

From: KnNY [REDACTED]  
Sent: December 8, 2020 9:42 PM  
To: ZYG-RegionalClerk <[zzg-regionalclerk@peelregion.ca](mailto:zzg-regionalclerk@peelregion.ca)>  
Subject: Written Submissions: Dec. 17 public meeting

**RECEIVED**  
**December 8, 2020**  
REGION OF PEEL  
OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL CLERK

REF: November 26th motion to change Peel council composition

*Dear Ms. Lockyer,  
I would like the following to be included as a written submission to the  
December 17th public meeting.  
Thank you.*

*Regards.  
K. Yates*

[REDACTED]

The November 26th late-day motion to change the composition of Council at The Region of Peel was a blind-side to Caledon. It was not on the Regional meeting agenda, nor was there any sign of it coming.

To add insult to injury, one of Caledon's own councillors sided with Brampton and Mississauga to, in my opinion, give Caledon away.

Councillor Groves made an equally profound and shocking betrayal of her own municipality, Town Council colleagues, and constituents on July 21, 2016 when she voted against Caledon residents' best interest to allow Brampton and Mississauga to dictate planning decisions in Caledon. (see [Groves Supporting Solmar](#) and [Enterprise, July 27, 2016](#))

Then, just as now, I do not buy the "cheaper" argument. "Cheaper" for whom? Who is going to benefit when Brampton and Mississauga are overriding Caledon to make planning and development decisions? Documents on the Region's web site debunk the inflated figure quoted at the time.

In my view, these two incidents of betrayal by Councillor Groves seem very much linked together, and linked to development.

Nor do I buy the "under-represented by population" argument put forward by Brampton and Mississauga, and quoted by Councillor Groves. Caledon and its residents have the same rights as those in Brampton and

Mississauga. Just because those two jurisdictions are more populous does not mean they have the right to trample on those of Caledon.

The way I see it, Canada's system of government has two chambers for a reason. The House of Parliament is representation by population. The senate is representation by province. This is to give smaller provinces, such as P.E.I., some voice at the national level, and protect them from being run over by more populous provinces such as Ontario and Quebec. Why ever on earth should the municipal structure not have the same safe-guards?

In fact, it does. The oft quoted section 218 in Chapter 25 of the Municipal Act includes "...in addition to anything else the Minister wishes to consider...". In other words, the concept of representation by population can be tempered and modified with other factors and considerations.

I might point out that the American system is structured in exactly the same way. The House of Representatives is representation by population, the Senate protects states' rights.

The November 26<sup>th</sup> motion, and the way in which it was presented, was an egregious political move by Brampton and Mississauga against Caledon. I would have expected better from Patrick Brown. To vote in favour of it was an equally egregious betrayal by Councillor Groves against Caledon, and to me, her flimsy justification makes it even worse.