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This thesis uses theories of the state in order to explain the City of Vancouver's housing actions from 1900-1973. Theories of the state are used to identify and contribute to an understanding of the constraints and opportunities a municipality faces in intervening in housing.

The theoretical discussion, developed by a literature review, is in three major parts. First, the role of the state in capitalist society is discussed. The neo-Marxist perspective of the role of the state is adopted. According to this perspective the state has a two fold role. First the state functions to aid in capital accumulation. Second, the state functions to legitimize the capitalist system. The second part of the discussion rests on theoretical distinctions on the ways in which the state fulfills its role. Pluralist, instrumentalist and corporatist/managerialist perspectives are analyzed and it is concluded that at different times and circumstances it is possible that all three might apply to the way a state acts. The third part of the theoretical discussion is on the local state. The local state is not separate from the state, though it does have some autonomy. In the areas where the local state does have some autonomy the way it acts can be explained by the three differing theoretical perspectives.
The history of the City of Vancouver's role in housing is presented by describing policies, programs and plans undertaken by the City from 1900 to 1973. This research was accomplished primarily by reading original government records in the Vancouver City Archives. With respect to housing initiatives, the City was constrained by its financial and jurisdictional ties to the national state. However, this thesis shows that at times the City was able to define its own terms and conditions and exhibit some autonomy.

The details of the housing history also show that the City of Vancouver's role was in capital accumulation and the legitimation of capitalism. For most of the period studied the City of Vancouver was the instrument of the capitalist class. However, this neo-Marxist interpretation is tempered by evidence that both the corporate goals of the City itself and the pressure exerted by local interest groups have had a significant impact on the City of Vancouver's housing actions. This is explained by the nature of housing as a consumption item, as well as by the need to account for human elements in state actions. The fact that the local state is necessary for democratic legitimation and that housing can be made important to critical production issues presents opportunities at the local government level for housing reforms.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to use theories of the state in order to explain the City of Vancouver's housing actions from 1900-1973. Theories of the state are used to identify and contribute to an understanding of the constraints and opportunities a municipality faces in intervening in housing. Theories of the state are developed in two ways. The first deals with the question: what is the role of the state? What social and economic functions does the state fulfill? The second area of inquiry addressed by theories of the state is: how does the state fulfill its role? How do we explain the actions the state takes?

The answers to these two questions provide a framework for analyzing the specific history of the City of Vancouver's housing interventions. The analysis will help determine the limits and opportunities on municipalities in defining and implementing housing policy.

This chapter discusses the need to understand the role and actions of the state, explaining why theories are needed and why a history of local state intervention is necessary. The method used, definitions, and the organization of the rest of this thesis are also included in this chapter.
1. The Problem

Municipal governments are limited in the role they can play in ensuring an adequate and affordable housing stock for their residents. The City of Vancouver is perceived to be unable to resolve its major housing problems and the mid-1980's are a time when the range of options for municipal action in housing seems extremely limited. There is a need for a careful analysis of how and why this situation developed, an analysis which can only emerge from a historical review of the municipal role in housing.

It is commonplace to cite the restricted scope of authority and funds available for housing policy at the local level (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1981, p. 1). The reasons behind this situation are fundamental to understanding a municipality's limited ability to plan and implement housing policy.

In order to better understand these limitations and look for opportunities the research focus of this thesis will be on:

1. current theories of the state;

2. what an analysis of the City of Vancouver's housing policies, programs and plans tells us about the constraints and opportunities on local government's role in housing.

Therefore, the findings of this thesis center on: one, what lines of theory hold the most potential for housing analysis; and, two, the history of the City of Vancouver's role in housing - what happened and what significance it had.
2. Why a History of Local Governments' Role in Housing?

Why a History? The intrinsic value of history is the first reason why we need to focus on the evolution of local governments' role in housing. Our current institutions, policies, plans, assumptions and attitudes have all evolved from events in the past. Studying the past helps to illuminate the present and points the way to the future. Planning in general, and housing planning in particular, is future orientated. Yet, as Anthony Sutcliffe points out, "planners need the past more than anyone ... for without it they cannot draw on experience" (Sutcliffe 1981).

Another planner, Eugenie Birch, asks how can those involved in the housing issues of the future be qualified to judge the relative worth of any action if they do not have the ability to distinguish among the cultural and institutional issues embedded in ... society? To do this they need exposure to planning history - the experiences, accomplishments and failures of their professional forebears. (Birch 1980)

In their study of British housing policy and practice, Malpass and Murie (1982) argue that historical background "is essential to any understanding of contemporary housing problems and policy" (p. x).

This thesis is, therefore, a response to the present lack of historical analysis of the role of local government in Canadian housing. The research effort is based on the premise that it is important to understand past experience before embarking on new policy initiatives.
Why Local Government's Role in Housing? Housing is the "physical, economic and social backbone of community structure" (Nenno 1982, p. 2). Nenno (1982) gives ten reasons why housing is important to a local jurisdiction:

1. Housing is a durable, physical product in a neighbourhood setting.
2. Housing is a major user of community land.
3. Housing is a generator of local public facilities and services.
4. Housing is the object of local real estate taxes.
5. Housing is a major influence on its physical and social environment.
6. Housing is an essential supporter of business and industry.
7. Housing is a major source of employment.
8. Housing is a major investment or expenditure for individual families.
9. Housing is a major investment for the private financial community.
10. Housing is a major ingredient in family satisfaction or dissatisfaction and in a community's sense of well-being.

In short, local government is the jurisdiction that is closest to the housing problems experienced by its residents. "Since housing markets are highly localized, there is much to commend in a less centralized approach to housing issues" (Goldberg and Mark 1985). A municipality is, given the appropriate resources and expertise, best able to define, research and evaluate a local problem. On this basis, the role of the local state in solving a problem that is highly localized is of great interest and the local state's actions in doing so
warrants study.

This thesis does not question whether the state should intervene in housing, but considers why it intervenes when it does. It is not the purpose of this thesis, therefore, to conclude with a determination of what the municipal role in housing ought to be.

3. Why Use a Theory of the State?

This thesis makes use of theories of the state in order to explicitly examine the role of one level of the state in housing policy and programs. The last twenty years has produced many attempts to theorize about the role of government and housing. However, most housing analysis is not rooted in a theory of the state. Marcuse coined the phrase the "myth of the benevolent state" (Marcuse 1978). By this he meant that it is fiction to believe that

the government acts out of a primary concern for the welfare of all its citizens, that its policies represent an effort to find solutions to recognized social problems, and that government efforts fall short of complete success only because of lack of knowledge, countervailing selfish interests, incompetence, or lack of courage.

(Marcuse 1978)

Theories of the state deal explicitly with the relationship between the state and the social and economic setting in which the state is situated. In order to determine whether the idea of the benevolent state is indeed a myth we need to reflect upon the theory of the state in general and the local state in particular.
A theory of the state in a capitalist society addresses the following question: "How does state policy ... arise from the specific problems of an economic and class structure based on the private utilization of capital and free wage-labour and what functions does this policy perform with regard to this structure?" (Offe 1984a). Theoretical work on the state is necessary to provide the answers to how and why a state performs the functions it does, the way it does.

Macpherson (1977) identifies three positions one might take in examining society. The first category are those who on the whole accept and uphold the existing liberal-democratic society and state, with no more than marginal reservations or hopes that they can be made somewhat better, within the same framework, by for instance more informed citizen participation, or less or more welfare-state activity. (Macpherson 1977)

Macpherson claims that this group of analysts not only don't have a theory of the state, but they can't 'afford' one. By working with a model of people and society based on a market economy "they assume maximizing market man as the norm, (and) they need not go behind that to inquire into the nature or potential of man and to relate that to the state" (Macpherson 1977). Therefore, the state is "treated as an agent which does or should subserve the principle of (distributive) justice or (individual) liberty" (Macpherson 1977).

Macpherson's second category are those "who accept the humanistic values read into liberal-democracy by Mill and the
idealists, but who reject present liberal democracy as having failed to realize those values" (Macpherson 1977). This second category has need for a theory of the state and has adopted a pluralist theory of society and of the democratic state. Therefore, liberal-democrats who accept the values of a liberal-democracy, but feel that Western industrial societies have failed to realize the true potential of liberal-democracy must develop a new theory of the state. It is in this category that the work in this thesis falls. Macpherson suggests that those in the second category need to draw on the recent work of Marxists.

The third category in Macpherson's typology are those who use a Marxist frame of analysis and who are committed to understanding the role of the state. Neo-Marxists have, in the past two decades, contributed greatly to developing a theory of the state. Within the parameters of Marxist theory the debate has lead to several differing approaches.

In spite of the seeming incompatibility of each major theoretical approach (these are evaluated in Chapter 2), we must be warned against accepting only one perspective as the basis for analysis. "Using only one approach," argues Alan Burnett, "can incur the danger that research will find out only what a given theoretical perspective has encouraged the researcher to look for" (Burnett 1984, p. 27). Burnett (1984) found in his research on neighbourhood participation that "no one theoretical approach has a monopoly of wisdom, and
insights can be gained from several." This principle will be used in studying theories of the state in more detail for their applicability to an analysis of the role of local government in housing. In particular, theories of the state will be assessed for their applicability to local areas and to the Canadian situation.

4. Method

The research is divided into two parts. The first part is a review of current literature on theories of the state and theories of the local state. From this review, an analytical framework is developed to use in understanding the results of the historical research. It is not the purpose of this thesis to integrate all theories or to develop a new theoretical perspective. Rather, existing theories will be used in developing the analytical framework. Also, it is not the purpose of this thesis to prove or disprove any particular theory. The aim is to explain the historical data in light of the theories.

The second part of the thesis is an historical study charting the evolution of the City of Vancouver's role in housing from 1900 to 1973. The aim is to illustrate the key events, not to provide every detail in a long history. Not only will the history highlight key events, it will also identify what was not done - particularly opportunities missed or refused.

The history concludes in 1973 for three reasons. First,
there is a need to impose some limit on the historical period studied. Second, the history of the City of Vancouver's housing programs and policies is already well documented from 1973 on. For example, the City of Vancouver's major 1979 housing report, *Understanding Vancouver's Housing*, makes extensive reference to events since 1973. The period before 1973 is not nearly so well recorded and needs documenting. Third, 1973 was a major turning point. In 1972, municipal elections brought a new style of civic government, and provincial elections a new government in the legislature. These political changes, combined with a major revision in federal housing policy and programs in 1973, create a significant turning point in the City's role in housing.

The history was developed using primary sources in the Vancouver City Archives. Sources included civic government records from the Board of Administration, City Clerks Office, Finance Department, Health Department, Mayors Office, Parks and Recreation Department, Planning Department, Social Services Department, Social Planning Department, Special and Standing Committees of Council, and the Vancouver Town Planning Commission. Manuscripts, newsclippings, annual reports and City Council minutes were also used. In addition, journal articles, theses, books and statistical records relevant to the history were used.

5. Definition of Terms

*The State and Government*. The state is defined in terms
of its form and function. Its form is derived from the institutions which make it up and its functions are the activities that the institutions perform (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 23). The term the "state" is not the same as the "government." The state is a complex set of institutions, that includes government, but also includes three other major institutions used to fulfill state functions. The government is one institution and includes the political or rule-making legislative and executive bodies.
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The other three institutions are the administration, (which includes bureaucracies in the civil service "as well as in public corporations, central banks, regulatory commissions, etc." (Panitch 1977, p. 6)) the judiciary and the repressive apparatus (the police and the military) (Therborn 1978, p. 41). The state also includes the "sub-central levels of government, that is, provincial executives, legislatures and bureaucracies, and municipal institutions" (Panitch, 1977, p. 6). It should be noted that this thesis looks only at government and administrative interventions. While "the
"state" is broader than government and administration, not all aspects are examined in this thesis.

What this definition of the state excludes is important. This definition leaves out political parties, the privately owned media, the church, pressure groups. These other institutions form part of the political system and no doubt part of the system of power in a liberal-democratic capitalist society, but, ... they remain autonomous from the state. (Panitch 1977, pp. 6-7)

The Local State. A local state is defined as any government entity having a political and spatial jurisdiction at less than the national scale, and having the authority to raise revenues from, and make expenditures on behalf of its constituents. The local state may therefore take many forms, and more than one type of local state may exist in any nation. (Clark and Dear 1981)

In a study of the spatial organization of the state hierarchy in Massachusetts, Dear and Clark (1981) limited the definition of the local state to include only municipal governments. That will be the case in this thesis as well.

Municipal Intervention in Housing. For the purpose of this thesis, there are four ways in which a municipality can intervene in housing that will be examined. They are the direct provision of housing, which includes public housing, urban renewal, etc.; welfare functions such as subsidies and shelter allowances; planning (policies, housing targets, subdivision); and, regulations such as minimum standards and zoning by-laws and building codes.
6. **Organization of the Thesis**

Chapter 2 reviews theories of the state and theories of the local state. It concludes by identifying the implications of the theory for analyzing the history of the City of Vancouver's housing actions.

The history of the City of Vancouver's housing policies and programs from 1900 to 1973 is provided in Chapter 3. The period studied is divided into three sections and key events are summarized at the end of each section.

In Chapter 4 theories of the state are used to analyze the City of Vancouver's role in housing. This is done by establishing what the theory predicts should be the role of the City, by summarizing the evolution of the City's role in housing, and by seeing what the theory explains in the Vancouver history.

Chapter 5 provides some concluding comments, presents the implications of the thesis for housing and planning and suggests areas of further research.
1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to determine how existing theories of the state and theories of the local state can be used as a means of analyzing the City of Vancouver's evolving role in housing.

A useful way of looking at various theories of the state is provided by Johnston (1984) who developed a three level hierarchy of theories. Figure 2 illustrates this hierarchy of theories. The highest level of theory is a grand theory of the state explaining the role of the state in any society. This level of theory is not addressed in this study. Instead, the second level of the hierarchy, in which the theory of the role of the state in a particular society, is the level used as a starting point here. In this case, the theoretical role of the state is developed specifically with reference to western capitalist society.

Overall we find that theory has focussed on the liberal democratic state "rather than on a theory of the state as such ... Twentieth-century traditional theorists have not given much attention to the specific nature of the state in capitalist society" (Macpherson 1977). As we shall see, the theory adopted in this paper rests on a neo-Marxist view of the twofold role of the state which is to ensure the capital
accumulation process is maintained and to ensure that the capital accumulation process is not challenged by those disadvantaged by it.

Capital accumulation refers to the ability of private enterprise to produce things not only for the products themselves but for the surplus value or profit they generate. The neo-Marxist theory of the role of the state in capitalist society is that the state has the mandate to create and sustain the conditions of accumulation for private enterprise in order that the capital accumulation process be maintained. However, capitalism "is built on inequality and exploitation, which generates tensions between "haves" and "have-nots," exploiters and exploited" (Johnston 1984, p. 54). In order to legitimize the domination of society by capital the state must relax the tensions generated by capitalism,

to convince the relatively deprived that the system is beneficial to them and, when and where necessary, to temper the demands of the exploiters, so that in their search for greater profits they do not foment unrest which would damage or even destroy the system.

(Johnston 1984, p. 54)

The state must not appear to function exclusively for capital, which would leave it open to challenge by those disadvantaged by the process of private accumulation. The state must appear to pursue "the common and general interests of society as a whole" (Offe 1975) so that it can continue its role in accumulation. The state seeks legitimacy for the capitalist system as a whole by pursuing some actions that
would appear to deny its fundamental relationship in maintaining the conditions for capital accumulation.
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The third level in the hierarchy of theories are those which theorize about actions within the state. This level theorizes about the many ways in which the state can perform its roles of accumulation and legitimation. The major theoretical perspectives of the actions within the state explored in this chapter are the pluralist, managerialist and the Marxist (including the instrumental and structural perspectives) political economy approaches.

Theories of the role of the local state in capitalist society sometimes run parallel to, and sometime overlap considerably, with theories of the state. Sorting out the relationship of the local state to the central state, and to
society in general, forms the second part of this chapter. The theoretical framework is developed through a literature review.

2. Theory of the Role of the State

There are two major theoretical perspectives on the role of the state. One is based on liberal democratic views of the pluralist state and the second is based on a Marxist political economy view.

Liberal Democratic Theories. While the state as such is rarely examined by liberal democratic theorists, and the tendency is to see government agencies as only one set of interest groups among many other (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 42), liberal democratic theories allow the state one of four roles. The role of the state can be allocation, stabilization, distribution and/or arbitration. First, the state can be the supplier or provider of public goods and services. "Relevant policy questions include the proper criteria for state intervention and for allocative efficiency. The research problem in this category is concerned with issues of allocation" (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 51). In terms of local government, there are three reasons offered for the public rather than private provision of certain goods at the local level:

1. public goods may be provided as a means of controlling spatial externalities or spillover effects;

2. public goods may be provided at a particular level because the market cannot; and
3. Public goods may be provided as a means of maintaining certain desired collective (moral, political or otherwise) preferences of the local community.

(Clark 1981, after Ostrom et al. 1961)

Second, the state can act as a regulator and facilitator of the operation of the marketplace. Those who view the state in this way are most concerned with the stabilization function of the government.

Third, the state is seen as a social engineer in the sense of intervening in the economy to achieve its own policy objectives. In this case, "policy questions are predominantly of a distributive nature" (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 51).

Last, the state can act as a neutral arbiter between conflicting or competing groups interests in society. The state supervises and regulates the "competition of interests so that none could abuse their power to gain mastery of some section of social life" (Kirk 1982, p. 135). In this role the state acts like a referee and "changes the focus from decision-making in the market system to decision-making in the political arena" (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 51).

Theorists in these categories say that the state acts for "the protection and reproduction of the social structure (the fundamental relations of production) in so far as this is not achieved by the automatic process of the economy" (Mandel 1975, p. 474). More specifically, in relation to urban problems the state acts "as the prime provider of items for collective consumption and as administrator and manager of
conflicts which arise or could arise given the nature of this provision" (Lambert et al. 1978, p. 16).

Political Economic Theory. The Marxist political economy view directly links the state and capital. It is this category of theory, with its emphasis on the relationship between the state and capital, on which this chapter will focus.

The state, according to Offe (1975, 1984), should be defined both in terms of its structure or institutions (such as the legislature, judiciary, etc.,) but also in terms of its functional relationship between the state and the accumulation process of a capitalist society (Offe 1975, p 125). The functional relationship is based on capital accumulation and the need for legitimation to maintain the conditions for accumulation (Offe 1975, O'Connor 1973).

The capitalist mode of commodity production is one where private decisions (rather than public decisions) determine the use of the means of production. In this case, the state has no authority to control or order production - the state is outside the accumulation process. The state does have both the authority and the mandate to create and sustain the conditions of accumulation. However, the state's position is constrained by its dependence on taxation revenues generated through the accumulation process. The state faces taxation constraints as it's political ends depend on material resources derived through taxation of privately accumulated capital. Since state power and the ways in which material
resources are used depend primarily on the revenues derived from the accumulation process the state depends on the presence and continuity of the accumulation process and the state itself would be threatened if it pursued policies that were not consistent with protecting and maintaining capital accumulation. At the same time the state must appear to pursue the common and general interests of all society, including equal access to power, etc., if it is to function in its specific relationship to the accumulation process. One of the most common ways it does this is by seeking democratic legitimation through electoral support of representative government (Offe 1975, pp. 126-127 & 1984, pp. 120-121).

The capitalist state is characterized, therefore, as being excluded from accumulation, as being necessary to the maintenance of accumulation, as being dependent on accumulation and as having to deny and/or conceal the first three characteristics (Offe 1975, p. 144).

The consequence of the state's dual function in accumulation and legitimation is that in order to secure the interests of capital in accumulation the state must invest in production. The state invests in production by providing physical infrastructure and by training workers - developing human capital through education, etc. The second function of the state is the legitimization function which it does by investment in consumption and through its institutional form of democracy. Public goods which serve the interests of the
working class and society in general and individual goods such as housing make up state investments in consumption. Kirk (1980) reminds us that a capitalist mode of production involves an essential contradiction. There is a "fundamental tension between the profit-maximizing dictates of the economy and the political desideratum that people's needs are provided for." The state is necessary to the smooth functioning of both capitalism and meeting social needs. If the state is to retain the function of securing the capital mode of production then it has to retain the political mandate or legitimacy to do so. The implication of having a dual function - meeting the needs of both production and consumption, is conflict. The state must find a balance between production expenditures which directly aid capital and consumption expenditures which only indirectly aid capital.

The state can be seen as dependent on the "democratic idealization of society and its implications of authority and popular control" (Clark 1981) because it hides the fact that "the material resources of state power, and the ways in which these are used, primarily depend upon the revenues derived from the accumulation process, and not upon the voting preferences of the general electorate" (Offe 1984b). Democracy is necessary for the state to be legitimized to carry out its role in accumulation. Democracy is a tool enabling the continued domination of a ruling class over a subservient class. According to Marxist analysis, the practice of indirect representation characteristic of
democracies in capitalist nations causes a "separation between responsibility and control (which) creates a situation whereby the state may act as an autonomous and independent body, that is, from direct intervention by the enfranchised corpus of voters" (Clark 1981).

Democratic representative government plays an important role in legitimizing the state's role in capital accumulation. It is important however, not to underestimate the requirements of a democratic form of state. Some would argue about the extent of democracy in Canada, (Resnick 1984) or would, through Marxist analysis, dismiss gains made by the working class through the democratic process so that political actions that "wrought an improvement in working conditions, the reduction and regulation of work hours, and improved health and medical benefits (to mention only a few) are often ridiculed" (Clark 1981). But, the democratic form of the state is an important factor, particularly at the local level with which this thesis deals.

The neo-Marxist view of the role of the state is adopted for this thesis and it is with the accumulation and legitimation functions of the state in mind that this thesis looks at the theories that explain the ways in which a state can act to fulfill these two functions.

3. Theoretical Perspectives on Actions Within the State

Pluralist Theories of State Action. While no label is
perfect, many theories of actions within the state fit well under the category of pluralist or representational theory. Theorists in this category rely on a pluralist view of a democratic state. Power is said to be

competitive, fragmented and diffused; everybody directly or through organized groups has some power and nobody has or can have too much of it ... There are in Western societies, no predominant classes, interests or groups. There are only competing blocks of interest whose competition, which is sanctioned and guaranteed by the state itself, ensures that power is diffused or balanced and that no particular interest is able to weigh too heavily upon the state.

(Miliband 1973, pp. 4-5)

The basic assumption held under this view is that the state is neutral and that it is independent of any particular class interests (Saunders 1979, p. 150). All groups are said to be represented by the state and the minority that governs is open and responsive to the needs of the majority who express their preferences through the electoral process. In fact, the pluralist theorists claim that "the overall neutrality of the state and its freedom from any intrinsic class bias is guaranteed by the electoral process" (Saunders 1979, p. 152). Elections rest on political equality and political accountability. Therefore, political leaders must respect the political will of citizens if they wish to be re-elected.

The fragmentation and diffusion of power in a pluralist society does not mean that power is equally distributed. Rather

the theory argues that the sources of power are
unequally, though widely distributed among individuals and groups within society. Although all groups and interests do not have the same degree of influence, even the least powerful are able to make their voices heard at some stage in the decision-making process. No individual or group is completely powerless, and the pluralist explanation of this is that the sources of power—like money, information, expertise and so on—are distributed non-cumulatively and no one source is dominant.

(Ham and Hill 1984, p. 28)

The pluralist approach rejects a class-based view of society. Democracies are seen to be a process of progressions, incorporating new and more interest groups. The system is regarded as open and responsive to differing groups (not classes) with differing interests that interact and represent issues. Policy outcomes, therefore, do not reflect differences in power, but differences in intensity of preferences.

Because power is said to be fragmented and diffused in a pluralist political system, an analogy is drawn between the state and the economic marketplace. The state is seen to be a political marketplace "in which the 'supply' of decisions comes to balance and reflect the level of effective demand" (Saunders 1979, p. 154). This perspective rests on the assumption that "people shout when they have a reason to, and the louder they shout, the better their reason, and the greater is the likelihood of their views being accepted" (Saunders 1979, p. 152). Therefore, what a group achieves depends on its political resources and its ability to express its preferences.

The state rests on consensus and is characterized by
stability and gradual change that is reform orientated. The need for consensus is a constraint on the state and helps to explain why the state is not an instrument for any one class or interest group. If the state tried to function other than by consensus those in power "would be certain to fail for a coerced majority could simply vote against the incumbent at the next election and replace them with more responsive officials" (Dahl 1963, p. 76 quoted in Saunders 1979, p. 153).

In terms of analysis, pluralist theorists pay most attention to the activities of organizations and interest groups, "their aims and aspirations, membership and support, activities and tactics, in influencing particular policies" (Kirk 1982, p. 138). Pluralists see the local state as a democratic institution reflecting the wishes of the general population and the activities of the the various pressure groups" (Short 1982, p. 165). Pluralist theories of the local state emphasize local control and local self-determination, decentralization, competition among local governments over the delivery of public goods and services and support the ideology of local autonomy (Clark and Dear 1984, p. 131).

Critique of Pluralist Theories of the State. While pluralist theorists acknowledge that the state plays a role in protecting and reproducing the social structure, their viewpoint "deliberately leaves unresolved the questions of the purpose, method and degree of state intervention to maintain the social structure" (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 46). The economic context of political decision-making "is taken as a
non-problematic 'given', a neutral background against which political and cultural differences are worked out, an influence which can be taken completely for granted" (Kirk 1982, p. 140). The role of decision-makers and the way in which decisions are made in a larger social-economic context is not the subject of pluralist theory. Critics suggest that the consensus of the pluralist state may in fact be a manipulated one created by a minority interest through a politician who creates public will by control of propaganda (education and the media for example).

Another criticism put forward is that the theory of a pluralist or representative state assumes the equality of the ability to pursue interests of the various competing interest groups. "The market analogy which underpins representational theories of the state inevitably raises the question of how far political demands are backed by effective political 'purchasing power'" (Saunders 1979, p. 155). There are wide variations, in terms of scope and type of issues, funds and facilities available, organizational skill of group members and the ability to articulate demands and mobilize support among varying interest groups (Kirk 1982, p. 136). In addition, not all interests are represented by groups and not all groups have representation.

Pluralist theory is criticized "for ignoring the possibility that power may be exercised other than on key issues" (Ham and Hill 1984, p 31). 'Non-decision-making' is
an important aspect of government policy and an area in which interest groups are unlikely or unable to be vocal.

A fourth criticism is about the assumption of the one-way nature of political influence from the bottom upwards. Political influence is said to flow from constituents to politicians and officials without regard for the power and/or resources of dominant interest groups, or actors within the state, against less powerful groups (Kirk 1982, p. 138).

Lastly, pluralist theory focusses on the activity of participants in the political process and has little to say about inactivity of constituents.

If no complaints are heard, it is assumed that people are either satisfied with the status quo, and have no complaints, or else they are not sufficiently interested to register complaints if they have them. What this approach does not allow for is the fact that people may be inactive because they perceive themselves to be powerless and without influence. (Kirk 1982, p. 138)

In fact, modern day democracy is considered to be functioning well if political participation is minimal and left primarily to voting in elections. This view stands in contrast to nineteenth century democratic theorists such as John Stuart Mill who saw liberal democracy as the means whereby all individuals could more fully develop their potential through political participation. (Saunders 1979, pp. 155-156)

Pluralist theories are not used to reveal the shortcomings of current forms of democracy (compared to Mill's idealised version), but are used to describe existing political systems "serving to elevate every element of those systems into
virtues, and to justify what they find by ad hoc rationalization" (Saunders 1979, p. 156).

**Managerialism and Corporatism.** Managerialist or bureaucratic theories assert that it is not the various interest groups in society who have most ability to influence decision-making. Instead the managerialist thesis states that it is managers (bureaucrats, politicians and elites) who control the terms, forms and content of political debate and action, to the extent that they are able to remove from the political sphere "important issues about the unequal distribution of scarce resources and successfully redefine public issues as private troubles and political issues as technical concerns" (Lambert et al. 1978, p. 169). The emphasis is clearly on the actions of managers and not on constraints imposed by the structures of society. Urban managers are seen to perform a mediating function between the central state and the local population and between public and private sectors" (Ham and Hill 1984, pp. 40-41).

Research within this theoretical framework has primarily been done at the local level, where the managerialist approach shows that residents have little real influence on local government and where, in many cases, elected officials rely heavily on the expertise of their full-time bureaucrats in making decisions. Research focusses on identifying "the urban managers, their ideology and constraints and the distributional consequences of their actions" (Short 1982, p. 166).
Pahl's (1975) work on urban managers showed that "the distribution of resources in urban systems is influenced by urban managers, that is bureaucrats, local politicians and other local elites with control over resource allocation" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 40). Urban managers included government technocrats and 'social gate-keepers' "who mediate in the allocative processes and who have the capacity to shape the socio-spatial system" (Kirk 1982, p. 139). This includes housing department officials, real estate agents, private landlords - those who control access to urban facilities such as housing or social services. However, in later work the term urban manager was limited to local state bureaucrats, excluding elected officials and private sector officials (Saunders 1979, p. 192 and Short 1982, p. 166).

The degree of autonomy that urban managers have can be seen as a continuum:

At one extreme ... the local state officials have relative autonomy in shaping and implementing policy. Policy directives from the centre are so loose and local political interest so muted that the managers' actions are an independent variable in policy implementation and policy outcomes. At the other extreme, central state directives are so clearly specified that the local bureaucracy has little room for independent action and the central and local state act as one. (Short 1982, p. 167)

There are three factors that affect the degree of urban manager autonomy - ecological, political and economic constraints (Saunders 1979, p. 189). It is unnecessary to go into detail about each of these constraints for this study,
although it is important to note that these factors narrow the scope of decision-making, they do not determine it (Saunders 1979, p. 196).

The managerialist thesis was criticized as it is not based on a theory of the state. The managerialist thesis lacks a theory of power which could hypothesize on the relative importance of different sets of managers. It also fails to "take adequate account of the context of constraints in which urban management decisions were taken" (Saunders 1979, p. 168). A theory of corporatism addresses these problems by changing the definition of managers to mean only bureaucrats and by taking "explicit account of the internal structure of the state (i.e. the relation between central and local levels) and of its external relationship with the private sector" (Saunders 1979, pp. 168-9).

Corporatist theory, developed by Winkler (1976), is based on the view that the state has become more direct and interventionist. The state moves from a position of supporting the process of capital accumulation to directing that process. In making this shift, new patterns of relationships have developed between the state and the major economic interest groups, and the state, although unconstrained by these interests, has autonomy deriving from its command of legal, organizational and other resources. It is this autonomy which enables the state to act in the interests of capital, labour and other interests as appropriate ... Above all, it is the independence of the state which is stressed by the corporatists.

(Ham and Hill 1984, p. 41)

The state is not seen to be controlled "by any particular
economic class or group, but plays an independent and dominant role in its relationship with labour and capital" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 37). Urban managerialists (bureaucrats in particular) are seen to have some degree of autonomy, but work closely with private sector elites such as those in real estate interests. This view is contrasted with Marxists who see local elites as "essentially subordinate to the pattern of power and class relations in the national state" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 59).

In corporatist theory the state is seen as being increasingly involved in directing economic activities rather than just supporting them, and in increasingly being involved in production rather than just allocation. The state undertakes these new roles because

the dynamics of capital accumulation have given rise to problems in the private sector (industrial concentration, declining productivity, high technological development costs and growing international competition - Winkler 1976, p. 117) which the traditional supportive role of the state has proved incapable of resolving.

(Saunders 1979, p. 170)

Corporatism is the response of the state to the problems of capitalism. This response is centered on production issues and not issues related to consumption items such as education, welfare, health and housing, in which the state has traditionally been involved.

The contribution of managerialist/corporatist theory is that it acknowledges "the power and complexity of central and local government bureaucracies, and the gradual expansion and
increasing control of government activity in everyday life" (Kirk 1982, p. 139). In addition, corporatism "provides an explicit theory of the autonomy of the state in advanced capitalism" (Saunders 1979, p. 173) by showing the growing role of the state in production issues as a response to current problems in capitalist societies. By focussing on the bureaucracy we can see the difficulty that some interest groups have in influencing the state because state bureaucracies are not necessarily responsive to pressure from below.

The main problem with this approach is that the focus of attention is placed on the bureaucracy. Like the pluralist approaches, the managerialist/corporatist approach operates in an economic vacuum, "without reference to the fact that in a capitalist society governments operate and make decisions within the constraints of a capitalist economic system" (Kirk 1982, p. 140). The managerial approach concerns itself primarily with the relationship between the local and national state but neglects the question of the relationship between the state and private business interests (Saunders 1979, p. 173).

It is not enough to identify the managers and their distribution of such scarce resources as housing. Scarcity is socially determined and the actions and ideologies of managers have to be seen in a much wider social and economic context. (Short 1982, p. 166)

**Elitism.** Elitism is a perspective drawn from Weberian sociological theory. A theoretical approach sometimes called
neo-pluralism (Ham and Hill 1984), the elitist approach stresses "the power exercised by a small number of well organized societal interests and notes the ability of these interests to achieve their goals" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 25). Elites exercise power as part of a dominating class, and use the state as an instrument of their power. The elitist approach is considered a distinct theoretical approach and actually was developed "largely as a response to and critique of Marxism" (Saunders 1979, p. 158).

Nonetheless, the elitist perspective is similar to the instrumental approach to the theory of the state and shares the view of the state as "the instrument whereby one group achieves political domination over another" (Saunders 1979, p. 158). Elite theorists distinguish between the elites and the masses while as we will see, the Marxist instrumental approach distinguishes between the ruling capitalist class and the proletariat who form the labour or working class. The elite occupy key positions in politics, economic interests and the military and the overlap and connection between leaders in these institutions is the source of their power. Senior officials in public bureaucracies are also part of the elite and are accorded the same power as other elites.

Some challenges to elitist theory are similar to those of Marxist instrumentalism and the critique of instrumentalism will apply. While challenging the view of power distribution supported by the liberal-democratic pluralists, it has been suggested that the existence of elites
is not incompatible with pluralist democracy because competition between elites protects democratic government ... According to this interpretation the structure of power in western industrialised countries can be described as democratic elitism involving not only competition between elites but also their circulation and replacement.

(Ham and Hill 1984, pp. 31-32)

**Marxist Theories of the State.** Marxist theory rests on the notion of class domination and conflict and is firmly rooted in the political economy of a society. Economic factors are not treated as non-issues. "The political activities of the state are inextricably bound up with economic developments within society" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 24). The political structure of a society is seen to be related to its economic system. Therefore, the state is not neutral - it is biased. Economic interests influence political action and "the state is an important means of maintaining the dominance of particular social classes" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 25).

The state is not seen as a benevolent agent of welfare improvement for all but as an arena for class struggle. In general, that struggle results in state policies which serve the interests of the dominant class, but the subordinate class may win occasional battles and wrest certain concessions to its interests.

(Malpass and Murie 1982, p. 3)

At the local level, "Marxist approaches give an account of urban issues which tie them firmly into the capital accumulation process, and offer an implicit or explicit critique of the exploitation of working people under capitalism" (Kirk 1982, p. 141).
Classical Marxist Theory of the State. While there is no coherent theory of the state in Marx's own writing, contemporary writers have found enough to form the basis for later analysis. Overall, the view developed from Marx's work is "that the capitalist state was fundamentally the coercive instrument of the ruling classes, and was a product of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms" (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 52).

Six themes related to the theory of the state can be found in classical Marxist literature:

1. the state as a parasitic institution, with no essential role in economic production;

2. the state and state power as epiphenomena, i.e. superficial reflections of an independent economic base;

3. the state as a factor of cohesion in society, regulating class conflict predominantly in the interests of the dominant class;

4. the state as an instrument of class rule, as a consequence of its 'capture' by a dominant class;

5. the state as a set of institutions, which tends to avoid assumptions about the class character of the state, focussing more on the empirical manifestations of the state apparatus; and

6. the state as a system of political domination, with special attention to the characteristics of political representation and state intervention (e.g., democracy as the best political setting for capitalism).

(Clark and Dear 1981, p. 52)

From this work, contemporary Marxists have evolved and divided into two main theoretical approaches, instrumentalism and structuralism.
Neo-Marxist Theories of the State - Instrumentalism. One of the key issues in contemporary Marxist debate is the nature of the relationship of the dominant class to the state. The instrumentalist position theorizes that in capitalism the state is used by the capitalist class to dominate the working class, for economic gain. Therefore, the state is not a neutral agent - it is an instrument for class domination.

Figure 3 shows that in conflicts between capital and labour, capital controls the state which then coerces labour to resolve the conflict in capital's favour.

Miliband (1973 and 1977) suggests three reasons why the state is an instrument of bourgeois domination in capitalist society. First, there is a similarity in the social backgrounds of the capitalist class and those in senior positions in the state (including government, civil service bureaucracy, military, judiciary and so on). These two groups share similar values and ideologies. Second, those in the economically dominant capitalist class are able to use their personal contacts, and networks, and associations representing their business and industries to pressure the state. Third, because state officials are dependent on a successful economic base for continued survival in public office, the freedom of the state, while not eliminated, is limited by the demands of the capital mode of production.

The relationship between the ruling class and the state's bureaucratic elite is described as a 'conspiracy'. This
In Marxist theory, society is made up of two levels. The economic level is the base or infrastructure of society and the political level in which the state is embedded is part of the superstructure (which also includes cultural and ideological levels). The pure Marxist instrumental position is based on economic determinism - the economic level determines the form and function of the other level. The state is therefore, always controlled by representatives of the dominant capital class. In modifying this view Miliband (1977) suggests that the state can be taken over "by the representatives of dominant economic classes, or by the political representatives of other classes who nevertheless remain prepared to rule on behalf of capital" (Saunders 1979, p. 161).

In this case the state remains an instrument of the
dominant class, and the state is used to protect and enhance existing social relations. However, politicians and elites of the state are not seen as identical to the dominant economic class and therefore, have some freedom to do things which reflect cultural rather than economic biases. The differences between the two positions are illustrated in Figure 4.

Marxist instrumentalists such as Miliband theorized that instead of the economic structure determining the political, it constrains it. The political superstructure does, therefore, have some autonomy. Political leaders can make decisions that don't always reflect the interests of the dominant economic class - there are non-market values at play as well. The instrumentalists' relative autonomy is "due to the degree of freedom enjoyed by those in positions of power for determining how to best serve the interests of the 'nation' (i.e. capital)" (Saunders 1979, p. 162). The constraints upon the state are not complete -

those who control the state have a limited degree of discretion which enables them to decide how best to serve the interests of the capitalist class, and their decisions will not always coincide with the demands made upon them by members of that class. (Saunders 1979, p. 181)

This type of relative autonomy is, as we shall see, a different concept than the relative autonomy of Marxist structuralists.

There are two major problems with the instrumental perspective. Even though it is acknowledged that the state has relative autonomy, there is no attempt to theorize about
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the limits on the state's ability to act in ways that do not promote the demands of capital (Saunders 1979, p. 165).

Second, in spite of the qualification of relative autonomy, instrumental theory rests heavily on economic determinism, ignoring the potential for individuals and groups to make gains unrelated to the imperatives of capital.

**Neo-Marxist Theories of the State - Structuralism.** The structuralist position is also based on a class society but theorizes that the state does not favour specific interests and is not allied with a specific class (Offe 1984b, p. 119). Instead,

the functions of the State are broadly determined by the structure of society itself, rather than the people who occupy positions of power. The State attempts to alleviate persistent class contradictions, generate accumulation and accommodate contradictions within society as the balance of power between classes shifts. Thus the
State is not an autonomous entity, but reflects the balance of power among classes at any given time.  
(Clark and Dear 1981, p. 53)

While instrumentalists see the state as an object, an autonomous institution, which is 'captured' and used by the capitalist class for use by that class, structuralists regard the state as "the condensate of a relation of power between struggling classes" (Poulantzas 1976, p. 74, quoted in Clark and Dear 1981, p. 54) and is not a 'thing' set apart from classes. Therefore, the state can be politically dominated by a class that is not economically dominant (Saunders 1979, p. 182).

By reflecting the power relations that exist between classes in society, and since the state exists in a society dominated by capital, the state "protects and sanctions ... a set of institutions and social relationships necessary for the domination of the capitalist class." While not an instrument of any one class, "the state nevertheless seeks to guarantee the collective interests of all members of a class society dominated by capital" (Offe, 1984b p. 120).

Analysis of the state does not focus "on individuals who appear to administer it (managerialism) or on the individuals who appear to influence or dominate it from the outside (instrumentalism)" but on social classes (Saunders 1979, p. 180). This is because the means of production "generates objective relations between capital and wage-labour into which individuals enter as agents on one or other of these two
classes" (Saunders 1979, p. 180). The state is not, according to structuralists, "a collection of institutions and functions but a relationship between classes in society" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 35).

Poulantzas (1973) argues that the state is relatively autonomous because the links between the capitalist class and those in the state are not as important as the structural relations of the political, cultural and ideological levels of the superstructure to the base. The state is not entirely subordinated by the economic structure, and can serve the interests of both capital and labour. However, in the long term, the interest of the state is to serve capital and the state necessarily serves the economic base. In this case, relative autonomy of the state is structurally determined by the relationship between the economic and political instances in the social formation. Although the nature of this relationship will ultimately be determined by the prevailing forces and relations of production ... and in capitalism this ensures that the economic will be the dominant instance, it does not follow that the economic determines the political. Rather, each level in the social formation is relatively autonomous from each other, and it follows that the class practices which correspond to these levels will also be relatively autonomous. The state does not therefore directly represent the economic interests of any one class. (Saunders 1979, pp. 181-182)

Since the state reflects the balance of power it can not be the tool of any one particular class and is therefore relatively autonomous.

The fundamental criticism of Marxist structuralism is that it "can be moulded to fit any situation at all,"
(Saunders 1979, p. 185) thus failing to meet the requirements of a theory of the state which are to be able to take account both of the political power of capitalist interests and of the ability of the state to act independently of those interests ... by stipulating those situations in which capital predominates, and those in which the state predominates.

(Saunders 1979, p. 185)

Structuralism fails then, to address "the extent to which the state is acting on behalf of the dominant class" (Panitch 1977, p. 8). The structuralist perspective also neglects the role of individuals. How can the state be explained "without reference to the purposive actions of individuals? How do system needs come to be fulfilled when nobody deliberately sets out to fulfill them?" (Saunders 1979, p. 186). And lastly, structuralism in the final analysis is based on economic determinism - the economic level in society is determinate in organizing the relations of the social formation (Saunders 1979, p. 188). "To collapse the range of social experience to the outworking of deep economic structures is to present an impoverished view of the social, cultural and political realms of life" (Duncan and Ley 1982). Marxist analysis of the capitalist system with its focus on social class and the key role of the economy has led to the neglect of many other variables,

especially social psychological factors. The Mode of Production or the Logic of Capitalism are mystifications replacing a detailed examination of the relation between the actions of human beings and the economic and political structures within which they act.

(Duncan and Ley 1982)
In addition, both instrumental and structural Marxists have been criticized for underestimating "the requirements imposed on the state by its liberal-democratic form" (Atkinson and Chandler 1983, p. 4). The particular institutional form of the state and the role and nature of the bureaucracy are also overlooked by the neo-Marxists. Clause Offe and Peter Saunders have attempted to address some of the shortcomings of instrumentalism and structuralism and their contributions follow.

**Neo-Marxist Debates - Offe's Contribution.** Offe's work regarding the capitalist state fits well under a general discussion of Marxist theorists while addressing some of the shortcomings of Marxist theory. By drawing on Marxism plus a wide variety of other traditions the theoretical tradition Offe advocates is best described as eclectic (Offe 1984c, p. 253). Saunders (1979), as we shall see, draws strong comparisons between Offe's work and that of instrumentalism.

Offe sees society as a system made up of three interdependent but differently organized structures. The three subsystems are the economy (in this case, capitalist), a political or state structure and a socialization or cultural structure. In this scheme, the state is independent, an 'identifiable entity' with its own functions and objectives. "At the same time it is clearly situated as a constituent element of a wider set of power relations" (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 55). This point of view is similar to the
structuralist position that the state "represents a relation between or an expression of, forces in society and that it is not a force in its own right" (Bedale 1980). The state will act not as an instrument of capital but in "the interests of all members of a capitalist class society, and many policies will not directly serve the interest of the capitalist class" (Clark and Dear 1981, pp. 55-56).

The role of the state is not to serve as an instrument of the capitalist class but to mediate in conflicts between the processes in the socialization and economic sectors of society. Since the economy is a capitalist one, the state's actions in mediating between the two structures will be to ensure the conditions for capitalism are guaranteed. However, at the same time the state must guarantee that the needs of the social structure are not compromised by the economic system. The state is clearly involved in both accumulation and legitimation.

The state is, therefore, not involved in reinforcing class relations, it is involved in resolving conflicts between the social and economic subsystems of society. This view helps to explain why the state performs a multiplicity of roles, including actions that do not serve the interests of capital. Social policies can be put forward by the state that "do not necessarily or automatically 'serve' the 'interests' of the capitalist class" (Keane 1984 p. 18).

Offe sees state activities as falling under two main
categories. State activities are either allocative or productive. The allocative function (or distribution of resources) is a traditional role for the state. The state, in its allocative role, provides an organized framework for production and accumulation. The allocative function is seen to be responsive to political pressures and therefore is an area of state activity which can be used by a dominant economic class. The state in early capitalism (liberal capitalism) is characterized by its allocative function as an instrument of a ruling class. Allocative decisions today continue to reflect the power exercised over the state by a dominant economic class (Saunders 1979, p. 174). In this way, Offe shares the instrumentalist perspective.

The conditions of late capitalism have exposed two weaknesses. The first weakness is an economic one - society is unable to produce all the necessary inputs for accumulation through the process of accumulation alone. The second weakness is that the ruling economic class, the capitalists, are made up of "competitive accumulating units ... unable to develop a class consciousness containing consented and workable directives as to how the state should operate" (Offe 1975, p. 134).

The state has responded to these two weaknesses. First, the state has taken on a productive function "to engage in the production of commodities and services which the private sector can no longer produce" (Saunders 1979, p 174). While allocative functions are responsive to political pressures,
productive decisions are not because "the demands of the most powerful groups will not necessarily be consistent with the sorts of policies which are necessary for ensuring continued accumulation" (Saunders 1979, p. 175). It is the state that determines the criteria by which it should act - therefore the state is not the instrument of any class. "The origins of state policies are thus internal to the organization of the state itself" (Saunders, 1979, p. 175).

Offe argues that the internal organization of the state faces several problems in maintaining the balance it seeks. The state becomes primarily reactive and is unable to initiate 'rational' long term planning. The state is, in the final analysis, incapable of evolving into a form of internal organization through which it can "adequately discharge the functions it is called upon to perform" (Saunders 1979, p. 178). (An analysis of the problems of the internal organization of the state is beyond the scope of this thesis, but suggests an area for future research.)

The second way in which the state deals with weaknesses in the accumulation process is to develop state policies (decision rules about activities). State policy, Offe suggests, substitutes for the lack of class consciousness within the ruling class (1975, p. 134). State policies are important because they determine what potential goals and which problems are put on the political agenda. The state must balance its responses (in terms of policies and
productive functions) to weaknesses in the accumulation process with the role the state plays in the accumulation process. Offe (1975, p. 144) argues that no mode of organization or decision-making structure in the state can establish the necessary balance between the internal organization of the state and the accumulation process.

Offe argues in fact, that state policies that are actually designed with the intention of securing and enhancing capitalist process may threaten (directly or indirectly) the collective power of capital. This happens because the state is in the contradictory position of resolving the problems internal to both the social and economic subsystems, causing in turn, problems internal to the state.

Offe theorizes that the relationship between the political and economic substructures of society is determined by the commodity form whereby owners of a unit of value exchange their value as a commodity. "The commodity form is the general point of equilibrium of both the capitalist state and accumulation, which continues as long as every value appears in the form of a commodity" (1984b, p. 121). As long as the commodity form of exchange relationship functions

there is no need for the state to intervene in private economic decision-making; there is no lack of the material resources required by the state; there is no problem in maintaining a steady process of accumulation;... and, finally, there is no legitimation or consensus problem for political elites who manage to maintain this universe of commodities. (Offe 1984, p. 121)

The problem that has evolved is that the very dynamic of
capitalist development tends to paralyze the commodity form. A commodity form is paralyzed when it is no longer possible to exchange it for money or other values. "The failure of a value offered for exchange is supposed to be self-correcting: the owner of the exchange-seeking value will either be forced to lower the price or to offer an alternative good" (Offe 1984b, p. 122). However, in late capitalism, this is not the case.

There is plenty of everyday evidence to the effect that both labour power and capital are expelled from the commodity form, and that there is little basis for the liberal belief that they will be reintegrated automatically into exchange relationships. (Offe 1984b, p. 123)

Therefore the fundamental purpose of state policy in late capitalist societies is to ensure that individual economic actors are able to enter exchange relationships. The state, in a capitalist society, does not protect the interests of a particular class -

rather it sanctions the general interest of all classes on the basis of capitalist exchange relationships ... (state) policies are designed to provide a maximum of exchange opportunities for both labour and capital, so that individuals of both classes can enter into capitalist relations of production.

(Offe 1984b, p. 123)

In particular, Offe theorizes that "social policy is the state's manner of effecting the lasting transformation of non-wage labourers into wage-labourers" (Offe 1984a, p. 92). The reason that social policy is focussed on means to incorporate labour power into the labour market is because individuals do not "spontaneously" sell their labour power on the labour market. This is due to a variety of disincentives to enter
wage labour such as migration, acceptance of alternative economic and life forms, reduction of level of subsistence or extending the length of period of dependence on the family and so on (Offe 1984a, p. 93). On the other hand social policy must continue to respond to the needs of labour while attempting to make labour and capital's needs mutually compatible (Offe 1984a, p. 104).

Offe does not reduce the state's social policy to control exclusively by capital. State intervention or policies are seen as long-term strategies to avoid the crisis that class antagonisms necessarily lead to by placating both classes in the capital mode of production (Clark and Dear 1981, p. 59). The function of 'shaping society' of state social policy is limited therefore to "the definition of the themes, times and methods of conflict and, thus, to the establishment of the political-institutional framework - and not the outcome of the process of social power" (Offe 1984a, pp. 108-109).

In conclusion, although Offe started out by arguing that the internal structure of the capitalist state guaranteed the domination of capital, (he) soon arrived at the conclusion that the form of the capitalist state is deeply problematic for accumulation and legitimation alike. (Jessop 1982, p. 107)

Offe's contribution is to theorize that state policies or intervention do not always serve a particular class, but they facilitate the functioning of both social and economic systems. Due to this dual role there are limitations on the
state's role as it must simultaneously ensure the 
proletization of labour and guarantee capital accumulation 
while maintaining its legitimacy through ensuring the 
continuation of social relations to act as a conflict resolver 
between the two subsystems.

**Neo Marxist Debates - Saunders's Contribution.**

Saunders's point of departure is taken from Offe's conclusion 
that the state is "merely reactive and is incapable of 
evolving a form of internal organization which can adequately 
discharge the functions it is called upon to perform" 
(Saunders 1979, p. 178). Saunders amends Offe's work so that 
it takes account of the corporatist thesis which he claims is 
a form of internal state organization which can overcome many 
of the problems of the state's role in capitalism. Since a 
corporatist state positively intervenes in the production 
decisions of firms, based not on increased bureaucracy or 
democracy, but on "an extension of rational planning to 
include major capitalist interests," (Saunders 1979, p. 178) 
corporatism is not 'merely reactive' but is a form of state 
organization Offe had not thought possible since it "combines 
central control and rational planning with flexibility and 
delegated responsibilities" (Saunders 1979, p. 178).

By combining the instrumental and corporatist 
perspectives, Saunders is able to link theories of the state 
with an analysis of the role of the local state. Saunders's 
theory rests on a distinction made between corporate and non- 
corporate (or pluralist) sectors of state policy-making.
State policies regarding the corporate sector of the state are concerned with production. "Here the state can be seen as taking an increasingly independent and directive role in close consultation with big business and organized labour, this independence being limited only by the need to maintain capital accumulation" (Saunders 1979, pp. 178-179). The non-corporate or pluralist sector of the state is concerned with policies regarding consumption items (such as housing, education, social services, etc.). "Here the state can be seen as external to the various different classes or political forces in civil society, and thus as open to influence by the most powerful of them" (Saunders 1979, p. 179).

This leads Saunders to speculate that in terms of a local state's production functions (planning, utilities, housing, etc.,) there will be an increasingly close relationship between local authorities and private business enterprises ... reflected in, for example, regular quasi-official and informal meetings with the two ... and in a growing division within local authorities themselves between those in key positions of power and those who are excluded from corporate policy-making.

(Saunders, 1979, p. 179)

Saunders contribution is in bringing together corporatist/managerialist and instrumental perspectives to distinguish "between those areas where the state is largely the instrument of dominant political forces, and those where these forces are subjected, and incorporated within, attempts by the state to extend its control over the production process" (Saunders 1979, p. 180). This leads to a more
detailed discussion of the local state.

4. The Local State

Recent theoretical work ... has identified the role of the state as an important area for research, and the idea of the 'local state' has emerged, providing a theoretical focus on local government and its position in relation to the state generally.
(Malpass and Murie 1982, p. 2)

The purpose of this section is to review the literature aimed at developing a theory of the local state. If we use the same hierarchy as in the first part of this chapter we start again with a mid-level theory of the role of the local state. Such a theory is concerned with the local state's relationship with the central state and with the functions that the local state performs.

The third level of the hierarchy, theories that explain actions within the local state, so closely overlaps those covered under the state - pluralist, managerialist/corporatist and marxist approaches - that they are not repeated here, although they will be used in the analysis of the City of Vancouver's housing history.

The theory of the role of the local state is problematic since the term 'local state' implies a separate and autonomous body with its own range of institutions such as the military, judiciary and so on. In fact, if we go back to the definition of the state in Chapter 1 we see that municipal government is itself an institution of the central state. This is clearly supported by the fact that municipalities in Canada are
created by provincial legislation, and the provinces in turn receive the mandate for municipal affairs from the division of powers established in the Canadian B.N.A. Act/Constitution Act 1982 which creates jurisdictional and financial constraints on local state actions. However, the local state is a concept with some validity, for the local state certainly has some autonomy from the central state. The functions of the local state and the degree of autonomy is central to this discussion.

The Role of the Local State - Functions. State expenditures fall into three major types of expenditure - social investment expenditure and social consumption expenditures, collectively known as social capital and social expenses (O'Connor 1973). As shown in Figure 5, social capital expenditures are those expenditures which socialize the costs of private production. The social investment form of social capital is made of "those state expenditures which contribute directly to private sector profitability by providing the resources that the private sector itself cannot supply profitably" (Saunders 1980). Projects and services provided by the state under this category also increase the productivity of labour, and therefore, the rate of profit (Lauria, no date). Social investment includes the public provision of physical infrastructure such as roads and utilities, industrial parks and programs aimed at industrial development.
Social consumption means expenditure on public items such as hospitals and education which serve the interests of the working class and society in general, and individual goods such as housing. Social consumption expenditures lower the reproduction costs of labour for capital and therefore lower the cost of production. For example, local state expenditure on housing helps to depress money wages since part of the cost of producing the worker is borne by the state rather than by the individual and his (or her) family, with the result that the value (in Marxist terms) of labour power is reduced and the rate of profit is thus increased.

(Saunders, 1979, p. 145)

While contributing indirectly to capital requirements by maintaining and reproducing the labour force, social consumption functions also directly support the population (Saunders 1980), serving to legitimize the capitalist system. However, both types of social capital expenditures are
necessary for private accumulation to continue and remain profitable (Saunders 1979, p. 144).

O'Connor's third area of state expenditure is called social expense. Social expenses include "the military, police and other expenses designed to protect the social formation from disruption" (Dear 1981a). In addition to repressive measures, this category includes welfare items. Social expenses are not productive but reflect the social control function of the state and aid in legitimation of the system.

The local state has the greatest impact in the social consumption sector, particularly in directly providing services. In England it has been possible to "distinguish between social investment policies, determined within a corporate sector at national and regional levels of government; and social consumption policies, determined through competitive political struggles often at the local level" (Saunders 1980). The evidence is that the local government has progressively lost responsibility for social investment and that "the contradictory functions of social investment and social consumption do tend to have been located at different levels of the state" (Saunders 1980). There is, therefore, a tendency for a division of labour between the local and central state (Short 1982, p. 174). The central state tends to be primarily concerned with economic priorities, while the local state is concerned with social demands which pose a "challenge to the market and the commodity form on which capitalism is based" (Saunders 1980).
Therefore, while the primary function of the local state is to aid accumulation, within that role we see the local state increasingly involved in social consumption expenditures which serve both to lower the reproduction costs of labour and to some extent, legitimize the capitalist system.

While local state social consumption expenditures aid in the reproduction of labour power, it is important "not to see these goods and services simply as aids to capital accumulation. In a very real sense they represent gains to labour" (Short 1982, p. 174). Nearly every state expenditure can serve both accumulation and legitimation (O'Connor 1973, Lauria no date) and housing provides a good example of an area that fits under all three categories of state expenditure. As a social consumption item housing serves to ensure the reproduction of labour power and improves labour's quality. Local state expenditures on housing (such as in providing infrastructure for residential development) can be considered under the category of social investment. As a social expense, housing aids social consensus. The state ensures the supply of a crucial resource which the market economy cannot provide at an adequate level (Saunders 1979, p. 146).

Role of the Local State - the Question of Autonomy. In a study of urban autonomy in Canada, Taylor (1984) found that urban governments were "by and large, left alone to deal with both the progress and problems of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century society and economy" (Taylor 1984). Senior
government legislation was largely open ended, enabling rather than enforcing local government responses.

However, by the 1920's local entities were financially strained by the costs of municipal services and began petitioning "for a re-adjustment among all levels of government of revenues and responsibilities" (Taylor 1984). Following World War One, senior governments responded with the result that the autonomy of the local state in Canada was curtailed through changes in provincial statutory control (including supervision of municipalities through departments of municipal affairs, increased provincial involvement in social welfare, and fiscal supervision tied to senior government policy); changes in administrative and regulatory control at the senior levels (resulting in a concentration of authority at a central point and homogenizing the amount and type of services delivered); changes in local finance (particularly the erosion of the local tax base during the 1930's and 1940's when provincial authorities eliminated "local income taxes, sales taxes, and personal property taxes, eliminated or reduced the local share of liquor and motor vehicle taxes, and in some instances placed restrictions on untrammelled exploitation of the property tax" (Taylor 1984)); and lastly, the expansion of the conditional grant system separated responsibility for problems and the power (particularly fiscal power) to solve them (Taylor 1984).

Much of the debate within the Marxist literature is concerned with the degree of autonomy of the local state. The
degree of relative independence of the local state from the central state is a fundamental issue,

since a local state that is morally and fiscally independent may be able to refuse the directives (class or otherwise) of the national state and be open to the control of local interest groups opposed to national state objectives. A completely dependent local state, on the other hand, may simply mirror the objectives and the class biases of the national state.

(Clark 1981)

The local state is obviously constrained and influenced by central state financial resources and legislation but it is not necessarily an active agent or instrument of the central state. Therefore, in a completely autonomous local state, the potential is for a "local political transformation that could threaten the whole state structure ... (on the other hand) without autonomy, the local state would simple exist to carry out the orders of other state apparatus" (Clark and Dear 1984, p. 131). If, as some theorists claim, (Cockburn 1977, Broadbent 1977) local government is simply an extention of the capitalist state "it means that a general theory of the capitalist state can be applied with little modification to what has come to be known as the 'local state'" (Saunders 1980). Since the key role of the central state is to reproduce the conditions within which capitalist accumulation can take place, the role of the local state is to reproduce the labour force and the relations of production by supporting capital accumulation (by for example, providing necessary economic infrastructure like roads, and by ensuring a continual supply of labour-power through social facilities like housing); and to maintain legitimacy (as when it plays different local groups
off against each other and thereby fragments the working class as a whole). (Saunders 1980)

The functions of the local state do "confirm its implication in the maintenance of capitalist social relations, especially through the flow of capital and expenditures on social consumption" (Dear 1981a). Also, the proliferation of local governments "neatly obfuscates relations of power and deflects and controls social conflict. In this perspective the local state is a mere sidekick of the central state in maintaining capital accumulation and ensuring legitimation" (Short 1982, p. 172).

However, this point of view is widely debated. Bourne (1981) found that in the case of national programs of public sector housing, for example, local states were sometimes able to effectively 'scuttle' national policy by being unable or unwilling to find suitable locations for government assisted housing (p. 229). Rose (1980) suggests that the legislative arrangements of senior governments in Canada require "that the local community has a clear recognition of need and a clear indication of the desire for the public assumption of responsibility to provide housing accommodation for low income groups" for national policy to be successful (p. 22). In the U.S.A., Johnston (1984) found that some communities declined aid offered by senior governments "so that they can retain freedom of action without strings" (p. 181).

Stressing the unitary nature of the state by viewing the
local state as an arm of the capitalist state doesn't take into account the specific function (social consumption) and mode of operation (democratic) of the local state. (Saunders 1980). The mode of operation or form of the state is fundamental to this discussion. "How democracy is viewed as functioning in capitalism is the central issue for analyzing the actions of the local state" (Clark 1981). The local state in Western industrialized nations is a democratic one and is therefore relatively open to political pressures from non-capitalist interests compared to the central state which "is dominated by a 'corporate' sphere of interest-mediation, where representatives of large capital (and to some extent of organized labour) enjoy direct access to the policy-making process" (Saunders 1980). So, not only must the state reconcile its economic priorities with the social demands facing local government it must deal with the challenge to its planned strategies posed by democratic popular protests at the local level (Saunders 1980). The local state is open to democratic pressure and it is concerned with the provision of services based on criteria of need rather than profit or ability to pay. The local state is part of the state apparatus but it is a vulnerable part ... a part which can be used to achieve real gains and defend real advances. (Short 1982, p. 174)

However, the democracy possible at the local level is subject to the various coercive tools of the national state as well as the ideological legitimacy of the national democratic structure ... It is precisely because of the democratic nature of the local state that it is so controlled and dependent. (Clark 1981)
On the other hand, the central state may well need to preserve the democratic image of the local state in order to contribute to the legitimacy of the state. The local state plays a key role in legitimation. As we saw in examining theories of the central state, democratic legitimation is one of the functional conditions which guides the institutional form of political power. The "capitalist state must produce mass loyalty which is organized by a system of formal democratic institutions" (Ossenbrugge 1984, p. 70). In this way, the "spatial allocation of public goods and services (at the local level) as well as elections and other forms of participation are part of the legitimization system" (Ossenbrugge 1984, p. 76).

The independence of the local state in Canada from the central state is constrained in three ways. First, as previously mentioned, the local state is clearly under the jurisdiction of the central state. It would seem that the extent of jurisdictional problems is closely tied to financial dependence on the central state and to political debates regarding issues of centralization and decentralization.

Second, the local state cannot always undertake the level of service it was democratically elected to do because it is dependent upon higher tiers of the state for financial support. "Even if decisions were taken democratically at the local level against general state interests, the local level has little fiscal power to enact its own decisions" (Clark
1981). The national state can actually prescribe public service provision at the local level, by making fiscal support conditional on meeting the central state's expectations. One of the key roles of the local state is in fact implementing national policy. Often, local states are "acting on behalf of central government (and) their performance is crucial to the achievement of national policy goals" (Malpass and Murie 1982, p. 2).

Third, even though the local state has its own revenue generating powers and "is directly responsible to local economic and political pressures, the relationship between the local state and the local economy is vague and tenuous" (Clark and Dear 1984, p. 134). Business and industry elites no longer identify with 'place' as they did at the beginning of the century (Taylor 1984). This is because the "economic system operates at a much wider spatial scale than recognized by conventional political boundaries, so that local states may have little impact upon, or control over, the processes affecting local economies" (Clark and Dear 1984, p. 135). Since the local economy is often reliant on the fiscal policy of the national state, the local states find themselves, first of all, subject to central state policy, and second, perhaps even in competition with other local governments to be recipients for central state programs in their jurisdiction.

However, it is clear that at various times and places the local state can act with some degree of freedom. The consequences of this autonomy are increasing tension between
central and local state and renewed attempts by the central state to maintain overall control on the levels of public expenditure. Social consumption will be allowed to maintain legitimation but not to the extent that it poses an ideological challenge to existing property relations or a fiscal problem in public expenditure (Short 1982, p. 175).

To conclude, the state is one, but made of up tiers. The local state is a component or instrument of the state. At the same time however, the local state is a democratic institution in its own right (Clark and Dear 1984 p. 132). This leads to a tension between its function which is "largely determined outside the local electorate by higher tiers of the state ... (making it) an instrument of wider social design" (p. 132) and its democratic form with the implication of local self-determination. Therefore, analysis of local state actions has to consider the legitimation and accumulation functions of the state, the extent to which the local state is autonomous and able to respond independently to local pressures and whether the local state's actions can be best explained by instrumental, pluralist or managerial perspectives.

5. The Implications of Theory for Analysis of the Vancouver History

The purpose of this section is to determine which are the useful concepts of the various theories of the state and the local state to see how they might be used as a tool of analysis for the study of the City of Vancouver's role in
housing. The review of theories of the actions within the state covered the pluralist approach - those who see the state as one set of pressure groups among others; the managerialist/corporatist approach which puts great emphasis on state autonomy and the ability of individuals within the state and the state generally, to dominate in social relations; and the Marxists who see the capitalist state as a means by which class domination is perpetuated (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 36).

Macpherson (1977) suggested that much could be gained by considering the Marxist perspective of the state.

The main strength of Marxist analysis is in focussing attention on the economic context of political activity ... (therefore avoiding) the trap of analyzing political behaviour in isolation from factors which have a significant influence on that behaviour.

(Ham and Hill 1984, p. 43)

Consideration of the capitalist economy, with its fundamental goal of capital accumulation and need for legitimation, is critical to an understanding of the state in western industrialized countries. While the state can serve many different groups, in the long run it serves the interests of capital. Analysis of the political role of the state cannot be removed from a consideration of a society's economic base.

The main problem with Marxist analysis, and the reason that it cannot be embraced in entirety as an analytical framework is that "Marxist theory fails to provide an adequate explanation of independent action by the state, and it gives insufficient attention to the way in which political power may
derive other than from economic power" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 43). Clearly the state in capitalist society is not independent of economic interests, but the way in which the state serves working-class or labour interests and cultural values deserves more attention.

There is no attempt in this thesis to integrate the various theoretical perspectives or to dogmatically subscribe to only one. "To search for a single theory of the state is less useful than adopting a more eclectic approach which draws on the strengths of different theories" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 43). However, it may be useful to think of the various theories as several "layers" of explanation:

Thus, a political economy approach represents the highest level (or scale) of explanation. In a median position comes the managerialist paradigm and its focus on organizations and interests/rules that they pursue. At the lower 'level', individual participant's activities are explained in terms, for example, from public goods and behavioural perspectives.

(Burnett 1984, p. 44)

Within each 'layer of explanation' we can pull out the key points that will be used in analyzing the Vancouver history.

In conclusion, we see that the state cannot be reduced exclusively to its functional relationship with the capitalist mode of production. Rather than rely on the theory that the state is a functional requirement of the capitalist system, it is necessary to see the state as deriving "equally from the economic and political imperatives of capitalist commodity production ... (the state) must be analysed both as
'embedded in society' and as an 'institution in its own right'" (Driver 1985). The state has to reconcile its economic priorities with the social demands facing local government. This means the state must deal with the challenge to its strategies posed by democratic interest groups at the local level as well as with the individual values and influences of its own managers.

The theoretical analytical framework adopted here can not ignore the importance of the economy to local housing policy, but at the same time it can not rely on economic determinism. The state mediates in class relations, but "an adequate theory of the state needs to consider non-class-based struggles" (Ham and Hill 1984, p. 44).

**Implications for Analysis of Research.** There are several implications of theories of the state for analysis of the history of the City of Vancouver's housing policies and programs, 1900-1973. First, the analysis must consider how the City of Vancouver's role in housing is attributable to either the accumulation or legitimation functions of the state, rather than a social equity or social justice role characteristic of the 'benevolent state.'

Second, the analysis must consider the nature and extent of autonomy the City of Vancouver was able to display in its housing policies and programs. Were programs and policies imposed by the central state and/or were City initiatives stopped by the central state? The issue of autonomy hinges on
the financing of housing programs by senior governments, the impact of senior government resources on the City, actual legislated jurisdiction of the municipality for housing, and the extent to which the central state relies on the local state for democratic legitimation.

Third, the analysis goes to the level of theories of actions within the state and considers the influence of business and industrial interests on Vancouver's housing interventions. To what extent, with respect to housing, was the City of Vancouver an instrument of capitalist interests?

Fourth, while it is beyond the scope of this thesis to determine the specific roles that urban managers and/or elites have played in determining housing policy in the City of Vancouver, a general discussion of the possible influence of managers and whether there is any evidence to support the corporatist thesis will suggest areas for further study.

Fifth, the analysis will consider how the democratic pluralist form of government in the City of Vancouver has affected the outcome of housing policy.

Lastly, the analysis must consider the implications of overlapping theories on studies of local government policy since a variety of theoretical perspectives have been adopted.

Now that we have the theoretical basis for the analysis, in the next chapter we will look at the details of the City of Vancouver's interventions in housing in the period 1900 to
1973. The theoretical framework will be picked up again in Chapter 4 which examines how the theory of the state helps to explain the City of Vancouver's housing actions. A study of the history of the City of Vancouver's evolving role in housing, using the analytical framework suggested by a reading of theories of the state, will therefore, illustrate the opportunities and constraints of the local state in pursuing housing policy.
CHAPTER 3
THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF VANCOUVER'S HOUSING ACTIONS

This chapter reviews the major municipal government interventions with respect to housing in Vancouver during the period between the turn of the century and 1973, when amendments to the National Housing Act and a change in Vancouver's government changed the nature of local government housing activities in Vancouver. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first covers the period 1900 to the Second World War. The second covers the end of the Second World War until 1960 and the third concludes the history by reviewing the events of 1960 to 1973. The major political events in Vancouver during the study period are important for the discussion. Since the history of urban politics in Vancouver is well documented (Gutstein 1983, Ley 1979, Smith 1982, Tennant 1980), highlights of Vancouver's political history will be included in the summary at the end of each of the three sections. References to primary sources found in the Vancouver City Archives (VCA) are documented in footnotes at the end of this chapter.

1. The Turn of the Century to the End of the Second World War 1900-1945

The Vancouver Health Department. One of the first actors concerned with housing in the City of Vancouver was the Health Department. The role of the Health Department, in
identifying the worst cases of poor quality housing and arguing for higher standards, was a major one throughout the 1900-1945 period. Its position was strengthened in 1900 (and in subsequent years) by revisions to the Vancouver Incorporation Act (later the City Charter) which greatly increased the powers of the City regarding health matters (McPaul 1979).

As early as 1905, the Health Department helped provide accommodation by co-operating with the Salvation Army in sheltering the indigent. In 1904, the position of Medical Health Officer became a full time one and in 1905 the Medical Health Officer was empowered by City Council to provide temporary relief for all 'casual cases.' By 1907, an economic recession, causing high unemployment and the need for food and shelter relief, led the City to appoint a Relief Officer to serve under the Medical Health Officer (McPaul 1979).

Another of the Health Department's welfare concerns was the provision of a home for the elderly. Until 1906, the aged and the infirm were cared for in the public wards of the Vancouver General Hospital. When the hospital was moved from Cambie Street to Fairview an Old People's Home was established in the old hospital building. In 1913, a new home was built for the elderly, and in 1919, the responsibility for the home was transferred to the Social Services Department.
The Health Department also showed great interest in the housing conditions of Vancouver citizens. In particular, it was concerned with conditions in lodging or rooming houses. A Lodging House By-Law passed in 1910 and the appointment of a Lodging House and Restaurant Inspector in the following year gave the Health Department the opportunity to improve housing conditions in this area. Housing conditions proved to be a major concern of the Health Department throughout the 1900-1973 period.

The Health Department found that highly profitable real estate speculation resulted in poor quality low cost housing. In a review of the development of Vancouver from 1904 to 1911, a Health Department Inspector noted that

In the successive booms that struck the town forcing property values to the highest possible level, persons with land were only too anxious to make the most revenue they could out of any building they erected and to spend as little as possible on them, without regard to the welfare of those who had to occupy them.

In this connection a very bitter fight was waged by the Department against the then existing practice of allowing buildings to cover 100% of the lot with only a very shallow light well to provide light and ventilation for the rooms.

In 1911, the Health Department received 184 applications for licenses to operate a lodging house. Of these, 113 applications were rejected "owing to insufficient toilet accommodation, defective fire escape exits, and unsanitary premises."

Besides City efforts in providing relief in the form of
lodging and the Health Department campaign for improved conditions in lodging houses (approximately 3000 rooming houses went on the Registered List in the years following the introduction of by-laws for lodging houses, the main municipal intervention in housing was through building regulations. City Council adopted the City's first building regulation in 1900, and a comprehensive building by-law was put into effect in 1908. Regulating housing through by-laws was on of the first and most enduring of municipal interventions in housing.

The decade 1910 to 1920 was another period in which the Health Department was a forerunner in dealing with housing issues. In the Medical Health Officer's Annual Report for the Year 1911 concern is expressed for "the urgent need of accommodation being provided for the working classes, and for those seeking employment, who drift into Vancouver from the Eastern Provinces and the Southern States."

In the years before zoning the City was able to make selective use of health and fire regulations to protect certain neighbourhoods from apartments and Chinese laundries. These regulations reflected racial prejudice and concern about property values (Gutstein 1983, Weaver 1979). In 1912, the Medical Health Officer expressed concern about the "growing tendency of erecting apartment houses in the City, and to call attention to the resultant evils which must attend this form of housing."
In 1913 a Health Department Inspector cited what he considered to be the "immediate and imminent dangers from a health standpoint with regard to housing":

1. Inadequate air space around cabins, apartment houses and lodging houses,
2. Dark rooms,
3. Kitchens or light-housekeeping rooms used for sleeping purposes,
4. No standard of floor area per person,
5. Insufficient cubic air space per person provided,
6. Concealed beds,
7. Unventilated, or improperly ventilated gas fixtures,
8. The indiscriminate letting of bedrooms by the smaller private houses.

To remedy the situation, the Inspector suggested there was an urgent need for a "carefully thought out 'Housing By-Law,' based on a Town Planning System and embodying all habitable buildings." However, as we shall see, the whole study period is characterized by the lack of a comprehensive plan for housing.

The Health Department was also responsible for a special order of council that resulted in the destruction of 80 shacks and over 40 boat houses on the foreshore of Burrard Inlet. The shacks and boats were considered "a grave menace to Health, also housing a number of criminals and other undesirables." No mention is made of any provisions made for those left homeless by this action, in spite of the fact that the Health Department knew from past experience it would cause hardship. The 1911 Annual Report of the Medical Health
Officer notes that Chinese homes were severely overcrowded "owing in part to the demolishing of China Town by the Railway Company, the City and the Health Department, and the fact that no provision has been made for the creation of a new Chinatown."

**Relief Efforts.** The problem of housing and feeding large groups of single unemployed men was a problem the City faced throughout the period preceding the Second World War. In 1907, in response to an influx of unemployed men looking for work, the City opened the old City Gaol for sleeping quarters. Recovery from the depression in 1908 led to the closure of the shelter and other temporary relief programs (Roy 1981). The winter of 1911-12 was another difficult one for the Vancouver area economy and the City once again had to deal with increased demands for relief.

Relief work was divided into two major areas. The first was for Vancouver men who were married and had a family and home in Vancouver. Medical care, food, fuel and a shelter allowance, in exchange for labour, were common forms of relief for this group. The second type of relief was for the hundreds of transient single unemployed men who came to Vancouver seeking work or at least to be unemployed in a less hostile climate. Meal tickets and bed tickets, in exchange for labour (usually at below the going rates), was the form of relief for these men.

The Associated Charities of Vancouver (a civic agency co-
ordinating the work of private citizens and the city relief department (Roy 1981)) coordinated relief work during this time. A work requirement was closely tied to receiving relief to act partly as a deterrent to those considering coming to Vancouver for a "free ride". Many felt that "by providing shelter and food the City risked becoming a mecca for the useless and undesirable of North America" (Roy 1981). On the other hand, if the City did not provide relief, it faced potential social unrest.

The outbreak of war in August 1914 caused another period of high unemployment. The provincial government made it clear that the municipalities were responsible for their own unemployed. However, by April 1915, the City was running out of funds to feed and shelter the unemployed and began cutting off relief to those who couldn't establish residency in the City. The province then supplied some funds under this emergency situation and relief work was resumed in exchange for bed and meal tickets. However, by the end of the month, the City once again had to reduce its relief roles (Roy 1981).

The problem of unemployment, coupled with the inability of the unemployed to feed and house themselves, continued as a major problem in Vancouver throughout this period. At the close of the First World War in 1919, an influx of returning soldiers and the closing of wartime industries again led to high unemployment in Vancouver. In the winter of 1920-21 the federal government agreed to contribute to one third of the
cost of relief for the unemployed. "This policy broke many precedents since Ottawa had always argued that unemployment was a problem for local authorities" (Roy 1981).

By late 1921, the City of Vancouver decided that in order to house many of the single men on relief work, it would establish a camp "at the Hastings Park fair grounds where the unemployed, living under military discipline, worked on constructing a nine-hole golf course and cutting firewood in return for a bed and three meals a day" (Roy 1981).

It appears that throughout these periods of economic depression the City felt capable of looking after the needs of its own citizens. It was those who came from the Prairies, the interior of B.C and the U.S.A. looking for work who put a burden on Vancouver's relief efforts. By the end of 1929, the City of Vancouver notified the senior governments that the problem they were dealing with could not be considered theirs alone - the City provided relief for citizens from across the country, and the municipal government required help (Roy 1981). This illustrates the dilemma of many municipalities whose ability to respond to problems within their boundaries is limited when the problems are regional or national in origin and scope.

Regulatory Initiatives. In 1911, representatives of civic groups and the Board of Trade formed the Vancouver Planning Committee. The Committee looked at the potential of planning for Vancouver. In 1922, Point Grey (then a separate
community) adopted a zoning by-law - the first in Canada. In 1924, another municipality that also later joined Vancouver, South Vancouver, adopted a zoning by-law similar to the one in Point Grey. Point Grey considered zoning essential in continuing its development as a first class residential area (Roy 1980, p. 68) and other property interests in Vancouver saw the potential for enhancing their investments.

In 1925, the City of Vancouver in conjunction with the Associated Property Owners (APO), the Vancouver Board of Trade and other real estate interests and planning interests were successful in pressuring the province to pass a Town Planning Act "permitting municipalities to establish town planning commissions to advise them on town planning and educate the public" (Roy 1980, p. 106). The extent of influence of property interests in pursuing planning legislation is reflected in the fact that the APO reviewed all drafts of the zoning by-law before they went to council (Gutstein 1983).

In 1925, the City of Vancouver formed the Vancouver Town Planning Commission (V.T.P.C.) and in 1926 the Commission began serious work. The preoccupation of the Town Planning Commission from its inauguration to the mid-1930's was clearly with zoning. While hiring the firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates to prepare a master plan for the City, the Vancouver Town Planning Commission went ahead and produced an interim zoning by-law (#1830) which was adopted in 1927. A more comprehensive zoning by-law was adopted in 1928 followed in 1930 by a Zoning By-Law (#2516) that reflected the intent
of Bartholomew's Plan for Vancouver, finished in 1929.

The zoning by-law reflected "a clear and rather rigid policy, similar to that in most other North American cities, of allocating separate areas for various types of housing" (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1981, p. 7). The zoning by-law was used to restrict "all forms of multiple housing, regardless of density, to the inner areas of the City" (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1981, p. 7). Zoning was used, therefore, to protect existing residential areas "from the intrusion of apartments, stores and industries." For example, the 1930 zoning by-law was quickly amended in response to a petition against the proposed development of a bungalow court "so as to definitely prohibit the erection of Bungalow Courts in One-family Dwelling Districts."

In some cases, the City was unable to create regulatory tools strong enough to implement its policy of protecting established residential areas. The V.T.P.C. was able "to control the many requests from distressed property owners who sought immediate gain by having their property rezoned from residential to apartment or commercial" (Roy 1980, p. 108). However, it was not until the zoning by-law was amended in 1939 that the Commission could keep housekeeping units out of single-family neighbourhoods (Roy 1980, p. 108). And,

in spite of the Town Planning Commission's efforts to use zoning to prevent blight, some neighbourhoods, particularly east of Main Street, deteriorated as homeowners were often unable to afford repairs or taxes. The lack of repairs caused a deterioration of housing. The non-payment of taxes
made the task of administering the city difficult.
(Roy 1980, p. 110)

In 1930, the construction of a duplex residence on Creelman Avenue in Kitsilano Point precipitated the issue of architectural control.' While the City Charter was amended in 1933 to enable such a section, it was not until 1936 that Council endorsed a recommendation of the V.T.P.C. to include in the building by-law a section allowing a building permit to be refused if the appearance of the new building would be to the detriment of the neighbourhood. However, "attempts to limit the construction of new buildings to those in harmony with their neighbours failed because the Architectural Board of Control established in 1936 was neither 'sufficiently broad nor restrictive'" (Roy 1980, p. 108). In spite of failure to apply the regulations, it is important to note that the City was once again able to obtain the right from the Province to prevent 'undesirable' development.

The V.T.P.C. reported to the Town Planning, Parks and Boulevards Committee (renamed in April 1934 the Civic Planning and Parks Committee). Like the V.T.P.C. this committee concerned itself primarily with zoning matters and subdivision related to creating a city of single family homes (Holdsworth 1981, p. 107). For example, it approved the subdivision of a residential parcel in the area of 10th Avenue and Crown Street. Holdsworth (1981) suggests that while the problems of speculation were well known, the single minded pursuit of subdivision of land for single family homes was
indicative of the failure of planning. The Bartholomew Plan recognized the consequences of land speculation on Vancouver, stating that "there is probably no more striking example of the ills of uncontrolled and haphazard subdivision of land on the continent than there is here" (Bartholomew 1929, p. 309). The 1929 Plan attempted to remedy some of the inefficiencies that were the result of private speculation, but the Plan's "main planning impact was the instigation of zoning by-laws that institutionalized the land-use consequences of private land development" (Holdsworth 1981, p. 106).

The Bartholomew Plan restricted its planning for housing to zoning. Four different residential districts were created—one family, two family, three storey multiple dwelling and six-story multiple dwelling districts (Bartholomew 1929, pp. 220-221). In the Plan for the City of Vancouver, the role and extent of acceptable planning and government intervention in housing is stated:

The general opinion seems to be that such building is in its nature a matter of private rather than of public enterprise. In Vancouver, the zoning by-law has been prepared with every attention for present and future housing needs as far as they could be considered within the scope of the Commission.  
(Bartholomew 1929, p. 233)

The single family house was the model for residential development (Holdsworth 1984). The 1929 Plan acknowledges the fact that Vancouver was largely a city of single family home districts. However, rather than plan the future of residential districts, Bartholomew accepted that whether or not these will remain one-family or
become two-family can be surely left to the wishes of the owners themselves, and the by-law amended accordingly when occasion arises.  
(Bartholomew 1929, p. 225)

The Plan for Vancouver did admit that Vancouver experienced a housing problem. However, the planners begged off any attempt to resolve it, believing that it can only be solved when the city or the state is in a position to guarantee to every individual householder a wage sufficient for the payment of a reasonable rent. While town planning can go far to create and maintain desirable housing conditions, it is beyond its scope as outlined by Provincial Acts, to concern itself with the very important economic problem involved in such an undertaking.  
(Bartholomew 1929, p. 234)

Here we have an early expression of housing as an incomes problem. And, even though a housing problem is identified, the planners explicitly decide to do nothing to resolve it.

**City Responses to The Depression.** During the Depression housing problems came to the forefront in Vancouver. Many lived in sub-standard dwellings. The Health Department undertook a survey of lodging houses in 1920 and 1927 and found an abundance of the problems they had been fighting well before the First World War. In annual reports from 1933-1939, the Medical Health Officer repeatedly reported that hard economic times were responsible for many people living in dwellings "which would not ordinarily pass for that purpose, also for considerable overcrowding of families into tenements."

In the early 1930's the City addressed the problem both tenants and homeowners had in paying for their homes. One
solution was to participate in the provincial government's Land Settlement Scheme. The City provided one third of the cost for each family it recommended to participate in the scheme which gave families land for a home and farm outside of urban areas. The impact of the program on Vancouver was small (only thirty-seven Vancouver families who were on municipal relief participated and by the end of 1935, eight families had quit and returned to the city.

Another and more important way in which the City of Vancouver tried to help those having difficulty housing themselves was through shelter allowances, as part of municipal relief. In 1933, the Relief Officer reported to the Relief and Employment Committee that with 6,000 married municipal relief recipients, 75% of whom were tenants, shelter grants were being paid to only 1,100 cases. This suggested the need for a more comprehensive scale of shelter allowances.

By the mid 1930's, the Relief and Employment Committee recommended that property owners on relief should get the same consideration for a shelter allowance as tenants. In 1936, the Public Welfare and Relief Committee were able to report "the granting of an allowance equal to the tenant shelter scale to owners of unencumbered property on which taxes were delinquent."

By 1935, the City had another housing problem on its hands. Under the British Columbia Better Housing Act 1919,
money advanced by the federal government to the province, and in turn advanced to the City of Vancouver, was loaned by the City to 151 World War One veterans during 1919 to 1921 to purchase houses (Jones 1978, p. 28). By 1935, of the 151 loans 132 were outstanding; 37 had already reverted to the City and another 66 were in arrears. The loans had been made at a time when house prices were inflated and repayments on the loans were out of proportion to the value of the houses. The City's response in this case was to appeal to the provincial government for aid, assuming that the province would turn to the federal government which had originated the scheme.

**The Housing Problem Identified.** The Building, Town Planning and Parks Committee continued to deal extensively with zoning matters (in January 1937 a new committee, the Civic Planning and Parks Committee took over). The Committee received advice from the Vancouver Town Planning Commission and dealt with such matters as proposed amendments to the zoning by-law to allow apartments in areas not zoned for such, and complaints about the "infiltration" of Hindus and Chinese into neighbourhoods not considered their "own."

A proposal for a "working man's Shaughnessy Heights," put before the Social Services Committee by an alderman in January 1937, called for developing a 2,000 acre residential development on City owned tax sale land adjacent to the Fraser golf course to be financed by a federal government housing
The proposal was not carried forward due to the impracticality of the City providing all new services and utilities. In addition, there was no access to existing transportation, necessary for 'working men'. The Committee felt that other areas were more suitable and were already serviced.

The shortage of affordable and adequate housing and the substandard condition of many dwellings led City Council to appoint the first of many special Housing Committees on June 28, 1937. Council gave the Committee the task "to make a survey of the housing situation in Vancouver and to draw up and present a comprehensive Housing Plan to the City Council, based on the needs of the City. The Housing Committee was made up of an alderwoman who served as Chairperson, a member of the Town Planning Commission and the Secretary of Zoning Matters for the City.

After consulting with local interest groups and petitioning other governments for information the Housing Committee submitted a preliminary report to Council on November 15, 1937, and a final report dated December 6, 1937 was adopted by Council on December 13, 1937. On receipt of the report, Council resolved to bring to the attention of the Governor-General-in-Council the necessity of inaugurating a plan whereby monies be made available for adequate Housing Schemes, which will provide necessary and suitable homes for those persons whose means do not enable them to take advantage of the provisions of the Dominion Housing Act.

The Housing Committee concluded that the City of Vancouver
should look to the federal government in order to implement a housing scheme for low-income Vancouverites. The housing problem was declared a "Dominion-wide question and that its solution rested with the federal government."  

In June 1938, the federal government passed the National Housing Act which provided municipalities with funding for low-income rental housing. Part 2 of the N.H.A., 1938, authorized the minister "to make loans to Local Housing Authorities to assist in the construction of houses to be leased to families of low income." The Housing Committee studied the provisions of the Act carefully. What was required of the municipality was clearly of interest:  

The municipality must approve each project and also agree not to levy municipal taxes on the houses owned by the Local Housing Authority exceeding in the aggregate 1% of the cost of construction. The municipality must also agree not to levy any taxes on the income of the Local Housing Authority. In the case of a Limited Dividend Corporation an agreement must be obtained from the Municipality that, if at any time before the loan is paid off, its net earnings are insufficient to pay the semi-annual payments due to the Minister of Finance, the municipality will forgo all taxes or such lesser amount as will enable the Limited Dividend Corporation to make the payments in full.  

The formalization of planning in Vancouver was accomplished in close association with civic interest groups and the City continued this tradition with its Housing Committee. The Housing Committee felt that the federal government anticipates cooperation between municipalities and public-spirited citizens in an effort to alleviate the existing housing shortage through the medium of
the National Housing Act ... The Committee, is therefore, associating itself with the Vancouver Housing Association, a branch of the National Housing and Planning Association of Canada, composed of public-spirited citizens who are anxious to assist in a constructive way, with housing schemes.  

In June 1938, the Housing Committee was given the go-ahead to study the possibility of utilizing tax sale lands for a municipal housing scheme. (The City had acquired property as a result of tax sales since the early 1900's.) The Committee also discussed a proposal put forward by the Pacific Housing Corporation and Toronto General Trust company to construct 100 low-rental units under Part 2 of the N.H.A., with a possible expansion to over 490 units. However, Council "balked at the stipulation of the (National Housing) Act which requires municipalities to confine their tax levy on houses built with the aid of Dominion loans to 1 per cent" (compared to 4 1/4% municipal levy on property). Another proposal, in cooperation with the Vancouver Housing Association for 50 houses in the Trout Lake area was also considered. However, in spite of community support for the City of Vancouver to participate in a low-rental scheme (except for outright disapproval expressed by the Associated Property owners, the Vancouver Federated Ratepayers and the Vancouver Real Estate Exchange), a proposed plebiscite to deal with the issue of low-rental schemes was never held, and the City's opportunity to participate in the program lapsed as the program ended March 31, 1940. The City's reluctance to become involved in such a program also hinged on a dislike for the federal government's requirement that the
municipality collect only 1% tax. The Housing Committee recommended that in light of disagreement over the 1% taxation clause, City Council ask for an extension of the deadline to participate in the low rental scheme. However, the opportunity was lost.

**Welfare Initiatives.** The City had other housing matters with which to deal. Relief for property owners who were unable to pay their taxes continued to be an issue. In July 1936 Council initiated a scheme whereby homeowners in jeopardy of losing their homes though tax delinquency could work on a municipal public works project to keep their property. In 1936, approximately 300 homeowners worked under this scheme. In 1937, 150 delinquent taxpayers were given work and in 1938, work was found for approximately 135 homeowners.

Other welfare actions included opening two hostels for single women (one in 1939, and one in 1940). One was described as a home for "girls who were promiscuous and who were in danger of becoming prostitutes." The City withdrew its funding in December 1945, due to the limited use made of the hostel accommodation brought about, it was claimed, by improved economic conditions.

The problem of single destitute men continued to hound the city. In 1938, the City supported 1,170 single men at 100% of the cost and 1,169 men at 20% of the cost of assistance (the province contributed the other 80%). At this time the men were able to choose their own food and shelter.
The Social Service Department of the City questioned the desirability of this and decided to find out whether the province had any 'camps' to which the men might be moved to live and eat all in one place. In this way it would make the City's aid as unappealing as possible and be treated as a temporary measure. It would also be easier to contain any 'anti-social' behaviour.

The City also helped to fund Abbott House which provided temporary shelter for single men. In 1941, the City provided 25% of the House's funds in spite of concerns that it had been an obstacle to the smooth operation of Social Service Administration in that it encouraged transients, etc., to take up residence in Vancouver rather than merely rendering assistance in an emergent situation.

Another housing related welfare function of the City at this time was to increase shelter allowances for single parents with a child of the opposite sex so that they could afford to rent two rooms rather than both live and sleep in one.

The Housing Committee studied waterfront areas and basement suites in the West End and found terrible conditions:

The shacks themselves are cold, clammy and vile, often without heat ... Even greater is the menace of fire to the West End district from the heating methods followed in Basement Suites of that area. Life in such places must in time unbalance reason and break down constitution.

These examples and other surveys proving poor housing conditions again led the City to consider a 'housing standards
by-law.' In 1938, the Housing Committee reported to Council the need for a by-law, similar to one already in use in Toronto, because "the number of low standard living quarters is growing at an alarming rate." First, however, it would be necessary to get enabling legislation since the City Charter did not allow a by-law regarding housing standards.

In 1940, another housing survey was undertaken "to provide the necessary details for consideration in connection with the proposal to establish a standard of housing by-law." The survey of 207 dwellings in six different parts of the city led to the drafting of a proposed housing standards by-law, but it was not adopted. This was due partly to concern about imposing further hardship during the already difficult war years.

Removal of foreshore shacks continued, but concern shifted as the issue of housing shortage grew and the end of the war came in sight promising even greater pressure on housing. Reports of the Social Service Department highlight the shortage of housing in Vancouver and is one of the first times that the need for an increased supply of low-cost housing is raised:

Lack of housing continues to be an issue of major proportions. Not only does the small shelter allowance granted by the department limit the accommodation available to recipients of relief, but the influx of war workers and soldiers' dependents has accentuated the situation. It is recognized that an increase in the shelter grant is not the solution unless it is coupled with an effort to encourage construction of dwellings available at modest rent. The housing situation as it now exists in unquestionably proving costly to the community in child delinquency, sickness and marital problems.
Housing and Planning. In 1940, the V.T.P.C. suggested that it too might have a role to play with respect to housing, which up until then was considered somewhat out of the bounds of a narrow interpretation of planning. Housing came on the Town Planning Commission's agenda in 1942. In its Annual Report 1941 the Commission proposed a "definite consideration for the problems of housing. Housing under the urge of war conditions has become a real and challenging planning problem, and in many cities of the United States and Britain, is now part of planning activity."

The City's response to the mounting housing problems, partly caused by many years of economic hardship and partly by the pressure of war, was to form, in February 1943, another committee, the Housing and Blighted Areas Committee. The work of this committee soon fell under another new committee, the Post War Housing Committee of City Council, and the first committee ceased to meet. In recommending that a special committee on low cost housing be created the Town Planning Commission was interested in the provision of adequate housing accommodation for persons in the low income brackets, and the abolition of unhealthy housing conditions, but realize(d) that any effort in this direction not directly financed by private enterprise must originate with the City Council and such public bodies. (However) no large city can solve the housing problem alone. Building bylaws, zoning regulations and demolitions do no more than scratch the surface, while the limitation of taxation power and the obligation of maintaining public services make it impossible for a city to undertake housing reform without full national aid.

The end of the war offered opportunities for new relationships
with senior governments and the need for a coordinated effort with the province and the federal government was identified.

A report of the Post War Housing Committee called for "legislation authorizing municipalities to make plans for the development of blighted and other areas; to carry out such plans by means of purchase or appropriation." Lack of enabling legislation was an important constraint for the City at a time when it appeared ready to take on much more responsibility with respect to housing.

Concern over property taxes again held back the City from an expedient agreement with the federal agency, Wartime Housing Limited (WHL). WHL wanted to build low rent houses for veterans in Vancouver but Council "opposed the payment of a nominal sum for tax sale lots conveyed to WHL, and it objected to the loss of future tax revenue incurred by the transfer of city land to the crown" (Wade 1984, p. 77). The City was concerned that the WHL houses would "'jeopardize' the interests of nearby homeowners."

In late summer 1944, the City finally entered into an agreement to donate 100 lots, tax free to WHL for low rental housing. The City also agreed to not hold WHL to a strict adherence of building and zoning by-laws in order to increase the agency's flexibility. The 100 building lots were located between 28th and 40th Avenues, east of Main Street and the agreement included the option for the City to purchase the houses and lots back in eleven years time for a cost of $1,000
per house. Since the value of the houses alone in 1944 was approximately $3,000 this might be considered a good deal.

The City was cautious about the WHL program and wanted some proof of its suitability to the Vancouver situation. In January 1945, the federal government asked Vancouver to extend its wartime housing program by an additional 400 lots. Council decided, in light of the fact that none of the first 100 houses were completed, to wait and review its position when they could see tangible results of the program.

In spring 1945, Council authorized its Properties Committee to search for another 100 City owned lots for WHL, and it was suggested that rather than the City eventually purchasing the houses it would be better if the veterans did so, to give them more than a "tenants interest" in the property.

By 1945, the need for housing and local political demand helped Council overcome its reluctance and agreements with WHL in July and September of that year brought the total number of lots conveyed to WHL at $1.00 per lot to 1,200 (Wade 1984, p. 119). 818 lots between Grandview Highway and 22nd Avenue, Cassiar Street and Boundary Road, of which the City owned 747 lots already were also considered for residential development.

Not only family housing was in short supply. The city experienced
increased difficulty in securing adequate lowpriced housing for persons in receipt of public aid. While throughout the year this condition was marked, it has become even more acute in the past 2 months, particularly for single persons dependent upon cheaper lodging houses in the waterfront area for accommodation.
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Some members of the civic administration recognized that "private enterprise is unable to provide housing for a fairly large number of citizens on the basis of financial gain." As the war years closed, the City looked for ways to extend its involvement in providing housing in cooperation with the provincial and federal governments. However, this was not an easy task. Helen Alford, an English woman who toured Canada in 1945, giving lectures on housing in England, prepared, on her return to England, a report on housing and local government in Canada. She sent a copy to the sponsors of her trip, the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. In her report she commented on the difficulty of urban interests, such as housing, being resolved within the jurisdictions spelled out by the British North America Act (BNA Act):

municipalities are gravely troubled by a national problem such as housing which forces itself through the doors of every city hall, they have no weapons with which to meet it, no public forum in which to voice their grievances effectively, and above all, no higher authority to turn to with any confidence in their understanding or desire to help.
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Once again, the City in 1944 produced a Plan for Vancouver that had little consideration of housing, other than creating and protecting single-family home districts through subdivision control and zoning (Bartholomew 1944). By 1946,
the City realized that such an oversight was no longer acceptable and another era in the City's evolution in housing began.

**Summary of Key Events 1900 to 1945.** For most of the time before the Second World War, city government functioned on the council-committee style with aldermen elected by wards. Vancouver's early councils thought that the role of council was to provide services for the rapidly growing city "in a financially sound, efficient manner" (Gutstein 1983, p. 196).

In 1936, the ward system was abolished and the Non-Partisan Association (NPA) formed to prevent the Cooperative Commonwealth Foundation (CCF - the forerunner of the New Democratic Party) from introducing party politics in Vancouver. The NPA successfully dominated council in the 1937 elections and maintained their commanding lead until 1968. This is particularly important since throughout the more than 30 year reign of the NPA, it was closely allied with business and real estate interests.

In the first part of the study period the City established the precedent for municipal regulation of housing. Business and property interests strongly influenced the implementation of a regulatory process. Zoning (and its antecedents of health and fire by-laws) protected property owners from elements that would lower property values or threaten an established way of life.

Welfare efforts related to housing were an important
concern for the City. The City carried out most of the responsibility for welfare in the pre-World War Two years, and a program of shelter allowances and emergency shelters composed the City's housing efforts in this area. The City wished to limit housing assistance but walked a fine line between attracting the unemployed from less well-off communities, meeting the needs of its own residents and preventing major social unrest over poor living conditions. Throughout the period, the City gradually lost the responsibility for welfare efforts as the cost became too great a burden. Gradually, responsibility for welfare actions shifted to the senior levels of government.

The City did not undertake to supply housing (other than temporary emergency shelter or a small housing project for the aged). By the Second World War, Council clearly felt that besides ensuring the city had a supply of developable land, any supply initiatives should come from senior governments. Responsibility for the lack of affordable housing did not rest with the City.

The City's major planning initiatives in the period before 1945, the 1929 and 1944 Bartholomew Plans, did not establish the City's goals and objectives for housing. The Plans simply equated housing planning with zoning and left the provision of housing to the private market.

In conclusion, housing was still very much the responsibility of the private sector, with municipal
regulations aiding the development process and ensuring the
protection of property interests. Welfare efforts were
limited and supply and planning policies and programs non-
existent. The rise of the business-real estate orientated
civic party, the NPA, coincides with these housing actions
undertaken by the City.
2. The End of the Second World War to 1960

**Housing Studies.** At the end of the Second World War two things were clear to the City. First, major initiatives to supply affordable housing to the growing numbers of families in Vancouver was essential. Second, the lack of information about housing in Vancouver needed to be rectified. Following the war, data collection and assessing housing conditions and needs in Vancouver was a major concern.

In its 1946 Annual Report, the Vancouver Town Planning Commission pointed out that in all modern town plans "the matter of housing is considered of the same importance as zoning, major streets, parks and schools, etc., and is included in the plan." The City had yet to include such a comprehensive plan for housing and in the Commission's opinion the 1944 Bartholomew plan should be revised to include housing so that Vancouver would have a "truly comprehensive and all embracing Town Plan." Under pressure from the Vancouver Housing Association, a citizen interest group, and in order to bring housing into the overall planning process, Harland Bartholomew, planning consultant to the City was asked to develop a proposal for a major housing survey in Vancouver. Bartholomew submitted his proposal in November 1946 but decision to proceed was postponed to be put before the new incoming 1947 Council.

Bartholomew never undertook the study, and, in May 1947, a U.B.C. research team headed by Dr. Leonard Marsh proposed to
undertake, with City assistance, a detailed survey of housing and the families in the area known as Strathcona "to test out the pros and cons of low-rental housing and related developments within a long term plan." The City (again prompted by the Vancouver Housing Association) contributed $1,000 towards the cost of the study, and CMHC contributed $5,000.

Meanwhile, in August 1946, the Health Department reported on its concerns about housing in Vancouver. The report looked at each type of housing (cabins, hotels, single family houses, apartments, etc.) and concluded that

many occupied quarters and buildings exist today that are not fit for occupancy and until better units are available the best the staff can do is curb gross unsanitary conditions and maintain a fair degree of decency.

In 1948, the Health Department undertook another housing study, this time exclusively on lodging houses (including rooming houses, boarding houses and hotel-type rooming houses). 600 lodging houses were studied in order to provide the data necessary to update by-laws regarding lodging houses. By 1949, the lodging house study covered 1000 Vancouver lodging houses.

The City's attention turned to the issue of 'blighted' or 'slum' areas in Vancouver, with a view to preparing a redevelopment plan. In 1949 the issue was referred to a special committee for study. The Housing and Blighted Areas Committee of the Town Planning Commission met in 1948 to
discuss the need for study of housing in Vancouver and the possibility of developing low cost housing. However, the Commission felt that programs designed to create low cost housing depended on the participation of the federal government. Council formally asked the Town Planning Commission to "report in connection with specific areas which are considered to require redevelopment" in April 1950, but after identifying four areas and touring the sites and discussing their findings with other City officials, the Committee made no recommendation. The Committee reported that, since the City had no funds allocated for redevelopment and could not be considered to be serious about rehabilitating parts of the city, there was no point in proceeding.

In 1948, the City asked the Provincial government for an amendment to the City Charter to allow the City to establish a local housing authority. The housing authority, through agreement with the provincial and federal governments, was expected to enable the City "to accelerate home construction, and commence a program of re-development in blighted areas."

The Chairman of the Building, Civic Planning and Parks Committee, Alderman Archie Proctor, went to Seattle and Portland in 1947 to study housing measures undertaken by these cities and returned to Vancouver convinced "that government subsidy was the answer." With Proctor's report on American initiatives in hand and the provincial amendment to the Charter allowing the City to enter "into projects for slum clearing or housing with either the Dominion or Provincial
governments or both, and for setting up a Housing Authority," the Mayor established a temporary Housing Authority.

The temporary Housing Authority made low rental housing its priority, and the Housing Authority resolved to proceed with the preparation of a definite housing project including plans, costs and legislative requirements, if any, for the erection of multiple dwellings on City owned property between 33rd and 37th Avenues and Ontario and Main Streets.

By the end of the year, it was clear that federal-provincial plans would soon be announced that would change the nature of the City's role in a low rental scheme. The Temporary Housing Authority felt that instead of pursuing its own low rental project, "a complete survey of existing housing conditions in the city (should) be conducted in order that a true picture of the need for housing accommodation may be presented to the Provincial government."

A survey, which it was hoped would reach most Vancouver households, led to a disappointing return of only 2,500 completed questionnaires. However, the returns clearly indicated the need for low rental housing in Vancouver and was treated as a success by citizens' groups such as the Vancouver Housing Association which had been pointing to such a need for many years.

**Post-War Initiatives Involving Senior Governments to Supply Housing.** As had been concluded by Council's special
Housing Committee at the close of the Second World War, the City of Vancouver would have to rely on the senior governments for help in providing low cost housing. In 1946, City Council pressed Ottawa to assume responsibility for speeding up Vancouver construction programs and providing low-rent houses. In 1947, the Mayor of Vancouver wrote to Prime Minister W.L. Mackenzie King stating the need for federal government policy in the matter of housing, particularly low cost housing, emergency housing, and slum clearance. The Mayor expressed the fear that the federal government was trying "to shift the responsibility of cost in substantial part on to cities, municipalities and local governments" similar to the way in which unemployment relief had been handled in the 1930's.

City of Vancouver relations with the federal government were strained over the issue of property taxation in federally developed residential areas under Wartime Housing Limited. A special committee appointed by City Council studied the taxation issue with respect to veteran's housing. The City felt that if the federal government would allow the tenants of the subsidized housing to purchase their homes "the problem now facing municipalities, insofar as taxation is concerned, will be dissolved, and the tenants would then be placed on the City's Tax Roll." In 1947, a federal-municipal discussion regarding federal subsidized housing was held up. "The big stumbling block is that Ottawa insists on a fixed taxation. We cannot, in this way, create a favoured
The City of Vancouver continued its wartime complaint that federal housing projects in Vancouver paid too low property taxes to the City. In addition, the federal government required the City to sell lots for $1.00 so that the federal government could develop new housing. The City wanted $400.00 per lot and full taxes paid, an exception to every other municipal agreement in Canada. Vancouver also wanted to ensure that Wartime Housing Limited didn't sell existing houses developed by WHL at discount prices as it had in other cities. By refusing to accept what the federal government claimed was accepted as a matter of routine by other municipalities, Vancouver gained a reputation of being uncooperative. The City's response to this accusation was that the federal government had found money for other projects it wanted to undertake - why not housing? And, a concern that was raised many times with respect to subsidized housing was that the City did not want to subsidize some citizens, while others paid for housing on the market. Acting Mayor George Miller stated that he considered it "a rank injustice to penalize one class of taxpayers for the benefit of a very small percentage of our citizens." At this time, the City was obviously more concerned about equity for those paying full market price for their housing than with those who had limited housing options due to shortages or affordability problems.
Under continued pressure from citizen groups the City negotiated with the federal government for more veteran's housing. Failure to agree on a price at which City lots should be made available led to several months delay. However, in December 1947, an agreement was signed for 600 units to be built by WHL/CMHC on a 100 acre site known as Renfrew Heights and the first houses were occupied in fall 1948.

In November 1948, the City agreed to another federal housing project for veterans, in the area bounded by 54th, Argyle, Marine and Boundary known as Fraserview. "The Working Man's Shaughnessy Heights" was a low rental project of 1,100 homes and was ready for the first occupants in September 1950.

By the end of 1948, the City was again concerned about the lack of senior government initiatives, particularly at the provincial level. Aside from providing veteran's housing in developments such as Renfrew Heights and Fraserview, the federal government indicated that it "declined to go further into housing unless the provincial authorities agree to contribute financially." At this time, City Aldermen suggested that the City needed a rent reduction plan in addition to the construction of low-cost homes, and that senior government support was long overdue.

In December 1949, a series of meetings were held in Victoria, B.C. between the province and various municipalities.
to establish the role that British Columbian municipalities would play in new federal-provincial housing programs and to determine the housing needs of the municipalities. The Premier hosted the meetings to seek advice from the municipalities regarding the type of projects that might be undertaken. The Premier preferred programs that increased the ability of private developers to produce housing for home ownership. Therefore, assembling land and services within municipalities was seen as a priority for municipalities. Any subsidized housing for low income groups would require municipal participation in the subsidy. Since neither the provincial nor federal government would act as landlords for subsidized rental housing, the municipality would have to establish a management authority.

The 1949 amendments to the National Housing Act established a Federal-Provincial scheme to finance low cost housing, and the City, in 1950, began the slow process of implementing a public housing program. In May 1950, Council gave unanimous approval to test out the new federal-provincial legislation on the City owned site known as Little Mountain that had been identified by the Temporary Housing Authority for a low rental housing project. Council warned that the "city is definitely not getting into the business of providing houses for everyone who wants them" and that the subsidized rental accommodation was targetted at old age pensioners and others with subsistence wages. The only cost to Vancouver, which would sell the land to the province at its assessed
value (the Province agreed to install the services) would be payment of 12.5% of the difference in operating costs of the project and rent revenue received. However, it was to be another two years before the project came on stream again and a public housing project implemented in Vancouver.

**Other Post-War Events.** One of the events which precipitated the building of nearly 2,000 veterans' homes was the occupation of the old Hotel Vancouver (Wade 1984, p. 76). The extreme post-war shortage of housing led a group of veterans to occupy the hotel and claim it as an emergency shelter. Under this pressure, Council agreed to give a grant to the Citizen's Rehabilitation Council to manage a temporary shelter in both the old Hotel Vancouver and Dunsmuir Hotels, arguing that the City lacked the "administrative machinery to operate a hostel." The City also refused to surrender its tax revenue (Wade 1985).

The City's Legal Department "has always advised (and Council has followed the advice) that the City has no power to go into the business of building dwellings for people, or of spending public money to bonus others to build houses or make them available to those in need of accommodation." Two exceptions to this interpretation were allowed, one under Wartime Housing contracts authorized by the Vancouver Enabling Act 1945, and another under amendments made to the City Charter in 1945 giving the City the power to make agreements under the National Housing Act. In order to support emergency housing for veterans the City was forced to find an
innovative means of participation. The City made a grant under the Council's power to aid charitable institutions and chose not to examine too closely whether the Citizen's Rehabilitation Council was a charitable institution. In July 1947, the two hotels housed 498 families and 235 single persons for a total of 1,413 occupants, many of whom were rehoused in Renfrew Heights when it opened.

In May 1947, the City agreed to give another grant to the Citizen's Rehabilitation Council to house 60 families in emergency shelter at the Seaforth Armouries on Burrard Street. "The City, however, will be protected against 'going into the housing business' by a commitment from the rehabilitation group to reimburse the City, out of rent, for the amount the latter expends on the scheme." The City also contributed to an emergency shelter on Sea Island, but, with the availability of new low rental homes, withdrew its support in November 1947. Clearly, while the City was willing to front-end the expense of supplying housing, it was unwilling to develop it or maintain a financial interest.

The post war shortage of housing created a dilemma for the City with respect to establishing and enforcing minimum housing standards. By 1946, the question of basement suites in apartment buildings had been before Council for more than two years, and no solution had emerged. In October 1946, the Town Planning Commission reported that it had received petitions from the Vancouver Housing Association (opposed to
basement suites) and solicitors representing apartment owners (requesting that an area greater than the one third of basement area already permitted be expanded). The City's planning consultant, Harland Bartholomew, reported that he, and many other town planning consultants and housing authorities, was opposed to basement suites. The Town Planning Commission recommended basement suites not be allowed because they would "permanently lower the standard of housing in Vancouver (and) cause unwarranted increase in population density thus impairing future public health as well as the future economic wealth of the City."

The City again dealt with the issue of a minimum housing standards by-law as Council resolved, in June 1948, to set up a Committee to consider such a by-law. A similar by-law had been drawn up in 1938 but had not been enacted. A study made of lodging houses and a report with general observations about residential accommodation in hotels, apartments, rented houses, owner occupied cabins and trailers formed the basis for drawing up a standard of housing by-law. The Committee studying the matter also looked at the "Minimum Housing Standards Ordinance" of the City of St. Louis, Missouri and were particularly interested in a section of the ordinance which gave the City of St. Louis the authority to establish a revolving fund "for the purpose of making loans available to owners of dwellings so that repairs and alterations to dwellings can be made as authorized by the Building Inspector." The Committee ordered a standard of housing by-
law to be drafted but, instead of a comprehensive by-law, the end result was an amendment to the Lodging House By-law. One of the difficulties in producing a standard of housing by-law was identified by the Housing and Blighted Areas Committee of the Town Planning Commission. The Committee felt that there would be difficulty in "correlating the needs of the Health and Building Departments in order to make such a By-law workable."

The City did make some small advances in regulating housing. Council passed an amendment to the zoning by-law prohibiting housekeeping units or suites in basements or cellars (the Town Planning Commission considered this "one of the most outstanding events of the year" and a "gratifying outcome."

An area bounded by Granville and Burrard Streets and 1st and 4th Avenues came under particular scrutiny by City Council. The Parent Teachers Association (PTA) in the area identified a growing slum housing problem. In response to the Henry Hudson PTA's concerns Council resolved, in April 1950, to study housing conditions in the area identified. As a result the zoning by-law was amended by Council in August 1950 to prevent new residential development in light industrial areas, and fire limit boundaries were extended to stop rehabilitation of existing dwellings.

In anticipation of a federal-provincial housing program, City representatives attempted to clarify the City's role in
implementing the program and met with the Vancouver Building Contractor's Association. The contractors were assured "that they would have an active part to play in construction of homes under the proposed Provincial-Dominion Plan and that the City would see lots were made available to them."

The City of Vancouver was concerned with policies regarding residential development of City-owned land. In December 1949, Council resolved to dispose of lots to individuals where the City had small subdivisions with services already installed. In February 1950, the Supervisor of Lands and Rentals reported that the City had 1,350 lots which could be made available for sale Council decided that "where there are subdivisions without such services, lots therein be withheld from sale pending consideration of the Housing Plan." However, the senior governments' housing plan failed to meet Council's expectations. In 1950, Council rejected federal-provincial aid for readying unserviced land for new low cost housing developments and decided to finance the servicing of two parcels of land (at Puget Drive and 16th Avenue and 44th Avenue and Dumfries) that had been held for federal-provincial initiatives by selling the lots at market prices. Council rejected senior government aid because it failed to cover all servicing costs.

**The 1950's - First Initiatives in Public Housing.** In 1950, the City's land holdings at the Little Mountain site were picked for the City's first public housing project. In the same year, Leonard Marsh presented the results of his
urban renewal study and outlined a $15 million dollar project consisting of low rental apartments and row housing for the Strathcona area. Even though Marsh envisaged that the major part of redevelopment costs would be carried by senior governments, Council was "reluctant to take on any burden that might raise the taxes of existing home owners in order to provide homes for others" (Roy 1980, p. 144). However, the City did agree to pay 12.5% of the operating losses from public housing built by the federal and provincial governments under the 1949 National Housing Act.

Implementing the first public housing project was not an easy process. The first tender bids came in much higher than anticipated, and in 1951, plans for Little Mountain came to a standstill. Failure to get a competitive bid for Little Mountain jeopardized the completion of Fraserview. The high cost of building in Vancouver caused the federal government to reconsider its participation in supplying housing. At the same time, City Council passed a resolution urging the federal government to ease lending regulations and encourage the private sector to build homes.

By 1952, the federal, provincial and municipal governments worked out the financing scheme for Little Mountain. The governments agreed that the project be broken down into smaller parcels in order that more contractors could bid on the project and Council gave the go-ahead for Little Mountain. Further delays in the approval process (caused
by a difference of opinion between the City and senior governments as to the type of tenants to be housed and rents to be charged held up construction until 1953. In April 1954, the first families moved into the 224 unit project.

The City assumed responsibility for initiating public housing projects by identifying likely public housing sites and for tying development of public housing in with urban renewal projects. In 1953 the Building and Town Planning Committee established a special committee to consider appropriate sites in Vancouver for public housing projects. One site considered and rejected in 1953 was in Fraserview, an area already under public development. Rejection of the site in Fraserview was based on the opinion that the "low density area is too valuable for development for low rental housing."

In 1951, the City was close to establishing a civic housing authority. However, the need for a management body to administer public housing projects led the province, through an Order in Council under the Housing Act of the province, in agreement with CMHC, to establish the Vancouver Housing Authority. The Vancouver Housing Authority administered policies governing the selection of tenants, allocation of units, the rent scale and maintenance of public housing.

By 1960, the City had decided that public housing projects should house more senior citizens. Little Mountain contained no accommodation designed specifically for seniors,
although seniors did occupy a small percentage of the units. Orchard Park, the City's second public housing project (169 units) developed in 1957, had 20 percent of the units designed specifically for seniors. Vancouver City Council wished to provide more housing for seniors under Section 36 (Public Housing) of the National Housing Act and over several years made their wish known to CMHC. In 1958, the Minister responsible for CMHC indicated that he was willing to consider a higher percentage of seniors units in public housing projects.

Because the senior governments made payments in lieu of full property taxes on public housing projects, the net cost to the City of subsidizing operating losses was positive. For example, the Annual Report of the Vancouver Housing Authority in 1956 showed Vancouver's share of the subsidy to be $5,963.12, while it received payments in lieu of taxes of $34,146.76 for a net gain of $28,183.64. The 1957 Annual Report reveals a similar situation.

Other Dealings with Senior Governments in the 1950's. In August 1955, CMHC began selling homes in Renfrew Heights to its tenants. The City, which held the option to repurchase the properties, had already made its position clear. The City saw a resolution to the property taxation problem if the homes were sold to tenants. Three years later, City Council passed a resolution to ask CMHC to pay the equivalent of full taxes on properties for which CMHC was still landlord in Renfrew Heights and Fraserview. The City
drew a comparison with the Little Mountain public housing project which was taxed at full value. CMHC agreed to the request and paid the equivalent of full property taxes from January 1959.

**New Comprehensive Initiatives.** In 1952, the City of Vancouver established a Planning Department which undertook responsibility for a development plan for the City. In 1955, rather than wait for a complete development plan, (which never was produced), Council decided to publish parts of the plan as they were prepared. With respect to housing, the *Vancouver Redevelopment Study, 1957* and the *Apartment Zoning Report, 1958* are the two most important.

Before the two development plan reports were released, the Planning Department oversaw the introduction of a new zoning and development by-law in 1956 (#3573) which contained several means to improve residential development. New daylight regulations, setback, screening and landscaping provisions and the introduction of comprehensive development districts gave the City a greater hand in shaping the residential environment. The 1956 by-law also modified previous rigid zoning by-laws regarding residential zones to allow more flexibility in developing multiple unit housing.

The *Vancouver Redevelopment Study* was a "blueprint" for urban renewal. The terms of reference for the Study were: 1) to select those areas of predominantly residential use which may require redevelopment during the next 20 years, and 2) to
produce a program of redevelopment integrated with the City's long range planning. A Housing Research Committee, made up of representatives from CMHC, the province, and City governments was established to guide the City Planning Department in undertaking the study begun in 1956 (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1957).

The 1957 study recommended 'blanket' clearance of nearly 713 acres in the inner city and another 75 acres of scattered clearance over a 20 year period. (The plan was not strictly followed and by 1970 only 70 acres in the City had been acquired and were in various stages of redevelopment (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1970b).

The City tied public housing closely to its urban renewal program: displaced residents were given the chance to relocate into public housing as their own "slum" housing was demolished. In particular the study included three proposals for housing:

1. encourage developers to provide medium to medium-low density housing;

2. provide housing for the elderly and single people by public housing if private development of sites intended for this purpose doesn't take place; and,

3. use accommodation in various public housing projects to accommodate people displaced by the scheme.

The first comprehensive attempt to deal with multiple unit buildings came in the form of a report prepared for the Technical Planning Board in 1958 and adopted for the most part by Council in the same year. Council's policy concentrated
apartment development in the already zoned multiple dwelling districts in the inner and central city and allowed a limited amount of medium density development adjacent to the City's major commercial areas in suburban parts of the city. This provided a greater variety of housing in the suburban areas, and increased the number of units in areas already high in amenity.

**Continuing Attempts to Maintain Housing Standards.**

Illegal basement suites continued to be a problem for the City. In large part, the problem stemmed from a wartime federal Order-in-Council, P.C. 200, which permitted "shared accommodation" during wartime housing shortages. Vancouver was the only city to interpret P.C. 200 to "mean a right to make structural alterations to convert single family homes into multiple use irrespective of the zoning district." Council allowed all basement suites converted prior to January 1951 to remain occupied until March 1954 when P.C. 200 was revoked.

In 1953, an amendment to the zoning by-law validated illegal suites under certain circumstances. A 1955 amendment to the zoning by-law allowed the Technical Planning Board to permit conversion of large old homes and to allow illegal suites, installed prior to 1951 to remain occupied. In 1956, a "schedule of limited consents" laid down the length of time permitted for an illegal suite, installed prior to 1956, to remain occupied. "This schedule set out the varying
periods of time permitted for conversions of different quality and in accordance with the zoning districts." In November 1959 Council attacked the problem again and resolved to eliminate illegal suites within ten years.

In 1960, the Vancouver Housing Association asked City Council to assume responsibility for the rehousing of those displaced by the closing of illegal or sub-standard accommodation where tenants were unable to find suitable housing at rents they could afford. Not only was this suggestion similar to the principles of urban renewal, where those displaced were offered public housing, but the Vancouver Housing Association cited the example of the City of San Francisco which assumed the responsibility for relocating all families displaced by government actions. The Board of Administration found the Association's proposal "unrealistic and impractical." Instead, Council adopted a policy of permitting parents or grandparents to continue to occupy suites in their children's houses in single family dwelling areas, subject to safeguards for ending the use of the suite when the parents terminated their occupancy. How to administer such a proposal was never worked out.

Foreshore shacks were also on the agenda during the 1950's. In 1955, the City began removing 250 foreshore shacks, and in November 1958, having accomplished the job "with a minimum of publicity and expense" the Committee on Foreshore Shacks was able to hold their last meeting.
In February 1958, Council approved a revised Lodging House By-law (#3686) which, in spite of including some advances in maintaining and improving conditions in lodging houses, was a poor substitute for the more comprehensive minimum of standard of housing by-law that had been discussed for many years.

**Summary of Key Events 1945 to 1960.** The NPA maintained its dominance of City Council throughout 1945 to 1960. The one significant change in the form of civic government introduced in this period was the Board of Administration, a modified example of the council-commission form of local government. The Board of Administration, formed in 1956, was composed of two senior administrators. "One of the commissioners, Gerald Sutton Brown, an English Planner who had helped set up the planning department, came to be the most powerful person at city hall, his power verging on the absolute" (Gutstein 1983, p. 199). Under NPA leadership, the City's policies continued to focus on the promotion of physical growth and development.

In response to federal government initiatives to house war veterans, the City provided land for approximately 4,000 low rental single family homes. This supply policy, while aimed at those who would enter the post-war labour force, did little to help those who needed housing assistance but who were not veterans. Federal veterans' housing programs raised the issue of municipal control and influence over programs imposed by senior governments. The City resented the loss of
property tax revenue expected by the federal government, and failed to participate in an early low rental scheme for this reason. However, either the issue of housing veterans was more popular or more pressing (occupation of the old Hotel Vancouver is an example of the pressure applied) and the City grudgingly capitulated.

The City became aware of the housing problems of its poorer citizens as a result of several post-war studies, many of which were initiated by local interest groups, and considered taking more direct action. Plans to deal with 'blighted' housing, combined with a federal public housing program resulted in the landmark Vancouver Redevelopment Study 1957.

Throughout the post-war years, the City examined ways to regulate and maintain housing quality. However, in spite of constant attempts, the City did not institute a comprehensive minimum of standard housing by-law.

By the end of the 1950's, City activity in planning and supplying housing had increased. Regulation was still an important function and the welfare component also remained important as a more comprehensive approach to housing the poor evolved.
3. 1960 to the Early 1970's

Public Housing in the 1960's. Construction of a public housing project called MacLean Park heralded the beginning of the decade that is most closely associated with public housing in Canada - the 1960's. In 1963, both Skeena Terrace with 234 low rental units and MacLean Park with 159 units opened. The approval process for the 376 unit Raymur Place began in 1963, but the provincial government held up approval for several months, delaying the start of the development until mid 1964. Raymur Place, the largest public project undertaken in Vancouver at the time, was intended to house those displaced by a 28.5 acre clearance of run down buildings.

In August 1963, City Council reviewed the status of public housing in Vancouver. The main conclusion of the review was to note that the high cost of land in Vancouver made the provision of public housing difficult. Council noted that Vancouver was the only municipality in the region providing public housing and that other municipalities should initiate public housing projects. Council also noted that while the City's 12.5% share of the operating loss on public housing units amounted to $48,300 in 1962, the senior governments had paid property taxes in excess of $127,830. For the City, participation in public housing provided a net financial benefit.

In 1964, the City again pressured the federal and provincial governments to provide seniors housing under the
public housing provisions of the National Housing Act. This time the City was successful in getting a 100% senior citizen public housing project, Killarney Gardens, underway.

The public housing program was closely tied to the urban renewal program and by 1965 the City realized the need for a framework to replace the 1957 Vancouver Redevelopment Study. The Director of Planning negotiated with CMHC for funding for a major review and study of the City's urban renewal program and submitted a formal request in 1966. City efforts to re-evaluate the urban renewal program presaged in many ways the Federal Government action in August 1969, in withdrawing a large share of their financial commitment to the Urban Renewal Sections of the National Housing Act pending their own review of this program. Meanwhile, more public housing units came on stream—Killarney Gardens, the first project in Canada exclusively for Seniors, opened in 1966 with 188 units. Raymur Place opened in 1967, and Nicholson Tower, (223 units) another project exclusively for seniors, opened in 1969.

A 304 unit extension to MacLean Park approved by City Council in 1966, opened in 1970. Grandview Terrace (154 units) and Culloden Court (132 units) also received Council approval in 1966 and opened in 1969 and 1970 respectively. Carolina Court (50 Units) and Chimo Terrace (80 units) both the result of new policy to make public housing sites smaller and more dispersed, opened in 1970.

The provincial government delayed construction of the
MacLean Park extension, Grandview Terrace, Culloden Court, and Nicholson Terrace after Council approval. The four month delay ended when the province approved all four projects in March 1967. The province's influence in public housing decisions in Vancouver became an issue in late 1967 when the province issued new guidelines which it expected the City to endorse in order "to expedite approval of 12 projects for 2,000 persons. The Province imposed a building cost limit in public housing of an average of $12,000 per unit. This gave the province, in spite of City objections, a greater voice in project approval. Other guidelines proposed by the province were not as contentious and included dispersing public housing throughout the City, assurance of rezoning for housing projects by the City and a regional approach to public housing. The City wanted to avoid delays in producing public housing and had no choice but to endorse the guidelines thus bowing to provincial authority.

In 1968, the newly formed B.C. Housing Management Commission took over responsibility for managing public housing projects in B.C. Two public housing schemes proposed by the City were rejected by the Commission on the basis that the land the City offered for sale was too costly. The approach the provincial body preferred was the expansion of existing smaller public housing projects. Following this preference projects such as Rupert and Vaness were increased from 25 to 41 units, and Brant Villa increased to 48 units by 1971.
In addition, in 1968, CMHC rejected a site approved by both the City and the province at Pandora and Semlin Streets as inappropriate for residential development. The City was forced to reject its own proposal and consider other uses for the 9 lots it owned (2 lots had been bought specifically for the public housing proposal).

The City's position on the federal-provincial program of urban renewal and public housing was made clear in 1969 when City representatives met with Federal Cabinet minister Paul Hellyer, who conducted a cross Canada study of federal government housing programs. The City wanted the federal government to continue funding urban renewal and public housing in Vancouver. Specifically, with respect to housing, the City wanted a continuing program aimed at improving housing conditions, assistance in rehabilitating and installing municipal services, an urban renewal scheme for the downtown area containing the worst housing and a continuation of federal-provincial funded public housing.

The City warned that while it would continue to identify sites suitable for public housing and assemble the land for the federal and provincial governments, "many of the sites will have to be provided from land already developed and it will be necessary for the senior governments to accept the higher land costs involved."

In June 1969, the Greater Vancouver Regional District adopted public housing as one of its functions. The City
supported making public housing a regional function so that lower cost sites outside Vancouver could be developed.

In 1968, the City faced a serious challenge to its urban renewal-public housing program. Council approved an urban renewal program for the Strathcona area bounded by Hastings, Union, Gore and Glen Drive (known as Scheme 3, Sub-area 1). City proposals included redeveloping two-thirds of the area for public housing and increasing the population of the area from 4,500 to approximately 8,000. A local citizens movement grew up around the issue and the Strathcona Property Owners and Tenants Association (SPOTA) organized formally on December 18, 1968. SPOTA immediately began to pressure City Council and the provincial and federal governments to preserve and rehabilitate the area and not to clear it.

In the City's 1969 submission on Urban Renewal and Public Housing the City concluded that extensive rehabilitation was not feasible in the Strathcona area. SPOTA appealed to the federal government, and the minister responsible promised that the federal government would only participate in a renewal scheme that favoured rehabilitation, met the approval of the area residents and involved them in the planning process. This led to a four level committee, the Strathcona Working Committee, made up of representatives of the federal, provincial and City governments and SPOTA. The Committee's work resulted in recommendations which led to the Strathcona Rehabilitation Project which was signed by all four parties in February 1972, signalling the end of urban renewal in
The City's planning and urban renewal goals were seriously compromised by this episode. The City was reluctant to participate in a rehabilitation scheme and did not feel that Strathcona was the most suitable area. The City's plans for a freeway through the area were rejected. The City argued that it was not legally able to participate in the funding arrangements proposed. "This was quickly met with a Provincial proposal to make any necessary amendments to the Municipal Act."

Meanwhile, the City received federal funding for its proposal for an urban renewal study. In 1968 and 1969, it published reports on single family zones, apartments, duplex and conversion districts. In 1970, the City's proposals for the five year period 1971-1975 were presented. The experiences of a decade of urban renewal and the federal government moratorium on all public housing and urban renewal projects in Canada (imposed in January 1969 as a result of a 1968 Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development) led the City to recommend a course that the Federal government was to follow up on with its 1973 National Housing Act - the end of urban renewal and the introduction of an approach focussing on community improvement and development (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1970b). A new era of conserving and rehabilitating urban neighbourhoods was underway.

The City, also in 1970, allocated $1 million for the
1971-75 capital budgets to assemble sites for public housing, setting a target of 1,300 units.

**Special Needs Housing - the Focus on Seniors and Skid Road.** Besides the two public housing projects dedicated to seniors housing and the small percentage of units available in other public housing projects, the City was under pressure to facilitate the development of more housing for its senior citizens. In 1964, the City explored the idea of establishing a Limited Dividend Senior Citizen's Housing Corporation (under Section 16, N.H.A.) to increase the supply of senior's housing. Nothing came of the idea, however.

City policy from the late 1950's up until 1967 was to sell City land at half its assessed value to non-profit societies willing to develop housing for seniors. The conditions included full payment of property taxes. In 1967, Council resolved to give non-profit groups a choice. They were given the option of purchasing City land at its full assessed value and receiving a grant in lieu of taxes "effective upon the completion of the first building inspection." In 1968, Council decided to encourage private non-profit groups to provide seniors housing on City-owned land. In 1971, the City advertised its interest in promoting seniors housing and negotiated with various seniors groups to sell City-owned lands to construct housing. The City was also able to initiate a 500 unit seniors' housing project under the public housing section of the National
Housing Act. Construction was underway in 1973.

Temporary or emergency housing for those on 'Skid Road' came on the City agenda in 1964. The City made an application for a hostel under Section 35 of the National Housing Act (Public Housing) but the Province rejected the proposal, thinking that the project involved nursing care and that private institutions should be encouraged to provide this type of accommodation through a Provincial grant program. However, recognizing the need for accommodation for single people in 1966, the Province suggested that the City resubmit a proposal.

In 1967, a hostel proposal was approved by all three levels of government and a lease was signed to rent a downtown hotel for five years to accommodate 250 men. Pacific Hostel, operated by the City, opened in 1968. The City's financial contribution was 3.75% of the operating costs. In 1970, the City arranged for the YWCA to operate a women's hostel. Bridge 'Y' opened in 1971 and accommodated 188 women.

In 1972, a Special Committee regarding Skid Road housing meet several times to discuss the possibility of special housing to meet the needs of Skid Road residents. In 1973, Oppenheimer Lodge, a 147 unit project for single persons, funded under the federal-provincial public housing provisions of the N.H.A., started construction. The Committee continued meeting until it was amalgamated with Council's newly formed Housing Committee in April 1973.
Finetuning the Regulatory System. A 1964 Apartment Zoning Report of the Technical Planning Board led to a major public review of apartment zoning in suburban areas. Apartment zones were established at nine of the City's 'District Commercial Centres.' Proposed zones at 10th and Blanca and Dunbar and 25th were successfully opposed by local residents and were not approved by Council.

In 1969, the City prepared a policy report on low density multiple housing in light of ad hoc decisions regarding rezoning for this type of development. The concern about continuing on an ad hoc basis was that "the City's single-family dwelling districts could become so fragmented that they would gradually cease to exist as a meaningful zone." At the same time, the City was concerned about meeting "the growing demand for low density, high amenity, multiple accommodation in the suburban parts of the City for various income and social groups."

The City's general policy was to preserve single-family areas, but interpretation of this policy proved to be wide. Despite some strong neighbourhood objections, Council approved a 'thin' house on a 'narrow' lot which to this day is a contentious issue in Vancouver neighbourhoods.

An area in which the City tried to get involved, but failed, was in preventing the eviction of families with children from apartments. The City found that it clearly had no authority to intervene.
Land Lease. It was during the 1960's and early 1970's that the City of Vancouver pursued some innovations in housing. One of the most important was developing a policy of land lease, rather than sale, of City-owned land.

During the 1960's, the City still sold land for private residential development as well as for federal-provincial housing projects (55% of City land sales each year were needed for debt charges). For example, the City sold its Langara lands to Marathon Realty for development in 1967. The City was able to put conditions on its sale of land while encouraging innovative projects. The City had, in fact, promoted the development of innovative housing. In July 1970, the City advertised that it was willing to consider proposals for innovative low cost homeownership housing under existing Federal legislation on land it owned in the south east sector of the city. An example is an innovative housing project approved by Council in September 1979. Dawson Development bought City land for a low-cost homeownership project on the condition that the 132 units were constructed by a City defined deadline.

However, in 1967, the City began to consider leasing, rather than selling City owned land and asked Corporation Counsel to "report on the powers of the City of leasing land on a long term basis for housing and advise what effect this would have on the City's fiscal policy." The case for leasing was favourable. In 1968, the Board of Administration reported on the terms possible under a lease and the effect on
the City of long term leases. Council decided on a trial limited lease of 247 lots at various sites. The City agreed to a pilot project with the B.C. Co-op Union and Western Co-op Housing to develop co-operative housing on City-owned land. The City set aside a 5-8 acre site in its major development of the south east sector. In 1970, the City worked out a lease agreement with the United Cooperative Society. The Society, funded by the United Church, leased land at 80% of the market value for the 105 cooperatively owned town houses it proposed to build. One of the City's most ambitious projects as a result of the newly developing land lease policy was to be in False Creek.

**Plans and Major Projects.** In 1967, the City began detailed planning for the south east sector, a 620 acre site of City owned land. Champlain Heights, as the sector was renamed, was the City's opportunity, through strict guidelines for development, to ensure a wide variety of housing types. While a private company, Intercontinental Holdings, expressed interest in developing the whole project, the City decided to break it down into smaller parcels (Vancouver, City Planning Department 1968a). The land in Champlain Heights was to be sold to developers to provide capital for the City's five year public works program. However, in late 1973, the Champlain Heights Implementation Report included an objective for the City to retain ownership of the land, along with exercising direct control over development (Urban Land Institute 1980).
The City's control over development and its integration of public housing, an innovative (for the time) low cost condominium project, senior citizens' projects, and the experimental land lease for a co-operative made Champlain Heights a bold municipal initiative. Champlain Heights was the City's opportunity to address seriously the question as to whether there are "other housing types and layouts that can provide all the amenities of single-family dwelling living plus greater individual choice of size or parcel, type of unit, views and desired facilities available?"

In 1968, the City began planning the redevelopment of its land holdings in False Creek. In spite of controversy over the best land use for the area (many thought it should be developed for industrial use (Hulchanski 1984, p. 108)), the City committed itself to a significant residential development with no industrial land use (Hulchanski 1984, p. 114). In late 1972, final goals and objectives developed for False Creek clearly set out a policy of socially mixed housing to incorporate a variety of housing types for a wide range of income groups. In False Creek, the City retained control of development through the formation of a temporary agency, the False Creek Development Group (Hulchanski 1984, p. 10).

Another major plan, undertaken in the late 1960's was a master plan for Vancouver. The first part of the plan presented the major issues in Vancouver and indicated that housing would play a major role in the Vancouver plan. While the plan was never completed it provided a good milestone. It
elaborated three main policies which guided the City with respect to housing:

1. increase the supply of housing for low income families;
2. clear and rebuild rundown sections of the inner city through urban renewal; and
3. preserve the single family areas of the City.

The major issues Part 1 of the plan identified, related to the City's housing policies, were:

1. to consider where to extend apartment zoning;
2. the future of the City's single family areas; and
3. new construction is demolishing older low rental housing - what is the most appropriate way for the City to deal with the growing need for low cost housing?

(Vancouver, City Planning Department 1968b)

Other Initiatives to 1973. The City occasionally conferred with interest groups regarding housing issues within the city. In May 1955, Civic organizations were invited to express their views on housing policy at a special meeting. In 1966, the Civic Development Committee meet with representative builders, developers, and the Building Trades Council to encourage production of adequate housing for low income groups. In 1967, a special committee regarding housing called a meeting to discuss with leaders in the design, building and associated fields, practical measures to try to solve the current housing shortage and to explore ways and means of expediting housing production, particularly for the people in low and moderate income brackets.

The City undertook some short term measures to ease the
shortage of affordable accommodation. In September 1967, the Mayor's Office opened a Housing Registry to list low cost rental accommodation, but five months later only 45 offers of accommodation for rent had been received.

In 1968, the City again looked at the possibility of establishing a limited dividend company or a city housing corporation to supply housing. The City preferred a housing corporation as it would be eligible for more financial contributions from CMHC, while allowing the municipality more autonomy. However, the required an amendment to the City Charter to create a municipal housing corporation, and a motion to pursue such an amendment was defeated.

The study period ends with the formation of a standing committee of Council regarding housing. Housing as a municipal issue was elevated from temporary special status to the more permanent standing committee. And, finally, in much the same vein as at the beginning of the century, the Health Department was able to proclaim proudly that it had pressed 30 convictions under the lodging house by-law and that 400 below standard rooms in lodging houses were permanently closed as a result of court action brought by the City.

Summary of Key Events 1960 to 1973. The City of Vancouver's major activity in the period 1960 to 1973 was urban renewal and public housing, reflecting the NPA's goals of promoting physical growth and development (Gutstein 1983, p. 199). The City's role in public housing was to plan and
initiate the sequence of public housing projects, in conjunction with its urban renewal program. To a great extent, both the province and the federal government influenced the scope and nature of public housing in Vancouver. When a Vancouver citizen's group challenged both programs the senior governments worked out the terms of the truce with the City only reluctantly involved.

The City made some major gains in housing senior citizens. The City used the public housing program to meet needs it defined differently than those established by the federal government.

In 1968, two new Civic organizations challenged the NPA: the Elector's Action Movement (TEAM), "a coalition of reformers and more conservative business interests," and the Committee of Progressive Electors (COPE), "tied to trade unions and the working class." Both ran candidates against the NPA with some success (Gutstein 1983, pp. 203-206). Real change came in 1972, when TEAM candidates won the mayoralty race and eight out of ten aldermanic seats. Committed to a liberal ideology and the 'liveable city' a TEAM led council embarked on a residential option for False Creek and committed itself to social mix and land lease in its own major development.

By 1972, the values behind urban renewal were challenged and rejected. The way in which governments supplied low rental housing was also under question. A major shift in
government policy at all three levels was overdue and began to evolve during 1973.

The study period ends with the City dealing with the constant problem of substandard housing through regulation and with bold initiatives to regulate and supply the type of housing the City wanted in municipally planned and developed projects such as False Creek and Champlain Heights. These developments are good examples of the City's land lease policy which allowed the City long term planning control over land.
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CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE CITY OF VANCOUVER'S HOUSING ACTIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to use the framework provided by the review of theories of the state in Chapter 2 to explain the City of Vancouver's housing actions (as elaborated in Chapter 3) from 1900 to 1973. The first part of this chapter summarizes the major implications of the theory. In the second part of the chapter the City of Vancouver's housing history is summarized by looking at the similarities and the major changes in approach over time. In the third section the history of the City's intervention in housing is analyzed according to the theoretical framework.

1. What the Theory Predicts We Will Find

The relationship of the state and capital is an important one in this analysis. The local state is part of the larger state and the dual function of the local state is, as with the central/national state, legitimation and accumulation. Therefore, the theory suggests that all housing actions pursued by the City of Vancouver can be attributed to either the accumulation or legitimation role of the state or to resolving the contradictions that arise in meeting this dual function.

The theory also predicts the relationship between the central state and the local state; the local state does have
some autonomy from the central state, but the actions of the local state are conditioned in two ways. First, the extent of independence experienced by the local state is constrained by its financial situation. While Dear and Clark (1981) argue that the financial constraint is severe, allowing the central state to greatly limit local autonomy, Johnston (1984, p. 181) found this case to be over stated. The ability to decline senior government financial assistance, to set the terms and conditions of assistance, and evidence that local governments have been created and financially aided explicitly to increase autonomy temper the severity of financial restraint. Nonetheless, an examination of the Canadian situation shows that financial constraints are important and have increased over time (Taylor 1984).

The second way in which the local state is limited is by the determination of its rights or jurisdiction. It is certainly true that "the local state has no inherent legal authority or power" (Dear and Clark 1981). Even though financially constrained, the autonomy invested in local states by the central state is substantial and significant (Johnston 1984, p. 182). The very fact that parts of the local state are democratic and responsible to a local electorate helps to prevent central state interference and forge some autonomy. The local state is clearly subordinate to but not necessarily an agent of the central state. How the local state exercises its autonomy depends on whether the actions of the local state are best explained by pluralist, managerial/corporatist or
neo-Marxist theories.

The first theory which predicts the way in which the City of Vancouver fulfilled its role in accumulation and legitimation is explained by the instrumentalist perspective. This perspective argues that the local state is the property of a single class in society which operates the state to its own ends. Instrumentalism has been found applicable at the local level in both England (Saunders 1979) and the U.S.A. (Johnston 1984).

According to instrumentalist theory we should find that problems or issues of concern to the interests of the dominant class receive government intervention, while those matters of little concern, do not receive much in the way of government intervention. It is production decisions over which the capitalist class are most interested and concerned and therefore more likely to act. This leads to the prediction that the local state, as a tool of the capitalist class, will intervene when it is critical to capital accumulation and legitimation. For example, "housing is only one stake in broader conflicts, and often one of the smaller stakes" (Marcuse 1982, p. 84). Housing may simply not be important (relatively speaking) to the process of accumulation and legitimation, or conversely, only the things that make housing important to accumulation and legitimation will be put on the political agenda. Therefore, state actions that affect the production (as opposed to consumption) sector of the economy are more likely to be the focus of state attention.
While we cannot reduce all social policies of the state to a role in serving the interests of the capitalist class, the instrumental theory predicts that the main way that the capitalist class will use the local state is to maintain housing as a market commodity, or use housing to reproduce labour, or prevent major social upheaval or some combination of all three.

Offe qualifies the instrumental approach by arguing that the role of the state is to resolve conflicts between the social and economic systems in society. Sometimes the state undertakes actions that do not directly serve the interests of capital in order to resolve these conflicts. As capitalism has evolved this has included more state involvement in production, as opposed to allocative activities, in order to maintain capital accumulation. While allocative activities are explained by instrumental theory, we must consider the implications of an increasingly autonomous state with its own motivations for production.

This leads to a second theory to explain the City of Vancouver's housing actions; the managerialist/corporatist thesis. Urban managers, it is accepted, generally share similar backgrounds to each other, and have considerable influence in developing and implementing policies because of their training, skills, experience and full-time involvement. Managers, the corporatist theory predicts, are motivated by the ability of the state to play an autonomous role in capital
production. Managers in the City of Vancouver, therefore, must be considered as critical to the evolving housing policies of the City.

However, the British experience shows that the central state is the level most likely to act in a corporate manner and is, therefore, the level at which the corporatist/managerialist perspective will be most applicable. In England, the evolution of local government intervention has been one of a reduced involvement in areas related to production and increased responsibility for consumption items to which the state is more open to political pressure from pluralist interests. Therefore, the third theoretical perspective, pluralism, is important since it helps explain "how managers are selected and their guidelines framed" (Johnston 1984, p. 56). The democracy of local government must in some measure be real to allow the political agenda to be set, at least partly, by the popular wishes of the local constituency. Popular local movements and interest groups must be considered for their impact on policy in order to get beyond the pure economic determinism of neo-Marxist perspectives.

It it with these ideas in mind that the history of the City of Vancouver's housing actions from 1900 to 1973 is first summarized and then analyzed.
2. Summary of City of Vancouver's Housing Policies and Programs 1900-1973

Over the 73 year study period the actions undertaken by the City of Vancouver with respect to housing can be categorized as being either welfare, regulatory, planning or supply actions. These categories are useful in summarizing a long and detailed history.

Welfare actions refer to initiatives aimed at providing the minimum requirements for shelter for those unable to provide it for themselves. Examples from the City of Vancouver history include the provision of an Old People's home, shelter allowances, and subsidies for charitable organizations willing to undertake housing projects for low income households. Supply actions overlap with welfare actions in some cases as in the City's provision and management of a home for the elderly. The city participated in supplying housing when it cleared land for public housing and when it acted as developer in Champlain Heights and False Creek. The City's activity in supply also included the provision of residential infrastructure which enabled private developers to build housing.

Regulatory actions include zoning by-laws, health and fire regulations and the City's long standing attempt to develop a minimum of standard housing by-law. Lastly, examples of the City's limited housing planning actions are found in its policies for increasing residential density, the introduction of planning tools such as zoning and the
preparation of a twenty year redevelopment plan.

Welfare and regulatory actions are consistently represented throughout the period, while major supply and planning initiatives are not in evidence until the 1950's. The links between these categories of housing actions and the theoretical models are developed in the next section.

A study of American housing and planning experience in the late 1800's and early 1900's (Marcuse 1980a) shows that once the threat of public health problems and the political unrest of the slums was perceived to be over, interest in maintaining or enhancing property values were the major impetus for housing initiatives. This led to housing being divorced from overall planning initiatives. Similarly, the Vancouver history is characterized by a lack of a comprehensive and integrative plan for housing. For most of the years prior to the Second World War, after the introduction and enforcement of health and fire by-laws, housing planning was equated with zoning aimed at protecting and enhancing private property values for private gain. For example, both Bartholomew plans dealt with housing under zoning measures. After the War, the City dealt with housing on a crisis-management basis, dealing with each issue as it came up rather than pursuing long term goals. Housing and the major planning initiatives of the late 1920's and mid 1940's were not integrated. The City never established a department or permanent agency to deal with housing (whether it be for welfare, regulation, planning or supply of housing)
and housing was dealt with by council through a series of special committees. The planning department, the social service department and the health department shared divided responsibilities for housing and there was no apparent coordination of the activities of these departments.

The city's continuous commitment to preserve the character and value of its single family, owner occupied residential areas is one of the constants in the history of Vancouver's housing actions. Home ownership as an expression of the primacy of private property (a basic tenet of capitalism) and the financial gains to be made in residential real estate, are behind local state support in this area.

The City remained constantly committed to providing opportunities for preserving single family housing. This commitment extended to home ownership. The City ensured that residential land for single family homes was zoned and serviced, even acting as developer in some cases. The City petitioned the senior governments for financing for potential homeowners and it pursued innovations in increasing opportunities for home ownership (such as a condominium project in Champlain Heights). The City promoted the rights of home owners and tried to protect the home owner from subsidizing the homes of others. Home owners were protected from intruding land uses, although by the end of the period, the City was trying to introduce more residential options by allowing multiple family units in some traditionally single
family areas. An observer from England in 1945 noted that owning one's house in Canada was associated not only with respectability, "but with a deeper - indeed almost a mystical - value," cleverly exploited by real estate interests in each municipality (H. Alford, "Housing and Local Government in Canada," 1946, VCA 34-C-5). Added to this, was the popular view that "the habitual renter is our worst citizen" and that tenancy threatened the democratic structure of society (Voss 1946).

Throughout the period the City faced the same problems again and again. A major problem the City faced was to ensure a minimum standard of housing. The City tried to prevent the occupation of poor quality dwellings. This is illustrated by the City's preoccupation with a minimum standard of housing by-law, removal of foreshore shacks, lodging house by-laws, studies of housing condition, action regarding illegal suites and its participation in the Federal government's urban renewal program.

In a study of low cost housing in Manhattan, Jackson (1976) found that developers could, in the nineteenth century, profit from housing a large proportion of low income households. However, the "standard of housing provided for them was so low as to seemingly cause danger, squalor, sickness and immorality" (Jackson 1976, p. 285). Government regulations raised the minimum standards but reduced the developer's ability to profit from low cost housing. Therefore developers no longer provided housing for the poor.
The City of Vancouver continuously experienced a shortage of low cost rental housing due to the inability of private enterprise to meet such a demand. This problem is illustrated by City actions to house single unemployed men and senior citizens, to provide land for veterans housing and its participation in the federal government's public housing program.

The City, while remaining remarkably consistent in some areas of its housing policies, did evolve and develop some major changes in approach. An important change was an ideological one. City Council's position on the acceptability of local government intervention in housing changed throughout the period. From ensuring that the City was not in the "housing business," to attempts to establish a Housing Authority to supply housing shows the extent of the differences.

There is a growing and changing recognition of the use the City could make of its own land for housing. One of the most significant changes came when the City embarked on a policy of leasing its land for housing projects instead of selling it. Land came to be viewed as a public resource rather than exclusively a market commodity. However, the potential for significant impact through a major land bank was lost due to earlier policies of selling city land for revenue and the extremely high cost of acquiring new sites to add to the City's portfolio.
Attempts to deal with housing shortages (both absolute and the particular case of low cost housing) changed from an emphasis on the single family house to the multiple family dwelling. These changes have had a major impact on the ability of the city to target low income groups and on the urban land form.

And finally, throughout the period, there was a shifting of responsibility for housing between four levels of government (federal, provincial, regional and municipal). The changing nature of central/local state financial responsibility led to the municipality gradually taking on more responsibility for planning and regulating the supply of housing (the least costly of housing interventions) while the costly welfare and supply aspects of housing shifted from municipal to federal/provincial jurisdiction. In addition the regional and provincial governments have assumed a management function for publicly supplied housing.

Having briefly summarized the theory and the housing history, the next step is to link the two.

3. What the Theory Explains About the History

The role of the local state is to aid capital accumulation and ensure the legitimation of this process. The City of Vancouver's housing interventions all serve, therefore, to fulfill one of these functions. In the previous section the housing actions undertaken by the City of
Vancouver were characterized as either welfare, supply, planning or regulation actions. Throughout the history presented in Chapter 3 the emphasis on each type of action changed as financial constraints on the municipality, jurisdictional changes and the changing nature of capitalism affected the City's actions.

When regulations related to housing were introduced, the guiding force was capital accumulation. In the years before planning or zoning, profitable but highly erratic speculative land development was the way in which housing was produced. The introduction of city intervention in land development, first through health and fire restrictions, then through zoning, was the result of business and property interests concerned with protecting their present investment and stabilizing land values. Health and fire regulations for low income or slum areas evolved out of the desire to protect those in well-off single family areas from low income housing and non-residential uses. Zoning to protect the environment and land values in single family residential areas occupied by Vancouver's business and professional elite limited opportunities for those relying on rental accommodation. However, zoning served the interests of capital by protecting capital investment in residential property by controlling for such negative externalities as apartments, different racial or ethnic groups or noxious land uses. City services and zoning enabled developers to sell lots for housing profitably, while curtailing the destabilizing effects of speculation.
Besides protecting actual capital investment, the City's housing policies helped capital accumulation by reproducing the labour force. Participating in federal programs to produce veteran's housing allowed those returning from war to re-enter the local economy. Similarly, City development of False Creek and Champlain Heights produced housing accessible to households with a wide range of incomes. This ensured that local business and industry had a range of employees from which to choose for low paying as well as high paying jobs.

The City also used housing policies and programs to legitimate the private capital accumulation process and the role of government in assisting this process. Legitimation activities were primarily a response to crises in the national economy. The Depression, movement of an industrial workforce to Vancouver to mobilize wartime industries, and the return of veterans after the two wars necessitated major government initiatives at both the national and local level. As the nature of capitalism changed, the City had to reduce some of the tensions caused by the inequality and exploitation of capitalism through relief and welfare efforts such as providing temporary emergency shelter, removing slums and initiating public housing and by giving community groups the opportunity to use city land for housing for low income groups. For example, during periods of economic recession and high unemployment in the 1910's and the 1920's the City provided shelter to single men as a welfare action. This was a state response to prevent social unrest and legitimize a
capitalist system that had made the men unemployable in the first place.

While City welfare actions support legitimation and regulatory actions serve capital accumulation, planning and supply initiatives can be seen to serve, at times, both accumulation and legitimation. For example the supply of public housing provided low cost shelter for low income households and helped abate their disenchantment with capitalist society. However, public housing also served the accumulation process by improving investment opportunities by reducing slum and blighted areas that lowered the value of land. Not only did public housing increase land values, it also gave the local state an opportunity to increase its autonomy. In Metropolitan Toronto, Holmes (1980) found that local governments used the provision of low income housing to positively affect their revenue base (based on property tax) by removing slums which hinder the growth of the assessment base, or cause it to decline. Therefore, the local governments did not meet just planning or housing objectives, they used public housing to facilitate the property development process which in turn improved the local state's financial situation.

Nonetheless, the City of Vancouver constantly came up against the limits of autonomy in its housing actions due to financial and jurisdictional constraints. Many of the times it failed to act in housing matters was due to the financial
constraints of its property tax base and its (over the years) growing reliance on senior government finances and program initiatives. From World War Two on, the City of Vancouver identified the Federal government as its major source of funds for housing.

The provincial government intervened in the City's affairs, for example, through political sponsorship of candidates in municipal elections. The provincial government saw the results of Vancouver's policies as critical to their own political agenda (Gutstein 1983). While studies have shown the lack of autonomy the City faced generally with respect to the provincial government (Smith 1982, Gutstein 1983), the province had such a small and poorly defined role in housing matters that Vancouver dealt most often with the federal government during the study period. An indication of provincial control is when it imposed guidelines on public housing in 1967. However, the more the province becomes financially involved in housing, evidence in other areas shows the more it is likely to restrict the City's autonomy in the area of housing. (See Andrea Smith, 1982, for an analysis of the provincial, as opposed to municipal, forces which directed the course of politics in Vancouver during the 1930's. In particular, Smith draws attention to the introduction of at-large elections and the formation of the NPA as "provincially inspired solutions to political and financial problems that affected both city and province.")

The local state's limited financial resources have
resulted in a reliance on low cost initiatives primarily in terms of regulation or negative control of housing. When the City actively supplied housing it had to co-operate with senior levels of government or rely on initiatives such as land write downs where the City foregoes the revenue it would have received had it sold the land at market value, by allowing a non-profit group to use it to develop low cost housing. It is in this area of offering below market value land and/or maintaining public ownership of the land which gives the City considerable control over how the land is used (Goldberg and Mark 1985). The local state can maintain some control over production issues related to housing, such as supplying it to those groups it chooses. False Creek and Champlain Heights are examples of the corporate actions of the local state. While the housing in such developments is a consumption or social expense item (therefore serving both accumulation and legitimation) the local state has considerable scope in determining who is to benefit from this intervention.

We also see in the history an ability for the City to define its interests outside of its authorized or legal jurisdiction and receive a favourable response. The City of Vancouver is unique in that it is the only municipality in British Columbia to have a separate municipal charter. The charter and its major revisions have each "been drafted by local officials and in most cases amendments proposed by the city council have been accepted by the legislature" (Tennant
1980). This is not to suggest that the City is not affected by provincial policies and actions but that "it is the case that Vancouver is remarkably autonomous in matters of civic structure, procedure and operation - that is, in matters relating to formal aspects of decision-making and distribution of power" (Tennant 1980). For example, the City, in 1948, wanted to establish a local housing authority and within a year the Province passed the appropriate enabling legislation. The Province also enabled the city to participate in federal/provincial housing programs through legislative changes to the City Charter. The Charter is not written in stone and legislative/jurisdictional problems have been overcome.

The City was also able, through a much more lengthy process, to get the taxation provision it wanted from the federal government with respect to veteran's housing. While the federal government initially imposed a land purchase-taxation scheme on the City in the post World War II years, Vancouver (almost singularly amongst all Canadian cities) held back its participation, and when it participated was able, eventually, to get a more favourable tax return from the federal government. The City took a strong stand on the position that full property taxation was the city's 'right'. The City also used the federal government's public housing program to provide the kind of housing it wanted - senior's housing rather than all family housing.

The actions of the City in providing housing assistance
have been determined to a large extent by the legislation and resources made available by the senior levels of government. However, the City has been able to express its autonomy by not participating in programs or by pursuing its own housing goals in major developments such as Champlain Heights or False Creek. The City's policies and actions in the area of housing have not all been imposed or constrained from above. We will now look at how they have been shaped by instrumental, corporatist and pluralist forces at the local level.

Instrumentalism and City Actions. Throughout the history presented here, the instrumental use of the state by the class controlling capital is reflected in the housing policy of the City of Vancouver. The link between the capitalist class and state is illustrated by the fact that

three-quarters of the city's mayors and nearly two-thirds of its aldermen between 1900 and 1925 were businessmen. Indeed, it was only in the 1960's that businessmen were surpassed as the occupation of a majority of newly elected council members. (Ley 1980)

The Non-Partisan Association (NPA) is the civic party that represented business interests and dominated city council from 1937 to 1968 (over 90% of the NPA's candidates were elected during this period (Ley 1980)). The NPA's goals were primarily economic and are characterized by their contribution to growth and economic efficiency (Ley 1980). The political makeup of the city council and their policies aimed at development and economic gain for a large part of the study period supports the instrumental thesis.
Close relations between the Board of Trade and City Council also illustrate the links between commerce and politics. "The Board of Trade was clearly regarded not as a mere interest group, but as something approaching the legitimate voice of the city" (Tennant 1980). In the years following 1945, Council, led by NPA-Board of Trade interests, promoted commercial growth and development by providing essential services, such as zoning the west-end of downtown for high rise residential development to provide accommodation for a growing downtown workforce (Tennant 1980).

The City was concerned about more than just housing a growing workforce. Because the City's revenue is partially based on property tax, it was necessary for the City to ensure that land values, through capital accumulation, remain high. Council was concerned about promoting land development since more than half of its revenues came from property tax. Council accepted "the business view that the functions of municipal government were to ensure orderly physical growth and provide services to real property: both would enhance land values" (Gutstein 1983).

A study of the Vancouver property industry and land use controls from 1910 to 1945, found that "businessmen have defined the instruments of land use and directed their outcome" (Weaver 1979). This introduces doubt about the characterization of municipal government as an open political process and about the ability of planners to provide "more
effective leadership in making planning an effective function of government" (Walker 1950, quoted in Weaver 1979).

The influence of capitalist interests on City policy is illustrated by the City's determination to avoid getting into "the housing business." The City clearly identified housing as a private enterprise activity. The City's position was that there should be no competition with the private housing sector. This did not mean no intervention, but intervention was to be indirect and orientated towards the private market. Therefore, local state initiatives, such as residential land servicing, encouraged and assisted the private sector to provide housing. The principle of government intervention was a market welfare approach, to help keep the private market functioning.

The City's concern over taxation for low cost housing initiatives in the 1940's also illustrates the identification with the interests of business. The representatives of capitalists in the City did not want property owners and businesses supporting subsidies such as reduced taxation for federal low income housing. The concern was for protecting those paying full market price for housing, rather than for those who had limited housing options. Those who could not afford housing themselves were ineligible to be on the receiving end of City interventions during most of the early part of the study period. One of the most effective constraints on local state housing actions was "the almost universal faith in private property as the anchor of personal
freedom" (Warner 1972, p. 25). This view, combined with capitalist control of the local state, explains why in the early part of the history many of the the City's housing actions were directed at those already well housed.

The emphasis on zoning regulations related to housing is another response that illustrates the capitalist class's hold on the local state. Not only did zoning protect individual homeowners from unwanted intrusions which would "rob anyone of a chance for the reasonable enjoyment of his rights," (Dalzell 1927) but zoning "stabilizes efficiency and values as due in economic efficiency ... Property values become more stable, mortgage companies are more ready to lend money, and more houses can be built" (Dalzell 1923).

Overall, the evolving nature and use of regulatory tools worked in a negative fashion to slow or prohibit development considered economically undesirable, either to individual property owners or to the City's tax base. Because housing regulations are negative and limiting, they do not produce a supply of housing (for any income group) and serve to protect the interests of those owning the existing housing stock.

Managerialism/Corporatism. In spite of the pervasive nature of the instrumentalist position, it fails to account for the role that urban managers such as health officials, city administrators and planners played. The results of the study on Vancouver are far from conclusive, but the lack of detail regarding individual managerial efforts does not hinder
a more general consideration of their role. For instance, for many years the Medical Health Officer put housing conditions on the public agenda. Attempts to raise the standards of the poorest housing in Vancouver must be considered partially the result of professionals whose values were imposed on the poor. The imprint of professionalism can be found in the City's urban renewal program. Individuals in the bureaucracy influenced the choice of a policy aimed at wholesale renewal and the substitution of public housing for existing homes and neighbourhoods.

The familiarity of names of planners such as Harland Bartholomew and Gerald Sutton Brown attest to their impact on local matters. Sutton Brown was elevated to the Board of Administration which, during the 1960's, was "the centre of power in civic decision making" (Tennant 1980). Sutton Brown was so influential that "a developer with big plans would go first to Sutton Brown and second to the mayor" (Gutstein 1983, p. 199).

It was not until the ascendancy of the civic party TEAM, in the years following 1968, that there was "a major retrieval by city council of actual control over policy making" (Tennant 1980). While there is no doubt that city bureaucrats were guided by economic principles of protecting land values (through health, fire and zoning by-laws (Weaver 1979)), and creating the city efficient (Gutstein 1983, Tennant 1980) other values must have influenced their vision of what the
city ought to do, particularly for low income households and in the provision of land suitable for suburban single family dwellings. The "liberal ideology" of TEAM began to influence city issues after 1968 and non-economic values such as "liveability" came on the city agenda (Ley 1980).

On the other hand, we can speculate that it was the lack of managerial expertise in housing at the local level (Dennis and Fish 1972, p. 144), particularly prior to the 1950's, that prevented the development of local housing initiatives on any large scale.

**Pluralism.** Lastly, we must consider the predictions of pluralist perspectives. It is clear from the history of the City's housing actions that local interests and popular democratic movements helped shape the City's intervention in housing. When veteran's occupied the Old Hotel Vancouver in protest over post-war housing shortages, the City was forced to participate in the federal wartime housing program. The Citizen's Rehabilitation Council persuaded the City to finance their emergency shelter operations. The Vancouver Housing Association, a citizens' group, is largely responsible for putting housing on the City's agenda during the 1930's to 1950's. The Association convinced the City to help finance a study of housing conditions in 1950 and was successful in applying pressure to convince the city to establish a temporary housing authority and consider a low cost rental housing project in 1949. In addition, home owners' or ratepayers' groups "perhaps because they were usually trying
to prevent change ... often had their wishes acceded to" (Tennant 1980).

Another excellent example of the state's receptiveness (reluctant as it was) to a policy change influenced by a local interest group was S.P.O.T.A.'s ability to change an urban renewal project in Strathcona to a rehabilitation project, and to define, in many ways, the terms of reference of the project. Local political protest had an impact on the City's housing actions.

**Conclusion - The Theory and the History.** In conclusion, the overall neo-Marxist framework of the role of the local state in capital accumulation and legitimation has helped in understanding and explaining the history of the City of Vancouver's housing initiatives. The way in which the City fulfilled its accumulation and legitimation functions is explained by using three theoretical perspectives - instrumentalism, corporatism and pluralism.

As capitalism evolved and macro-economic conditions dictated, the City has responded in ways described by the three theoretical perspectives. For example, in the early years of the history, the capitalist class was able to control the local state. However, as capitalism led to an increasing need for state intervention in housing the City has taken more control over the provision of housing. This control has been limited, but not determined, by the City's financial and jurisdictional ties with the central state. And, at times of
particular crisis, the opportunities for legitimation offered by the democratic process have allowed local interest groups to shape local housing actions.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this thesis have focussed on one, which theories of the state and local state hold the most potential for housing analysis and two, the history of the City of Vancouver's role in housing from 1900-1973. The importance of this investigation rests on concern about the constraints and opportunities for local government intervention in addressing local housing problems.

This thesis did not attempt to define current housing problems, or to establish a position regarding the desirability of government intervention. Rather, given local government intervention in housing, the thesis has shown that the role and actions of the local state are important theoretical concepts for analysis.

1. Conclusions

The major conclusion of this thesis is that analysis of local policy must consider the relationship between the state and the capitalist system. Local state intervention in housing in Vancouver in the period 1900-1973 was primarily a response to the immediate needs and growing problems of the capitalist system as a whole and the impact of these problems on housing and land development at the local level (e.g. reaction to destabilizing land speculation, response to
shortage of housing for the labour force, prevention of social unrest, and so on). The local state is a part of the central state and both levels of the state play a key role in capital accumulation and legitimation. The history shows that at times the City of Vancouver was over involved in accumulation-focussed intervention (zoning by-laws, provision of residential infrastructure) which led to dissatisfaction by some and the need to shift emphasis to legitimation-focussed interventions such as subsidies for social housing.

This thesis successfully joins in the challenge of the 'myth of the benevolent state.'

The phrase 'housing policy' conjures up the image of the Benevolent State, rationally seeking policies intended to deal with a 'housing problem.' In fact the state as we know it today is not benevolent, and those policies adopted by it dealing with housing are not part of an overriding purpose to serve the general welfare. (Marcuse 1980b, p. 5)

Local state intervention in housing in Vancouver was not the result of a commitment to values of equity or social justice or to a long term view of a 'better' society prompted by a 'benevolent' state.

The local state proved to be primarily reactive to problems generated by the economy in general. As an area of state intervention public consumption items generally and housing specifically may be overlooked as growing tensions in private production need to be resolved. In many cases housing is not critical for the resolution of economic crisis which helps explain non-decision-making. The City was involved in
housing when it had "significance for the continued accumulation of capital, and for the continued reproduction of labour power and of the relations of production" (Short 1980, p. 8). When housing problems were significant to capital accumulation and legitimation the state has responded. Success in solving housing problems may rest therefore on linking consumption and production issues more closely. This means that housing must be seen to be critical to maintaining accumulation.

The financial and jurisdictional constraints on the local state are documented in this history. While the City of Vancouver was often able to get around these constraints the history of Vancouver's housing interventions confirmed that there are limits to the autonomy of the local state.

The limits on the local state imposed by the provincial government's involvement in public housing and influence in the political makeup of council foreshadows recent events such as the removal of elected trustees on the Vancouver School Board, the imposition of a land-use plan for the north shore of False Creek and federal/provincial discussions to shift social housing to the provincial jurisdiction. These events suggest a new era of reduced local autonomy and even closer ties between senior government and local government policy, imposed from above. These findings support the theory of writers such as Clark and Dear who find local state autonomy to be significantly constrained.
However, the history suggests that some opportunities for challenging the inequitable and exploitive nature of capitalism may be situated in the local state. A popular political movement at the local level could strengthen local state autonomy and pursue policies contrary to capital accumulation, particularly if influential urban managers shared the goals of the majority pressing for such gains. Since the national state relies on the local state for democratic legitimation some changes in housing policy, as a direct result of the democratic process, will be possible. However, the gains to be made are likely to remain on the consumption side - good news for those interested in state involvement in housing, but not so opportune for those looking for wholesale change through a grassroots democratic 'revolution'. In the case of production policies and intervention in the macro-economy, from which the local state has gradually become more removed over the century, the central state is likely to retain its influence and function with respect to capitalism. Overall, the history confirms the neo-Marxist theory of the state's role in accumulation and legitimation but suggests that consumption issues such as housing may be open to more varied influence.

The main conclusion with respect to the implications of the history of the City of Vancouver's actions for the theories is that theories that explain the actions of the local state need to be integrated into a single perspective clearly linked to the theory of the role of the state. The
history of the City of Vancouver's involvement in housing from 1900 to 1973 shows that the local state, like the central state, is related to the capitalist mode of production. However, how the local state performs its functions with respect to this role is not explained by only one theoretical perspective. As the conditions of capitalism have changed, the definition of the best way for the state to fulfill its role in accumulation and legitimation have changed. Neo-Marxist, corporatist and pluralist theories are all needed and useful in contributing to an explanation of the activities of local government. Theories that rest exclusively on economic determinism overlook the important role of civic bureaucrats and the democratic form of local government. Individuals and interest groups are important actors in determining actions of the local state, and the human element is necessary to get away from the rigid economic constructs of Marxism.

2. Implications of the Thesis for Housing and Planning

The thesis illustrates the use we can make of a history - the constraints and opportunities of the past illustrate some of the constraints and opportunities of the present and future.

The thesis shows that drawing on theoretical perspectives from traditions outside of planning provides a useful analytical framework. In particular we see that the theoretical concept of the capitalist system and the state within that system reveals some real, practical problems for
housing planners. If the desire is to continue to work within the capitalist system, the theory presents some opportunities for reform and gains for those currently not benefiting from the capital accumulation process.

3. Directions for Further Research

Theories of the state have proved useful in historical analysis. The next research step would be to use them in a period of greater economic contradiction and tension - the most recent ten years. The connections between capital and the state could be more explicitly drawn out, and the role of urban managers, only hinted at here, more fully developed. In addition, the impact of institutions of the state other than the government and bureaucracy (particularly the judiciary) could be examined.
REFERENCES CITED


Dennis, Michael and Fish, Susan (1972) *Programs in Search of a Policy.* Toronto: Hakkert.


Hulchanski, David (1984) St. Lawrence and False Creek. Vancouver: School of Community and Regional Planning Papers, University of British Columbia.


Lauria, Mickey (no date) The Capitalist State. unpublished mimeograph: Department of Geography, University of Minnesota.


MacPherson, C.B. (1977) "Do We Need a Theory of the State?" European Journal of Sociology. 18(2) pp 223-244.


_________ (1980b) The Determinants of "Housing Policy". Papers in Planning PIP 22, June. (no publisher cited)


