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NDP calls for wealth tax bill ‘immediately’, PBO pegs revenue at $5.6-billion

The governing Liberals ‘will pay a heavy political price,’ if they don’t introduce a new wealth tax, said NDP finance critic Peter Julian.

NDP finance critic Peter Julian is calling on the federal government to immediately introduce legislation to bring in a wealth tax, which a new report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer says could bring in $5.6-billion in new revenue.

Finance Minister Bill Morneau (Toronto Centre, Ont.) said on July 8 that the government was on track to run a $343-billion deficit this year alone, as the government continues to borrow and spend to keep households and businesses afloat amid the COVID-19 pandemic.

Both the federal Liberals and NDP have promised to levy new taxes on Canada’s wealthiest residents. The NDP has called for a tax on the wealthiest one per cent of Canadians, while Mr. Morneau’s mandate letter from the prime minister instructs him to introduce a new tax on luxury boats, cars, and personal aircraft, and to do an analysis to “ensure that wealthy Canadians do not benefit from unfair tax breaks.”

The governing Liberals were slow to introduce new legislation when the forty-third Parliament began, and the COVID-19 pandemic sidelined the legislative process in mid-March. The House is now in summer recess.

“We need to start taking action on the revenue side, so that we can continue to maintain services and support through the pandemic, and look to enhance public investments coming out of the pandemic,” Mr. Julian (New Westminster-Burnaby, B.C.) said in a July 10 interview.

On July 8 four non-profits released a statement of their own calling for a wealth tax.

“Canada should immediately bring in legislation to tax the extremely rich as a means to not only raise revenues, but curb worsening inequality,” read the statement signed by the Broadbent Institute, Canadians for Tax Fairness, Resource Movement, and Leadnow.

The July 8 economic update showed a federal debt over $1-trillion and a deficit of $343-billion. It also showed that the federal debt-to-GDP ratio, which the Liberals have often touted as a key financial marker, is expected to rise to 49 per cent in fiscal year 2020-21, up from 31 per cent the year prior. GDP is expected to shrink by 6.8 per cent this year before rebounding by 5.5 per cent next year.

Mr. Julian asked the PBO to estimate the potential revenues from a one per cent tax on families with a net wealth over $20-million. Released July 8, the PBO estimated that 13,800 Canadian economic families would be subject to the tax, and it would net $5.6-billion in revenue in fiscal year 2020-21. Administering the program

Continued on page 27

IF THE OFFSHORE RECOVERS, CANADA RECOVERS.

We have a community of voices behind us.

Canada’s offshore industry produces some of the least carbon-intensive petroleum in the world.

— Dr. Aaron Henry
Natural Resources and Sustainable Growth,
Canadian Chamber of Commerce

Founded from Hibernia funding, we’ve introduced over 6,000 girls & women from rural communities to STEM careers.

— Mary Clarke
Executive Director, Esteem Women Inc.

Investing in our oil and gas industry is an investment in Canada’s supply chains.

— Christian Buhagiar
President and CEO, Supply Chain Canada

www.weareNLoffshore.ca/supportNL
Essential to the Economy

Serving exporters, importers, retailers, farmers and manufacturers, CN’s transportation services are integral to modern life, touching the lives of millions of people every day.

$250B WORTH OF GOODS TRANSPORTED

26,000 RAILROADERS EMPLOYED

25% OF WHAT WE TRANSPORT IS EXPORTED

$2.9B CAPITAL INVESTMENTS (2020)
COVID showed us what’s possible when the roads aren’t clogged with cars. Let’s hang onto that when things get back to ‘normal.’

First, housebound citizens needed some exercise and gradually emerged to walk, run, cycle, or rollerblade. Unfortunately, walking is difficult, because our sidewalks are just not wide enough—they were squeezed down to a minimum of 1.2 metres in many places to create the maximum possible room for cars. Keeping a two-metre separation for safe social distancing is simply not possible, so walking needs to spill into the street, to join the cyclists.

The second push came from restaurants, cafes and pubs that wanted to re-open. The folly of indoor re-opening has been demonstrated in Texas and Florida, so expanded outdoor patios to serve customers safely are a better choice. These patios often require more public space outside the front door.

These two forces signalled an urgent need to rebalance public streets to focus on accommodating people rather than cars. Automobiles are remarkable personal mobility machines, probably the most important appliance developed in the first half of the twentieth century. Canadian planners spent the second half of the twentieth century trying, and failing, to adapt our cities to this disruptive technology.

Automobiles impose substantial environmental and social equity issues. It is difficult to function in our vast suburban environments if you are too old, too young or too poor to own and operate a car. In the denser central parts of the city, they also pose an urban design challenge, because automobiles require a great deal of space to be operated at speed and then parked. Almost all the space in public streets is devoted to moving and storing cars.

Some citizen activists pushed back against this trend before the coronavirus, using tactical urbanism techniques to make temporary and small-scale changes to local streetscapes that demonstrate better use of public space. On Parking Day, some activists feed the meters and transform curbside parking spots into pop-up cafes or mini-parks. In Hamilton, tactical urbanists used paint and traffic cones to demonstrate that sidewalks could be improved, and intersections made safer near schools.

A few municipalities adopted these tactics, notably Halifax transforming its winter curbside parking into outdoor patios in summer. The coronavirus has pushed many Canadian municipalities to experiment with similar pop-up cafes this summer, which is a boon to our service sector and also to public life.

The next level of intervention is to close entire traffic lanes to create more room for pedestrians, cyclists and transit. New York City was a frontrunner in these tactics under the visionary leadership of Mayor Michael Bloomberg and Janette Sadik-Kahn. They used temporary “pilot projects” to convert automobile traffic lanes in Times Square, with careful surveys of before and after conditions to demonstrate the value of newly created public spaces. Although critics predicted a Carnageddon of congestion and downtown store closings, an amazing thing happened: traffic levels remained the same and retail sales increased. Pedestrians and cyclists take up much less space and spend more money than drivers.

Toronto used similar techniques in its controversial King Street pilot project and acclaimed transformation of Queen’s Quay West into a multi-use waterfront boulevard. The coronavirus pushed many other Canadian cities to experiment with converting a lane to wider sidewalks, cafes, and cycle lanes in downtown streets.

Completely closing an entire street to automobiles has long been a common tactic for low traffic periods, such as Sunday mornings. Bogota’s Ciclovía network is a global inspiration and the National Capital Commission has provided Sunday Bikeways on the Ottawa River Parkways since the 1970s. These networks have expanded during the pandemic.

Of course, some roads are better candidates for closure than others. The Ottawa River parkways have pleasant waterfront views and offer the opportunity for long, uninterrupted walks and rides, which are a rarity in big cities. The NCC’s closure of the Queen Elizabeth Driveway (QED) was particularly appropriate. It runs along the Rideau Canal, adjacent to denser downtown neighbourhoods in need of outdoor exercise. Fast-moving traffic is a menace on the Driveway, since its narrow lanes and tight curves were designed for the pre-automobile era.

The NCC recently announced that the Driveway closure will continue to September. As work restrictions are gradually lifted in the meantime, we have a golden opportunity to assess whether these “temporary” urban interventions are worth retaining to increase more sustainable forms of transport and keep the improvements to our quality of life.

A traffic-free Queen Elizabeth Driveway may turn out to be a “keeper.”

David Gordon is a Professor and Former Director of Queen’s University’s School of Urban and Regional Planning.
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THE COMPLETE, **MADE IN CANADA** PROPELLER SHAFT SOLUTION

Thordon Bearings Inc., Dominis Engineering Ltd. and Patriot Forge Co., three world-class, family-owned and operated high-performance manufacturing businesses in Ontario, have joined forces as a consortium to provide fully integrated and complete vessel shaftline systems for Canada’s most important vessels included in Canada’s National Shipbuilding Strategy. These global industry leaders will provide the highest quality shaftline system to significantly improve operational performance, lower costs for Canada’s Navy and Coast Guard and create sustainable jobs in the critically important Canadian manufacturing sector.

For the past 30 years some of the most critical and core major ship equipment have been supplied from overseas. Now more than ever the times call for world quality, Canadian manufactured components for Canada’s ships; supporting high skilled, high tech, high paying jobs right here in Canada.

www.ThordonBearings.com/CISSpartners
Government must help businesses, not just households, to sustain economic recovery

It will be a hollow victory to help individuals survive the first stage of the crisis, but then have their jobs disappear later this year or next.

Ensuring firms survive only to be swamped by too much accumulated debt just postpones the stress on our financial system, government finances, and ultimately the recovery itself.

The key to recovery for businesses is finding a mechanism to help firms deal with their excessive debt loads. Firms in Canada already entered the government-mandated shutdown of non-essential services with historically high levels of debt. High indebtedness is partly the result of years of tantalizingly low interest rates offered by central banks; even corporations with huge cash reserves like Apple issued bonds to take advantage of interest rates reaching lows that may never be repeated.

After the pandemic arrived in Canada, firms saw their revenues plunge. In some of the hardest-hit industries such as airlines, accommodation, food, recreation, auto dealers and personal services, revenues dropped by 65 per cent or more.

Meanwhile, even with extensive layoffs, companies still have to pay some fixed costs such as property taxes, rent, mortgages and other debt, skeleton headquarters staff, security, utilities, and so on. As a result of the squeeze between a sudden drop in revenues and high fixed costs, even businesses with a fundamentally good business model (such as dentists) assumed large levels of debt during the lockdown. This debt risks pushing many into insolvency.

Governments have traditionally adopted the so-called Bagehot rule as a guide for emergency lending to the private sector, which is to lend generously against good assets to solvent firms in order to assure that no taxpayer money is at risk. This treats the fundamental problem as a crisis of liquidity and not solvency. However, this approach has some serious flaws.

So far, governments have successfully kept loans flowing to businesses—bank loans jumped eight per cent between February and May—while sending money with no strings attached directly to households. While preventing a rush of business failures, the problem is that the high and accelerating indebtedness of firms at a time of declining revenues means many eventually will become insolvent. For example, delaying rent payments means that this expense will increase when the moratorium ends, with no guarantee that revenues will return to pre-crisis levels.

The underlying stress on firms, especially small businesses, is why polls show over a quarter are uncertain they will survive the current crisis even with the current level of government aid. Despite such a major threat to the sustained recovery of jobs and income in Canada, this draws little interest from governments, which remain fixated on households. It will be a hollow victory indeed to help individuals survive the first stage of the crisis but then have their jobs disappear later this year or next.

The traditional Bagehot approach to lending during a financial crisis won’t work in the current downturn because corporate debt has reached too high a level and because the unpredictable course of both the pandemic and government’s response make it impossible to differentiate between good and bad debt.

Jeremy Stein, chair of the Department of Economics at Harvard and a former Governor of the U.S. Federal Reserve Board, has argued that the federal government has to be prepared to take on some debt from firms to assure their ability to survive. To protect central bank independence, it has to be government, and ultimately, taxpayers, who absorb these losses. So far, households have been on the receiving end of the bulk of government largesse; indeed, a sharp jump in personal deposits at banks since February suggests, overall, more aid to households was provided than was necessary. It is now time for governments to step up and help firms directly.

The real risk in the huge increase of government transfers to households during the pandemic is that government will soon test the limits of its borrowing capacity, as reflected in the recent downgrade of federal debt, even before a wave of business bankruptcies puts more demands on its resources. If the federal government is unable to help firms, then much of the short-term aid to individuals will have been wasted as people lose their jobs and return to government support. Then the demands on government may prove to be unsustainable, and our nascent economic recovery unsustainable.

Philip Cross is a senior fellow at the Macdonald-Laurier Institute and the former chief economic analyst at Statistics Canada.
In the next wave of economic recovery, ‘speed, scale, and simplicity’ need to make way for sustainability

Putting ‘green strings’ on government spending and subsidies should be a key part of Canada’s effort to fight climate change.

Vanessa Corkal
Opinion

When Finance Minister Bill Morneau provided Canadians with a fiscal update July 8, he described how the federal government helped pull Canadians and businesses back from the brink of financial insolvency due to the country entering lockdown in response to COVID-19. These principles, he said, were applied to all new programs: speed, scale, and simplicity.

Programs had to be implemented quickly, accessible to everyone, and easy to apply for. The government understood the conditions that needed to be met to ensure these efforts did what they needed to do—help Canadians manage financially in a time of emergency. And yet, despite a $343-billion deficit and the second highest debt-to-GDP ratio in Canada’s history, even more spending will be required to help get the economy back on track. The need for recovery spending is not up for debate; how those funds will be spent, on the other hand, will be a hotly debated topic in the months ahead.

While leading companies are committing to net-zero emissions and calling for investments to support the zero-emissions transition, there are others who are committed to the status quo. If funding is allocated without sustainability in mind, especially in high-carbon sectors, we could end up undermining vital climate change and equity goals.

Internationally, organizations such as the International Energy Association, more than 155 businesses, and countries such as Germany and the UK are calling for a green recovery that will build a resilient, low-carbon economy that puts workers and well-being at the forefront.

Canada has signalled its interest in moving in this direction, and Morneau’s speech July 8 stated, “We need to invest in an economy that is greener and more diverse.” But we need more than statements—we need a commitment.

If the federal government is truly dedicated to its promise of net-zero by 2050, and if it actually wants to invest in a green economy, now is the time for Trudeau to commit to the principles that will ensure this new wave of spending takes Canada in a sustainable direction.

A recent report by 14 environmental groups titled Green String Principles: Conditions and Policies for Green Recovery from COVID-19 in Canada offers a framework for doing so. One of its key messages is that conditions must be applied to all companies receiving funding. This would include requiring applicants to have effective and measurable plans to reach net zero emissions by 2050, disclose climate risk to shareholders, and ensure the financial support secures the labour force—either through existing jobs or a fair transition to new jobs.

But conditions must be applied to government, too, to ensure they are allocating funding and developing programs and policies across all sectors in line with their commitments to a green recovery. With many investments flowing through the provinces, provincial and territorial governments also need to apply conditions to spending. Ottawa could encourage this as well; one example would be to tie provincial stimulus to the adoption of net-zero building codes, while supporting building retrofits across the country.

Funding should support enterprises using innovative technology or providing tangible social benefits to communities, who could use the money to scale up; it should not be used to expand the development of large CO2 emitters via the expansion of oil, gas, or coal.

The forthcoming report from the Task Force for a Resilient Recovery, of which the International Institute for Sustainable Development is a founding member, will provide further specific policy proposals later this month.

Speed, scale, and simplicity were the right principles for this government to follow in the early days of the pandemic. But now we need new principles and conditions that will take this nation to a climate-safe future that puts the wellbeing of people and the planet first.

Vanessa Corkal is an energy policy analyst at the University of Ottawa’s International Institute for Sustainable Development.
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Remote working brings a new set of challenges

In remote working, the nature of the work does not change, but everything else does. So, work-life balance becomes important. We are used to a routine at work. For remote work to be productive one must have a routine. Introverts and extroverts react quite differently to remote work and their routines will reflect that. While the specifics vary, the essential components include space, structure, rhythm, schedule, interaction, reward, and discipline. It is good to have a dedicated space for remote working that does not double as a dining table during worktime. A work schedule that distributes various tasks through the day and aligned to our work rhythm for efficiency and creativity is a must.

We need structure that stabilizes the workplace with start and finish times that suit our needs, with breaks to recharge, and lunch to reenergize. It is good to have a fixed time to have virtual meetings for work related interaction, and to chat and share lighter moments. All of this creates the routine and preserves work-life balance. We also need to give ourselves little rewards for accomplishments during the day, and enforce discipline to respect the schedule we made for ourselves. We are social beings and prolonged isolation is not conducive to robust mental health. The breaks, if carefully planned, can contribute to the enhancement of mental health. So does the ambience that envelops the workday and space. Perhaps all this will eliminate presenteeism in remote work.

Vishwanath Baba is a professor of management at McMaster University's DeGroote School of Business.
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Post COVID-19: reopening our cities means restructuring older adult care

Home care and informal care givers must be utilized and better supported in any re-think of Canada’s approach to caring for its oldest residents.

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted aging populations in countries around the world, bringing to light many long-standing and severe challenges for older adult care sectors. Both home care providers and long-term care facilities have found themselves ill-equipped to respond to the current emergency, leading to tragic consequences. Familial and informal caregivers, who continue to supplement and support our fragmented care system, have been reduced to little more than “non-essential” and thus removed from the circle of care during a time when older adults may need these people most. It is clear that reform is desperately needed.

As we begin to reopen our cities and consider transformations post-COVID-19, governments must restructure older adult care. Given the LTC system appears increasingly overburdened and impacted, we know many older adults would prefer to remain at home, why not look to existing innovations in the home care sector and try to improve coordination and balance between home and long-term care? By doing so, we could allow older adults and their families more autonomy in their care decisions, ultimately improving their quality-of-life and the delivery of older adult care.

First, we have to come to terms with the unique care needs of older adults, as they represent an increasingly large proportion of the global population. In Ontario alone, the number of adults age 65 or older is expected to almost double from 2.4 million in 2018 to 4.6 million by 2046. Within Ontario, older adults have been among the most vulnerable to the COVID-19 pandemic, a truth supported by many disturbing statistics: 16 per cent of all of Ontario’s 33,000+ cases have been residents of long-term care facilities, a population that also accounts for 64 per cent of the province’s 2,600 deaths. All told, roughly 1 in every 50 residents in Ontario’s long-term care facilities have died of COVID-19. In Ontario 12,230 people aged 60 and over have tested positive for the virus, representing around 37 per cent of all cases. Compare that number to the around 12 per cent of all Ontarians that fit in this age group, and you can see the disproportion.

The pandemic has also exposed challenges in delivering care to this population through long-term care facilities. The terrible conditions inside some of these care homes have been discussed in national and international media, and on May 19th, Ontario’s Minister of Long-Term Care, Merrilee Fullerton, announced that she would be launching an independent commission to investigate Ontario’s long-term care system in September. The focus on long-term care homes has opened up an opportunity for home care, where older adults continue to receive the support they need from formal caregivers and health care professionals while staying in their own home. The question of why home care hasn’t been given enough attention during this crisis is puzzling. Even for individuals who may not be good candidates to receive care at home, the question of what can be learned from home care delivery models is valuable and may illuminate how we can improve care in general for older adults.

A recent study by a team of researchers at the University of Toronto’s Munk School of Global Affairs & Public Policy, in partnership with the Reach Alliance, explored an innovative model of care called “consumer-directed” or “self-directed care” that provides care recipients with more control over the care being provided to them. Self-direction refers to a growing trend in health care that provides people with more autonomy in deciding what care they need and how their needs should be met. The notion of self-direction highlights that it may be reasonable for a client to select a family member as one of their formal care providers and this family member should therefore be formally employed and compensated as such. Self-direction is not new to Ontario, it was introduced by the government in 2017 and dismantled soon thereafter by a coalition of for-profit and not-for-profit home care providers, citing concerns with increased bureaucraticization, ultimately delaying care. Their concerns may have been valid, as older adults don’t need more hurdles to get through in order to access appropriate care, but it seems increasingly evident during this pandemic that familial and informal caregivers continue to be undervalued in our home and long-term care systems. We must learn to value the very important role they play in older adult care and begin to redesign our care systems to demonstrate this.

Home care isn’t right for everyone, and there will be those whose needs are best met by institutions like long-term care homes. But the tragedies of the pandemic have made it increasingly evident that these two systems cannot function without familial caregivers supporting their loved ones both at home and in institutional settings. As the sector responds to the crisis, and the conditions in Ontario evolve, researchers and policymakers must think about what can be done to better support older adult care moving forward. The need for reform is evident, and as more research into the home care sector becomes available, there can be greater opportunities to learn from the strengths and weaknesses of the two delivery models. As cities reopen across Canada, let’s welcome the myriad of innovations developing in older adult care and ensure restructuring better values the important role of families and informal caregivers, for the benefit of all.

Anna Cooper Reed is a social worker and PhD student at the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation at the University of Toronto.
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The other side of Canada’s deficit coin

Cutbacks to downsize Canada’s national debt would come on the backs of Canadian households.

For every transaction in the economy, there is someone on the other side: someone who is paying money always has someone on the other side receiving it. Last Wednesday’s economic snapshot revealed a historic $345-billion deficit, 15 times higher than where the federal deficit stood at the end of last year. This came as no surprise, given the scale of what was necessary to support Canadians during the initial phases of the COVID-19 crisis, which forced the shut down of our economy in order to protect public health.

The real question around deficits isn’t if they should occur, which they do for all sectors, even households. The question is: which sectors are on the benefit or surplus side of any deficit? In the case of the national deficit, the flipside of that coin is: government spending shifted substantial economic burden off of the shoulders of workers, students, families, seniors, and corporations at a time when they desperately needed the support.

Without help, households would have faced their own deficits as they lost jobs and incomes plummeted, but everyday expenses remained. They would have withdrawn more from their savings, racked up credit card debt and drawn down lines of credit to pay for food and housing. In the worst cases, more jobless Canadians would have turned to other sectors like the provinces for social assistance, or non-profits for things like food. Then it would have been those sectors that would have shouldered deficits. Thankfully most of that despair and deficit shifting was avoided because the federal government stepped up and the deficit created by COVID-19 appeared on federal books.

For households alone, COVID-19 emergency response funding reduced the deficit that Canadian households would have faced without federal support by a whopping $224-billion. The corporate sector was cushioned by $41-billion in spending. Provinces and municipalities, which are in line to receive a proposed $15.9 billion support package, were also spared a harsher financial blow.

Overall, the largest beneficiaries of the federal deficit were those who’ve lost their jobs or their hours during the pandemic. This portion of the deficit encompasses the Canadian Emergency Response Benefit (CERB) but also the Employment Insurance (EI) benefits that will continue long after the CERB wraps up in August, as is presently the plan.

The second largest group benefiting from deficit spending were those at risk of losing their jobs, but who were, instead, supported through various payroll supports such as the Canadian Emergency Wage Subsidy as business revenues tanked.

As expected, austerity hawks are already making the rounds calling for spending cuts and privatization. That would be a mistake. What is often missing from the “deficit=bad” debate is the context that a deficit in one sector of the economy, like the federal government, always results in a surplus of the same size in another sector—in this case, households and businesses when they needed it most.

The opposite is also true. Federal surpluses achieved through public service and program cuts must force another sector into deficit by the same amount. When the federal and provincial governments ran consistent surpluses during the 2000s, they did it at the expense of households. The federal government reduced EI payments and health care transfers, for example, in the mid-1990s. The direct effect was on households, which didn’t get as much support when laid off or sick. They made up that difference by digging into savings or taking on more debt, resulting in massive deficits among households—deficits that households have been running since the early-2000s.

Given the uncertain trajectory of the pandemic in the months ahead, as well as historically high unemployment that is disproportionately impacting women, racialized, and low-wage workers, massive government spending cuts would only make a bad situation worse. And importantly, if CERB or EI support were cut, it would shift the deficit from the federal government onto exactly those workers.

There will be a need for continued federal investments through the COVID-19 recovery and rebuilding period on things like universal affordable child care, public health care, and long-term income support modernization. Every one of those investments will pay off for generations to come.

Spending cuts aren’t the only way to reduce deficits. Addressing long-standing fiscal revenue issues through progressive tax reform measures, like wealth taxation, is not only a solution that most Canadians support, it would help Canada with its recovery and rebuilding efforts.

Government leadership in a time of unprecedented global crisis saved lives, and kept workers and businesses afloat by investing in emergency programs that made public health the priority. This wasn’t just a one-time deal. The future of Canadians relies on steady government leadership in the months and years to come.

David Macdonald is senior economist with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives in Ottawa.
Aviation sector needs help to join economic recovery

With all the flight and travel restrictions in place during COVID-19, the aviation industry is truly at the mercy of government policies.

The airlines have been hammered by this pandemic," Mr. Wurdrick said. "The PBO assumed that temporary steps to maintain the financial stability of their respective aviation industries, from Germany to France to the United States of America. Canada has offered numerous financial lifelines to industry throughout the course of the COVID-19 public health emergency, a number of which the aviation industry has benefited from. There remains, however, a further, and more urgent need for specific sectoral support for tourism and travel service organizations, including hotels, airports, and airlines who remain hard-hit by continued government advice to avoid non-essential travel.

While Canadian airlines report many of government funding and potential government involvement in their strategic choices, it remains the government’s obligation to oversee the management of the current health emergency with unwavering focus on maximizing Canadians’ health.

The issues being debated about aviation sectoral support revolve around primarily aviation investments, such support, whether as loans, grants, or other financial support mechanisms, and the conditions that such support would carry. Typical government support has to date been in the form of outright grants, term loans, funding with equity participation and in some cases funding with sustainability targets focusing on reduced energy consumption and reduced emissions levels. Is there an appetite for such funding models? What concern has to be about the successes and failures of government actions during this period. The Canadian aviation industry should be characterized as one that attracted government attention for financial support in the light of continued government action to minimize the spread of the COVID-19 virus.

If there is one segment of Canada’s economic activity that is tied to the mercy of government policies, aviation, and consequently tourism are prime candidates.

Much has been said about the difficulties being faced by aviation globally, and have taken the initiative to shore up the financial viability and the economic engine that aviation provides. Notwithstanding the relatively good financial situation of Canadian carriers at the start of this pandemic’s impact on travel, the ongoing reduction in air travel demand will put most of Canada’s carriers at greater risk. Efforts to add additional liquidit through public and private financial vehicles can only go so far. There is a limit to the ability of a country’s aviation industry to increase their financial burden by weakening their balance sheets.

With the country undergoing phased restart of portions of the economy, one must not forget that aviation is a key underpinning of the Canadian economic engine. A failure to provide a level playing field for this industry to begin the long road to recovery will have long-term implications on how and when Canadians will once again feel better about our economic strength, and the future state of the Canadian aviation industry.

John Gradek is a Faculty Lecturer and Coordinator of the Global Aviation Leadership Program at McGill University.
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The Great Rebuilding II

Time to take urban policy seriously

The loss of life and the financial devastation associated with COVID-19 have been concentrated in Canada’s cities, but the data is often reported in a way that makes us blind to this reality.

BY DR. KATE GRAHAM, DR. NEIL BRADFORD, & DR. GABRIEL EIDELMAN

Every good photographer knows that getting a clear image requires choosing the right lens. The same can be said for good policy making: how we look at a problem or phenomena determines how clearly we see it, and how effectively we can address it.

Take the COVID-19 pandemic. For the past 16 weeks, the rapid rise of global case and death counts have dominated headlines around the world. Canada reached the 100,000 case mark just one day short of the 100th day of the pandemic. Every day, the government of Canada releases an epidemiological summary of how the pandemic has progressed, including data on how each province and territory has fared since the day before.

The problem with this is that it doesn’t give us a clear picture of how COVID-19 is affecting Canadians. A new report released by the Canadian Urban Institute, COVID Signpost 100, reveals the disproportionately urban nature of this crisis.

So far, the loss of life and the financial devastation associated with COVID-19 have been concentrated in Canada’s cities. The largest 20 cities in Canada account for 42 per cent of Canada’s population and yet have 87 per cent of total cases and 75 per cent of total deaths. People who live in cities report a more profound impact on their quality of life and personal financial situation.

More importantly, a look at how each city in Canada has fared reveals a high level of variation in their quality of life and personal financial situation. The problem with this is that it doesn’t give us a clear picture of how COVID-19 is affecting Canadians. A new report released by the Canadian Urban Institute, COVID Signpost 100, reveals the disproportionately urban nature of this crisis.

Unfortunately, Canada’s daily epidemiological summaries—along with the vast majority of nationally collected and reported data in Canada—ignores the local scale, creating a form of institutional blindness to the highly varied and localized ways that our nation experiences all manner of crises. This is a legacy of federalism that prioritizes provinces, most of which are large and diverse enough that this scale of data reporting is of limited utility.

It is the Simpson’s paradox of Canadian federalism, hindering our ability to meaningfully address the most pressing challenges facing our nation. With more than 82 per cent of Canadians now living in cities, Canada is long overdue for a new era of multi-level urban governance. No level of government in Canada is equipped on its own to address the complexity of challenges faced in our cities. Cities are crucial to both effective implementation of federal interventions, and multi-provincial agendas will require the front line policy innovations which are failing to be seen in terms of addressing the varied dynamics of the challenges they face.

The countries that have fared best during COVID-19 have been those with high-performing multi-level governance systems. As the OECD summarizes: “The most effective governments are the coming from systems characterised by flexibility, where there is room to act ‘on the ground’ combined with effective leadership at the national level.”

It’s time for Canada to get on board. The federal government has committed to a “whole-of-government” approach to the crisis and recovery. But it isn’t prioritizing the collection and reporting of city-level data, and it has essentially ignored calls from city leaders for greater federal support.

An essential first step is the creation of a Canadian urban policy observatory, a “one-stop shop” for qualitative and quantitative data on Canadian cities and city-regions, and the political systems which govern them.

A national urban policy observatory would have several distinct benefits for federal policy makers. It would provide comprehensive data on the unique realities in each Canadian city and community, bringing local challenges to the attention of federal and provincial governments to inform policy implementation; it would help direct resources toward cities with the greatest needs by providing current and comparable data on municipal fiscal pressures and revenue tools; it would provide race and ethnic-based data, as well as neighbourhood level data where possible, facilitating the execution of equity-seeking policy solutions; it would support national economic recovery strategies based on analysis of local assets and regional resilience; and it would facilitate coordinated intergovernmental policy learning, and thus serve as a building block for greater intergovernmental dialogue on urban priorities across Canada.

Where we look determines what we see. In a nation as urbanized and as diverse as Canada, we must use a cities lens if we want to really understand, and address, the challenges we face together.

The time for action is now. Dr. Kate Graham is director of research at the Canadian Urban Institute, and teaches part-time in the Political Science departments at Western University and Huron University College. She studies urban politics, local government, and gender and politics. Dr. Neil Bradford is director of the Governance, Leadership, and Ethics Program at Huron University College. He teaches urban governance, and studies urban and community development with a focus on multi-level governance. Dr. Gabriel Eidelman is director of the Urban Policy Lab at the University of Toronto’s School of Global Affairs and Public Policy and a contributing member of the Canadian Municipal Barometer research partnership.