

Presentation to Special Committee of Peel Region

Council Representation Proposal - Resolution Number 2020-1005

Whereas the Council of the Regional Municipality of Peel (the “Council”) has reviewed the number of its members that represent each of its local municipalities pursuant to s.218(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001 (the “Act”);

And whereas, the Council has formed the intention to pass a by-law pursuant to s.218(2)(a) of the Act to change the number of its members that represent the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon while maintaining the number of its members that represent the City of Mississauga, thereby maintaining the overall number of members of the Council;

Therefore be it resolved, that notice be given pursuant to s.219(1) of the Act of Council’s intention to adopt a by-law to

- i) change the number of its members that represent the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon by increasing the number representing Brampton by 2 to 9 members and decreasing the number representing Caledon by 2 to 3 members to be effective for purposes of the municipal election to be held in October 2022 and for purposes of the composition of the Council for the term of office to result from that election, and
- ii) to provide that the 2 additional members representing Brampton be selected by the Brampton City Council from among City Councillors to represent Brampton on Council for a full four year term;

And further, that staff be directed to organize a public meeting to be held to consider the matter of Council’s intention.

Presentation:

As a resident of Peel I am here to question the wording and perhaps the validity of Resolution 2020-1005, I would ask that the resolution is set aside, this request is made because I believe the wording of the resolution is flawed and without a legitimate basis, furthermore it is without reasonable logic.

Whereas the Peel Region councillors are paid by Peel Region to represent Peel Region and not as worded in the resolution representing the City of Brampton, the resolution if intended to be a motion by the City of Brampton should have been passed in open council at the City of Brampton meeting.

Furthermore the resolution formed by Regional Municipality of Peel (the “Council”) infers and falsely recognizes there are representatives of Caledon, Brampton and Mississauga; if this is the perception by council then there is much more to the issue than simply changing team colors.

¹Quote: *There is a legal and ethical issue involved in serving on two councils. It is an important legal principle that a representative serving on a board of any organization must protect and advance the interests of that organization regardless of how the person obtained the position. Specifically, someone elected to an area municipal council who also serves on the regional council must always act in the best interest of the regional council when he or she is dealing with regional matters. However, the person also has a responsibility to her or his area municipality. Mayors already must strive to balance this issue.*

Having double direct members on council would mean that every member of regional council will be serving two masters with the accompanying ethical and practical dilemmas.

This quote and entire report is not without merit and brings to light a latent flaw in the election act and regulations left from the time of amalgamations of councils in Ontario. I would urge all councillors to support a motion to the Province of Ontario to have regulation made to remove this irregularity of the elections act and regulations in the next election of 2022, thereby removing the “ethical and practical dilemmas” for all of Ontario in the upper-tier government proceedings.

However regardless of the provincial machine moving on the issue, it is entirely within the power of Peel Region to be leaders in Ontario and pass a policy by-law to eradicate “double direct” representatives. The discussion on this would be apropos as we as a nation look for ways to bring trust and faith back into the political spectrum, the move would also make the position more acceptable as a part time position and open it to a greater number of candidates. Another valued added and democratic move forward.

As the Resolution also attempts to balance and infer “representation by population” principles, the “Council” if they believe this is consistent with the “electorates will” of Peel, would be well advised to follow Caledon’s example of a Ward Review and establish “Regional Wards”. Thus, the electorate may elect “Regional Councillors” satisfying those that crave “rep by pop” elections which are indeed better suited to the upper-tier government for the provision of hard services.

(Bird, 2013) Other studies that have estimated cost functions have similarly found economies of scale for hard services such as water, sewers, and transportation, but generally not for such soft services as police, refuse collection, recreation, or planning (Bird and Slack 1993). Hard services are capital-intensive, so large government units can more readily make the substantial capital investments needed to extend the water distribution system or build a least-unit-cost-sized sewage treatment plant, for example (Bahl and Linn 1992). Other services, such as policing, are highly labour-intensive and hence unlikely to show significant economies of scale. Presumably much the same can be said with respect to other labour-intensive services such as social services, education, and to some extent even health.

Regional wards would not necessarily follow the Municipal Ward boundaries and may or may not include tax base or resources as part of the guiding formula although I personally feel natural resource representation is extremely important to Peel. Creating a more balanced Peel council without municipal city boundaries should be a goal for Peel Regional council, not following archaic and geocentric politics based on Municipal boundaries.

The aggressive and verbal arguments we see today within our regional council(s) and committee(s) over geographical or shall we say historical boundaries, is not conducive to efficient business and government practice, especially in the upper-tier council chamber, it is not acceptable behaviour. I might add these behaviours roll over into your administration and how they position reports, presentations, etc. you all need to move to a better place and remember it is Peel region on the corporation registration, not Caledon, Brampton and Mississauga.

Appendix A

Upper Tier							Lower Tier			
Municipality	Number of councillors	Population	Ratio	Direct election of chair	Method of election	Number of municipalities	Municipality	Number of councillors	Population	Ratio
Peel	21	1,333,346	63,493	No	1 chair 3 mayors 21 councillors (double direct)	3	Mississauga	11	673,000	61,181.82
							Brampton	10	603,346	60,334.60
							Caledon	8	57,000	7,125.00
								1,333,346		

Table 1: Elected Council Representatives for Two-tier Municipalities										
	Upper tier						Lower Tier Totals			
Municipality	Number of councillors	Population	Ratio	Direct election of chair	Method of election	Number of municipalities	Number of councillors	Total number of councillors	Population per councillor	Ratio
Peel	25	1333346	53334	No	1 chair 3 mayors 21 councillors (double direct)	3	Brampton - 10 Caledon - 8 Mississauga - 11	29	45,977	1585
York	21	892712	42510	No	1 chair 9 mayors 11 councillors (double direct)	9	Aurora – 8 East Gwilliambury – 4 Georgina - 6 King - 6 Markham - 12 Newmarket - 8 Richmondhill - 8 Vaughan - 8 Whitchurch-Stouffville - 6	76	11,746	155

Waterloo	16	478121	29883	Yes	1 chair 7 mayors 8 councillors	7	Cambridge – 8 Kitchener - 10 Waterloo - 7 North Dumfries - 4 Wellesley - 4 Wilmot - 5 Woolwich – 4	58	8,243	142
County of Essex	14	393402	28100	No	1 warden elected by 7 mayors 7 deputy mayors from each county's municipality	7	Amherstburg - 5 Essex - 5 Kingsville - 5 Lakeshore - 6 LaSalle - 5 Leamington - 5 Tecumseh - 5	50	7,868	157
Halton	21	439256	20917	Yes	1 chair 4 mayors 16 councillors (double direct)	4	Burlington – 6 Halton Hills - 6 Milton - 10 Oakville – 12	39	11,263	289
Durham	29	561258	19354	No (Yes in 2014)	1 chair 8 mayors 20 councillors (double direct)	8	Ajax – 6 Brock - 6 Clarington - 6 Oshawa – 10 Pickering - 6 Scugog - 7 Uxbridge - 6 Whitby – 7	62	9,053	146
Niagara	31	427421	13788	No	1 chair 12 mayors 18 councillors (direct election)	12	Fort Erie – 6 Grimsby – 8 Lincoln – 8 Niagara Falls - 8 NOTL – 8 Pelham – 6 Port Colborne – 8 St. Catharines – 12 Thorold – 8 Wainfleet – 4 Welland – 12 West Lincoln – 6	125	3,419	27

Oxford County	10	102756	10276	No	1 warden 8 mayors 2 councillors	8	Blandford-Blenheim- 4 East Zorra-Tavistock-6 Ingersoll-6 Norwich-4 South-West Oxford-6 Tillsonburg- 6 Woodstock- 6 Zorra-4	50	2,055	41
Bruce County	8	65439	8180	No	1 warden 8 mayors	8	Arran-Elderslie-6 Brockton- 6 Huron-Kinloss- 6 Kincardine- 7 Northern Bruce Peninsula – 4 Saugeen Shores- 8 South Bruce- 6 South Bruce Peninsula- 8	59	1,109	19
Muskoka	23	57563	2503	No	1 District Chair 6 Mayors 16 District Councillors (double direct)	6	Bracebridge - 8 Gravenhurst - 8 Lake of Bays - 5 Georgian Bay - 5 Huntsville - 8 Muskoka Lakes - 9	50	1,151	23