mayor of Burlington.

From the analysis to this point, the greater influence of Hamilton relative to Oakville is clear. Of the twelve indicators for which it is possible to compare the influence of Hamilton with that of Oakville and Toronto, Hamilton's influence is stronger on eleven, and Oakville/Toronto is very marginally stronger on the twelfth (weekly grocery shopping). Oakville has no radio or television stations, and none of the respondents reported reading a newspaper from Oakville, so Hamilton's influence can be compared only with that of Toronto for these media. Toronto fares better than Hamilton on the two non-print media, while Hamilton fares better in terms of newspaper readership.

The percentages of objective indicators answered by each respondent that have a geographic reference to 1) the respondent's sector of residence, 2) Burlington as a whole, 3) Hamilton, 4) north, 5) Oakville/Toronto, and 6) south, were calculated. Only for eight of the interactions is data available by sector of Burlington. Other interaction variables treat Burlington as an undifferentiated whole. For example, of the appropriate objective indicator questions answered by the respondent, the number of interactions that take place in the respondent's sector of residence was determined, and calculated as a percentage of those indicator questions the respondent answered. Thus if the respondent lives in sector one, and indicates that interactions of work, schooling, attending church, grocery shopping, other shopping, entertainment, recreation, and friends all take place in sector one, the respondent engages in 100% of these interactions exclusively or partly in the home sector. If only six of the interaction questions are answered, and all six take place in the home sector, the figure is still 100%. If none

of these interactions, though answered, takes place in the home sector, the figure is 0%. Table 19 presents the data relating to eight interactions based in the sector of residence, both overall, and by sector.³

Table 19
% of interactions taking place in the sector of residence (%)

	sector of residence							
% of up to 8 interactions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	overall
0%	17.6	57.1	25.0	57.1	28.9	16.5	11.1	19.7
1 to 25%	58.8	42.9	28.8	35.7	19.7	11.9	8.0	16.9
26 to 50%	17.6	-	38.5	-	38.2	39.4	40.7	36.8
51 to 75%	5.9	-	7.7	7.1	13.2	20.2	25.9	18.3
76 to 100%	-	-	-	-	-	11.9	14.2	8.2
t	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9
n	17	7	52	14	76	109	162	437

Whether or not the respondents can meet all these eight kinds of interactive needs in their own sector of residence, it is clear from Table 19 that they do not. Of the four sectors with reasonable Ns, sector five, abutting Hamilton, and sector three are the most interesting in that none of the sectors' respondents engage in more than 75% of the interactions exclusively or partly in their own sector of residence. The residents of these sectors would therefore seem particularly dependent on people in other areas, either within Burlington, or outside the town. The respondents in sector seven, bordering Oakville, are the least dependent on people outside their own sector of residence.

Table 20 presents similar data, this time regarding the percentage of up to thirteen interactions answered that take place in Burlington (regardless of whether in the sector of residence or not).⁴ Here again,

³The eight relate to work, schooling, attending church, grocery shopping, other shopping, entertainment, recreation, and friends.

⁴The thirteen relate to work, schooling, attending church, grocery shopping, other shopping, entertainment, recreation, friends, previous

one can see that whether or not the respondents can meet all these kinds of interactive needs in Burlington, they do not do so. Almost a third

Table 20
% of interactions taking place in Burlington (%)
sector of residence

% of up to 13 interactions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	overall
0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 to 25%	5.9	42.9	5.8	14.3	9.2	.9	3.7	5.3
26 to 50%	29.4	28.6	19.2	28.6	28.9	30.3	22.8	25.9
51 to 75%	47.1	14.3	46.2	42.9	42.1	45.0	51.9	46.7
76 to 100%	17.6	14.3	28.8	14.3	19.7	23.9	21.6	22.2
t	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.1
n	17	7	52	14	76	109	162	437

of the respondents overall (31.2%) meet less than half their interactive needs exclusively or partly within the boundaries of the town. Overall, a very small number of interactions (approximately forty) take place wholly or partly north of Burlington. Also, only thirty-one respondents, involving about forty-two interactions, engage in any interactions south of Burlington across the bridge. Thirteen of the thirty-one respondents live in sector seven, and eleven live in sector six. Therefore, it is obvious that interactions based outside Burlington take place mainly in or from Hamilton on the west and Oakville/Toronto on the east.

The greater frequency of links to Hamilton than to Oakville/Toronto is clear from a comparison of Tables 21 and 22. Of the four sectors of residence having reasonable Ns, the respondents in sector five most often have the most links with Hamilton, and the fewest links with Oakville/Toronto. See figures 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 later in

residence, origin of newspapers, adult relatives in Burlington, location of organizations, and percentage of close friends (when any) living in Burlington.

this chapter for diagrams representing the links, on eight interactions, by sector of residence with Hamilton compared with Oakville/Toronto.

Table 21
% of interactions taking place in Hamilton (%)*
sector of residence

% of up to 15 interactions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	overall
0%	5.9	-	-	7.1	-	-	2.5	1.4
1 to 25%	47.1	28.6	28.8	35.7	18.4	33.0	36.4	31.8
26 to 50%	29.4	42.9	38.5	21.4	44.7	47.7	43.8	43.0
51 to 75%	17.6	14.3	26.9	28.6	31.6	15.6	14.2	19.7
76 to 100%	-	14.3	5.8	7.1	5.3	3.7	3.1	4.1
t	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	17	7	52	14	76	109	162	437

*the fifteen are similar to those in footnote 4, excluding adult relatives, but adding origin of television and radio broadcasts, telephone calls (when any) to Hamilton, and percentage of close friends (when any) living in Hamilton.

Table 22
% of interactions taking place in Oakville/Toronto (%)*
sector of residence

% of up to 17 interactions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	overall
0%	-	-	5.8	7.1	2.6	7.3	3.7	4.6
1 to 25%	58.8	42.9	53.8	50.0	57.9	45.0	38.9	46.7
26 to 50%	23.5	28.6	26.9	28.6	31.6	39.4	43.2	36.8
51 to 75%	17.6	14.3	11.5	14.3	7.9	8.3	12.3	10.8
76 to 100%	-	14.3	1.9	-	-	-	1.9	1.1
t	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	17	7	52	14	76	109	162	437

*the seventeen are similar to those in footnote 4, excluding adult relatives, but adding origin of television and radio broadcasts, telephone calls (when any) to Toronto and to Oakville, and percentages of close friends (when any) living in Toronto and living in Oakville.

The above analysis indicates that, whether or not it is possible to meet all the interactive needs in each of the sectors of residence, sizable proportions of the respondents in each sector do not do so. Of course a larger percentage of the respondents can and do meet most of the interactive needs in Burlington as a whole, but even so the proportion of respondents who meet more than half their interactive needs in the Town as a whole is not particularly large. Overall, 68.9% of the

respondents meet more than half their interactive needs entirely or partly in the Town. Variations according to sector of residence are interesting. Of the four sectors of residence having reasonable Ns, the respondents in sector three are the least dependent on their sector of residence (i.e. having more than 50% of interactions based at least partly in the sector of residence) but the most dependent on Burlington as a whole (i.e. having more than 50% of interactions based at least partly in Burlington). The respondents in sector five also have a low level of self sufficiency in their sector of residence, but are the most dependent on areas outside Burlington, for only 61.8% of the respondents in sector five have more than 50% of the interactions taken into account based at least partly in Burlington. Variations in dependence on Hamilton on the one hand and on Oakville/Toronto on the other hand are shown for the four sectors in Table 23.

Table 23
Respondents having more than half their interactions in Hamilton
and in Oakville/Toronto by area of residence (%)

<u>sector</u>	<u>Oakville/</u>		<u>n</u>
	<u>Hamilton</u>	<u>Toronto</u>	
3	32.7	13.4	52
5	36.9	7.9	76
6	19.3	8.3	109
7	17.3	14.2	162
over all 7 sectors	23.8	11.9	437

The considerably stronger ties of the respondents to Hamilton than to Oakville/Toronto cannot be in doubt, at least in so far as they are based on the kinds of interactions examined.

Now, the links among the sectors of residence within Burlington are examined. It is possible to examine these links only for eight variables: place of work, place of schooling, place of church, place of weekly grocery shopping, place of other shopping, place of entertainment, place

of recreation, and place of close friends. The links among sectors are shown in diagrams one to eight. The strength of the links cannot be gauged from the diagrams. For the strength of links it is necessary to refer to tables 12 to 19 in Appendix A.

Examination of the diagrams (and of tables 12 to 19 in Appendix A) reveals several patterns of interconnection. For all eight kinds of interaction, there are reciprocal links between sectors six and seven. That is, for each kind of interaction there are people crossing the boundary between the two sectors in both directions. This is the only pair of sectors reciprocally linked so strongly. The next strongest linked pair are sectors three and six, with six reciprocal links. One other pair of sectors is reciprocally linked on more than half the eight kinds of interaction - sectors four and seven are so linked on five kinds of interaction. Table 24 summarizes the links between each possible pair of sectors.

Table 24
Linkages between sectors of residence*
sector of residence

sector of residence	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	0,1					
3	1,1	0,2				
4	0,6	0,1	4,3			
5	0,5	0,4	0,6	0,4		
6	2,5	0,2	6,2	2,5	4,4	
7	2,6	0,4	4,3	5,2	3,5	8,0

*the first number in each cell is the number of reciprocal links. The second number in each cell is the number of unreciprocal links (unidirectional).

Examination of combinations of three sectors reveals that the strongest reciprocal links are among sectors six, seven, and three, there being three interrelationships that are all reciprocal, and four other interrelationships that are not all reciprocal. Sectors five,

Figure 1
Work interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by work - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

<u>Figure 2</u> <u>Work links outside Burlington</u>		
Hamilton (west)		Oakville-Toronto (east)
5.9	sector 1	42.1
42.9	sector 2	28.6
32.0	sector 3	20.0
35.7	sector 4	14.3
60.6	sector 5	13.6
32.7	sector 6	17.8
31.3	sector 7	30.0

Figure 3
School interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by school - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

Figure 4
School links outside Burlington

Hamilton (west)	<u>School links outside Burlington</u>	Oakville-Toronto (east)
10.0	sector 1	-
-	sector 2	-
2.9	sector 3	-
14.3	sector 4	-
4.4	sector 5	4.4
10.5	sector 6	-
.9	sector 7	4.7

Figure 5
Church interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by church - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

Figure 6
Church links outside Burlington

Hamilton (west)		Oakville-Toronto (east)
-	sector 1	-
-	sector 2	33.3
6.9	sector 3	-
-	sector 4	-
7.3	sector 5	2.4
5.6	sector 6	-
5.2	sector 7	4.1

Figure 7
Grocery shopping interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by grocery shopping - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

Figure 8
Grocery shopping links outside Burlington

Hamilton (west)		Oakville-Toronto (east)
6.2	sector 1	12.5
-	sector 2	14.3
-	sector 3	-
-	sector 4	-
4.5	sector 5	-
1.0	sector 6	1.0
-	sector 7	1.4

Figure 9
Non-grocery shopping interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by non-grocery shopping - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

Figure 10
Non-grocery shopping links outside Burlington

Hamilton (west)		Oakville-Toronto (east)
12.5	sector 1	12.5
28.6	sector 2	28.6
16.7	sector 3	4.2
14.3	sector 4	7.1
13.6	sector 5	6.1
7.2	sector 6	7.2
6.2	sector 7	7.5

Figure 11
Entertainment interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by entertainment - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

Figure 12
Entertainment links outside Burlington

Hamilton (west)		Oakville-Toronto (east)
28.6	sector 1	14.3
50.0	sector 2	50.0
35.6	sector 3	13.3
33.3	sector 4	25.0
31.0	sector 5	31.0
20.4	sector 6	22.6
21.9	sector 7	27.7

Figure 13
Recreation interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by recreation - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

Figure 14
Recreation links outside Burlington

Hamilton (west)		Oakville-Toronto (east)
7.7	sector 1	-
50.0	sector 2	33.3
28.2	sector 3	7.7
36.4	sector 4	18.2
26.4	sector 5	7.5
18.2	sector 6	10.2
15.6	sector 7	17.2

Figure 15
Friends interrelationships of sectors of residence*

*each numbered circle represents a sector of residence. Lines between the circles represent links by friends - broken lines represent one-way links, the arrow indicating the direction. Unbroken lines represent reciprocal links.

<u>Figure 16</u>		<u>Friends links outside Burlington</u>	
Hamilton (west)			Oakville-Toronto (east)
13.3	sector 1		20.0
14.3	sector 2		28.6
19.1	sector 3		10.6
30.8	sector 4		-
19.7	sector 5		10.6
9.3	sector 6		12.4
10.4	sector 7		13.9

six, and seven are all interlinked on all eight kinds of interaction, but there are only two interrelationships that are all reciprocal. The number of connections among the sectors is, of course, lower when one considers groups of four or more sectors, and one also encounters the problem of low numbers of respondents in three sectors.

Aside from the low numbers of respondents in three of the seven sectors, there is the general problem of the arbitrary definition of the seven sectors. Were one to use different boundaries, or more sectors, the results might well be different from those above. Given the way the data were collected, it is not possible to analyze the data on the basis of more sectors and/or different boundary definitions, but at least the town need not be considered an undifferentiated whole. The analysis suggests that sectors six and seven, bordering each other, are strongly interconnected, and that sector three (to the north of sector six) and sector five (to the west of sector six) are also fairly strongly connected to sectors six and seven, though not to each other. (See the map in Appendix B for the relative positions of the sectors.) Sectors one and two seem rather remote from the other sectors, in having few interrelationships, especially reciprocal ones, with any other sectors, though one cannot make much of this finding in light of the very few respondents in the two sectors. Sector two has no reciprocal relationships at all, and only fourteen (out of a possible 48) links with the other sectors. Sector one has only five reciprocal links, and a total of 29 links with the other sectors.

Sector five is also interesting in having few (seven) reciprocal links with the other sectors in the town, though it has a total of 35 relationships (out of a possible 48). These figures indicate that the

respondents in sector five, bordering Hamilton, are dependent upon the other sectors of the town to a much greater extent than the other sectors are dependent on sector five. This lopsidedness is the most pronounced of any of the seven sectors, though sector one, comprising the northern rural half of the town, is almost as one-sided in its relationships with the other sectors in the town.

Relationship between subjective community and indicators of objective community

A total of thirty variables were included in the factor analysis to examine the relationship between subjective community and indicators of objective community. These included the five items of the index of local-cosmopolitanism, the three items of the index of subjective attachment, the score on the two indices, the percentage of activities that take place in the respondent's sector of residence, the four questions regarding the percentages of close friends in the four cities or towns, the three questions on telephone calls, number and origins of newspapers, origins of television and radio broadcasts, home ownership, knowing neighbours, the two questions on elected positions, adult relatives in Burlington, number and location of organizational memberships, and frequency of church attendance. The results are given in table 23 of Appendix A.

Two variables were considered to be the most clearly indicative of perceptions of community - score on the Alford and Scoble index of subjective attachment, and score on Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism. On the varimax (rotational) factor analysis, these two variables were the key variables in two principal factors, score on the Alford

and Scoble index having a load of .9507 on one factor, and score on Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism having a load of .9758 on another factor. These two factors were the most important of the eleven factors identified, accounting for 9.2516 % of variance and 10.7468 % of variance respectively. No other factor accounted for more than 6.41 % of variance. The results of the factor analysis are not very encouraging to those who would rely on objective indicators to locate perceived communities.

Considering first the factor on which score on the subjective attachment index has the highest loading, one finds that the objective variables do not fare well. Those variables that have loadings greater than plus or minus .2 are listed, in descending order, in Table 25.

Table 25

<u>Varimax loadings of variables on two factors.</u>			
<u>subjective attachment factor</u>		<u>local-cosmopolitanism factor</u>	
score on A-S index	.9507	score on Dye index	.9758
A-S Q3 (satisfied)	-.8632	Dye Q5 (local roots)	.7471
A-S Q2 (moving out)	.8347	Dye Q4 (big cities)	.6778
A-S Q1 (good place to live)	.2668	Dye Q3 (newcomers)	.6341
Dye Q3 (newcomers)	-.2509	Dye Q2 (papers and TV)	.6204
% friends in Burlington	-.2375	Dye Q1 (local clubs)	.4828
		A-S Q2 (moving out)	-.2133
		score on A-S index	-.2128
		frequency church attend.	-.2038

Only one objective variable is included in this list, and it has the lowest loading of the six. The percentage of activities that take place in the respondent's sector of residence has (with percentage of friends in Toronto) the smallest loading of the thirty. Thus is underlined the necessity of using social survey techniques to acquire data on subjective attachment to communities. Objective indicators are, on the whole, not reliable indicators of subjective attachment as measured

by this index (which was found earlier to be a poor scale).

Looking now at the second factor, on which score on the local-cosmopolitanism index has the highest loading, only one objective variable is included in the list (Table 25) of variables having loadings greater than plus or minus .2 - frequency of church attendance, and it is lowest on the list. The percentage of activities that take place in the respondent's sector of residence fares less badly on this factor than on the other, but has a loading of only .0926.

Again, it was considered unnecessary to do a second factor run after eliminating variables having little discriminatory value, for each of the thirty variables had at least one varimax loading of at least plus or minus .4600 on the eleven factors.

Relying on available census or traffic movement data to locate perceived communities would certainly make the task of data collection much easier than large scale social survey research. However, the analysis above indicates quite clearly that one cannot and ought not rely on such data, for they do not reflect perceptions of community at all well. Of course the usefulness of the measures of perceived community can themselves be questioned, particularly the index of subjective attachment, for the previous chapter has shown that the three question-items comprising the Alford and Scoble index do not on the present data constitute a good scale. Nor were either of the two indices designed to help geographically locate perceived communities. However, no better measure of perceptions of community can be constructed from the present data.

Effects of independent variables on patterns of interaction

The effects of a number of independent variables on percentages of interactions based in the sector of residence, in Burlington as a whole, in Hamilton, and in Oakville/Toronto; and on percentages of close friends in Burlington and in Hamilton are now examined. As before, only sectors three, five, six, and seven are considered separately because of the low numbers of respondents in the other three.

1) age. When all seven sectors are combined, there are no coefficients of correlation between age and the six dependent variables greater than plus or minus .198 (-.198 for percentage of close friends in Burlington - significant at .05 level). When the data are examined by sector of residence, it is found that age is more strongly correlated with percentage of interactions based in the home sector in sector five than in the others (for sector five, $r = -.312$; for all seven sectors combined, $r = -.089$. None of the coefficients are significant at the .05 level). Thus in sector five as age increases the percentage of interactions based in the sector of residence declines whereas in the other sectors age has almost no effect. Age has little differential effect on the other five dependent variables, whether the sectors are controlled or not.

2) occupation. When all seven sectors are combined there is no coefficient of correlation stronger than plus or minus .169 between occupational status and the six dependent variables. Sector five stands out in having a coefficient of correlation of $-.370$ (not significant at the .05 level) between occupational status and percentage of interactions based in Burlington, compared to all seven sectors combined

($r = -.084$, not significant at .05 level). In sector five the percentage of interactions based in Burlington tends to decline as occupational status rises. Sectors five and six also differ from the other two sectors in having stronger correlations between occupational status and percentage of interactions based in Oakville/Toronto (for sector five, $r = .324$; for sector six, $r = .326$; for all seven sectors combined $r = .169$. Only the last is significant at the .05 level). Finally, sector five also has the strongest correlation ($r = -.339$, not significant at .05 level) between occupational status and percentage of close friends in Burlington. For all seven sectors combined, r equals $-.054$ (not significant at .05 level). Thus the respondents in sector five tend to have a decreasing percentage of close friends in Burlington as occupational status rises.

3) education. The effects of education on the six dependent variables are almost the same as those of occupational status. For percentage of interactions based in Burlington, r for sector five is $-.328$, while for all sectors combined r equals $-.085$ (neither significant at .05 level). Regarding percentage of interactions based in Oakville/Toronto, r for sector three is $.354$; for sector five, $r = .313$; for all seven sectors combined $r = .174$ (only the last is significant at the .05 level). Thus in sectors three and five the percentage of interactions based in Oakville/Toronto tends more strongly to increase as education level rises. Again, sector five has a stronger coefficient of correlation ($r = -.323$, not significant at .05 level) between education and percentage of close friends in Burlington than the other sectors (for all seven sectors combined, r is $-.106$, not significant at .05 level).

4) income. Level of income has little effect on any of the six dependent variables, either for all sectors combined, or by sector of residence.

5) length of residence in Burlington. Two of the six dependent variables are affected by length of residence, though half the coefficients of correlation for these two are not significant at the .05 level or better. The coefficients of correlation are:

	sector 3	sector 5	sector 6	sector 7	all 7 sectors
% interactions in Burlington	.456	.332	.293	.296*	.281*
% friends in Burlington	.330	.479*	.327	.391*	.368*

*these figures are significant at the .05 level

As length of residence increases, both the percentages of interactions based in Burlington and close friends in Burlington tend to rise.

6) home ownership. In sector five, the correlation between home ownership and only one of the six dependent variables is notably stronger than for the other sectors. For the percentage of interactions based in Burlington, the correlation with home ownership for sector five is -.403 (significant at .05 level), compared to a figure of -.065 (not significant at .05 level) for all sectors combined. In sector five, home owners tend to engage in a higher percentage of interactions in Burlington than do those who rent.

7) number of neighbours known well. As an independent variable, the number of neighbours known well has little effect on any of the six dependent variables, either when all seven sectors are combined, or when the four sectors are examined separately. This variable has also been examined as a dependent variable, and some variations of note are found in cross-tabulations of it with the six independent variables

above. There is a strong difference by sector when the variable is correlated with occupation. For sector three, r is .442 (significant at .05 level) and for sector five, r is -.282 (not significant at .05 level). Thus in sector three as occupational status rises the number of neighbours known well tends to increase, while in sector five the number of neighbours known well tends to decrease. Length of residence in Burlington correlates rather strongly and significantly with the number of neighbours known well for sector six (r .426, significant at .05 level), compared to sector three, where r is .134 (not significant at .05 level). Similarly, home ownership has a stronger impact on the number of neighbours known well for sector six (r -.368, significant at .05 level) than for the other sectors, especially sector three, where r is -.003 (not significant at .05 level). Especially in sector six, therefore, home owners tend to know more neighbours well than do those who rent.

Analysis of the effects on the seven dependent variables of the independent variables for which sector of residence was controlled indicates that all of them have some effect, in that all of the independent variables are significantly (at the .05 level) correlated with at least one of the seven dependent variables. Length of residence and number of neighbours known well have effects on the most (four out of seven) dependent variables. Only twenty-two out of a total of 210 coefficients of correlation exceed plus or minus .300, and only eight of the twenty-two are significant at the .05 level. Four of the eight are for length of residence.

As was found earlier, in the analysis of the effects of the independent variables on subjective community, sector five appears to be rather different from the other sectors in terms of the effects the independent variables have on the dependent variables.

CONCLUSION TO PART THREE

In Part Three, an attempt has been made to effect an advance in the use of a community criterion as a boundary determinant, first by developing a new concept of community in terms that can be operationalized in social survey research, and then by testing that concept and techniques of analysis in an effort to locate any major deficiencies or problems in them. This conclusion is directed to a critique of the test application. A more general critique of our concept of community and its use as a boundary determinant is left to the Summary and Conclusion of the thesis.

The sample

The selection of the sample was random of the adult residents of Burlington who were eligible to vote in the 1972 federal election. Whether people younger than eighteen years of age should have been included in the population sampled is a moot point. To exclude these people is to exclude a fairly large proportion of the residents of an area. In the case of Burlington, they account for approximately 27% (about 24,000 people) of the resident population. There can be little doubt that the kinds of interaction engaging children are quite different from those engaging adults. In particular, children are likely to have a rather narrow range of interactions with a rather small number of people and based in a small geographic area. For younger children, the range of interactions is likely limited to those revolving around the family and school, in the main part. If one were to include children in the population sampled, one would expect that their perceptions of community, if any, would have reference to a particularly narrowly-defined

area. If one decides to exclude from a sampled population very young children, what ought to be the cut-off point? Setting the cut-off point at the legal age of maturity seems the most appropriate, for one must remember that it is for political purposes that the research is being conducted - to help determine the boundaries of political units. People younger than the legal age of maturity have rather limited opportunities to participate in political activities at the sub-national, national, and international levels.

On the other hand, legal adults' range of interactions are to some extent influenced by their children, if they have any. Adults' ranges of interaction can be both expanded and contracted by the presence of children in the household; expanded in terms of participating in matters of education for example, and narrowed in that time and attention spent on child-rearing reduces the time and opportunities available for other kinds of interaction.

A compromise of sorts can be effected by sampling adults, not as individuals, but as members of households, and therefore collecting data on interactions and perceptions of the members of households instead of individual adults. It is this sort of approach that was attempted in the data collection for the test application. Thus instead of the 1036 names in the original sample being viewed as representing approximately two per cent of the adult population in Burlington, they can be viewed as representing something in the order of six per cent of households in Burlington.

The main problem with the sample selected for data collection in Burlington is the very low numbers of completed questionnaires from

three of the seven demarcated sectors of the town. This resulted from the random sample selection, and the unequal populations in the seven sectors. What the populations of the seven sectors are was not known at the time the sample selection was done, and is not known now. The evidently unequal but unknown population sizes plus the fact that it could not readily be determined in which of the seven sectors the names on the electoral rolls resided made it impossible to use a stratified sampling technique, compensating for the low population in some sectors by increasing the proportion of the population sampled in those sectors. The inability to say much about the relationships that the respondents in the three sectors have with people in other sectors in the town or with people outside Burlington stems from the sampling procedure employed.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to pose only those questions which it was thought at the time were going to be necessary for data analysis. A considerable number of other questions, which it would have been of interest to ask, were not included because they were not thought to be of immediate importance to the analysis. It was considered essential to present the respondents with a questionnaire that could be completed within fifteen minutes, and which would not appear to be so complex as to dissuade people from completing and returning it.

All in all, the questionnaire used seems to have been a satisfactory research instrument, though not without some deficiencies. The 446 completed questionnaires represent 43.8% of the questionnaires sent out that were apparently deliverable. This rate of response is a rather good one for social surveys of this type, and seems to suggest that the at-

tempt to construct a questionnaire not too lengthy or complex was reasonably successful. The high response rate may well have been aided by widespread interest in Burlington at the time over regional government. Some indication of the level of interest in the subject can be seen in the frequency with which the respondents took up the suggestion of making additional comments. Many respondents filled up one or both of the blank back pages with lengthy and detailed comments, and some added extra pages of comments. Only two or three questionnaires were returned with comments that could be considered hostile to either this survey or to academic research generally.

Only one set of questions was not used in the analysis, and could therefore have been omitted from the questionnaire. These were questions that were supplementary to those asking where the respondent goes for certain purposes, such as work and church, and asked the mode of transport and the travel time for each of seven kinds of interaction. No useful method of analysis could be devised to make use of the answers to these supplementary questions.

In addition, there were several questions which posed problems either for the respondents or for the coding of the responses. The questions relating to television viewing and radio listening gave some difficulty to those respondents who did not usually listen to or watch a single station. Some respondents overcame the difficulty by giving more than one answer to each of these questions, which was easily taken into account in the coding, but other respondents wrote 'no one particular station' or something similar. There was also some, but not frequent, difficulty with the last series of questions, which required reference to the grid map of the town. Rather than indicating the number

of the sector or area on the map where interactive behaviour was based, some respondents simply put a checkmark in the answer space, perhaps meaning that they, rather than some other member of the household, did the weekly grocery shopping, went to church, or whatever. The question 'What is the number of the area on the map where ...' should have been restated in whole for each type of interactive behaviour, rather than only once at the beginning of the section. Like the questions on radio listening and television viewing, this last series of questions implied a single area for an answer. This too posed some difficulty for some respondents, who indicated that a particular kind of interaction was based in more than one area. Place of school was most frequently subject to this difficulty, in that a household's children attending secondary school may do so in a different sector or area than do the same household's children that attend primary school. Compensating for multiple answers in the coding was less satisfactory than it was for multiple answers to the questions on radio listening and television viewing, for there are too many permutations and combinations of sector and area numbers to permit separate coding categories. The coding scheme used did reflect to a reasonable degree instances where the interaction is based in multiple areas.

It was with some trepidation that the gridded map was used at all, for no instances of such a mapping technique having been used previously on mailed questionnaires could be found, and it was felt that the pre-test of the questionnaire was too rushed and limited to properly prove out the use of such a map. The concern seems to have been unwarranted, however. It is of course possible that the response rate might have been higher had the map not been used, but there seemed no alternative,

other than personal interviews, for the purposes of determining the geographic location of the various kinds of interactive behaviour. For those who did complete and return the questionnaire, the map seems to have presented little or no difficulty, aside from the problem noted earlier in the way the questions requiring reference to the map were posed. The rate of response to the questions referring to the map differed little from that to the other questions. Only one respondent seems to have had trouble - she commented that she had never been able to read maps, and proceeded to give very detailed reference points in answer to the questions. Using a street map of the town, her answers were easily translated into sector or area numbers. The matter of the number and size of demarcated sectors has been raised earlier and will be raised again in the Summary and Conclusion to this thesis, but on the whole the mapping technique devised appears to be a useful one, for it enables one to examine a study area in greater detail, rather than as an undifferentiated whole.

It is not difficult to come up with a long list of other questions that could have been asked on the questionnaire, but were not. The questions on cognition, for example, could have been much increased, but the utility of asking this kind of question on mailed questionnaires is debatable. Other attitudinal measures could have been added, for example in relation to political participation and alienation. Questions designed to construct new and better indicators of subjective community could have been asked. It is often hard but necessary to resist the temptation to add just a few more questions, for one must weigh the added benefit derived from asking more questions to the costs in terms of a possibly lower rate of response. The questionnaire that was used ap-

pears to have been a reasonably successful instrument in terms of getting adequate breadth and depth of data with a satisfactory response rate.

Data analysis

There are a number of other statistical techniques that one might have used in the data analysis. For example, much of the analysis was bi-variate, and none, aside from factor analysis, was more than tri-variate. One might therefore have tried to use additional controls on variables. However, given the number of respondents, further multivariate analysis would have tended to expand the number of cells to the point where too many cells would be empty. With the low number of respondents in three of the seven sectors, there are already a fair number of empty cells.

The test application seems to indicate that one can use mailed questionnaires to collect the kinds of data that our concept of community requires, though the personal interview technique would have enabled one to have more confidence that answers to cognitive questions, for example, were meaningful. Personal interviews might also have facilitated determination of geographic boundaries and locations of perceived communities. They might also have enabled one to be even more precise about the geographic location of interactions, but the mapping technique that was used seems to be a useful and relatively easy means of collecting such data in reasonable detail.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Concepts of community

The review, in Part One, of the literature on community made it clear that there is not one concept of community; rather there is a great variety of concepts, three of which were examined because they appeared to be representative and illustrative of a large and influential segment of the literature on community. They appeared to be the main schools of thought which have given rise to subsequent work. It is therefore not coincidental that the main works reviewed were first published some time ago. None of the three schools of thought was considered to be entirely adequate for the present purposes - that is, to aid in the determination of boundaries of units of government. In the case of the themes of community as common life and of community as social system, the theorizing was found to be too highly abstract to be suggestive of techniques for empirical research. In the case of the theme of community as human ecological system, the problem was rather different. Here, there was an abundance of possibilities for empirical research, but the theorizing was considered to be inadequate in that the theme does not take into account peoples' sentiments, emotions, and motivations. What one was therefore faced with was the necessity of developing yet another concept of community that would facilitate empirical research relating to boundary determination of political units.

This kind of boundary criterion was found to be mentioned rarely in the theoretical literature either on community or on local government. To determine the extent and frequency with which a connection between community and the determination of boundaries of local government is made in the non-theoretical literature, Part Two reviewed some forty-

seven studies, reports, and papers made public in Canada since 1953, and which were sponsored in whole or jointly by the provincial governments in Canada. The review is the most exhaustive undertaken in Canada to date, but it could have been expanded considerably by considering reports and papers prepared under the sponsorship of bodies and organizations other than the provinces and in countries other than Canada. If this thesis stimulates others to conduct further research, it will perhaps have helped the furthering of theorizing and research into the connection, both existing and ideal, between community and boundary determination. Few of the Canadian reports reviewed were especially instructive in terms of both proposing the use of a community criterion for boundary determination and indicating how the criterion might be operationalized to allow consideration of peoples' behaviour patterns and peoples' perceptions of community. The word community was used so often in so many of the reports and studies that clearly it is widely considered to be important, somehow, to local government. But the often imprecise usage of the word, and the scarcity of efforts to go beyond the use of rather primitive aggregate data analysis purportedly bearing on the locating of communities are indicative of the difficulty of using concepts at high levels of abstraction for specific purposes.

It was in an attempt to overcome this kind of difficulty and to make some advance over earlier work that Part Three began by developing a new concept of community in terms which could provide direction to empirical research on the matter at hand - boundary determination. It is hoped that others may be stimulated to pursue this effort to a greater level of sophistication. The test application of the concept of com-

munity that was developed should provide some ideas for improvement and further work. A single test case cannot be considered a thorough test of the concept and the research techniques. Perhaps Burlington is, after all, more nearly unique than originally thought. Perhaps people in most areas of settlement do not experience pulls from more than one direction. This may be true particularly in relation to the largest cities, where there are unlikely to be neighbouring external areas exerting influences that would detract from or weaken perceptions of community people in the largest cities may have. Even so, one ought not assume that highly urbanized populated areas are undifferentiated social masses, even though topographically such areas might appear to be undifferentiated urban masses. It is, after all, people rather than places or buildings that perceive communities, and therefore within an undifferentiated physical mass there may very well be a highly complex pattern of interrelationships operating among individuals and groups. It should not be impossible, using the techniques tested in Burlington or an improved version of them, to locate communities geographically out of the web of interrelationships in large cities. If peoples' perceptions and patterns of behaviour do not or cannot be expected to cover — the entire urban mass, then there seems little reason to expect that political units should do so, unless one adopts a point of view that the most important concern of political units is efficiency (however measured) in terms of planning, finance, administration, or whatever.

Such concerns need not be thrown to the wind, however. A concept of community need not be the sole determinant of the size and boundaries of political units. Nor does there need to be a political unit cor-

responding to each level of community that can be identified. It is argued that a community criterion should be the starting point in a process of boundary determination. That is, the process should begin by locating communities geographically, using techniques similar to those used in the test case. The effects of other considerations on the community boundaries can then be examined, and adjustments made to the boundaries as seem most appropriate. At the end of this process, there is a reasonable chance that the boundaries will reflect peoples' perceptions and patterns of interactive behaviour, at least to a higher degree than basing boundary determination on such criteria as a minimum population size, a minimum financial base, ease of planning and of constructing physical infrastructure, and so on. It is of course within the realm of possibility that one might settle on virtually the same boundaries in using the second approach as in using the first approach. The probability of such a coincidence is unknown, for the two approaches have not been tried simultaneously. Indeed, the former approach has not been used at all in Canada to date.

Problems and recommendations

The test case has pointed out several problem areas, but it is questionable whether they are indicative of major flaws in the concept of community developed. A main problem is what one ought to do when one finds considerable divergence between area(s) of community located by examining peoples' perceptions, and area(s) of community located by examining peoples' patterns of interaction. The test case has demonstrated that interaction need not always be integrative in terms of people perceiving those with whom they interact being members of perceived commun-

ities. The opposite kind of reaction seems to have been experienced by some of the respondents, in that there is a rather strong orientation to Hamilton based on peoples' patterned interactive behaviour, and at the same time there is considerable antipathy to Hamilton. Thus one of the major findings of the test case was a widespread orientation to Hamilton on indicators of objective community, a weaker orientation to Oakville that seems to be leapfrogged by an orientation to Toronto, but antipathy toward Hamilton and toward the idea of Burlington's becoming part of a regional government that would include Hamilton. There seems to be a general neutrality of feelings about Oakville and the prospect of Burlington's becoming part of a regional government with Oakville. By the indicators of objective community, the respondents are rather strongly oriented toward Hamilton; by the indicators of subjective community, they do not strongly identify with Hamilton.

If Burlington must be included in a reformation of the structures of local government west of Toronto, the test case analysis indicates that, by subjective community, Burlington should more properly be included with Oakville. By the indicators of objective community, Burlington should more properly be included with Hamilton. This is the dilemma. It is necessary at this point to recall the caveat stated earlier - that in choosing the area for study, one must bear in mind that one can look only in one direction over the boundaries of the study area. That is, one can look only outward from the study area in examining patterned interactive behaviour and perceptions. Necessarily, examination of the patterns of interactive behaviour and perceptions of people outside the study area relative to the study area is excluded.

This problem of looking only from the inside of the study area outward cannot be escaped, no matter what the size of the study area, unless it covers the whole world. The larger the study area, the less severe the problem.

The difficulty with the boundaries of the test case study area need not prevent one from making some general comments and recommendations regarding regional government in the area, apart from the obvious recommendation that similar research should be done in Oakville and Hamilton. If a regional government including Burlington and some other place is to have a reasonable chance of functioning without acrimony and hostility, at both the levels of the electorate and the elected representatives, it would seem ill-advised to include Burlington with Hamilton in the territory of a region, in spite of the strong objective ties of Burlington to Hamilton. The antipathy of the respondents to Hamilton seems too deep-seated and widespread, even with the strong objective ties between the two, to give such a regional government much of a head start or much hope of somehow overcoming the antipathy. Though it was found in Chapter 6 that Burlington's objective ties to Hamilton were stronger than to Oakville, it was found that there were substantial objective ties eastward, though those to Toronto cannot be separated from those to Oakville. Only 4.6% of the respondents engaged in none of the interactions examined based in Oakville/Toronto, and 83.5% engaged in up to half the interactions examined at least partly in Oakville/Toronto. Thus it is on more than the basis of relative neutrality toward Oakville and hostility toward Hamilton that inclusion of Burlington in regional government with Oakville appears to be a reasonable recommendation.

There still remains the alternative of leaving Burlington as it is, as a single and separate political unit. Whether the external boundaries of the town should be modified is another question, but it

is difficult to answer because of the very low number of respondents in three of the seven demarcated sectors, particularly sector one, which at least geographically is quite remote from the rest of the town. Nevertheless, the data analysis tends to suggest that none of the people in any one of the sectors would likely exclude the people in any of the other sectors from their perceived community, and thus there are grounds for recommending that Burlington be left as a single and separate political unit. There are equally good grounds for recommending that the town, if it is to become part of a regional government, constitute a lower-tier unit of government. Therefore any regional government that is to include Burlington should not be of the unitary form.

If the town were to remain a single political unit, the test case analysis indicates that it could be divided into wards for purposes of representation and administration. Sectors six and seven, for example, could well become one ward, sector three another, and sector five a third. As for the other three demarcated sectors, no recommendation can be made, given the weak data base for those sectors.

Another main problem evident from the test case is the absence of a good measure of community in the subjective sense. The two indices, of subjective attachment and local-cosmopolitanism, were included in the questionnaire with some reservations which need not be recounted again. The data analysis indicated that Alford and Scoble's index of subjective attachment is not, on the present data, a good scale. The three question-items are not very highly intercorrelated, particularly because of the first item ('In general, Burlington is a very good place to live in.'), the responses to which were almost invariably 'agree'.

The question-items from which scores on Dye's index of local-cosmopolitanism are determined constitute a more satisfactory scale in that they are reasonably well, though not always highly, intercorrelated. Still, the question arises of whether either or both indices are adequate from the purposes of determining a) whether the respondent perceives communities, b) if so, how strongly the respondent perceives them, and c) the geographic extent of the communities perceived. The indices do not serve the third purpose, though other indicators were brought into play to give some indication of the geographic extent of communities perceived. Nor do the indices enable one to determine for individual people the number of communities perceived, if more than one. The questionnaire was not designed to develop and test new scales bearing on subjective community, though the need for new and better ones is now clear. This is another area in which further research is needed.

While the two indices certainly do not enable one to answer all the above three questions satisfactorily, it is possible that some of the difficulty encountered arose from the choice of Burlington as the location for the test case. The very high population growth rate of the Town at least since 1951 may make any measures of subjective community difficult to apply, for so many of the residents of the town have lived there for such a short time, perhaps a time too short to have allowed them to acquire much of a sense of belonging to one or more groups of others in the locality. It will be recalled that more than half the respondents have lived in Burlington for ten years or less, and that there was some, though small, correlation found between length of resid-

ence and score on the two indices. Had an area having a more stable population been selected as the location for the test case, less difficulty with the indices might have been encountered. If this is so, it suggests that there is a deficiency in the notion of subjective community developed in Chapter 4, or at least in the operationalization of subjective community, for the concept developed was not viewed as limited in application to only long-established areas of relatively stable population size and composition. But it is not known what results one would get by replicating the present study in such an area, and therefore it is premature to revise the notion of subjective community now.

Another problem has to do with the division of a study area into smaller units for analysis. The boundaries of the seven sectors of Burlington were settled upon because they were important divisions that could easily be recognized by most of the respondents. They are very similar to a division of the Town used by Burlington's Planning Department, and are therefore less arbitrary than would have been the case had one divided the map of the town into a neat gridwork of sectors of equal size, the boundaries possibly running down or across unknown streets, or cutting through blocks. On the whole, the mapping technique used was a useful and innovative experiment that seems to have worked quite well. It has the great advantage of enabling one to examine a

locale other than as an undifferentiated whole. The division and number of demarcated sectors was considered to be about as complex and detailed as the use of mailed questionnaires would allow. A study area as large and as populated as Burlington should be divided into a considerably greater number of smaller sectors. Better yet, if the available resources permit using the personal interview method of data collection, a gridded map could be dispensed with entirely in favour of the interviewer's putting marks on a map for each respondent, indicating very precisely where patterned interactions are based. This technique of marking things on a map might also facilitate the precise location of boundaries of any communities the respondent perceives, though it may be questioned whether individuals often do perceive communities in terms so strictly geographical that they can be translated into lines on a map. It seems more likely that the boundaries of perceived communities are grey blurs rather than sharp lines. Once the geographical bases of interactions have been marked, the first step toward data analysis can be to establish a gridwork ex post facto. The advantage of such a technique is that it does not force the respondents to think in terms of a gridwork which probably has no basis of community.

Working with a larger number of smaller sectors need not impose insuperable problems of analysis. In the test case, determination of the number and type (whether reciprocal or unidirectional) of linkages between and amongst the sectors was done manually, for the number of sectors was not so large as to preclude this. Depending on the number of sectors in future research, it may be necessary to make use of a computer to examine the linkages for all the permutations and combin-

ations of sectors. The point is that one need not be restricted to only a small number of divisions of a study area. The more divisions the better, for the degree of precision increases with the fineness of the grid.

The final problem has to do with the relationship between subjective community and objective community. Though the measures of subjective community that were used have not been found to be entirely satisfactory, the analysis in Chapter 6 quite clearly indicates that one would be ill-advised to rely on indicators of objective community to identify and locate perceived communities. No series of objective indicators was found to contribute much to the two factors that seem to relate to perceptions of community.

Future research

Some avenues for future research have been noted in passing. For example, the lack of relationship between objective and subjective indicators raises some interesting questions. Are the results of the test case unique in not finding relationships between objective and subjective community? To what extent do interactions give rise to feelings of community; that is, what are the integrative or disintegrative effects of interactions? Do different kinds of interaction (for example non-travel communication versus physical movement of people) have different kinds of effect on the development or extension of feelings of community? What gives rise to feelings of community if interactions are only a partial explanation? Can the strength and extent of such feelings be altered by changes to the boundaries of units of government?

Finally, it is worth reiterating the view expressed earlier that

the concept of community that was developed, and the indicators and techniques of analysis used, are not considered to be limited in their applicability to local governmental units. They would seem applicable to other levels of government too, whether sub-national provinces and states, or nations, or international regions. It was in fact through reading some of the literature on international integration theory that the idea for this thesis came about. But the utility of the concept as a boundary determinant at other than the local political level must be left for future research.

Implications for policy-making

As an experiment, the research has not been altogether successful in finding a satisfactory method of using a concept of community as a criterion for determining boundaries of units of government, largely because of difficulties encountered in operationalizing subjective community. However, the results of the research could still have utility for policy-making on the question of what to do about Burlington in regard to regional government. The evidence examined in the last two chapters seems sufficient to justify recommending that if Burlington is to be included in any regional government, it should be in one with Oakville and not in one with Hamilton.

As to the utility of the present concept of community for policy-making about boundary determination on a more general level, the previous few pages have indicated that the concept needs to be applied in other kinds of localities, and possibly refined in the light of further research, before policy-makers could confidently make decisions on the basis of the kind of data collected in this study. That further re-

search and refinement is left to others.

Appendix A: Tables

Tables 1 to 11 were compiled mainly from Canada Yearbooks, for 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957-58, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963-64, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970-71, 1972. Additional sources are:

- for Table 1, the 1972 figures are from Ontario. Department of Municipal Affairs 1972 Municipal Directory (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1972), p. viii, plate D.
- for Table 3, the 1972 figures are from British Columbia. Statistics Relating to Regional and Municipal Governments in British Columbia (Victoria: Department of Municipal Affairs, May, 1972), pages 5, 8.
- for Table 5, the 1972 figures are from New Brunswick. Department of Municipal Affairs Annual Report (Frederickton, 1972), p. 35.
- for Table 6, the 1972 and 1973 figures are from a letter from the Hon. H.A. Collins, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, April 2, 1973.
- for Table 10, the December, 1971 figures are from Saskatchewan. Department of Municipal Affairs Annual Report, 1971-72 (Regina: Queen's Printer, 1972), p. 39.
- for Table 11, the 1973 figures are from an interview with Mr. A.D. Dunning, Head, Municipal Affairs Section, Canada Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, March 27, 1973.

Table 1
Local government units, by type, by year: Ontario

year	total	city	town	village	county	town- ship	LID*	metro	district/ region
Dec 31, 1952	962	29	151	156	38	572	16		
Dec 31, 1953	964	29	152	157	38	573	15		
Dec 31, 1954	967	29	152	159	38	573	15	1	
Dec 31, 1956	973	29	155	156	38	572	22	1	
Jan 1, 1958	976	29	157	154	38	573	24	1	
Jan 1, 1959	977	30	157	154	38	573	24	1	
Jan 1, 1960	976	30	158	154	38	575	20	1	
Jan 1, 1961	976	30	157	156	38	574	20	1	
Jan 1, 1962	979	30	158	158	38	574	20	1	
Jan 1, 1964	977	32	158	157	38	573	18	1	
Jan 1, 1965	977	32	157	159	38	572	18	1	
Jan 1, 1966	974	33	155	158	38	571	18	1	
Jan 1, 1967	972	38	151	155	38	571	18	1	
Jan 1, 1968	964	38	152	155	38	562	18	1	
Jan 1, 1970	945	38	151	150	35	551	17	1	2
Jan 1, 1971	921	39	152	144	34	531	16	1	4
Jan 1, 1972	921	39	153	144	34	530	16	1	4

*local improvement district

Table 2
Local government units, by type, by year: Alberta

year	total	city	town	village	M.D.*	county
Dec 31, 1952	273	7	72	137	54	3
Dec 31, 1953	274	7	72	138	53	4
Dec 31, 1954	277	8	75	146	41	7
Dec 31, 1956	284	8	83	145	41	7
Jan 1, 1958	295	9	86	152	38	10
Jan 1, 1959	301	9	86	156	38	12
Jan 1, 1960	302	10	87	157	36	12
Jan 1, 1961	307	10	88	161	31	17
Jan 1, 1962	305	10	89	158	31	17
Jan 1, 1964	309	9	90	162	22	26
Jan 1, 1965	313	9	89	167	20	28
Jan 1, 1966	318	9	93	167	21	28
Jan 1, 1967	324	9	99	167	21	28
Jan 1, 1968	326	10	100	167	19	30
Jan 1, 1970	326	9	101	168	18	30
Jan 1, 1971	326	9	101	168	18	30

*municipal district

Table 3
Local government units, by type, by year: British Columbia

year	total	city	town	village	district	regional district
Dec. 31, 1952	112	35		49	28	
Dec. 31, 1953	113	35		49	29	
Dec. 31, 1954	113	35		49	29	
Dec. 31, 1956	118	36		52	30	
Jan. 1, 1958	122	35	2	55	30	
Jan. 1, 1959	125	32	3	60	30	
Jan. 1, 1960	123	32	3	57	31	
Jan. 1, 1961	123	32	3	58	30	
Jan. 1, 1962	125	32	4	59	30	
Jan. 1, 1964	128	32	4	62	30	
Jan. 1, 1965	130	32	8	58	32	
Jan. 1, 1966	141	32	10	58	36	6
Jan. 1, 1967	150	32	12	56	39	11
Jan. 1, 1968	165	31	13	56	40	25
Jan. 1, 1970	166	31	13	54	40	28
Jan. 1, 1971	168	31	14	56	39	28
May, 1972	172	31	14	60	39	28

Table 4
Local government units, by type, by year: Manitoba

year	total	city	town	village	R+SM*	metro
Dec. 31, 1952	190	4	33	39	114	
Dec. 31, 1953	190	4	33	39	114	
Dec. 31, 1954	190	4	34	38	114	
Dec. 31, 1956	190	5	35	37	113	
Jan. 1, 1958	190	6	35	37	112	
Jan. 1, 1959	190	6	35	37	112	
Jan. 1, 1960	190	6	35	37	112	
Jan. 1, 1961	191	6	35	37	112	1
Jan. 1, 1962	191	8	34	37	111	1
Jan. 1, 1964	198	9	36	41	111	1
Jan. 1, 1965	197	9	36	41	110	1
Jan. 1, 1966	197	9	36	41	110	1
Jan. 1, 1967	197	9	36	41	110	1
Jan. 1, 1968	196	9	36	40	110	1
Jan. 1, 1970	196	9	36	41	109	1
Jan. 1, 1971	196	11	34	41	109	1

*rural and suburban municipalities

Table 5

Local government units, by type, by year: New Brunswick

year	total	city	town	village	county	LID*	commission
Dec. 31, 1952	78	4	19	3	15	37	
Dec. 31, 1953	79	5	19	3	15	37	
Dec. 31, 1954	91	5	18	3	15	50	
Dec. 31, 1956	98	5	20	2	15	56	
Jan. 1, 1958	98	6	20	1	15	56	
Jan. 1, 1959	96	6	20	1	15	54	
Jan. 1, 1960	96	6	20	1	15	54	
Jan. 1, 1961	116	6	20	1	15	62	12
Jan. 1, 1962	115	6	21	1	15	62	10
Jan. 1, 1964	110	7	20	1	15	57	10
Jan. 1, 1965	110	7	20	1	15	57	10
Jan. 1, 1966	113	6	21	1	15	60	10
Jan. 1, 1967	105	6	21	78			
Jan. 1, 1968	114	6	21	87			
Jan. 1, 1970	120	6	21	93			
Jan. 1, 1971	121	6	21	94			
Mar. 31, 1972	121	6	21	94			

*local improvement district

Table 6

Local government units, by type, by year: Newfoundland

year	total	city	town	LGC*	RD**	LID***	metro area
Mar. 31, 1953	37	1	30	2	4		
Dec. 31, 1953	44	1	32	8	3		
Dec. 31, 1954	48	1	32	11	4		
Dec. 31, 1956	61	2	31	24	4		
Jan. 1, 1958	67	2	31	27	4	3	
Jan. 1, 1959	74	2	33	32	4	3	
Jan. 1, 1960	77	2	33	35	4	3	
Jan. 1, 1961	85	2	33	43	4	3	
Jan. 1, 1962	88	2	39	39	5	3	
Jan. 1, 1964	100	2	45	47	4	2	
Jan. 1, 1965	113	2	49	51	4	7	
Jan. 1, 1966	128	2	54	60	4	8	
Jan. 1, 1967	152	2	62	74	4	10	
Jan. 1, 1968	164	2	63	80	4	15	
Jan. 1, 1970	190	2	69	92	3	23	1
Jan. 1, 1971	218	2	73	102	5	35	1
Jan. 1, 1972	252	2	87	112	7	43	1
Jan. 1, 1973	274	2	93	118	8	52	1

*local government community

**rural district

***local improvement district

Table 7
Local government units, by type, by year: Nova Scotia

year	total	city	town	county
Dec. 31, 1952	66	2	40	24
Dec. 31, 1953	66	2	40	24
Dec. 31, 1954	66	2	40	24
Dec. 31, 1956	66	2	40	24
Jan. 1, 1958	66	2	40	24
Jan. 1, 1959	66	2	40	24
Jan. 1, 1960	66	2	40	24
Jan. 1, 1961	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1962	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1964	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1965	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1966	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1967	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1968	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1970	66	3	39	24
Jan. 1, 1971	65	3	38	24

Table 8
Local government units, by type, by year: Prince Edward Island

year	total	city	town	village
Dec. 31, 1952	13	1	7	5
Dec. 31, 1953	17	1	7	9
Dec. 31, 1954	20	1	7	12
Dec. 31, 1956	21	1	7	13
Jan. 1, 1958	24	1	7	16
Jan. 1, 1959	24	1	7	16
Jan. 1, 1960	24	1	7	16
Jan. 1, 1961	24	1	7	16
Jan. 1, 1962	25	1	7	17
Jan. 1, 1964	25	1	7	17
Jan. 1, 1965	25	1	7	17
Jan. 1, 1966	29	1	7	21
Jan. 1, 1967	29	1	7	21
Jan. 1, 1968	30	1	7	22
Jan. 1, 1970	32	1	7	24
Jan. 1, 1971	32	1	7	24

Table 9
Local government units, by type, by year: Quebec

year	total	city	town	village	county	T+P*	metro/ region
Dec. 31, 1952	1682	35	131	331	76	1109	
Dec. 31, 1953	1693	35	134	337	76	1111	
Dec. 31, 1954	1716	36	139	335	76	1130	
Mar. 16, 1957	1731	42	149	336	75	1129	
Jan. 1, 1958	1737	42	152	336	75	1132	
Jan. 1, 1959	1745	54	160	336	74	1119	2
Jan. 1, 1960	1748	54	162	336	74	1120	2
Jan. 1, 1961	1752	55	168	337	74	1116	2
Jan. 1, 1962	1751	56	171	334	74	1114	2
Jan. 1, 1964	1753	63	178	328	74	1108	2
Jan. 1, 1965	1756	65	180	325	74	1110	2
Jan. 1, 1966	1733	62	178	316	74	1102	1
Jan. 1, 1967	1729	66	178	309	74	1101	1
Jan. 1, 1968	1726	66	184	302	74	1099	1
Jan. 1, 1970	1712	64	195	292	74	1084	3
Jan. 1, 1971	1676	67	195	285	74	1052	3

*townships and parishes

Table 10
Local government units, by type, by year: Saskatchewan

year	total	city	town	village	RM*
Dec. 31, 1952	785	8	91	388	298
Dec. 31, 1953	783	8	96	383	296
Dec. 31, 1954	782	8	99	379	296
Dec. 31, 1956	780	8	99	377	296
Jan. 1, 1958	781	10	102	373	296
Jan. 1, 1959	781	10	104	371	296
Jan. 1, 1960	783	10	106	371	296
Jan. 1, 1961	786	11	110	369	296
Jan. 1, 1962	786	11	114	365	296
Jan. 1, 1964	790	11	120	363	296
Jan. 1, 1965	792	11	121	364	296
Jan. 1, 1966	791	11	123	363	294
Jan. 1, 1967	795	11	125	364	295
Jan. 1, 1968	803	11	130	358	304
Jan. 1, 1970	794	11	131	360	292
Jan. 1, 1971	792	11	131	358	292
Dec. 31, 1971	792	11	131	358	292

*rural municipality

Table 11

Local government units, by type, by year: Yukon and Northwest Territory

year	total	city	town	LAD*	village	hamlet	MD**	LID***
Dec. 31, 1952	5	2	1	2				
Dec. 31, 1953	5	2	1	2				
Dec. 31, 1954	5	2	1	2				
Dec. 31, 1956	5	2	1	2				
Jan. 1, 1958	5	2	1	2				
Jan. 1, 1959	5	2	1	2				
Jan. 1, 1960	5	2	1	2				
Jan. 1, 1961	4	2					2	
Jan. 1, 1962	4	2					2	
Jan. 1, 1964	4	2					2	
Jan. 1, 1965	5	2			1		2	
Jan. 1, 1966	5	2	2		1			
Jan. 1, 1967	5	2	2		1			
Jan. 1, 1968	6	2	3		1			
Jan. 1, 1970	9	3	3			3		
Jan. 1, 1971	10	3	3		1	3		
Mar. 27, 1973	18	3	4		2	6		3

*local administrative district

**municipal district

***local improvement district

Table 12

Location of activities taking place by sector of residence: Work (%)

work place	sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	17.6	-	-	-	1.5	1.0	-
sector 2	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	1.3
sector 3	-	-	8.0	7.1	-	2.0	3.3
sector 4	11.8	-	12.0	-	3.0	4.0	2.0
sector 5	-	14.3	2.0	-	13.6	3.0	1.3
sector 6	-	-	12.0	21.4	4.5	28.7	7.3
sector 7	5.9	-	6.0	7.1	-	6.9	17.3
multiple sectors							
in Burlington	5.9	-	2.0	7.1	-	-	.7
Hamilton (west)	5.9	42.9	32.0	35.7	60.6	32.7	31.3
north	11.8	-	-	-	1.5	1.0	.7
Oakville/Toronto	41.2	28.6	20.0	14.3	13.6	17.8	30.0
south	-	-	-	-	1.5	3.0	2.0
other	-	-	6.0	7.1	-	-	2.7
t	100.1	100.1	100.0	99.8	99.8	100.1	99.9
n	17	7	50	14	66	101	150

405

Table 13

Location of activities taking place by sector of residence: School (%)

school place	sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	50.0	-	5.7	28.6	2.2	2.6	1.9
sector 2	-	33.3	-	-	-	5.3	2.8
sector 3	10.0	-	80.0	42.9	-	-	.9
sector 4	-	-	2.9	-	-	-	1.9
sector 5	-	33.3	-	-	75.6	-	-
sector 6	10.0	-	2.9	-	2.2	71.1	.9
sector 7	-	-	-	14.3	2.2	5.3	81.1
multiple sectors							
in Burlington	20.0	-	2.9	-	-	2.6	.9
Hamilton (west)	10.0	-	2.9	14.3	4.4	10.5	.9
north	-	33.3	2.9	-	-	-	.9
Oakville/Toronto	-	-	-	-	4.4	-	4.7
south	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
other	-	-	-	-	8.9	2.6	2.8
t	100.0	99.9	100.2	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.7
n	10	3	35	7	45	38	106

244

Table 14
Location of activities taking place by sector of residence: Church (%)

place of church	sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	44.4	-	-	10.0	-	-	1.0
sector 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0
sector 3	-	-	58.6	60.0	-	3.7	-
sector 4	-	-	3.4	20.0	-	-	1.0
sector 5	-	33.3	6.9	-	70.7	-	1.0
sector 6	22.2	-	20.7	10.0	14.6	77.8	13.4
sector 7	11.1	-	-	-	-	11.1	73.2
multiple sectors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
in Burlington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hamilton (west)	-	-	6.9	-	7.3	5.6	5.2
north	22.2	33.3	-	-	-	1.9	-
Oakville/Toronto	-	33.3	-	-	2.4	-	4.1
south	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
other	-	-	3.4	-	4.8	-	-
t	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0	99.8	100.1	99.9
n	9	3	29	10	41	54	97
							243

Table 15
Location of activities taking place by sector of residence:

place of grocery shopping	sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
sector 2	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	-
sector 3	-	-	26.1	-	-	2.0	-
sector 4	6.2	-	8.7	15.4	1.5	-	2.1
sector 5	6.2	71.4	2.2	-	60.6	4.0	-
sector 6	6.2	-	21.7	15.4	16.7	61.0	3.5
sector 7	37.5	-	41.3	69.2	6.1	28.0	91.0
multiple sectors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
in Burlington	-	-	-	-	7.6	2.0	1.4
Hamilton (west)	6.2	-	-	-	4.5	1.0	-
north	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oakville/Toronto	12.5	14.3	-	-	-	1.0	1.4
south	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
other	6.2	-	-	-	3.0	1.0	.7
t	99.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
n	16	7	46	13	66	100	144
							392

Table 16
Location of activities taking place by sector of residence:

place of non- grocery shopping	Non-grocery shopping (%) sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-
sector 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
sector 3	-	-	4.2	-	-	1.0	-
sector 4	12.5	14.3	4.2	7.1	4.5	2.1	2.1
sector 5	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	-
sector 6	18.8	-	18.8	-	22.7	28.9	10.3
sector 7	37.5	28.6	37.5	50.0	28.8	38.1	60.3
multiple sectors	-	-	2.1	-	7.6	4.1	3.4
in Burlington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hamilton (west)	12.5	28.6	16.7	14.3	13.6	7.2	6.2
north	-	-	-	-	-	-	.7
Oakville/Toronto	12.5	28.6	4.2	7.1	6.1	7.2	7.5
south	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	.7
other	6.2	-	12.5	21.3	15.2	8.1	8.9
t	100.0	100.1	100.2	99.8	100.0	99.8	100.1
n	16	7	48	14	66	97	146

394

Table 17
Location of activities taking place by sector of residence:

place of entertainment	Entertainment (%) sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
sector 2	-	-	2.2	-	-	-	-
sector 3	-	-	6.7	-	-	1.1	.7
sector 4	14.3	-	-	-	-	1.1	1.5
sector 5	-	-	2.2	-	1.7	-	.7
sector 6	-	-	17.8	-	17.2	22.6	10.9
sector 7	14.3	-	8.9	8.3	5.2	12.9	25.5
multiple sectors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
in Burlington	14.3	-	2.2	8.3	1.7	6.5	.7
Hamilton (west)	28.6	50.0	35.6	33.3	31.0	20.4	21.9
north	7.1	-	-	-	1.7	-	-
Oakville/Toronto	14.3	50.0	13.3	25.0	31.0	22.6	27.7
south	-	-	2.2	8.3	-	2.2	.7
other	7.1	-	8.8	16.6	10.3	10.8	9.5
t	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.8	99.8	100.2	99.8
n	14	6	45	12	58	93	137

365

Table 18
Location of activities taking place by sector of residence:

place of recreation	Recreation (%) sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	46.2	-	2.6	-	5.7	4.5	6.2
sector 2	7.7	-	-	-	-	1.1	-
sector 3	-	16.7	33.3	9.1	-	-	1.6
sector 4	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	1.6
sector 5	-	-	5.1	-	15.1	4.5	1.6
sector 6	-	-	12.8	9.1	18.9	38.6	12.5
sector 7	23.1	-	2.6	-	1.9	3.4	29.7
multiple sectors							
in Burlington	7.7	-	2.6	15.2	1.9	5.7	3.1
Hamilton (west)	7.7	50.0	28.2	36.4	26.4	18.2	15.6
north	-	-	-	-	5.7	5.7	1.6
Oakville/Toronto	-	33.3	7.7	18.2	7.5	10.2	17.2
south	-	-	-	-	3.8	4.5	.8
other	7.7	-	5.1	9.1	11.3	3.4	8.7
t	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	99.8	100.2
n	13	6	39	11	53	88	128

338

Table 19
Location of activities taking place by sector of residence: Friends (%)

place of friends	sector of residence						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
sector 1	26.7	-	-	-	1.5	1.0	-
sector 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
sector 3	-	-	27.7	7.7	-	2.1	2.8
sector 4	-	-	2.1	30.8	-	1.0	-
sector 5	-	-	2.1	-	27.3	1.0	.7
sector 6	-	-	4.3	7.7	4.5	43.3	3.5
sector 7	13.3	-	4.3	-	3.0	7.2	47.9
multiple sectors							
in Burlington	6.7	28.6	12.8	7.7	15.2	11.3	9.0
Hamilton (west)	13.3	14.3	19.1	30.8	19.7	9.3	10.4
north	-	14.3	6.4	-	1.5	1.0	-
Oakville/Toronto	20.0	28.6	10.6	-	10.6	12.4	13.9
south	-	-	-	-	1.5	1.0	.7
other	20.0	14.3	10.6	15.4	15.2	9.3	11.2
t	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.1
n	15	7	47	13	66	97	144

389

Table 20
Demographic Characteristics of Burlington in 1961

	whole Town	Sector 1 north	Sector 2 midwest	Sectors 3 and 4 mid-east	Sector 5 S-W	Sector 6 mid-south	Sector 7 S-E
<u>Population</u>	47,008	2,666	3,880	6,582	7,821	16,173	9,886
<u>Average income of male wage-earners</u>	\$5,362	\$3,639	\$4,771	\$4,835	\$6,533	\$5,028	\$6,009
<u>Median education category of those not attending school</u>	1-2yrs of high school	1 or more yrs element- ary school	1-2yrs of high school	1-2yrs of high school	3-5yrs of high school	1-2yrs of high school	1-2 yrs of high school
<u>Male labour force distribution (%)</u>							
-managerial	20.4	9.9	19.0	9.5	32.8	18.6	23.8
-professional and technical	14.4	4.8	10.3	9.9	18.4	14.8	17.8
-clerical	7.2	3.4	6.0	9.3	5.7	8.7	5.9
-sales	9.6	3.6	8.7	8.6	11.0	10.0	10.7
-service and recreation	3.8	1.9	3.2	3.3	3.0	5.3	3.0
-transport and communication	5.3	10.1	6.3	7.1	3.9	5.0	3.9
-primary	6.2	36.5	6.5	4.7	1.8	3.8	5.9
-craftsmen, product- ion process, etc.	29.5	24.7	36.1	43.8	20.9	29.9	25.7
-labourers	3.7	5.1	3.9	3.8	2.6	3.9	3.6
<u>Ethnicity (%)</u>							
-British Isles	70.5	71.9	63.2	62.5	75.8	72.2	71.2
-French	3.4	2.1	5.1	5.2	2.6	3.0	3.2
-German	5.0	3.8	7.3	5.6	4.0	4.7	5.2
-Italian	2.0	1.2	5.4	1.2	2.8	1.7	1.3
-Netherlands	5.9	6.3	7.9	7.3	4.2	5.4	6.2
-Polish	2.6	1.2	1.6	4.1	1.6	3.0	2.6
-Russian	.3	.2	.2	.7	.4	.3	.2
-Scandinavian	.9	2.0	.5	.9	.7	1.0	1.0
-Ukrainian	1.9	.5	2.0	3.8	1.6	1.7	1.5
-other European	5.2	5.2	4.7	6.6	3.6	5.2	5.8
-Asiatic	.3	-	-	.4	.1	.6	.2
-other & not stated	1.9	5.5	1.9	1.7	2.7	1.3	1.6
<u>Religion (%)</u>							
-Anglican	23.8	23.4	20.2	19.2	24.4	25.1	26.0
-Baptist	3.3	2.0	2.5	3.9	2.7	4.1	2.8
-Greek Orthodox	.8	.5	.5	1.5	.6	.8	.6
-Jewish	.3	-	.4	.2	.7	.2	.3
-Lutheran	2.3	2.7	2.4	3.8	1.5	2.1	2.3
-Presbyterian	9.9	8.6	5.9	8.8	9.6	12.3	9.0
-Roman Catholic	19.4	12.0	25.8	25.4	14.8	19.6	18.2
-Ukrainian Catholic	.7	-	.9	1.6	.3	.8	.5
-United Church	32.3	45.2	30.4	27.6	38.3	29.2	32.8
-other	7.2	5.8	11.1	8.1	7.1	5.9	7.5

source: 1961 Census of Canada; Population and Housing Characteristics
by Census Tracts - Hamilton, June, 1963, pp. 8-9, 20-21.

Table 21
Demographic characteristics of Burlington, Oakville, and Hamilton in 1961

	Hamilton	Burlington	Oakville
<u>Population</u>	274,000	47,000	42,000
<u>Average income of male wage-earners</u>	\$3,999	\$5,362	\$5,285
<u>Median education category of those not attending school</u>	1 or more yrs elementary school	1-2 yrs of high school	1-2 yrs of high school
<u>Male labour force distribution(%)</u>			
-managerial	8.0	20.4	18.8
-professional and technical	7.2	14.4	12.5
-clerical	8.6	7.2	7.6
-sales	6.0	9.6	8.3
-service and recreation	8.0	3.8	6.9
-transport and communication	7.6	5.3	6.2
-primary	1.0	6.2	5.8
-craftsmen, production process etc.	45.5	29.5	29.2
-labourers	8.3	3.7	4.6
<u>Ethnicity</u>			
-British Isles	58.9	70.5	67.4
-French	4.2	3.4	3.2
-German	5.2	5.0	4.5
-Italian	8.5	2.0	2.6
-Netherlands	2.5	5.9	4.9
-Polish	4.2	2.6	1.9
-Russian	.5	.3	.2
-Scandinavian	.8	.9	1.6
-Ukrainian	3.1	1.9	1.4
-other European	8.7	5.2	4.0
-Asiatic	.8	.3	.6
-other and not stated	2.7	1.9	7.9
<u>Religion</u>			
-Anglican	19.9	23.8	28.9
-Baptist	4.4	3.3	3.6
-Greek Orthodox	2.2	.8	.9
-Jewish	1.2	.3	.3
-Lutheran	3.3	2.3	3.1
-Presbyterian	10.4	9.9	10.7
-Roman Catholic	30.9	19.4	20.1
-Ukrainian Catholic	1.3	.7	.2
-United Church of Canada	20.8	32.3	27.3
-other	5.8	7.2	4.9

sources: 1961 Census of Canada: Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts - Hamilton, June, 1963, pp. 8-9, 20-21, and 1961 Census of Canada: Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts - Toronto, July, 1963, pp. 24, 68.

Table 22

Loadings on Principal Factor Analysis (rotated) of the 20 variables for

		Objective Community						
variable	communality	factor						
	loading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
home ownership	53.1418	-.0778	-.0336	.0242	-.0348	-.7136	-.0062	.1139
no. newspapers	91.7723	.9462	-.0203	-.0506	-.0350	.1099	.0349	.0703
source newspapers	91.1358	.9528	.0171	-.0197	-.0031	-.0078	-.0178	.0490
source of TV	44.1596	-.0095	-.0688	-.0961	-.0009	.1694	-.0311	-.6308
source of radio	31.0423	.0954	.3538	.3547	-.0720	.2049	.0239	-.1079
no. neighbours	46.8022	.1372	-.2280	-.1016	-.1254	.5259	.1605	.2624
respondent elected	69.7491	.0262	.0712	.0689	.8105	.0149	-.1052	-.1370
family elected	67.8748	-.0386	-.0676	-.0843	.7954	-.0193	.1410	.1124
% friends,Burl.	57.5177	.0665	-.6746	.2479	-.0655	.1060	.0167	.1961
% friends,Oakville	59.2070	.0309	-.0833	.1388	.0191	.0967	.7384	-.1000
% friends,Toronto	44.5113	.0158	.5987	.0388	-.0294	-.0332	.2665	.1092
% friends,Hamilton	64.4549	.0071	-.0366	-.7650	.0598	.0346	-.1870	-.1349
adult relatives, B	40.8900	.0104	-.5887	-.1789	.0082	.0079	.1448	-.0953
telephone Toronto	54.2200	.1608	.4664	-.0787	.0063	-.1639	.4738	.2032
telephone Oakville	64.3114	-.0405	.0502	.0630	.0225	.0368	.7949	.0344
telephone Hamilton	68.4110	.1277	-.0154	-.7767	.0124	.1072	-.0456	.2250
no. memberships	63.3149	.1989	.0076	-.1747	-.1053	.3892	.0488	.6309
place memberships	41.1470	-.0571	.4004	-.1536	.0421	.1738	-.1109	.4242
church attendance	40.2802	.0317	-.0003	-.0574	-.0381	-.6294	.0126	-.0261
% acts,home sector	44.4092	.0658	-.2711	.4474	.1455	-.0052	-.1506	.3496
% of variance		9.6856	9.0804	8.6561	6.7918	7.5484	8.1411	7.0590

Table 23
Loadings on Principal Factor Analysis (rotated) of the 30 Variables for Objective and Subjective Community

variable	communality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
home ownership	66.3360	.0203	-.4504	.1134	-.1213	.0218	-.0125	-.0649	-.0183	.1934	-.5909	-.2019
no. newspapers	91.2860	-.0231	.1553	-.0601	.0437	-.0129	.9366	-.0248	.0396	-.0192	.0470	-.0223
source newspapers	92.3811	-.0008	.0318	-.0231	.0117	.0120	.9594	-.0039	-.0131	.0146	-.0045	-.0338
source of TV	64.2753	.0077	-.0623	-.0169	.0884	-.0022	-.0135	-.0425	-.0114	-.1299	-.0730	.7787
source of radio	59.3468	-.0178	-.0924	.0344	-.1455	.1044	.0457	-.0310	.0874	.1156	.6921	-.2199
no. neighbours	62.6837	.1199	.7546	-.1171	.0451	-.0180	.0587	-.0886	.1001	-.0484	.0575	.0090
respondent elected	70.5669	-.0700	-.1147	-.0769	-.0267	.0278	-.0035	.8073	-.1153	-.0265	.1058	.0579
family elected	68.2448	.0299	.0333	.1042	.0809	-.0381	-.0243	.7857	.1538	-.0020	-.1284	-.0598
% friends, Burl.	62.6612	-.0210	.3532	-.2375	-.3289	.5557	.0104	-.0348	.0487	.0682	-.1110	-.0858
% friends, Oakville	62.9146	.0227	-.0057	-.0031	-.1133	-.0443	.0482	.0286	.7772	-.0520	.0457	.0426
% friends, Toronto	57.2250	-.0525	.0654	-.0009	-.0507	.7317	-.0283	-.0325	.1312	.0467	-.0088	-.0771
% friends, Hamilton	69.5750	.0407	.0162	-.1015	.7933	-.0994	-.0113	.0592	-.1775	.0952	-.0107	.0027
adult relatives, B	45.5212	.0883	.0286	-.1939	.1445	-.5506	-.0178	.0078	.2137	.0486	-.1747	-.0778
telephone Toronto	65.1192	-.1435	.0431	-.1679	.0118	.6665	.1262	.0165	.3098	.0578	-.1202	-.1618
telephone Oakville	64.6018	.0412	.0668	.0108	-.0578	.1505	-.0231	.0369	.7810	.0288	.0283	-.0166
telephone Hamilton	69.4119	.0008	.3446	-.0294	.7099	.0613	.1230	.0263	-.0947	-.0298	-.1991	-.0381
no. memberships	61.0799	-.0601	.5352	.1301	.1173	.0033	.2399	-.0972	.0376	-.3253	-.0280	-.3393
place memberships	47.4053	-.0575	.0717	.1792	.1849	.2402	-.0185	.0112	-.1047	-.3325	.0436	-.4667
Dye1-local clubs	43.3922	.4828	.1410	-.1007	-.0660	-.0148	.0059	.1394	-.0869	.0392	.0878	.3605
Dye2-papers & TV	47.1935	.6204	.1200	.0261	-.0089	.0111	-.1073	-.0667	.0832	.0697	-.1294	.1653
Dye3-newcomers	48.7033	.6341	.0231	-.2509	.0521	-.0706	.0022	-.0081	-.0360	-.0064	-.0860	-.0708
Dye4-big cities	51.5529	.6778	.0223	-.0719	-.0608	-.0583	.0134	.0190	-.0014	-.1735	.1074	-.0341
Dye5-local roots	61.5466	.7471	-.1155	-.1413	.0531	-.0282	.0226	-.0412	.0517	-.1004	.0172	-.0715
A-S1-good place	60.5221	-.0653	-.0492	.2668	.0437	-.0607	.0367	-.0613	-.0272	.6587	.2838	-.0386
A-S2-moving out	76.9204	-.2133	-.0721	.8347	-.0398	.0477	-.0666	.0625	.0440	.0564	-.0265	-.0619
A-S3-satisfied	78.3904	.1589	.0054	-.8632	.0339	-.0761	.0040	.0152	.0321	.0555	.0119	.0446
church attendance	59.2040	-.2038	-.0790	-.0732	.0349	.0966	-.0506	.0127	-.0612	.7038	-.1594	-.0336
score on Dye index	99.1134	.9758	.0534	-.1516	-.0037	-.0387	-.0182	.0053	.0112	-.0558	.0056	.0895
score on A-S index	97.6312	-.2128	-.0597	.9507	-.0289	.0556	-.0280	.0119	-.0005	.1164	.0334	-.0648
% acts, home sector	59.0009	.0926	.3673	-.0009	-.5556	-.0383	.0514	.1674	-.2374	.1075	-.1919	-.0308
% of variance		10.7468	5.2491	9.2516	5.7109	5.7947	6.4055	4.5506	5.2240	4.4132	3.8591	4.2543

TOWN OF BURLINGTON STUDY - 1972

PART I please check the correct answer:

1. sex: ☐ female ☐ male 2. age: ☐ 19 years and under
☐ 20 to 29 years
☐ 30 to 39 years
☐ 40 to 49 years
☐ 50 to 59 years
☐ 60 to 69 years
☐ 70 years and over
3. occupation:
☐ farmer
☐ unskilled worker (eg labourer, waitress, taxi driver, janitor)
☐ semi-skilled worker (eg assembly line worker, steel mill worker, policeman)
☐ skilled worker (eg machinist, carpenter, plumber, electrician)
☐ clerical or sales
☐ proprietor, manager or official in a small concern
☐ semi-professional (eg librarian, nurse, journalist, computer programmer)
☐ proprietor, manager or official in a large concern
☐ professional (eg judge, accountant, teacher, doctor)
not employed: ☐ student (please now check your father's occupation)
☐ retired (please now check your previous occupation)
☐ housewife (please now check your husband's occupation)
☐ unemployed (please now check your last occupation)
4. education:
☐ 8 years of school or less
☐ some secondary school
☐ completed secondary school
post-secondary: ☐ university ☐ technical or vocational
5. What is the total gross annual income of your household?
☐ less than \$5,000 a year
☐ \$5,000 to \$7,500
☐ \$7,501 to \$10,000
☐ \$10,001 to \$12,500
☐ \$12,501 to \$15,000
☐ more than \$15,000
6. How long have you lived in Burlington?
☐ less than 5 years
☐ 5 to 10 years
☐ 11 to 15 years
☐ 16 to 20 years
☐ 21 to 25 years
☐ more than 25 years
7. Were you born in Burlington? ☐ yes ☐ no. If not, where did you live before moving to Burlington? _____
8. Do you own your own home, or rent it? ☐ own ☐ rent
9. Which newspaper(s) do you read regularly?

10. If you watch television, which station do you usually watch? channel _____
broadcast from which city? _____
11. If you listen to the radio, which station do you usually hear? _____
broadcast from which city? _____
12. Including yourself, how many adults live in your household? _____
13. How many children under 18 years old live in your household? _____
a) how many of them are in elementary school? _____
b) how many of them are in secondary school? _____
c) how many of them are employed and not in school? _____
14. How many of your individual neighbours do you feel you know well?
☐ none ☐ 1 or 2 ☐ 3 to 6 ☐ 7 to 10 ☐ more than 10
- 15.a) Have you ever held, or are you now holding, an elected position? (eg on Town Council, school, board, etc) ☐ yes ☐ no

15.b) Have any other members of your household held, or are now holding, an elected position? ☐ yes ☐ no

16. About what percentage of your close friends live:

a) in the Town of Burlington? ☐ less than 25%
☐ none ☐ 25% to 50%
☐ 51% to 75%
☐ more than 75%

b) in Oakville? ☐ less than 25%
☐ none ☐ 25% to 50%
☐ 51% to 75%
☐ more than 75%

c) in Toronto? ☐ less than 25%
☐ none ☐ 25% to 50%
☐ 51% to 75%
☐ more than 75%

d) in Hamilton? ☐ less than 25%
☐ none ☐ 25% to 50%
☐ 51% to 75%
☐ more than 75%

17.a) Do you have any adult relatives living in the Town of Burlington, other than in your own home? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) If so, how often do you see them to speak to? ☐ never

☐ almost every day ☐ once a week ☐ once every 2 weeks ☐ once a month or less

18.a) Do you have a telephone in your home? ☐ yes ☐ no

b) If so, approximately how many times a week do you phone to:

i. Toronto? ☐ times a week
 ii. Oakville? ☐ times a week
 iii. Hamilton? ☐ times a week

19. Do you have the use of a car? ☐ yes ☐ no

20.a) How many organizations do you or other members of your household belong to? _____
 (eg trade union, church group, service club, Chamber of Commerce, sports associations)

b) Where are most of these organizations based? (check all appropriate answers)

☐ some in Burlington ☐ some in Oakville ☐ some in Hamilton ☐ some or all in
☐ all in Burlington ☐ all in Oakville ☐ all in Hamilton ☐ other places

21. Do you know the name of:

a) the present Mayor of Burlington? ☐ no ☐ yes (name of Mayor _____)
 b) the county which Burlington is in? ☐ no ☐ yes (name of County _____)
 c) the present Mayor of Hamilton? ☐ no ☐ yes (name of Mayor _____)
 d) the present Mayor of Oakville? ☐ no ☐ yes (name of Mayor _____)

PART 2 Please check the answer which comes closest to your opinion. Work quickly - there are no right or wrong answers.

1. 'The most rewarding organizations a person can belong to are local clubs and organizations rather than large, nation-wide organizations.'

☐ strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ slightly disagree ☐ slightly agree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree

2. 'Despite all the newspaper and TV coverage, national and international happenings rarely seem as interesting as events that occur right in the local community where one lives.'

☐ strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ slightly disagree ☐ slightly agree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree

3. 'No doubt many newcomers to the community are capable people; but when it comes to choosing a person for a responsible position in the community, I prefer a man who is well established in the community.'

☐ strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ slightly disagree ☐ slightly agree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree

4. 'Big cities may have their place, but the local community is the backbone of Ontario.'

☐ strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ slightly disagree ☐ slightly agree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree

5. 'I have greater respect for a man who is well-established in his local community than a man who is widely known in his field but who has no local roots.'

☐ strongly disagree ☐ disagree ☐ slightly disagree ☐ slightly agree ☐ agree ☐ strongly agree

6. 'In general, Burlington is a very good place to live in.' ☐ agree ☐ disagree

7. 'I can hardly imagine myself moving out of Burlington at any time in the future.' ☐ agree ☐ disagree

8. 'I could be just about as satisfied with life in another place as I am here in Burlington.' ☐ agree ☐ disagree

9. How important to you are the existing boundaries of the Town of Burlington?
 ___not important ___not very ___slightly ___very
 ___at all ___important ___important ___important
10. How important to you are the existing boundaries of Halton County?
 ___very ___slightly ___not very ___not important
 ___important ___important ___important ___at all
11. Please rank the following in order of importance to you, numbering from 1 (most important) to 4 (least important): ___Canada ___Ontario ___Halton County ___Burlington
12. Do you think your interests and those of Burlington would be best served by:
 (choose one) ___a regional government including Burlington, Hamilton, Wentworth County.
 ___a regional government including Burlington and Oakville.
 ___the existing town and county boundaries as they are now.
- Why? (use the back side of the page if necessary)

PART 3 Please refer now to the gridded map of Burlington and area on the opposite page.
WHAT IS THE NUMBER OF THE AREA ON THE MAP WHERE:

1. you live?# How long have you lived in that particular area? _____ years.
2. you work?# (if you are a housewife, where your husband works. If you are a student, where your father works. If you are unemployed, where you last worked. If you travel around, where your firm's office is)
a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) Mode of transportation: _____ own car _____ car pool _____ bus _____ train
_____ cycle _____ walk
3. any children in your household go to school?# (if you are a student, where you attend classes)
a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) Mode of transportation: _____ car _____ bus _____ train _____ cycle _____ walk
4. you go to church?#
a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) Mode of transportation: _____ car _____ bus _____ train _____ cycle _____ walk
c) How often do you go to church? _____ every week
_____ not every week, but at least once a month
_____ less often than once a month
_____ never
5. you do most of your weekly grocery shopping?# a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) Mode of transportation: _____ car _____ bus _____ train _____ cycle _____ walk
6. you do most of your non-grocery shopping?# (eg appliances, furniture, clothing)
a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) mode of transportation: _____ car _____ bus _____ train _____ cycle _____ walk
7. you go most often for entertainment?#
a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) Mode of transportation: _____ car _____ bus _____ train _____ cycle _____ walk
8. you go most often for recreation, including sports?# a) How long does it take to get there from your home? _____ minutes
b) Mode of transportation: _____ car _____ bus _____ train _____ cycle _____ walk
9. most of your close friends live?#

Have you ever heard of the Plunkett Report? no yes If so, please describe briefly what it is about, and what you think of it.

(use back of page)

Have you ever heard of the Steele Report? no yes If so, please describe briefly what it is about, and what you think of it.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE (below or on the back of this page) WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books and theses

- Bell, Colin, and Newby, Howard. Community Studies: An Introduction to the Sociology of Community. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Burlington Confederation Centennial Committee. From Pathway to Skyway: A History of Burlington. Burlington: Corporation of the Town of Burlington, 1967.
- Clark, Terry N., ed. Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analysis. San Francisco: Chandler, 1968.
- Crawford, Kenneth G. Canadian Municipal Government. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1954.
- Dahl, Robert. Who Governs?. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Political Unification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Feldman, Lionel D., and Goldrick, Michael D., ed. Politics and Government of Urban Canada: Selected Readings. Toronto: Methuen, 1969.
- Gibbs, J. P., ed. Urban Research Methods. New York: Van Nostrand, 1961.
- Goodman, Jay S., ed. Perspectives on Urban Politics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.
- Hanson, Eric. Local Government in Alberta. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1956.
- Hawley, Amos. Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure. New York: Ronald Press, 1950.
- _____. and Zimmer, Basil. The Metropolitan Community: Its People and Government. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1970.
- Hill, John L. A. "Regional Government for Ontario: Challenge and Response," Unpublished M.A. thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, 1971.
- Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Jacob, Philip E., and Toscano, James V., ed. The Integration of Political Communities. New York: Lippincott, 1964.
- Kaplan, Harold. Urban Political Systems: A Functional Analysis of Metro Toronto. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

- Lithwick, N. Harvey. Urban Canada: Problems and Prospects. Ottawa: Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 1970.
- _____. and Paquet, Gilles, ed. Urban Studies: A Canadian Perspective. Toronto: Methuen, 1968.
- MacIver, Robert M. Community: A Sociological Study. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1920, and 3rd ed., 1924.
- McKenzie, R.D. On Human Ecology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- _____. The Metropolitan Community. New York: Russell and Russell, 1933.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man. New York: New American Library, 1964.
- _____. and Fiore, Quentin. The Medium is the Massage. New York: Bantam Books, 1967.
- Mann, Peter H. An Approach to Urban Sociology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Mill, John Stuart. Considerations on Representative Government. London: George Routledge, 1904.
- Miller, Delbert C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. 2nd ed. New York: David McKay, 1970.
- Minar, David W. and Greer, Scott, ed. The Concept of Community. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.
- Mitchell, William C. Sociological Analysis and Politics: The Theories of Talcott Parsons. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Park, Robert E. Human Communities. New York: Free Press, 1952.
- Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.
- _____. Structure of Social Action. 2nd ed. New York: Free Press, 1949.
- Redfield, Robert. The Little Community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Phoenix Paperback), 1960.
- Robinson, John P.; Rusk, Jerrold G.; and Head, Kendra B. Measures of Political Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan, 1968.
- Rosenau, James N., ed. International Politics and Foreign Policy. New York: Free Press, 1961.

Rowat, Donald C. The Canadian Municipal System. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1969.

_____. The Reorganization of Provincial Municipal Relations in Nova Scotia. Halifax: Institute of Public Affairs of Dalhousie University, 1949.

Shevky, E. and Bell, W. Social Area Analysis. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955.

Simmons, James, and Simmons, Robert. Urban Canada. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969.

Stein, Maurice R. The Eclipse of Community. New York: Harper and Row (Harper Torchbacks edition), 1964.

Stone, Leory O. Urban Development in Canada. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. Democracy in America. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1945.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. Community and Association. Translated by C.P. Loomis. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

Warren, Roland L. The Community in America. 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

_____. Studying Your Community. 2nd ed. New York: Free Press, 1965.

B. Articles and papers

Alford, Robert R., and Scoble, Harry M. "Sources of local political involvement," American Political Science Review, LXII (December, 1968) 1192-1206.

Bureau of Municipal Research. "Mini-Metros: Proposals to Shape Future Growth," Civic Affairs (August, 1969).

_____. "Regional Government - the Key to Genuine Local Autonomy," Civic Affairs (May, 1968).

_____. "Reorganizing local government - a brief look at four provinces," Civic Affairs (1972, no. 1).

Cook, Gail C.A., and Feldman, Lionel D. "Approaches to Local Government Reform in Canada: The Case of Winnipeg," Canadian Tax Journal, XIX (May-June, 1971), 216-225.

Duncan, Otis D., and Schnore, Leo F. "Cultural, behavioral, and ecological perspectives in the study of social organization," American Journal of Sociology, LXV (September, 1959), 132-146.

- Dye, Thomas R. "The Local-Cosmopolitan Dimension and the Study of Urban Politics," Social Forces, 41 (March, 1963), 239-246.
- Freilich, Morris. "Toward an Operational Definition of Community," Rural Sociology, 28 (1963), 117-127.
- Fyfe, Stewart. "Local Government Reform: Some Canadian Experiences," Presented to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1971.
- Green, F.H.W. "Community of Interest and Local Government Areas," Public Administration, 34 (Spring, 1956), 39-49.
- Hiller, E.T. "The Community as a Social Group," American Sociological Review, VI (1941), 189-202.
- Hillery, George A. "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement," Rural Sociology, 20 (March, 1955), 111-123.
- Kaufman, H.F. "Toward an Interaction Conception of Community," Social Forces, 38 (1959), 8-17.
- Krueger, Ralph R. "The Provincial-Municipal Government Revolution in New Brunswick," Canadian Public Administration, XIII (Spring, 1970), 51-99.
- Moulin, Leo. "Local Self-Government as a Basis for Democracy," Public Administration, 32 (Winter, 1954), 433-437.
- Panter-Brick, Keith. "Local Self-Government as a Basis for Democracy," Public Administration, 32 (Winter, 1954), 438-440.
- Plunkett, Thomas J. "Report of the Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation in New Brunswick: A Review and Commentary," Canadian Public Administration, VIII (March, 1965), 17-23.
- Quesnel-Oullet, Louise. "Changement dans les structures municipales: etude de la region de Quebec," Presented to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1972.
- Sutton, W.A., and Kolaja, J. "The Concept of Community," Rural Sociology, 25 (1960), 197-203.
- Tennant, Paul, and Zirnhelt, Dave. "The Emergence of Metropolitan Government in Greater Vancouver," Presented to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1971.

C. Government reports and documents

- Alberta. Co-terminous Boundaries Commission. Interim Report. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1953.

- Alberta. Royal Commission on the Metropolitan Development of Calgary and Edmonton. Report. Edmonton: Queen's Printer, 1956.
- British Columbia. Department of Municipal Affairs. Regional Districts in British Columbia, 1971: General Review. Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1972.
- Campbell, Hon. Dan. The Changing Face of Local Government, 1967. Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1967.
- Earl Berger Limited. Local Orientation and Identification Study. Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1971.
- Economic Council of Canada. Fourth Annual Review. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967.
- Great Britain. Royal Commission on Local Government in England. Report. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969.
- _____. Royal Commission on Local Government in England. Research Studies 9: Community Attitudes Survey: England. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969.
- _____. Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland. Report. Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969.
- _____. Royal Commission on Local Government in Scotland. Research Studies 2: Community Survey: Scotland. Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969.
- Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board. The Greater Vancouver Metropolitan Community. Vancouver, 1954.
- _____. Regional Districts: Proceedings of the Discussion on Bill 83, Regional Districts Legislation, as it Might Apply in the Lower Mainland Planning Area. Vancouver, 1965.
- Manitoba. Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission. Report and Recommendations. Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1959.
- _____. Local Government Boundaries Commission. Provisional Plan for Local Government Units in the Greater Winnipeg Area. Winnipeg, 1970.
- _____. Local Government Boundaries Commission. A Provisional Plan for the Structure of Units of Local Government Outside the Limits of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. Winnipeg, 1970.
- _____. Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg Review Commission. Report and Recommendations. 1964.
- _____. Proposals for Urban Reorganization in the Greater Winnipeg Area. Winnipeg, 1970.

Manitoba. Provincial-Municipal Committee. Report and Memorandum of Recommendations. Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1953.

_____. Royal Commission on Brandon Boundaries. Report, 1971.

_____. Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance. Report. Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1964.

Metropolitan Joint Committee. Final Report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, British Columbia. Vancouver, 1960.

Montreal. Commission for the Study of the Metropolitan Problems of Montreal. General and Final Report, 1955.

New Brunswick. Royal Commission on Finance and Municipal Taxation. Report. Fredericton, 1963.

_____. Royal Commission on the Greater Fredericton Area. Report. 1971.

_____. Royal Commission on the Greater Moncton Area. Report. 1971.

_____. Royal Commission on Metropolitan Saint John. Report. 1963.

Nova Scotia. Strait of Canso Local Government Review. Steering Committee Report. Halifax: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1971.

Ontario. Committee on Taxation. Report. Vol.II. Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1967.

_____. Design for Development: Phase Two. 1968.

_____. Department of Municipal Affairs. 1972 Municipal Directory. Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1972.

_____. Department of Municipal Affairs. Sudbury Local Government Reform Proposals. 1971.

_____. Department of Municipal Affairs. Waterloo Local Government Reform Proposals. 1971.

_____. Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review. Report and Recommendations. Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1969.

_____. Inter-departmental Committee on Government at the District Level in Northern Ontario. Report and Recommendations. 1969.

_____. Lakehead Local Government Review. Report and Recommendations. 1968.

_____. Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Proposal for Local Government Reform in an Area East of Metro, 1972.

Ontario. Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Proposal for Local Government Reform in an Area West of Metropolitan Toronto. 1973.

_____. Muskoka District Local Government Review. Final Report and Recommendations. 1969.

_____. Niagara Region Local Government Review. Report. Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1966.

_____. Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton County Local Government Review. Final Report and Recommendations. Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1965.

_____. Peel-Halton Local Government Review. Report. Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1966.

_____. Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto. Report. 1965.

_____. Select Committee on the Municipal Act and Related Acts. Fourth and Final Report. 1965.

_____. Sudbury Area Study. Report. 1970.

_____. Waterloo Area Local Government Review. Report of Findings and Recommendations. Toronto: Department of Municipal Affairs, 1970.

Ontario Municipal Board. Decisions and Recommendations of the Board. Toronto: Queen's Printer, January 20, 1953.

Oshawa Area Planning and Development Study. Regional Government Report. 1971.

Pictou County Municipal Coordination Study. Phase 2: Recommendations. Halifax: Institute of Public Affairs of Dalhousie University, 1969.

Quebec. Commission d'étude sur les problèmes intermunicipaux de l'Île Jésus. Rapport. 1964.

_____. Commission d'étude des problèmes intermunicipaux sur la rive sud. Rapport. 1967.

_____. Etudes sur les Communautés urbaines au Québec. Delimitation du Territoire. Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1968. (blue series)

_____. Etudes sur les Communautés au Québec. Delimitation du Territoire: Zone Métropolitaine de Québec. Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1968. (green series)

_____. Etudes sur les Communautés Urbaines au Québec. Delimitation du Territoire: Zone Métropolitaine du Saguenay. Québec: Ministère des Affaires Municipales, 1969.

- Quebec. Ministre des Affaires Municipales. Proposition de Reforme des Structures municipales. Quebec: L'Editeur officiel du Quebec, 1971.
- _____. Study Commission of Intermunicipal Problems on the Island of Montreal. Report. Quebec: Queen's Printer, 1964.
- St. John's Urban Region Study. An Outline. St. John's, Newfoundland, 1973.
- Saskatchewan. Committee on Provincial-Municipal Relations. Report. Regina: King's Printer, 1951.
- _____. Local Government Continuing Committee. Local Government in Saskatchewan. Regina: Queen's Printer, 1961.
- _____. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Alternative Forms of Local Government. Regina: Queen's Printer, 1955.
- _____. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Report 4: Rural Roads and Local Government. Regina: Queen's Printer, 1955.
- _____. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Report 12: Service Centres. Regina: Queen's Printer, 1957.
- Statistics Canada. Canada Year Book. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1952-1972.
- Toronto. Submission to Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto. 1964.
- Westmount. Local Government in the Montreal Metropolitan Area. 1971.
- Whitehorse. Financial and Related Consequences for the City of Whitehorse of City Enlargement and the New Municipal Aid Ordinance. 1972.