

ment: the criticalness of certain service and financial problems in the area; the recommendations of an impartial study commission; and the receptivity of the Ontario provincial legislature. The primary features of the Metropolitan Toronto Plan are (1) the establishment of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, an area-wide government encompassing the areas of all thirteen municipalities (a total of 241 square

miles, containing about 1,200,000 residents) and authorized to perform functions deemed essential to the entire metropolis; (2) the continued existence of the City of Toronto and of the twelve suburbs to carry out functions not assigned to the metropolitan government; and (3) representation from each municipality on the metropolitan governing body.⁹

RECOMMENDATIONS

Of the several approaches available today for the resolution of urban governmental and service problems—ranging from the adjustment and creation of boundaries to the coordination and reassignment of service roles—none can be termed universally relevant or appropriate. Each is capable of resolving certain problems in certain areas at certain times or in certain circumstances. Each requires a full understanding of the nature of the problems involved and of the impact it may have on existing local governmental roles and relationships. Each must also have the approval and support of governing officials or residents of the area involved.

For these reasons, contemporary recommendations for state and local action embrace a variety of approaches. The July, 1966, report of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, for example, stated:

“It is time for the citizens of the 50 states to take stock of their systems of local government in relation to urgent present and prospective needs. This involves more than an assessment of current performance. It also demands a judgment of future capabilities in planning and executing activities essential to healthy community devel-

opment. As we approach the twenty-first century, weaknesses in eighteenth and nineteenth century forms must be corrected—or new systems created—if local government is to survive as a vital force.”¹⁰

The spectrum of urban problems and of approaches to their solution in Maryland was intensively explored at a conference on the modernization of local government on December 9 and 10, 1966. Co-sponsored by Goucher College, The Johns Hopkins University, Morgan State College, and the University of Maryland, the conference at Goucher College was attended by officials of local government in Maryland, other Marylanders with practical experience in local government, and a distinguished panel of out-of-state ex-

⁹ For additional information on the Metropolitan Toronto Federation, see H. GOLDENBERG, *REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO* (1965); F. SMALLWOOD, *METRO TORONTO: A DECADE LATER* (1963); and *Metropolitan Toronto: A New Answer to Metropolitan Area Problems*, Address by Frederick G. Gardiner, American Society of Planning Officials Convention, Oct. 1953, in *AM. SOC. OF PLANNING OFFICIALS, PLANNING: 1953*, at 38-47 (1953).

¹⁰ *RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, MODERNIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO SECURE A BALANCED FEDERALISM II* (July 1966).