The Royal Society of Canada

The Canadian Academy of the Sciences and Humanities

La Société royale du Canada

L'Académie canadienne des sciences, des arts et des lettres

Transactions 2004: Life, Learning and the Arts

RSC Symposium, National Gallery, Ottawa, 19 November 2004

Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract
by
Phyllis Lambert

Presentation originally given at RSC annual symposium.

A version of this text was also presented as the James R. Mallory Annual Lecture in Canadian Studies at McGill University's Institute for the Study of Canada, Montréal, 31 Jan. 2001.

I would like to discuss buildings, not as individual objects, but as elements that make up the social fabric of cities, the way trees constitute a forest. My premise assumes urban architecture to be a social construct, in which those who build (client and architect), those who regulate (government), and those who live there (citizens) enter into a social contract. As such, the city is a litmus test of the status of societal and cultural values. It is particularly apt to reflect on this topic at a time when the prime minister of Canada has acknowledged that our cities need a new "charter of rights."

This social contract involving clients, architects, government, and citizens has evolved over centuries, beginning with the tacit agreement between *seigneur* and *censitaire* that eventually becomes government and the governed. In early modern times, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) equated morality, politics, and society with "commodious living." In *The Social Contract* of 1762, Jean-Jacques Rousseau sought to address the question of how we can be free individuals and still live together, or put another way, how we can live together without being oppressed by one another. We can do so, Rousseau maintained, by collectively submitting our individual wills to the general will, which results from agreement among other free and equal individuals:

> As I was born a citizen of a free State, and a member of the Sovereign, I feel
> that, however feeble the influence my voice can have on public affairs, the right
> of voting on them makes it my duty to study them: and I am happy, when I reflect
> upon governments, to find my inquiries always furnish me with new reasons for loving
> that of my own country.
>
> Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, Book I

As political relationships between government and the governed have evolved, so has the relationship between architecture and town building. We no longer construct on the vast scale of Versailles, where buildings, gardens, and territory were designed to focus on the ruler's persona. Nor do we impose the raw display of imperial power perpetrated by the British in the administrative district of New Delhi, India.

And we no longer assert the kind of top-down control exercised in the creation and management of late-nineteenth-century new towns in North America, such as Pullman, Illinois, or Arvida, Québec. My intention is to look at how these relationships have been dramatically transformed by the rise of public participation in the determination of urban affairs.

The Built Domain and the Social Contract in Canada

The great strength of architecture and urbanism in Canada resides in its willingness to engage as well as commit to the social contract as I've described it. This is seen in the evolution of relationships among clients who define their own needs, government agencies that establish regulations intended to protect the common good rather than the favored few, architects who through close analysis and a knowledge of history and philosophy interpret the client's needs, and citizens who assert their right to participate in realizing interventions in the urban fabric. Underlying these relations is an evolving understanding of the collective obligation to create an environment that enhances life and allows inhabitants to develop to their highest potential. We who live in cities are in a sense *cultivators* of the urban culture that grows in any given setting. (The analogy of a culture grown in the carefully-controlled environment of a Petri dish comes to mind.) But as urban dwellers, we are also part of the experiment. The ideal is, of course, to engender the richest and most just culture possible – the mulch of a social project mixed with self-realization, the interconnection of community with individual, and individual with community. Why else build?

In an effort to survey the trajectory of the social contract as it has obtained in Canada, I will focus on a remarkable series of urban projects spanning the twentieth century. A growing understanding of human needs can be read in the history of Canadian new towns, university campuses, emblematic structures, and new development projects built by industrial, corporate, and state clients in Canada since the end of the nineteenth century. Both the enhancement of design and the advancement of social goals have been served, as citizen participation evolved from no input at all to public policy granting citizens the right (as well as the responsibility) to participate in determining the urban environment. As I will show, these developments have produced unique architectural manifestations in Canada, in conjunction with urban projects on a scale commensurate with that of the country itself.

CANADIAN RESOURCE TOWNS

From the end of the nineteenth century, the majority of new urban settlements founded in Canada were "resource towns." Continental expansion required the implantation of new towns in the wilderness, which required the full range of infrastructural, industrial, commercial, residential, and cultural amenities to attract permanent residents. However, the aim of the perpetrators of cities – builders, architects, and clients – must be the construction of a viable social system and the cultivation of an entire cultural formation associated with such a system. From the early twentieth century, founders of new towns increasingly became concerned with the "larger good" in the way that Italian political scientist and activist Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) theorized a new breed of individuals who would fulfill particular functions in the social reality of a given time. According to Gramsci's model, architects and clients would engage thinkers, specialists, and organizers of the new social structures, acting as "organic intellectuals" (to use his term) who would constitute a collective "conscience" concerning human habitation. One can follow this learning curve in the establishment of Canadian new towns as the industrialists responsible for their existence progressively pursued more sophisticated approaches to design, beginning with the more or less rough-and-ready implementation of Shawinigan Falls, Québec, in the 1890s.

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   2 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

Shawinigan Falls, Québec (1898-1908)

A Boston banker who had worked in the textile mills of his native Lawrence, Massachusetts, and grasped the importance of motive power, established the Shawinigan Water and Power Company in 1898. At this spectacular site dominated by the rushing water of the river, he built a power plant to attract industries, and indeed, a powerful group of (mostly US-based) companies rapidly grew up around it (Fig. 1). They were centered on pulp and paper production, the transformation of aluminum (the first plant in Canada), electrochemical and electro-metallurgical works, and textiles. The initial town plan for Shawinigan Falls was drafted up by T. Pringle & Son, hydraulic engineers for the water and power company. Certain standards were set for housing (mandating a strip of grass in front of every house, three coats of house paint to be applied to each dwelling, and so forth) to give the town a certain cachet. These superficial indications of an incipient interest in the appearance of the town, imposed as they were from the town down, did not begin to address or advance any social goals.

In fact, the population of Shawinigan Falls was ethnically and economically divided, and this translated into the physical segregation of residential neighborhoods and markedly different types of housing built (Figs. 2a and 2b). Affluent and primarily anglophone executives lived farthest from the sites of industry in single-family homes, while the largely-francophone workers who comprised 90% of the population were crowded into multi-family dwellings situated close to the factories and thus exposed to the pollution they emitted.

This ordinary town with its extraordinary site was no utopian garden city. It was born of an industrial vision, and it was the force of this new energy combined with imagination that motivated the Shawinigan Water and Power Company – once it was clear that local industries could not make full use of the electricity it had the capacity to generate – to contract with the Lachine Rapids and Hydraulic Company to build the Montréal-Shawinigan electrical line in 1903. At the time, this was the longest distance over which electricity was transmitted in North America – ninety miles. As we know, our former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien is a proud native of this town, which has transcended the imperial model to become a regional center and a tourist attraction as an industrial site.

Arvida, Québec (1925-1927)

Less than ten years after a plan for the Québec pulp-and-paper town of Témiscaming was left only partially executed, the Aluminum Company of Canada (Alcan) laid out a carefully designed and landscaped town called Arvida. It was obvious that industry was learning. Moving beyond the mandate of Shawinigan Falls, where enterprising transformational industries first sought to exploit cheap electrical power, Arvida was nonetheless still a privately-operated company town.

Arvida was founded to bring workers to the Saguenay region to operate the aluminum smelters. Company managers responsible for laying out Arvida's neighbourhoods with curving, tree-lined streets based on the greenbelt model, maintained the credo that "contented workers can be obtained only if living conditions are the best"[i] (Figs. 3a and 3b). And yet in reality, workers were housed in rented dwellings and lived in conditions over which they had little control.

The company credo was reiterated in 1936, when town building resumed, "establishing its industry and building a model city in view of the benefit and advantages to the people residing therein."[ii] However, this "benefit" consisted only of single-family homes reflecting French Canadian traditions. In 1942, Alcan created the Commission d'urbanisme d'Arvida overseen by distinguished Montréal architects Harold J. Doran and Harold Lea Fetherstonhaugh,[iii] and the landscape architect Frederick Todd, who had worked with Frederick Law Olmsted on Mount-Royal Park in Montréal. The commission was dedicated to

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   3 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

monitoring residential buildings and landscaping. Over the course of this decade, the company gradually withdrew from managing the town, and by 1950 had initiated a plan for allowing resident tenants to become homeowners with all the rights related to this status.

Between 1952 and 1955, Alcan founded the new industrial town of Kitimat, which was carved out of the wilderness of British Columbia. Heeding the lessons of Arvida, and in response to the social and cultural climate in North America after World War II, Alcan established Kitimat as a public town with a democratic charter. Design professionals were involved in the implementation of the plan as well as the resolution of sociological and ecological problems arising from its wilderness location.

POST WORLD WAR II: BUILDING *TABULA RASA*

Kitimat, British Columbia (1952-55)

For the design of Kitimat, located in the wilderness of British Columbia (Fig. 4), Alcan turned to highly-respected and accomplished professionals from the United States, including New Yorker Clarence Stein, whose 1929-32 town, Radburn, New Jersey, was famous as a "town for the motor-age," introducing the separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic to the Garden City concept of neighborhoods. The architects and planners worked as a team, and in bringing together experts from various disciplines, were ahead of their time. Sociologists advised on the problems of those living in isolated towns, and Benton Mackaye, an outstanding ecologist, was consulted on the preservation of the landscape. Vancouver architects who had pioneered the new spirit of modern architecture in Canada, such as Semmens and Simpson, worked on buildings for Kitimat (Fig. 5).

Rather than offering rental housing for workers, Alcan provided financial bonuses and second mortgages to make home ownership affordable for its employees. Another innovation was Alcan's hiring of Vancouver builders rather than company-operated construction crews. The make-up of residential neighborhoods was more heterogeneous than at Arvida, with twin and row houses as well as single-family homes. Following the principles of Bauhaus planner Ludwig Hilbersheimer, all houses faced green spaces free of traffic, so that children could walk to school and adults to stores without crossing a street.

Like Kitimat, Don Mills near Toronto, created between 1952 and 1962, belongs to a period when new towns were being established tabula rasa elsewhere throughout the world. Between 1948 and 1956, one of the major architects of the twentieth century, Le Corbusier, laid out the new town of Chandigarh in the Punjab, India.

By the end of the 1950s, Oscar Niemeyer had designed major structures for the new capital city of Brasilia (1957-60) (Fig. 6b). Like the resource towns of Canada, Chandigarh and Brasilia were conceived in an untouched landscape. This is clearly expressed in Lucio Costa's initial concept sketch for Brasilia (Fig. 6a), and invokes the modernist utopian dream for building anew after the Second World War.

Don Mills, Ontario (1952-62)

The client for the town of Don Mills, E. P. Taylor, a successful Toronto financier, industrialist, and developer, set out to erect a plant and worker's housing for his family's O'Keefe brewery on a 2000-acre farm he had purchased.

Taylor enlarged the scope of his plan and in 1952, Macklin Hancock (Taylor's son-in-law, then studying at Harvard's Graduate School of Design) was asked to design and manage the construction of a whole

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   4 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

town, by then envisaged as a full-fledged community with its own industries, and following the model of Chandigarh's residential neighborhoods clustered around schools and churches (Fig. 7).

One of the innovative aspects of Don Mills was its founder's promotion of modern, "International Style" architecture. In contrast to typical subdivisions in North America at the time, the houses of Don Mills were architect-designed, and distinguished architects were commissioned for commercial and public building projects. Notable among them was an early and very good shopping center designed by John B. Parkin Associates of Toronto (Figs. 8a and 8b). Although Taylor's project clearly must have involved the state at the level of the provincial government, it did not much resemble the Keynesian model of economic partnership between government and private developers. Don Mills seems rather to have been an instance dominated by enlightened capitalism and enthusiasm for an idea that existed in more innocent days, that is, before developers operating as speculators began to dominate the field.

However, there were serious gaps between intent and results on a range of issues. The idea of creating community by making houses available to people of varying economic levels was not carried out. Initially, accommodations were to be offered at market rate or with government subsidy. However, by the mid-1950s, limits on size and price of homes eligible for loans – imposed by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (now Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation, CMHC) – were lifted, and larger houses on more expensive lots were constructed. As John Sewell commented in *City Magazine* in 1977: "Thus, the plan was changed, mainly because it was successful beyond anyone's expectation. The intention of providing housing for fifty percent of the work force was never realized because the market, rather than the plan, became the dominant factor."[iv] Yet the attraction of industry to the area – companies like Roger Communications – was successful.

The Emblematic paradigm: Megastructures

While new towns are rapidly being built in China and other parts of the developing world, not since the 1960s have they been built in Canada. Urban fragments and megastructures have taken their place. In his book on the subject, published in 1976, Reyner Banham cites the first coherent definition of the term "mega-structure" (still with its hyphen) articulated by architect Fumihiko Maki, in his *Investigations in Collective Form* of 1964: "A large frame in which all the functions of a city or part of a city are housed. It has been made possible by present day technology. In a sense, it is a man-made feature of the landscape. It is like the great hill on which Italian towns were built."[v]

Megastructures are essentially very large structures that serve a multitude of functions. Perhaps the earliest megastructure in Canada, not to mention the whole of the North American continent, was the mixed-use Marché Bonsecours built in Montréal in the 1840s to house a market, city hall, and concert hall, with an art gallery in its dome. It was followed by the unique and vast "Chateau Style" hotels first constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railroad at the end of the nineteenth century.

Canada's Chateau-style Railway Hotels

The Canadian Pacific Railway hotels came to be both geographically and culturally symbolic of Canada. Engaging the immense scale of the picturesque landscape, they also reflected the country's dual heritage of French and English traditions. The earliest of them, a spa hotel at Banff Springs, completed in 1888, was styled after a Scottish baronial castle, and Le Château Frontenac in Québec City, completed five years later (1893), pioneered the Canadian "Chateau Style" with its steeply-pitched roofs and dormer windows reminiscent of French chateaux of the sixteenth century (Figs. 9a and 9b).

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   5 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

American architects working for an American client were inspired to launch this early form of symbolic nationalistic "branding." In the United States, driven by civil war and the ongoing assertion of "states rights," cities have not been able to extend such efforts beyond the local sphere, and powerfully emblematic sites are typically occupied either by state capitol or court house buildings. In Canada, on the other hand, buildings for everyday public use – recreational and educational – fall into this category. True to Maki's definition of "mega-structure," such entities also have a special relationship to the land, invoking Pierre Elliott Trudeau's characterization, "The land is strong."

Université de Montréal, Québec (1924-44)

Crowning the northern slopes of Mount Royal, the Université de Montréal epitomized this phenomenon (Fig. 10). Begun in 1924 and completed in 1944, the campus was designed by architect and engineer Ernest Cormier, premier Canadian architect until mid-century. Cormier had spent ten years in Europe, mostly at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris.

Cormier's immense building was to house a hospital as well as university functions, all under one roof. It was considered a white elephant in the 1940s. It was also a new twentieth-century Canadian building type *avant la lettre*: a megastructure.

Simon Fraser University, British Columbia (1963)

The Université de Montréal was followed in the 1960s by Arthur Erickson's stunning Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. Architecturally, it is Canada's greatest contribution to architecture on a world scale (Figs. 11a and 11b). Formally very strong as it embraces the mountain top and welcomes students under the great space-frame roof, the "bones" of the overall plan allowed other architects to make buildings and yet keep its "urban" form, acting within Banham's parameters for megastructures: that they consist of frameworks to which can be added plug-ins, clip-ons, and so forth. The scale and presence of these buildings in the landscape were appropriate to a country with extreme climatic conditions, and in keeping with the Canadian hyper-consciousness of the land, they mark the summits of Mount Royal and Burnaby Mountain respectively. As megastructures *avant la lettre*, they were harbingers of urban architecture of the future. There have been many other mega-universities – great structures that occupy prominent sites on the hills and in the plains of Canada, such as John Andrews' Scarborough College, Ontario (1965); Ron Thom's Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario (1964-68); Arthur Erickson's University of Lethbridge, Alberta (1969-1971) (Fig. 12); as well as the commercial structure Place Bonaventure, Montréal (1967).

Place Bonaventure, Montréal (1967)

Place Bonaventure in Montréal, like Arthur Erickson's Law Courts and City Administrative Services in Vancouver, exemplifies an iconic megastructure (Figs. 13a and 13b). Raymond Affleck's Place Bonaventure figured as a pivotal example in Banham's *Megastructure*. Consistent with another of Banham's definitions of the building type, it is "like a boat...with hard sides and no windows," comprising three stories of retail shops starting at the street and Metro level, and above that, a large merchandising showroom floor, topped by a five-floor merchandising mart, and above that, what was originally the international trade center, and at the summit, a rooftop hotel clustered around a large garden surrounding a heated outdoor swimming pool. But Place Bonaventure stands as a failed example. Except for the hotel at the top, it has not worked. At the root of this cautionary tale is faulty analysis by a new breed of real estate developers who suffered from headiness, thought they could do anything, and gave in

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   6 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

to *hubris*. A locus for trade shows, it was soon outpaced by convention centers being built in the United States, and as a retail center, the location could not support its many shops.

Place Bonaventure was also part of the spirit of postwar optimism that brought urban renewal to Europe and North America. Urban renewal was, in effect, urban *removal* of those who could not defend themselves against eviction from neighborhoods that were to be redeveloped and replaced by high-rise buildings and new in-town highways. The disappearance in the 1960s and 1970s of the notion of a social contract between builders, government, and citizens in the development of cities led to strong protest – sit-ins, the occupation of buildings and parks, street marches – which schooled "communitarian" groups. Developers and government finally began to listen.

THE COMMUNITARIAN: COMMUNITY ACTION AND NGOS

In the 1970s, not-for-profit cooperative housing led by federal government housing programs like CMHC changed the nature of the urban landscape of Canada.

Over the course of the decade, three significant projects were implemented through CMHC programs for not-for-profit cooperative housing across the country, support for land acquisition, mortgage rates, and rent subsidies. In Ontario, the St. Lawrence Neighborhood development, the earliest major social project undertaken by CMHC, was put in place between 1972 and 1976 on abandoned railroad property along the Toronto shoreline. It remains exemplary of what can be accomplished under an enlightened municipal council with a forward-looking, socially-concerned mayor, as David Crombie was. In British Columbia, there was the initial redevelopment of False Creek and Granville Island in Vancouver which had begun in the late 1960s and continued until 1976. And in Québec, there was the renovation of the downtown community known as Milton-Parc in Montréal, between 1979 and 1989. The first two were actually economically and socially mixed *new* developments composed of fifty percent subsidized housing and fifty percent market-rate housing initiated by the government. But the development of Milton-Parc as not-for-profit cooperative housing initiated by existing residents involved the renovation of their own housing. All were significant in size and location. At least 3,500 units were built in St. Lawrence over a period of seven years on recycled land. 1,415 units were developed on the waterfront at False Creek. And Milton-Parc formed some twenty-three cooperatives to renovate 600 residential units within a six-square-block area in the center of the city. All were made possible through funding from the CMHC.

Milton-Parc, Montréal (1979-89)

Of the three, Milton-Parc most brilliantly exemplifies the power of citizen participation, resulting in a neighborhood of some 1,200 owner-residents – most of whom were originally tenants in the neighborhood – who now have the security of raising their families without the threat of eviction and rent gouging.

Responding to the construction of a new in-town traffic exchange the Milton-Parc saga began with a plan to demolish good three- and four-story greystone buildings covering six city blocks just east of McGill University, which would have displaced some three thousand people (Figs. 14a and 14b).

Local developers projected to create a superblock, with all traffic and parking below grade which was out-of-scale with the needs of Montréal (Fig. 15). Half of the targeted buildings were demolished, despite manifestations by residents – street protests, arrests, hunger strikes, court battles (Figs. 16a and 16b). But much creative planning took place, which led to a neighborhood coalition, with Heritage Montréal ultimately bringing the case to the CMHC.

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   7 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

The federal government purchased the land, but in a rare move, sanctioned the management of ownership, conversion and renovation by a small group of experienced citizens who worked with the residents in one of the most important examples of community-generated action, the Milton-Parc Co-Operative Housing Project by the Société pour l'Amélioration de Milton-Parc. The structure of ownership was innovative: The whole is a condominium formed by some twenty non-profit cooperative societies, permitting the tenant-owners to inscribe social regulations in the lease. The cooperative is also an educational entity, whose members learn to apply rules of meeting, financial administration, and maintenance, as well as democratic majority rule.

This neighborhood project born of strife is now an autonomously functioning community with a council of cooperatives and community management of commercial properties (Figs. 17a and 17b). Conditions to be maintained were discussed and determined by the residents. The principles underlying Milton-Parc were to create a downtown community with decent housing available to low and middle income residents who would not be evicted, where the elderly could reside in security, and where families could reside in safety with children.

Quartier International Montréal (QIM), 1997-2004

In 1997, a generation (exactly twenty-five years) after citizens began the work of creating a not-for profit community in Milton-Parc, members of the business community of the area led by Jean-Claude Scraire of the Caisse de dépôt formed a partnership with the city and the province to take in hand in the creation of a powerful new urban centre. In an extraordinary feat of construction, new structures spanned the open trench formed by a 1960s highway that had cut off Vieux Montréal from the rest of the city (Fig. 18). The extension of the Palais des Congrès de Montréal (the Montréal Convention Center) (Fig. 19) and the huge edifice for the Caisse de dépôt et placement (Fig. 20) both straddled this gap. The landfill between these buildings became a new public square in the city, Place Riopelle, a beautifully-landscaped square with a fountain by Canada's celebrated automatist and abstract expressionist artist Jean-Paul Riopelle (1923-2002)
(Fig. 21).

Public Consultation

For the QIM to happen, a change of attitude in the city was needed to counteract a city government and businessmen who rode rough-shod over citizens' lives and well-being. So confused were attitudes about the city in the 1970s that the federal government proposed inserting new urban structures on the derelict port lands now known as the Le Vieux-Port de Montréal (the Old Port). These nineteenth-century quays and a long, narrow strip of abandoned land lay between the river and Le Vieux Montréal (the Old City), whose grey stone buildings dating from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries make it one of the most coherent historic urban areas of North America. Since this was federally-owned public land, taking advantage of the election of a new government in Ottawa in 1984, Heritage Montréal convinced the minister responsible to hold "public consultations" so that all Montréalers could debate the issues and come to a consensus about its use. The process of public consultation on the Vieux-Port became a training ground for a new generation of professionals who would eventually work for the city, bringing new attitudes to the planning process. Public consultation changed the federal government's charge from speculative real estate development (a plan adopted in Toronto and slated for Montréal) to the creation of a public place that would benefit the population as a whole and make evident the history of the port that had given birth to the city and industrial development in Canada.

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   8 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

The final set of documents recording the procedures and conclusions of the vast consultation became the "bible" to which staff and board members of the Société le Vieux-Port de Montréal thenceforth have referred (Fig. 22). Because it represents the consensus of the citizens of Montréal, the document has also protected the Vieux-Port from the ambitions of politicians who had other agendas for development. The area now receives six million visitors a year.

Properly constituted public consultation, in which all voices are heard and questioned in open forums, with the proceedings recorded, synthesized, and published, is one of the most powerful mechanisms for ensuring that citizens have a role in the decision-making process. Experience has shown that citizens can be much better urban planners than bureaucrats who do not work in partnership with the community. Public consultations have finally been recognized legally as an inalienable right in Montréal, following the merger of twenty-eight municipalities to form the Island City and the establishment of the Office of Public Consultation through the new city charter.

The Role of Private and Educational Institutions

Citizen participation has been fostered by a number of exemplary private institutions. Heritage Montréal, formed in 1975, has developed the strongest program of its kind in Canada (Héritage Canada notwithstanding) through activism, watch-dogging, educational and public information programs, and fundraising. The more recently established Do.co.mo.mo Canada is concerned with buildings dating from after 1950. Environmental issues are kept in the foreground by institutions devoted to furthering knowledge of the built world. Since the 1980s, advanced academic programs in architectural history, theory, and conservation have been established by the four universities of Montréal and at the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) (Figs. 23a and 23b).

The CCA, founded in 1979, is a new form of international cultural institution devoted to public awareness of the role of architecture in society, promoting advanced scholarly research in the field and stimulating innovation in design practice. It does so through research programs, exhibitions, publications, and colloquia based on its unrivalled collection ranging from the fifteenth century to the present (Figs. 24a and 24b).

Such educational, research, and public programs have cultivated a constituency that is highly attuned to and concerned with the built domain and its patrimonial role (Fig. 25). Private institutions have individually and collectively shaped a climate of awareness that has brought Montréal to possess a heightened sense of its built and natural heritage. But this is a work in progress and requires a continually broadening base of citizen participation. Taken together, the public and private initiatives I have mentioned are basic to the responsible development of the city. It took vigilant citizen action to create them. It will take sustained public collaboration to nourish them, and eternal vigilance to protect them.

CONCLUSION

A period of euphoria existed in Britain and the United States after the Second World War, when it was widely proposed that the public realm be transformed based on communitarian values. But for some, this was also seen as a move toward consumerism.[vi] Both the utopianism of the 1960s and urban "renewal" were massive in the United States. The Keynesian project of an alliance between government and private corporations was more benign in Canada where the Gramscian "organic intellectuals" who eschewed facile received ideas continued to search for the critical next step.

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   9 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)

We have reviewed the changes over a century, from the corporate authoritarian model for a whole-system new town, to the communitarian emblematic urban fragment. I have tried to show that in Canada, in the twentieth century, corporations were major sponsors of noteworthy building programs, and that government had been an important perpetrator of social programs and building development.

In this talk, I have pointed to some recent examples of affirmation that are socially and spiritually essential to real transformation of the built world we share: The shift from *tabula rasa* to transformative strategies for the development of cities; the Milton-Parc model for not-for-profit cooperatives that uphold the social contract; the insistence of Montréalers on citizen participation in decisions to be made about the quality of the built and natural environment through public consultation; the policies of citizen organizations such as Héritage Montréal have led to institutional commitment to the study and protection of historic places and buildings; the practice of visionary architects who understand the social contract and transmit these values to generations of students; and the activities of centers for research in the history of architecture and urbanism, such as the CCA. While governmental policy has vacillated at times one can fairly say that the actualization of the social contract today has been due to citizen action.

The gradual transformation of corporate and political power into social power is a worldwide phenomenon that must continue. Surely in this new century we can find new means to affirm our commitment to the social contract – architecture as community, as a dynamic, organic process of development for the betterment of all. It is this grand aspiration that has given us the best of Canadian building in the twentieth century. We now must look to what can be achieved across the new century. Pianist Rosalyn Tureck expressed this so eloquently when she said that "the work is not played as a *tour de force*, as a dazzling display of technique – it is played as a life experience."

I would like to leave you with another passage from Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Social Contract* – one so apt for our times that it deserves to be restated:

> In a well-ordered city every man flies to the assemblies: under a bad government no one cares to stir a step to get to them, because no one is interested in what happens there, because it is foreseen that the general will [will] not prevail... Good laws lead to the making of better ones; bad ones bring about worse. As soon as any man says of the affairs of the State *What does it matter to me?* the State may be given up for lost.
>
> Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, Book III

Notes

[i] Lucie K. Morisset, "La Ville de l'Aluminium," in *Villes Industrielles Planifiées* (Montreal : Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1996) 195.

[ii] Morisset, 213.

[iii] Morisset, 221.

[iv] John Sewell, "Don Mills: E.P. Taylor and Canada's first corporate suburb," *City Magazine* 2 (Jan. 1977): 37.

[v] Fumihiko Maki, *Investigations in Collective Form* (St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1964) 8.

[vi] See for example David Harvey, *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985) 208.

Phyllis Lambert: *Canada: Urban Architecture and the Social Contract*   10 / 10
2004 Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada
SEVENTH SERIES / VOLUME IV / 2004; ISSN 1710-2839 (English version)