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ABSTRACT

The creation of regional governments in Ontario represents the first comprehensive reform of local government in the Province since the Baldwin Act of 1849. The new regions have generally been established on a two-tier basis but considerable controversy and discussion has taken place on the advantages or disadvantages of the various possible restructuring formats i.e. one-tier, two-tier or other. A central issue in Ontario local government reform is, therefore, the method of selection of the actual structure to be adopted in any particular case. The study investigates this issue by examining the development and performance of regional government in Ontario with particular reference to the major physical services and their relationship with the regional planning function in two regions - Niagara and Ottawa-Carleton.

The study concludes that the major factors involved in selecting a restructuring format are allocation of functions, provincial delegation of powers, regional expenditures, public involvement and regional planning. It further concludes that the restructuring of Ontario local government should be carried out so as to produce a stronger upper tier and possibly eventually only one tier (i.e. complete amalgamation). However, it is emphasized that restructuring is not necessarily required in every instance and a determination should always be first made in each case as to whether the existing local government structure, imperfect though it may be, would not be preferable to a restructuring.
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Introduction

The first comprehensive structuring of municipal government in the Province of Ontario was accomplished by the enactment of the Municipal Act of 1849, usually referred to as the Baldwin Act. The system of local government resulting from this Act remained basically unchanged for over one hundred years. Starting, however, in 1954 with the creation of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the Province of Ontario has carried through a comprehensive programme of restructuring local government to the extent that over 62% (1) of the total provincial population is now under restructured local jurisdictions. The restructuring has basically consisted of the creation of two tier systems with an upper tier exercising jurisdiction over a large area and a lower tier made up of local area municipalities each exercising jurisdiction over a portion of the latter area. In only one instance - Thunder Bay - has the local government reform process resulted in a single tier amalgamation rather than a two tier restructuring. The restructuring process is usually referred to as the creation of regional governments or, more concisely, regionalization.

The first regional government, apart from Metropolitan Toronto, was Ottawa-Carleton which began operating on January 1st 1969. It was followed by Niagara Region on January 1st 1970 and subsequently by nine

---

1 Source: Local Government Organization Branch, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.
further Regions (2) between 1970 and 1974. The formation of each of the Regions was preceded by various general studies and statements at the provincial level which set out certain concepts and philosophies for restructuring local government as discussed later. These were accompanied by individual studies in each of the areas being proposed for local government reform. These studies generally identified the particular problems and needs in the existing local government structures and proceeded to recommend the restructuring and redistribution of functions considered necessary to eliminate or at least alleviate the problems and to satisfy the needs.

The regionalization process involving, as it does, political, technical and social considerations, to name only some, is complex, multi-faceted and undoubtedly productive of virtually endless controversy, debate and argument especially by the public, politicians and bureaucrats directly affected by it in regionalized areas. However, a central issue, which is certainly worthy of study, is the method of selection of the actual structure, i.e. one-tier, two-tier or other, to be used in any particular case. The primary intent of this study is to first investigate the development and performance of regional government in Ontario and then to attempt to identify the major factors involved in selecting an actual form of restructuring. A further intent is to attempt to determine what form of restructuring, if any, is preferable for Ontario local government reform generally.

The methodology used in the study comprises four major approaches. Firstly, the evolution of provincial policy on local government reform

---

2 York, Muskoka, Sudbury, Waterloo, Peel, Halton, Durham, Hamilton-Wentworth, Haldimand-Norfolk.
in Ontario is reviewed in order to provide a general overview of the type of reform which the provincial government considered necessary to meet the problems of local government. Secondly, the theoretical aspects of local government are reviewed in order to provide a reference frame for the subsequent empirical investigation. Thirdly, the development and performance of regional government in two regions - Niagara and Ottawa-Carleton - is discussed with particular reference to the basic service or Public Works (3) functions and the relationship of the development of these functions to broad planning goals. This part of the study was researched by means of a series of field interviews with upper and lower tier elected and appointed officials in both Regions studied. Data in the form of various technical studies, annual reports, briefs and other documentation was also collected during the field visits. Fourthly, questionnaires were prepared and sent out to all upper and lower tier elected officials in each Region studied requesting responses on various aspects of regional government with particular reference to allocation of functions and services, regional expenditures, alternative types of restructuring, public involvement and regional planning.

As regards the general form and arrangement of the thesis, Chapter 1 is a historical overview of local government reform policy in Ontario generally. Brief commentaries by other writers on regional government are also given in this Chapter. Chapter 2, which deals with the theoretical aspects of the subject, first reviews the access versus service debate, then the centralization versus decentralization discussion and finally, the somewhat more abstruse concept of the areal division of powers. The

---

3 Public Works functions are usually of critical importance in any investigation of local government since they normally involve the largest group of civic employees and require the major portion of the municipal budget.
latter concept is included in recognition of the fact that the division of power is one of the most important, though not always identified, aspects of local government reform. Chapter 3 deals specifically with the Niagara Region. A brief description of the area encompassed by the Region is first given followed by a historical review of the events leading up to the establishment of the regional government. The new structure resulting from regionalization is discussed together with an account of the distribution of functions between the upper and lower tiers. The remainder of the chapter traces the development of the road, water and sewer services at the upper tier level. Regional planning is also discussed particularly with relation to service development. Chapter 4 carries out a similar exercise to that of Chapter 3 but for Ottawa-Carleton Region. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the questionnaire circulation under eight separate categories with each category reviewed under three headings. Chapter 6 is a comparative review of Niagara and Ottawa-Carleton Regions with particular reference to the more centralized and more unified form of government in the latter Region. Chapter 7 sets out the overall conclusions of the study.
CHAPTER I

THE EVOLUTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

POLICY IN ONTARIO

The creation of regional governments in Ontario represents the first comprehensive restructuring of local government in the province since the adoption of the Baldwin Act of 1849. Plunkett comments that the latter Act established townships as incorporated municipalities if they had more than 100 resident taxpayers. The township was conceived as a distinctly rural and farm oriented government unit. The basic powers and responsibilities of the county were set out in the Act of 1849 and in the intervening 116 years these have not altered substantially. While there have been modifications and amendments, the original powers and responsibilities assigned to the county have not been changed although in some cases these have been extended. (1)

The first actual restructuring, as distinct from annexations and amalgamations, subsequent to 1849 took place on January 1st, 1954 when the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto came into being. This new municipality was set up on a two-tier basis. The upper tier consisted of a Metropolitan Council consisting of twelve representatives from the City and one, the Mayor or Reeve, from each of the 12 suburban municipalities. The latter were reduced in number to 5 in a further

---

restructuring which took place in 1967. Rose notes that the solution chosen in 1953 for the Metropolitan Area of Toronto enabled the municipalities to continue their traditions, to preserve their identity and to administer local services while uniting with all the other area municipalities to provide services that were considered metropolitan in nature and scope (2). Plunkett commented that:

In establishing the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the Ontario Government was not really attempting a radical experiment. What it did was to apply the principle of a well-established element of the province's local government structure, the two-tier counties of rural Ontario (3).

The first noteworthy event in the evolution of regional government outside Metropolitan Toronto occurred in March 1965 when the Select Committee on the Municipal Act and Related Acts, otherwise known as the Beckett Committee, presented its fourth and final report (4). This report recommended in part that:

As a practical start, the county in whole or in part with additions thereto, be adopted as the basic unit of regional government.

That:

Cities and separated towns be included in the regional governments.

That:

The regional council be given the powers of assessment, taxation, planning, arterial roads, public health, hospitals, welfare and policing.

---


and that:

the regional council may assume any storm and sanitary
trunk sewer, sewage treatment plants, trunk watermain,
water purification plants, regional type parks, and
fire services and equipment for all or part of the larger
area. (5)

The next milestone was the report (6) presented in 1967 by the
Ontario Committee on Taxation, otherwise known as the Smith Committee.
This report first set out some theoretical considerations for local
government reform which will be discussed in the next chapter and then
developed five criteria for regional government dealing respectively
with a sense of community, the balancing of diverse interests, pro-
vision of an adequate tax base, the maximizing of efficiency and the
co-operative discharge of functions between regions. (7) The report
proceeded to propose a complete set of local government regions for the
entire province. In Southern Ontario three distinct classes of regions
were proposed - metropolitan, urbanizing and county-and in Northern
Ontario two classes - metropolitan and northern districts. Insofar as
the distribution of functions was concerned, the report proposed that
(8) planning, arterial roads, sewage treatment, trunk sewers, refuse
disposal and water supply be under regional jurisdiction and the re-
main ing services such as local roads, sewage collection, refuse
collection and water distribution be under lower tier jurisdiction.
The report emphasized that the lower tier would still have "substantial
and important responsibilities" and, therefore, appears to

5 Ibid. p. 1739
6 The Ontario Committee on Taxation Report, 1967. The Queen's
   Printer, Toronto, Ontario. Vol. II.
7 Ibid. p. 507-509.
8 Ibid. p. 514
anticipate the subsequent criticism by lower tier municipalities that the upward transfer of functions to an area-wide form of government would imperil their autonomy and indeed their raison d'etre.

The report comments at some length on the rationale for the four classes of region proposed - metropolitan, urbanizing, county and northern district. The metropolitan regions would be formed to avoid the dominance which would otherwise occur of a larger region by a metropolitan area such as Toronto or Ottawa and also to provide the technologically more complex services required in a metropolitan area as distinct from a rural area. The urbanizing regions would occupy an intermediate position between metropolitan and county regions and would:

be expected to require the pooled management of certain functions that would not be a matter of concern in most county regions. Examples would include serious involvement with large scale community water supply and sewage disposal. Again, urbanizing regions would have no conceivable interest in providing other services that necessarily constitute a key responsibility in metropolitan regions, for example major aspects of traffic management, including transit. (9)

The county regions would, in a two-tier division of functions, provide the less complex services required for rural areas with localized and relatively small urban centres. The district regions in Northern Ontario would be similar to the county regions in the south except that the Province should, primarily for financial reasons, bear more responsibility for parks, recreation and roads than it would in the south.

---

9 Ibid. p. 519
The next events to be noted in the evolution of regional government policy were the statements by the Ontario government entitled "Design for Development" - Phases One, Two, and Three. Phase I was presented to the Ontario Legislature in April, 1966 (10). It proposed several measures needed to accelerate regional development planning in the Province, but made virtually no mention of regional government. Phase Two (11), which was presented to the Legislature in late 1968, differed in content significantly from Phase One in that it linked the previously announced Provincial regional economic program to the need for reform of local government. It took the original five criteria for regional government from the Smith Report as mentioned previously and added three more dealing with community acceptability of proposed regional governments, use of regional boundaries by other institutions and criteria for design of lower tier municipalities. These eight criteria formed the cornerstone of Provincial policy on regional government and are quoted as follows by Clasky (12):

First, a region should show a sense of community. This can be measured in many ways -- where people live and work, the sociological and ethnic composition of an area, and very important in a Province with such deep roots, the shared experience and history of an area. In other words, a region should reflect how people see themselves in terms of their shared community of interest.

Second, a region should have a balance of interests. In other words, it should not be dominated by any one economic or social group to such an extent that it totally dominates the region.

Third, and this is fairly obvious, there must be a financial base adequate to carry out regional services at a level satisfactory to the people of the region.

10 Design for Development - Statement by the Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario on Regional Development Policy. April 1966.


Fourth, the region should be large enough for efficiency in the handling of municipal responsibilities, but not so large that it becomes difficult to have quick communication with all areas of the region.

Fifth, regional boundaries should permit the optimum in co-operation with neighbouring regions in matters of mutual concern. This means that we should draw regional government boundaries in a way that will not create undue problems for agencies, like conservation authorities, which will often cut across regional government areas.

Sixth, in formulating regional government proposals, we will work with communities to the greatest extent possible in developing plans for each specific region.

Seventh, we will try to have regional boundaries that are usable by other institutions. We intend that regional government boundaries will be used as basic "building blocks" in drawing up more uniform administrative boundaries for provincial departments.

Eighth, in our list of criteria is that in areas where there will be two tiers of government within a region, the smaller or local units will be designed according to the same criteria that are applied to the regional units.

Phase Two also affirmed the preference of the Province for urban-centred regions i.e. urban areas surrounded by rural hinterlands, but left open the question as to whether all regions should be one or two tier. It also emphasized that county boundaries would not necessarily be used for regional government purposes. As regards the distribution of functions, Phase Two took the usual viewpoint that area-wide services such as arterial roads, refuse and sewage disposal and water supply, should be regional responsibilities while services such as local streets, refuse and sewage collection and water distribution should remain with the lower tier municipalities. Phase Three (13) was presented to the Legislature in June, 1972. It stated that the guidelines for local

---

government reform set out in Phase Two were still valid but it indicated a more aggressive pace of reform. It did not, however, make any new or different proposals insofar as structural or servicing reform was concerned. It again emphasized that county boundaries should not necessarily form regional boundaries.

The latest and final Provincial statement on regional government to be discussed is the speech by the Provincial Treasurer in October, 1973 (14) on county restructuring. This statement differed significantly in several respects from the various Design for Development pronouncements mentioned previously. Firstly, it was apparently taken for granted that restructuring would be along county lines. This represents a change from the previous Provincial position that county boundaries would not necessarily form regional boundaries, and in fact it returns to the conclusions of the Beckett Committee which, eight years earlier, had proposed the county as the basic unit of local government reform. This change may or may not be significant since it could be argued that the major centres having been restructured, the remaining areas could be conveniently restructured along county lines and thus, if nothing else, avoid needless irritation to local political sensitivities by altering long established county boundaries.

Secondly, from the functional viewpoint, it is interesting to note that the Treasurer proposed that the county or upper tier should be responsible for not only arterial roads as usual, but also for the total water and sewage function. Previously, the Province would

approve a split of the latter two functions between the upper and lower tier but now considered that they should be reserved completely for the upper tier. Thirdly, the Treasurer made it clear that initiative for reform must now originate locally and the Province would not force reform on areas (15). The statements by the Treasurer generally set quite specific conditions for future restructurings and thus apparently left future Study Commissioners little opportunity to propose innovative local government reforms.

In summary, the evolution of local government reform policy in Ontario has resulted in the reincorporation of cities and separated towns into a variation of the original two-tier county system and in the division of functions between the two tiers with recent policy tending to favour increasing the upper tier functions. The overall local government system that now exists in eleven regions and in Metropolitan Toronto, has been the subject of commentaries by various writers and a brief mention of three of these may provide further insights into the policy evolution process. Smallwood (16) reviews the development of local government reform in Ontario and then lists two lessons arising from the Ontario and English experiences in reform:

First these experiences tend to reinforce the widely held belief that there is no single (or simple) answer to the complex issues of local government re-organization

---

15 However, the Province continues to make certain provincial grants available only to restructured areas and thus could be said, perhaps somewhat cynically, to have changed from a stick to a carrot approach.

The key point to emerge is that form does indeed follow function and that different structural mechanisms can take on a logic of their own depending upon the basic goals and given needs of a particular reform effort.

The second factor to emerge is that, as important as the study of local reform may be, such study is of marginal significance unless leadership exists to translate proposals into action. ----- As significant as these proposals have been, however, most are grounded in a classical orientation that emphasizes the rationalization of structures at the local level to increase the efficiency and enhance the democratic responsiveness of the local government system.

Plunkett (17) notes the lack of political emphasis in the reform process and comments that:

The scheme (for the establishment of Metropolitan Toronto) also postponed the need for a more genuinely responsive political structure which would provide a decision-making mechanism capable of resolving metropolitan issues that involve conflicts in ideology or social goals and objectives.

Plunkett discusses the formation of regional governments in Ontario generally and notes in particular the marked reluctance of the Provincial government to distinguish between urban and rural areas when setting up the new structures. This approach recognizes the converging values of town and country but leaves little room for preserving an essentially rural area on its own merits (18).

Fyfe considers that local government reform in Ontario pertains primarily to service delivery and he feels that participation, access to government, and the importance of political considerations have often been mentioned, but one is left with a feeling that for some...


18 Ibid. p. 47.
of the proponents this is only a ritual. Perhaps the last thing they
want is participation and genuine dissent. (19) Pyfe characterizes the
reform as an evolutionary and pragmatic program articulated by leaders
not overly impressed with theoretical arguments and yet well aware of
the diversity of the problems. (20)

The above comments may be summarized very generally by stating
that, in carrying out local government reform, the Province has apparently
perceived local governments as administrative and functional rather than
political entities and the whole local government reform process thus has a
somewhat mechanistic approach which does not appear particularly concerned
regarding the need for setting up politically viable local government
units.

19 Pyfe, Stewart. Local Government Reform in Ontario included
in: A Look to the North - Canadian Experience. Advisory Commission on

20 Ibid. p. 31.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT
RESTRUCTURING

The preceding chapter reviewed the development of regional government concepts in Ontario to date. Subsequent chapters will investigate the regional governments that have been established in two selected regions but before proceeding to this it is desirable to review the theoretical background of local government restructuring since it is expected that such a review will provide a basis for evaluating both the concepts and performance of regional government.

The theoretical discussion will be divided into the following conceptual areas:-

1) Access and Service.
2) Centralization and Decentralization.
3) Areal Division of Powers.

Access and Service

The concepts of access and service were first identified as prime values for whose fulfillment local government exists by the Ontario Committee on Taxation (1). The Committee defined access as the most widespread participation possible on the part of all or

---

1 The Ontario Committee on Taxation (O.C.T.) 1967 Report - Volume II: The Local Revenue System, p. 503. The Queen's Printer Toronto.
virtually all individual citizens and argued that access was most likely to occur at the local government level because the capacity of government to promote access is in part an inverse function of size. The latter argument was contested by DelGuidice and Zacks (2) who submitted that access is not an inverse function of size but is instead a direct function of size or nearly so and based their argument on a statistical examination of voting returns in Ontario municipalities of varying sizes. These returns showed quite clearly that the percentage of voter turnout in municipal elections varied directly with the population of the municipality. Other municipal data demonstrated that the larger the municipality, the greater the percentage of contested elections. DelGuidice and Zacks concluded that:

access is a direct function of municipal size in local Ontario elections with participation increasing progressively as one moves from less populous to more populous municipal classifications. (3)

The argument advanced by DelGuidice and Zacks is valid insofar as citizen participation in the elective process is concerned. It does not, however, recognize the basic fact that access, if considered as the degree of convenience with which a taxpayer can put forth his point of view or request or complaint to an elected representative, must be greater the smaller the municipality if for no other reason than that the elected official will likely represent far less people in the small municipality than in the large one. A city may have a representation ratio of 1 to 25,000 or lower whereas the ratio in a town or township


3 Ibid. p. 272.
may be 1 to 1,000 or higher. In the latter case the elected representative may know many of his constituents on a first name basis whereas in the former case he cannot possibly know more than a small portion of them and he will not be as knowledgeable of the problems of the individual taxpayer.

Returning to the Ontario Committee on Taxation, the second concept enunciated - service - is defined as not only the economical discharge of public functions but the achievement of technical adequacy in due alignment with public needs and desires. The Committee notes that:-

local government primarily serves two values critically important to our society, access and service --- but while the two values are complementary as well as desirable, each can potentially come into conflict with the other and neither access nor service can be pursued in isolation if the overall goal is a healthy democratic society. (4)

The Committee goes on to observe that the increasing difficulty in modern times of reconciling access and service has led to the preservation of small units of government to foster access coupled with the establishment of ad hoc authorities to provide area-wide functions covering more than the jurisdiction of any one unit of government and thus cater to the service concept. The Committee was critical of such attempts to balance access and service by a combination of traditional units and ad hoc bodies (5) and concludes that:-

---


5 The various Study Commissioners have generally been critical of the ad hoc device. Fyfe in his Waterloo Area Local Government Review (p.72) in 1970 concluded that "the existence of suburban roads commissions can no longer be justified." Mayo in his Niagara Region Local Government Review (p.67) in 1966 summed up his feelings in the following limerick:-

"The Councillors up at Pitlochry Believed in the creed of Ad Hockery They farmed all decisions To boards and commissions And so made their council a mockery."
the true state of affairs is likely to be one of
grinding friction between ad hoc authorities whose
responsiveness therefore suffers and municipal
institutions to which access becomes increasingly
devoid of meaning. (6)

The Ontario Committee on Taxation continued its theoretical dis-
cussion by commenting:

that a true reconciliation of service and access
must be the fundamental concern of those who would
restructure our local institutions and the size of
local government areas is an important but none the
less partial consideration. The number of levels of
government at which an equilibrium between service
and access can be sought is severely restricted.
It may well be that the ideal to be pursued, even
among the complexities of the present, is a single
such level. But with due regard to both theoretical
and practical considerations, we have formed the
opinion that in most circumstances two levels of
government can be both manageable and appropriate
to current service needs. It is our considered
opinions therefore that in most areas of the Province
the twin objectives of service and access can be
realized in optimal balance through a full-fledged
regional level of government and a streamlined lower
level. (7)

As noted previously, the Province has, except in one instance,
implemented two-tier restructurings and in effect has therefore accepted
the latter opinion of the Committee as a very basic theoretical under-
pinning of local government reform.

In general, the access-service concept is of use in understanding
the way in which regional government has developed in Ontario. However,
it would be difficult or impossible to operationalize the concept for
analytical purposes. The term access may relate to participation in the
electoral process or in the decision-making process of local govern-
ment or it may relate to the ease with which citizens can participate
in municipally related activities such as serving on boards or commissions.

6 Ibid. p. 506.
7 Ibid. p. 507.
The degree to which each of these types of participation may occur in any one local government unit may not be the same. The term "most widespread possible" is relative and does not provide a definitive measure of participation which could be used for the investigation of the performance of regional governments. Similarly the definition given for service is conceptual rather than absolute and does not lend itself to analytical purposes.

Centralization and Decentralization

The preceding discussion on access and service leads naturally into the related concepts of centralization and decentralization. As noted previously, the Ontario Committee on Taxation inversely equated access, at least in part, to the size of government. If a group of small government units is consolidated into one large unit, the administrative staffs will very likely be relocated to the approximate centre of population of the new large unit thus resulting in centralization and, possibly, reduction of access. Similarly, the Committee equated service to the economic discharge of public functions and technical adequacy. Both of the latter will be enhanced by economies of scale (8)

8 Hardy commented that "economies of scale are a by-product of increased volume which in turn permits production line techniques and mechanical aids to facilitate work output. As long as a government service can be organized to make volume an advantage, economies of scale should result. As growth proceeds, however, the problems of maintaining well ordered administration increase. Time spent on organizing, reporting, clarifying, checking, becomes greater. The growing economies of scale may be increasingly offset by an increase in such costs which is proceeding at a faster rate than the rate of growth of services. Eventually the point can be reached where economies of scale disappear and what are called diseconomies of scale take over." Hardy, E. Lakehead Local Government Review 1966. p. 19. In other words, centralization may only lead to increased efficiency up to a certain point, after which efficiency will begin to drop off.
and the availability of specialized technical staff in the larger municipality. Centralization, access and service are all, therefore, directly related and the centralization-decentralization concept affords another means of examining the access-service situation and has the additional advantage that it is more easily visualized and defined. The degree of centralization or decentralization that is present in any unit of local government can be ascertained with reasonable ease and can provide insights to the degree of access or service existing in the unit. Furthermore, investigation and comparison of the access and service of local government units on a global basis is facilitated by utilizing the centralization-decentralization concept. For instance, Richards, in discussing the recent reform of English local government, refers to the centralizing tendency of modern times (9) and notes that:

> care of roads demand highly skilled supervision and equipment which becomes more complex and expensive; hence the case for centralization of responsibility is strong on economic and technical grounds (10).

The theoretical implications of centralization and decentralization were reviewed by Fesler (11) who examined various approaches to the subject. The first approach looks at the doctrinal viewpoint and submits that it is based on a romantic view of society held by those who are idealists, who aspire to turn the clock back, to restore traditional values and face to face dealings between men and who apostrophize the virtues of the rural, small-town society (12). The romantics believe


10 Ibid. p. 31.


12 Ibid. pp 540, 541.
that only in the small town quasi-rural setting can democracy truly operate (13) and bring about a community with social and economic integration, a complete social system, an organism with a vitality of its own. Fesler, however, contends that small town or village government tends to be routine and minimal and attracts little interest even under democratic conditions. He notes that in the United States the turnout of voters is lowest for local elections. Fesler accuses the doctrinal approach of merging and confusing decentralization and democracy and notes that decentralization can exist in the absence of local democracy. A typical example of the latter was the situation in England prior to 1888 where aristocratic landed gentry, serving as justices of the peace, held the principal powers of local government (14). The latter is an illustration of decentralization without democracy arising from one particular cause i.e. the existence of a local dominant elite. Another example of decentralization without democracy is found in modern times in the comment by Steele that:

the municipal unit should be sufficiently viable to be entrusted with a significant range of powers. The existing shortcomings in this regard were well expressed in one of the briefs received by the Commission which remarked "that the diminishing of local power refutes the argument, sometimes heard, that local municipal government is real democracy because you are close to your elected representatives. It does not do much good to be close to municipal councillors if they have less and less control over the everyday needs of the people." (15)

13 This view is typified by the comment by Alexis de Toqueville that "Town meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring it within the people's reach, they teach men how to use and enjoy it." Democracy in America Phillips, Bradley 1945 Vol. 1 p. 61.

14 Fesler op. cit. p. 546

Perhaps the most obvious criticism of decentralization arising from the above examples is that it can very easily provide the expectation but not the substance of democracy and thus may lead to a local government which may well be less democratic than a centralized form of government.

Fesler also makes the interesting point that legislative action by a centralized national government is often necessary in order to set up decentralized units of local government and notes that:-

elaborate interventions in local government by the central government - often to save local self-government from itself - are central constraints that strikingly qualify the idealized version of a decentralized polity. (16)

The above comment is of course particularly relevant to Ontario where the Province has intervened strongly in local government by setting up the new regional governments.

The second approach to decentralization examined by Fesler was the political. He submits that decentralization may lead to:-

a real morcelisation of decision-making which may itself preclude the reaching of decisions that would probably attract majority support even on an aggregating rather than amalgamating basis. Collaborative decision-making may be virtually impossible and decisionlessness in the face of urgent problems may be an unanticipated consequence of the localizing of decision-making power. (17)

Again the above comments are relevant to the Ontario scene. Perhaps the most important reason for setting up regional governments has been to provide a level of local government which can make and enforce

---

16 Fesler op. cit. p. 549.
17 Ibid. p. 552.
area-wide decisions such as the adoption of a regional Official Plan.

Continuing with his analysis of the political approach to decentralization, Fesler notes the problem of:

illusory decentralization which is presented when formal powers or administrative arrangements are purportedly decentralist but politically controlled or influenced by the centre. (18) Workload is often decentralized to field officials but with such detailed regulations or requirements of referral of cases to the capital that there is scarcely any effective decentralization of decision making. (19)

Again there are strong similarities with the Ontario experience. The Province does have an apparently decentralized system of local government but even after recognizing the constitutionally subordinate position of Ontario municipalities with respect to provincial authority, it is clear that the provincial government has retained for itself the final say in all the significant decisions affecting local government.

A publication (20) by the Ontario Economic Council discusses this problem of over-centralized decision-making especially with respect to the planning function and gives several recommendations for the return of certain decision-making powers, such as approval of planning applications, consent administration, approval of zoning by-laws, etc., to local municipal councils. Similarly, requests have been made from the regional government level for the delegation by the Province of such functions as the approval of plans of subdivision, zoning by-laws, capital

18 Ibid. p. 555.
19 Ibid. p. 556.
expenditures, traffic by-laws, and water and sewage treatment plant extensions (21).

The third approach to decentralization discussed by Fesler is the administrative. He refers to:-

the conflict between area and function and notes that if the totality of a function is a vertical combination over which no single government has full control, the area-based claims of governments confront the rivalry of the "functional communities" of specialist civil servants and the private interest groups specifically concerned with particular functions (22).

This comment is of particular interest in the Ontario context. The establishment of regional governments has involved, as noted previously, the division of functions between two levels of government thus providing at least the potential for the conflict that Fesler foresees. However, a more evident source of conflict is that between the "functional communities" themselves. Many of the functions which are split under regional government were provided, prior to regionalization, by what is now the lower tier. The functional community or technical staff at the latter tier will resent their functions being taken over partially or completely by a newly established functional community at the upper tier. The creation of regional governments thus leads to the establishment of rival bureaucracies competing for control of the same functions (23).


22 Fesler op. cit. p. 558.

23 A lower tier official (who must remain nameless) in one of the regions studied commented during a discussion on the possibility of a takeover of certain functions by the upper tier that "We don't know where they (i.e. the upper tier) are going to attack us next."
In general, the thrust of local government reform in Ontario has been of a centralist nature (24). Two-tier restructurings with a general and progressive movement of functions to the upper tier have taken place. In addition, other former municipal functions such as assessment and administration of justice have been transferred completely from the local to the provincial level.

**Areal Division of Powers**

The preceding discussions on access and service and centralization and decentralization provide a reasonably complete theoretical base on which to carry out an empirical examination of regional government. However, before concluding the theoretical discussion it will be of interest to look at one further concept, namely that of area and power. This concept is related to the fact that since the time of Aristotle political science has been concerned centrally with the distribution and division of governmental power. (25) The author of a leading text on constitutional government and democracy states at the outset

---

24 Lionel Feldman considers that the provincial approach is basically pragmatic. "When there are service problems through disparity in a service level or incapacity to perform, then the provincial remedy is to pass responsibility for that function up to a level of government that has both the will and capacity to act. The first assumption is that the municipalities themselves will not act." *Ontario 1945-1973 The Municipal Dynamic* Ontario Government Bookstore 1974. p. 11.

Richard (Ibid. p. 73) reports the same centralizing tendency in English local government reform: - "Overall the 1972 Act (for restructuring local government) marked a further stage in the process of making local government less local..... The 1972 Act did provide for some decentralization but in sum the total of centralization was considerable."

that division of power is the basis of civilized government. It is what is meant by constitutionalism. (26)

Ylvisaker (27) accepted as a postulate that the basic values of the modern democratic state which should govern the division of powers within the state are liberty, equality and welfare. Taking each of them in turn, liberty would be promoted by dividing governmental power in such a manner as to protect the individual and groups against arbitrary governmental action and against great concentrations of political and economic power. Equality would be encouraged by dividing governmental power so as to provide broad opportunities for citizen participation in public policy. Finally, welfare would be advanced by dividing governmental power in such a manner as to assure that governmental action will be effective in meeting the needs of society (i.e. in the service delivery function). Ylvisaker then proceeded to develop the concept of the areal division of governmental powers as described in the following "maxim":

The areal division of powers should be concerned basically with what is meant by the phrase "the power to govern." The assignment of powers to component areas should in each case be a general one covering the whole range of governmental functions rather than a partial one related only to particular functions.

Ylvisaker justifies this maxim on the grounds of the need for elimination of controversy and discord, the need for the citizen to be afforded the opportunity to participate in the whole range of governmental activities, the desirability of curbing the proliferation of special purpose bodies divorced from the direct elective process and


27 Maass op. cit. pp. 34-41.
perhaps most importantly the fact that the grant of general power helps ensure the capacity of the areal components to survive and remain effective. He contends that observance of the above "maxim" would assist in realizing the values of liberty, equality and welfare referred to previously.
CHAPTER 3

NIAGARA REGION

Niagara Region is located in the area usually referred to as the Niagara Peninsula which is bounded on the north by Lake Ontario, on the east by the Niagara River, on the south by Lake Erie, and on the west by the newly formed Hamilton-Wentworth and Haldimand-Norfolk Regions. The Region covers approximately 720 square miles and includes all the area within the boundaries of the former counties of Lincoln and Welland which comprised 26 municipalities. The latter were consolidated to form the twelve area, or lower tier, municipalities which make up the Region. These municipalities range in size from St. Catharines, which is the largest in terms of population, to Wainfleet which is the smallest. The three largest municipalities in the Region, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls and Welland, account for some two-thirds of the total Regional population of approximately 350,000.

The first steps leading to the formation of the Region were taken in 1963 when a local committee made up of representatives from various municipalities in the area was formed to study the problems resulting from rapid urban growth and in particular to enquire into the adequacy of the existing local government structure to deal with the present and future needs of the Peninsula. A preliminary report suggesting further study was issued by the committee in 1964 and in mid 1965 the Minister
of Municipal Affairs appointed a Special Commissioner, Dr. H.B. Mayo, whose terms of reference were, in brief, to study the structure and operation of local government in the area and to make recommendations for the future. The Commissioner first compiled and issued a Data Book which provided relevant factual information, mostly in statistical form. The final Report of the Commissioner (1) was published in mid-1966 and provided recommendations as summarized in Appendix 'C' for a restructuring and re-allocation of the functions of local government in the area under review.

The Province did not decide on any specific implementation of the Report until early 1969 when the Minister of Municipal Affairs announced (2) that a two-tier Regional Government would be established effective January 1st, 1970.

The upper tier, i.e. the Regional Municipality of Niagara, would be governed by a Regional Council consisting of twenty-nine members including the Chairman. The members would be the mayors of each of the area municipalities plus regional councillors elected directly from certain of the area municipalities as detailed in Appendix 'C'. The Province would appoint the Chairman for the first three-year term of the new Council and thereafter he would be chosen by vote of the members of the Council. The Council itself would hold office for three years initially and for two year periods thereafter. The Council could form Standing Committees and in fact Committees for Planning, Public Works and Utilities, Finance and


Social Services were subsequently created. The Public Works and Utilities Committee is made up of twelve Regional Councillors i.e. one from each area municipality. The Council would be required to employ a Clerk, Treasurer, Engineer, Fire Co-ordinator and Auditor and could, if it wished, appoint a Chief Administrative Officer and Deputy Clerk. The Council subsequently decided not to appoint either of the latter two officials. The lower tier would consist of twelve area municipalities which may be described briefly as follows (1971 population in parentheses):—

1. City of St. Catharines (113,400)

St. Catharines is the major economic and transportation centre for the Region. It is largely urbanized, except for a strip on the west side of the city.

2. City of Niagara Falls (68,000)

The major tourist centre in the Region, Niagara Falls is urbanized in the north i.e. in the pre-Regional city but is mostly rural in the south.

3. City of Welland (47,520)

This municipality is located in the largely developed north-south corridor along the route of the Welland Canal. It has a firm industrial base and is generally urban except for an area east of the Canal.

4. City of Port Colborne (22,680)

The urbanized portion of the municipality is centred around the former city while the former Township of Humberstone is still mostly rural. The city has a firm industrial base.

5. Town of Fort Erie (23,400)

This was formed by amalgamating two urban resort communities with the hinterland ownership and is still largely rural.
6. **Town of Thorold (16,560)**

The possible further consolidation of area municipalities in the Region has been raised from time to time and the amalgamation of this municipality with St. Catharines would appear feasible and indeed desirable especially from a servicing viewpoint. The northern part of the town is urban (and in fact is a southerly continuation of the urban area in St. Catharines) while the southern part is rural. The town has a firm industrial base.

7. **Town of Grimsby (15,480)**

The town is located in the fruitbelt which lies north of the escarpment and is mostly rural.

8. **Town of Lincoln (14,040)**

Also located in the fruitbelt, this municipality is rural except for localized urban development.

9. **Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake (13,320)**

The urbanized area is generally confined to the original town but the rural hinterland extends to the boundaries of St. Catharines and Niagara Falls. The economy of the area is based on agriculture and tourism.

10. **Town of Pelham (11,520)**

This municipality is rural-residential in nature and is located in a prime fruit growing area.

11. **Township of West Lincoln (8,280)**

Three townships were combined to form this rural municipality.

12. **Township of Wainfleet (5,400)**

This rural municipality is the only pre-regional municipality which was not re-arranged or amalgamated in any way as a result of regionalization.
The announcement by the Minister of Municipal Affairs also dealt with the allocation of functions to each tier. The upper tier would be responsible for the following:

1. **Assessment**

The allocation of this function to the upper tier would permit the introduction of uniform assessment practices which would lead to more equitable sharing of costs and resources throughout the Region. The function was subsequently taken over on a Province-wide basis by the Province and is no longer at the Regional level.

2. **Regional Tax Levy**

The Regional Council would finance its operations by means of a regional tax levy which would be collected by the area municipalities. The share to be provided by each municipality would be based on equalized assessment.

3. **Capital Borrowing**

The Regional Council would have sole authority to issue debentures for both regional or local purposes and to control the capital budgets of the area municipalities.

4. **Planning**

The Regional Council would be the regional planning body and would be responsible for the preparation of an Official Plan and for ensuring that plans and proposals of area municipality planning boards were consistent with regional objectives.

5. **Water Treatment and Distribution**

This would involve the taking over of existing plants and facilities from the area municipalities. The Minister also stated that a final decision had not been made as to which tier would be responsible for local water distribution but it was subsequently decided that this function would remain at the lower tier.
6. Sewage Treatment

All disposal plants and trunk sewers would be a regional responsibility.

7. Regional Roads

Arterial roads and highways, including existing county and suburban roads, would come under the region.

8. Welfare, Health, Regional Parks

All of these would become upper tier responsibilities.

The lower tier would continue to be responsible, according to the Minister, for such functions as fire protection, police (this subsequently became regional), local streets, sidewalks, street lighting, solid waste collection and disposal, local sewers and local parks.

The Minister concluded his statement by announcing that it was his intention to draft legislation to establish the new region. Bill 174 (3) was subsequently introduced in the Provincial Legislature and was given third and final reading on June 22, 1969. It set the effective date for formation of the Region as January 1, 1970.

As mentioned previously, it is intended to review the major regional physical services in detail. These comprise roads, waterworks and sewage and the manner in which they have been developed and are being operated will be discussed together with their inter-relationship with the regional planning function. Comments will also be made on the consequences of splitting these services between upper and lower tiers.

---

The regional road system has evolved progressively over a five year period. It has been found through interviews with appointed and elected officials that the following underlying factors can be identified as being generally involved in the development of the system:

a) Legislative

Bill 174, either by accident or design, gives relatively little direction as to the appropriate or desirable extent of the regional road system. It merely states that initially all existing county roads shall become regional roads and goes on to say that the regional council may by by-law from time to time add roads to or remove roads from the regional road system. The Bill requires that sidewalks on regional roads remain under the jurisdiction of the particular area municipality in which the regional road is located and further states that an area municipality may construct local services with permission of the regional council on a regional road. The concept of divided service jurisdiction within the same right-of-way is, therefore, implicit in the legislation setting up the Region and may, as noted later, give rise to inter-tier priority conflicts. The Bill confers upon the regional council planning jurisdiction for a width of 150 feet on each side of an existing or future regional road right-of-way and also gives the regional council jurisdiction over such items as the erection of gasoline pumps within 150 feet of a regional road and the erection of advertising signs within one quarter mile of the road. All area municipality traffic by-laws (except for parking) and the erection of traffic lights by area municipalities are subject to the approval of regional council.

b) Technical

The major technical factor was the Roads Needs Study Report (4)

as completed in April 1971. The purpose of this report was to identify a desirable regional road system. The method of selecting a road to be regional was to establish that it met at least one of the nine technical criteria for upper tier road systems as specified by the Provincial Department of Highways (now the Ministry of Transportation and Communications) and as set out in Appendix 'C'.

The Road Needs Report recommended a comprehensive regional road network. This network generally consisted of the original county road system, certain provincial highway reversions and certain main or arterial streets in the cities. It would appear from discussions with regional and area municipality officials that the upper tier road system criteria some of which, as can be noted from Appendix 'C', are general rather than specific in nature, were applied with the intent of maximizing rather than minimizing the regional road network. This intent of the Region was concurred with by the area municipalities possibly to reduce their financial responsibilities for road maintenance and reconstruction. In any event, a considerable number of roads or streets were designated as part of the regional network as can be seen from the typical example of St. Catharines overleaf.

The fragmented nature of the local street system left under the jurisdiction of the area municipality should also be noted. At present the urban municipalities generally maintain the regional roads and streets within their corporate limits and charge back the cost to the Region. (The traffic function i.e. signals, signs and zone painting on regional roads was taken over by the Region in 1971 and is not carried out by the urban municipalities.) If, for instance, the Region were to take over the complete maintenance of the urban regional roads it is difficult to see
how the area municipalities could provide a maintenance function on
their local street system without incurring diseconomies such as having
to travel over regional roads to reach disconnected segments of their
system or without duplication of equipment already being used on the
regional roads. (5)

c) Political

In general and apart from the apparent overall desire, as previously
noted, for maximizing the regional road network, it would appear that the
legislative and technical factors discussed above were mainly responsible
for the regional road system as it now exists and political considerations
only prevailed in a few isolated instances such as regional road No. 529
in the Town of Pelham or No. 22 in the Town of Lincoln. Neither of these
roads strictly fulfilled the technical criteria but they were nevertheless
designated and in any event the criteria are, as previously noted, rather
general in nature and thus capable of broad interpretation.

5 The Regional Roadways Engineer, W.C. Holman, P. Eng., disagrees
with these comments. He considers that "regional roads being arterial
roads require a different level of service of maintenance than do local
streets. Whether the arterial streets are maintained by the Region or
by the local municipality would have little effect on the local munici-
pality's operation on local streets. For example, snow plowing, I would
assume in most enlightened municipalities is carried out on a basis of
arterial streets being cleared first and local streets later. Similarly,
other maintenance functions are carried out on a separate basis. I don't
believe that there necessarily should be a duplication of equipment since
there is a requirement for maintenance resources on both local streets
and arterial roads, and if the need is there for this equipment it must
be provided." Mr. Holman may be correct, but the fact remains that two
separate maintenance forces, both requiring essentially the same type
of labour, equipment and expertise, are still needed within the same area
if the Region maintains its own roads and streets in an urban area. It
would surely be preferable to obtain the economies of scale, opportunities
for administrative co-ordination and general efficiency resulting from
one unified maintenance force looking after all roads and streets in an
urban municipality.
d) Planning

The need for a strong planning organization has been one of the most cogent arguments for the establishment of regional governments generally. It is, therefore, somewhat ironic that regional governments have had considerable difficulty in developing their planning function. Metropolitan Toronto has never adopted an Official Plan and Ottawa-Carleton Region which has been incorporated since mid-1968 has only recently adopted an Official Plan. Niagara Region retained consultants to prepare an Official Plan which was completed in late 1972 in draft form but was set aside following discussions between the regional council and the area municipalities. The regional planning staff subsequently prepared a Policy Plan (6) which was adopted, subject to further discussion with area municipality councils and other interested parties by the regional council in December 1973. The Policy Plan set out general objectives and policies for regional planning but did not include the Urban Areas Boundaries Maps which had not been completed at the time the Policy Plan was adopted by regional council. These maps (7) are of particular significance from both planning and servicing viewpoints since in effect they delineate the areas in the Region within which properly serviced urban development will be permitted. In this manner the regional council will ensure that development is contained within defined areas rather than being permitted to occur in a haphazard, unplanned and randomly dispersed fashion throughout the Region. The basic intent of the Region with respect to urban development is contained in the following policy statement:


7. A typical such Map is included with Appendix 'C'.
Urban development will normally be permitted only within the "Urban Areas Boundaries" defined in this Plan (the Policy Plan) and only when municipal water, sewer and other services are adequate. In special cases some urban development may be permitted without the full range of services. (8)

The proposed Urban Areas Boundaries Maps were subsequently prepared by the Regional Planning and Development Committee as part of the Addendum to the Policy Plan and presented for adoption to Regional Council. The latter, however, in approving the Maps added approximately 5,000 acres, including some 1,500 acres in the tender-fruit growing areas immediately west of St. Catharines, to the total Urban Area acreage in the Region. The additions in general reflected a desire on the part of individual area municipalities to provide larger areas for urban development within their corporate boundaries even though this would conflict with Regional planning concepts. (The fact that local considerations prevailed over area-wide objectives five years after the establishment of the Region is noteworthy.) The Policy Plan and Addendum were forwarded to the Province following their adoption by Regional Council but are still under consideration and have not been approved by the Province as of May 1975. If and when they are, all local Official Plans will have to conform to them.

The Policy Plan sets out certain policies to be followed in administering the regional road system but in general there has been relatively little overall regional planning impact on the development of the system up to now. However, this impact will obviously become more and more significant if the Policy Plan is approved by the Province and begins to be implemented.

8 Addendum to Regional Niagara Policy Plan, October 1, 1974. p. 4.
It should be noted of course that the Region has been enforcing planning controls in accordance with the provisions of Bill 174 on existing and future regional road corridors. These controls are exercised by means of conditions imposed on subdivision control, approvals of severances, and approvals of area municipality zoning by-laws.

e) Topographical

The effect of such topographical features as the Welland Canal, old and new alignments, and the Escarpment on route planning and road reconstruction has presumably been the same as if the Region had not been formed except that these natural obstacles could be more easily traversed by an integrated regional road network than by routes planned by individual area municipalities acting on their own.

The preceding appear to have been the most significant factors in the development of the regional road systems. Turning now to the next regional service to be discussed, that of waterworks, the factors involved will be listed in the same order as previously for roads:-

a) Legislative

Bill 174 requires the Region to assume all works for the production, treatment and storage of water and all trunk distribution mains connected with these works. The Bill prohibits the Region from entrusting the control and management of the regional waterworks system to a public utilities commission (9). Provision is also made for the Region to enact

---

9 The reason for this prohibition is not evident from either the legislation or the previously mentioned announcement by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It may, however, be related to the criticism by the Study Commissioners, as noted previously, of special purpose or ad hoc bodies at the local government level. As a general comment, it may be observed that public utility commissions are usually revenue oriented and are thus interested in maximizing the sale of water. The possible resultant extension of watermains into previously unserviced areas may lead to pressures for undesirable or premature development to take place as discussed later with reference to Regional permission for service extensions by area municipalities.
by-laws establishing standards for the design, construction and maintenance of local water distribution works by the area municipalities. (It is of interest to note that Bill 174 does not contain a similar stipulation for local streets and roads.) The approval of the Regional Council is required for the extension of watermains (and also sewers) by area municipalities. A decision of the Council refusing to permit such an extension can be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board but this approval authority is nevertheless a significant power of the Regional Council, especially from a planning viewpoint. The Region continually receives requests from area municipalities for permission to construct service extensions. These requests may be submitted on the grounds that a general pollution problem exists such as the contamination of wells by septic tank effluent and are thus difficult to refuse since the intent is to eliminate an existing problem. However, the Region will be concerned that approval of the request will create new problems by permitting premature or unsuitable development to occur. The initial response of the Region to requests from area municipalities for permission to construct service extensions is frequently to suggest an interim solution such as the construction of lagoons or the installation of holding tanks for sewage which will deal with the existing problem but which will not permit new development to take place. The whole matter of requests by area municipalities for permission to construct service extensions will likely become more difficult for the Region to deal with in the future in view of the effect of the phasing in of uniform sewer and water rates as discussed later.

Provincial approval also is required for proposals by area municipalities to construct watermains (and sewers) and is contingent upon Regional approval being given first.
b) Technical

The major technical factor in setting up the regional waterworks system was the MacLaren Report published in December 1969 which stated that:

there is absolutely no advantage in the Regional Corporation assuming works that do not relate to the efficiency of water supply, pollution control and flood prevention ....... and overly extensive assumption by the Regional Council could also interfere with an area municipality's responsibility to provide local services of water distribution, the collection of sewage and land drainage. (10)

The report went on to recommend that only those trunk watermains greater than 16 inches in diameter and having a minimum of local service connections or those mains connecting one regional waterworks with another should be assumed by the Region. The latter would also apply for all future watermain construction by the Region except that no main smaller than 16 inches in diameter would be constructed.

The waterworks (and sewage) facilities of the Region were further investigated in a report (11) which was completed in mid-1971. This report, which is usually referred to as "Parc" Niagara after the name of the consortium of consulting engineers which prepared it, took as a basic premise the reduction to a minimum of the number of water (and sewage) treatment plants in the region and stated that the existing fifteen water production systems could be reduced to eight by phasing out certain existing plants, enlargement of other existing plants and


construction of certain new facilities. In other words, the ability of the Region to ignore political boundaries in planning overall water facilities would promote a more efficient and economical system. The latter would result not only from economies of scale in construction of new and larger plants, but also from operational economies in such areas as purchasing of materials and supplies (12) The proposed consolidation of the water system has not as yet generally occurred but all regional engineering planning is directed towards this end and it will take place in due course.

c) Political

The impact of politics on the development to date of the regional waterworks system appears to have been minimal. However, political alignments on Regional Council have played a major role in the establishment of common water (and sewer) rates throughout the Region. As noted previously, consolidation and re-arrangement of the water systems has generally not taken place to date and the cost of individual waterworks maintained and operated by the Region had been charged back directly to the area municipality in which the waterworks was located. However, the latter financial procedure is now replaced by a system whereby a uniform region-wide rate per one thousand gallons of water supplied to the area municipalities by the Region will be charged. The new policy was referred to as follows:—

12 It is of interest to note that initially, i.e. in 1970, the Ontario Water Resources Commission refused to permit the Region to take over the maintenance and operation of those plants which were being operated by the Commission and it was only after a meeting arranged by the then Department of Municipal Affairs between Regional staff and Commission representatives that the Commission agreed that it would be unnecessary and uneconomical for two agencies (i.e. the Region and the Commission) to continue providing the same function and that the Region should take over the Commission operated plants.
Even more controversial was the step taken late this year (1973) to establish one regional rate for sewer and water services. During the first term of Council such a move was defeated. This year however, with rural municipalities presenting a solid front, the measure passed despite strong opposition from St. Catharines. St. Catharines, with a well-established and efficient water purification system, objected to a regional rate because it would serve to greatly increase the wholesale water rate in the City. (13)

The actual increase to water consumers in St. Catharines will be from the present 10.5¢ per one thousand gallons to 32¢ over a five year phase-in period beginning on January 1, 1974. On the other hand, the rate in West Lincoln will drop from the present 95¢ to 32¢ over the five year period. The above two municipalities will experience the maximum increase and decrease respectively. The balance of the area municipalities will experience more moderate variations. The average increase in the Region will be from 16.5¢ to 32¢ per one thousand gallons over the five years.

The authors of the report discussing the proposed new rates apparently expected some opposition from St. Catharines and Thorold in view of the fact that the largest concentration of urban regional residents would all experience a greater cost increase than anyone else in the Region and they comment as follows:-

While it is obvious that the St. Catharines-Thorold area will be required to pay more for these services under this proposal than under the existing method of financing, one should remember that these two areas will be paying the same as all of the other areas in the commonwealth of communities making up Regional Niagara. (14)


The imposition of a regional water rate which in effect equalizes costs to water consumers throughout the Region regardless of the cost of supplying individual locations or areas, may have implications in economic terms regarding incentives to develop. If the cost of a service, such as water, in rural areas is the same as in urban areas, a greater and earlier dispersion of development outside existing urban areas may well occur. It is perhaps too soon after the commencement of the five year phase-in period for the imposition of the uniform rate to detect any significant trend towards such dispersion but it will almost certainly be a factor to be taken into account by Regional planners.

As regards the effect of uniform rates on service extensions by area municipalities to areas already developed, such as an existing subdivision on pumped wells, it might be expected that the availability of lower rates in those areas where the rates decreased would encourage rapid expansion of services in the area municipalities generally without adherence to any overall regional priorities. However, in practice, the activities of the area municipalities in constructing services is constrained by the availability of capacity in regional sewage and water plants which in turn is regulated by regional construction priorities based on availability of funds. This basic ultimate financial constraint would certainly inhibit any rapid or widespread proliferation of urban type services throughout the Region. (15)

15 A further financial check on local service extension is provided by the co-ordination of Provincially sponsored sewer and water schemes in the smaller municipalities with regional priorities for sewage and water plant construction or extension. This avoids the possibility of a local scheme being constructed which would overload the Regional plant facilities.
d) Planning

In general, as in the case of the regional road system, the impact of this factor on the development of the waterworks system has been minimal. The main inter-relationship has been the effect on localized developments of either the refusal or permission of the Region for the construction of local watermains by area municipalities. In addition, discussions take place both at a staff level and between the Planning and Development Committee and the Public Works Committee to ensure compatibility of all proposed regional waterworks (and sewage) construction planning with regional land use planning. The Policy Plan sets out objectives and policies for Public Utilities which typically state that:

the Region requires that each municipality include in its Official Plan priority and staging policies for both water supply and sewage disposal systems which recognizes the locations and amount of lands needed for future urban development and which is co-ordinated with Regional priorities and requirements. (16)

The above requirement is related to the designated urban areas as set out in the Addendum to the Policy Plan and as discussed previously.

The final Regional service to be discussed, that of sewage, has already been referred to during the discussion on waterworks. However, the following additional points may be noted as regards the factors involved in the development of the sewage system:

a) Legislative

Bill 174 requires the Region to assume as regional sewage works all treatment works operated by or on behalf of each area municipality or any local board thereof. The Bill permits the Region to assume any

16 Policy Plan. op. cit. p. 8.3
trunk sewer or trunk sewer system and gives the Region sole authority to decide if any existing or proposed sewer is in fact a trunk sewer and, therefore, eligible for assumption by the Region. As in the case of waterworks, the Bill prohibits the Region from delegating responsibility for the sewage system to a public utilities commission. The Bill empowers the Region to pass by-laws establishing standards for and regulating and governing the design, construction and maintenance of local sewers, either existing or proposed, in any area municipality. The Bill also prohibits any area municipality or local board from enlarging, extending or altering any local sewer without the approval of the Region.

b) Technical

The MacLaren Report referred to previously in connection with waterworks also dealt with the assumption of sewage works. The Report noted that:

the Region should not trespass into local collection systems designed primarily for the removal of sewage from the abutting properties nor take over sewers having large numbers of connections to private property. Such works are considered the responsibility of the area municipality and would otherwise represent shared ownership of complex facilities. (17)

As mentioned previously, Bill 174 gives the Region authority to designate any sewer as a trunk sewer to be assumed by the Region. The MacLaren Report provided criteria for such a designation by recommending that the Region assume any sewer with a capacity in excess of 6 cubic feet per second and which led directly to a regional sewage treatment works or which serviced or could potentially service more than one area municipality along its entire length.

17 MacLaren Report. op. cit. p. 18.
The sewage facilities of the Region were further investigated in the "Parc Niagara" report referred to previously. The latter recommended the phasing out of several small sewage treatment plants and the construction of certain larger plants resulting in a net reduction of four sewage treatment facilities in the Region. The further reduction of the number of facilities in the distant future was also recommended. The advantages of the reductions would be for the same reasons as previously enumerated for waterworks facilities. As in the case of water, the reductions have not as yet occurred but regional engineering planning is being directed towards this end.

c) Political

The comments made under this heading in respect of waterworks apply here also. The changes in sewage costs in area municipalities range from an increase of 33.6¢ per one thousand gallons in Niagara-on-the-Lake to a decrease of .09¢ in West Lincoln over a five year phase-in period. The increase in St. Catharines will be 14.8¢ which is very close to the average increase for the Region of 14¢. The political and financial impact of sewage rate changes will likely not be as great as that of the water rate changes for the following main reasons:

(i) The sewage rate is only a part of the overall tax demand on property owners and is not shown separately as in the case of water billings.

(ii) The sewers are generally located in the urban areas and the large cost of providing a rural service, as in the case of watermains, to sparsely populated areas is not applicable.

d) Planning

The comments given previously under this heading for the waterworks
system are also applicable to sewage.

e) Environmental

The Mayo Report noted the expansion of sewage systems that would be required to eliminate or reduce the considerable water pollution evident in the Region and emphasized the need for a strong regional planning body to co-ordinate such expansion with land use planning.

The preceding is a general review of the major Regional services. A concluding comment on the consequences of splitting these services between the upper and lower tier is necessary. The waterworks and sewage functions are perhaps the least controversial since the regional trunk sewers and watermains are maintained by the area municipalities in which they are situated and the cost charged back to the Region. Duplication of sewer and watermain maintenance crews has, therefore, not been necessary at the regional level. Similarly, the sewage treatment plants, lagoons, pumping stations (18), water treatment plants and storage facilities are maintained and operated by the Region and duplication of forces for these works is not necessary at the lower tier level. In general therefore, the splitting of the waterworks and sewage functions has no obvious operational disadvantages. It has, however, as noted later, other disadvantages related to extra administrative costs and inter-tier priority conflicts.

In general, the regional roads in the urban area municipalities are maintained by the latter and the cost charged back to the Region. This effectively eliminates the duplication of equipment or the possibility of

18 Pumping stations (and forcemains) were originally assigned to the lower tier but the area municipalities (except St. Catharines and Niagara Falls) apparently no longer have the special staff necessary to maintain these facilities since the water and sewage plants were taken over by the Region and they therefore requested the Region to take over the maintenance and operation of the stations.
differential service levels within the same municipality that would occur if the Region maintained its own roads within urban area municipalities (19). The Region continues to directly maintain the rural regional road network much in the same manner as the counties maintained the county road systems and the Region has developed a progressive and efficient Maintenance Management System for this purpose. Again, the system is operationally quite acceptable but a potential problem exists with regard to differential construction priorities. The entire road network within an unregionalized urban municipality is normally made up of arterial, collector and local roads and streets. These will usually be reconstructed or improved in accordance with an overall programme which recognizes the priorities of individual streets not only with regard to their own condition and traffic load but also with regard to the priorities of all other roads and streets within the municipality (20). However, with a split road function the regional council will have one list of priorities for reconstructing regional roads in a particular urban municipality and the municipality will have another list for the local streets under its jurisdiction. These lists will not necessarily be compatible or

19 The additional administrative cost involved in operating a charge-back system should not, however, be overlooked. In fact, in a general sense, the splitting of services would appear to be productive of what may well be significant administrative costs. For instance, notice has to be given not only to the Region but also to the other eleven area municipalities if an area municipality wishes to construct a sewer under the Local Improvement Act. As mentioned previously, a wide range of lower tier activities such as sewer and watermain construction and the passing of traffic by-laws are subject to Regional approvals. The preparation and processing of the paperwork necessary for such approvals requires staff time at both the upper and lower tiers. In general, the splitting of services brings with it duplication of administrative effort which tends to increase overall cost to the taxpayer.

20 It would be unrealistic, for instance, to expend the majority of available funds on local streets and allow the arterial roads to fall into disrepair.
form an integrated whole in any particular instance.

Inter-tier priority conflicts can also arise from the occurrence of both local and regional services on the same right-of-way. As an example, the reconstruction of a roadway is frequently necessary following construction of underground services on the right-of-way. If, however, the underground services (storm or sanitary sewers or watermains) on a regional road are under the jurisdiction of the area municipality, the Region may not wish to reconstruct the roadway at the same time the area municipality wishes to install the services if the roadway reconstruction is low on the list of regional priorities. This type of priority conflict would not occur if both the services and the road were under the same jurisdiction.
CHAPTER 4

OTTAWA-CARLETON REGION

Ottawa-Carleton Region is located in the eastern part of Ontario adjacent to the Province of Quebec. It is bounded on the north by the Ottawa River, on the east by Russell County, on the south by Dundas and Grenville Counties, and on the west by Lanark County. All of the latter counties still retain their original form of government and, in fact, there is little indication at this time that any of the areas surrounding Ottawa-Carleton Region will undergo restructuring or regionalization in the immediate future. At present the nearest Ontario regional government to Ottawa-Carleton is Durham Region which is centred on Oshawa, 200 miles to the west. Furthermore, Ottawa-Carleton is remote from any other Ontario urban centre of significant size, though it is, of course, adjacent to Hull and the Outaouais Regional Community in Quebec. The Region can therefore be studied in isolation from other Ontario regions or urban centres.

The Region covers 1100 square miles and is made up of the formerly separated cities of Ottawa and Vanier (previously known as Eastview) all of the former County of Carleton and also the Township of Cumberland which was formerly part of Russell County. The Region also contains within its boundaries the Ontario portion (except for small areas in Lanark and Russell Counties) of the National Capital Region. The original sixteen
municipalities making up the Region were left intact at the time regional
government was introduced. However, the number of constituent munici-
palities was reduced to eleven at the beginning of 1974 by amalgamating
the former Townships of Fitzroy, Huntley and Torbolton to form the new
Township of West Carleton, by amalgamating the Villages of Stittsville and
Richmond with the surrounding Township of Goulbourn and by amalgamating the
former Townships of North Gower and Marlborough to form the new Township
of Rideau. The constituent municipalities now range in size, in terms of
population, from Ottawa with a population of almost three hundred thousand
to Rockcliffe Park with a population of just over two thousand. The three
largest municipalities in the Region, Ottawa, Nepean and Gloucester,
account for over eighty-three percent of the total regional population.

It should be noted that the distribution of urban areas in Ottawa-Carleton
is significantly different from that of the Niagara Region. Ottawa-Carleton has
basically a single urban-centre - Ottawa itself - with only sparse and
scattered hamlet or village development outside the Ottawa metropolitan
area (which approximately coincides with the Regional Sewer Area as
shown on the map included in Appendix 'C'). Niagara Region, on the other
hand, is multi-urban centred i.e. around St. Catharines, Niagara Falls,
etc. This difference in the pattern of urbanization in the two regions
studied has affected the distribution of certain services as noted later
in this chapter. It has also possibly affected the regional planning
function as discussed in a subsequent chapter.

The Region was the first (except of course for Metropolitan Toronto)
in the Province to be reviewed for possible restructuring and/or re-
organization. The review was completed and a report (1) issued by the

---

1 Jones, Murray V. Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton County Local
Special Commissioner, Murray Jones, in mid-1965. Considerable discussion between local municipal representatives and the provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs and his staff took place following completion of the Jones study and culminated in an announcement (2) by the Minister in early 1968 to the effect that the Province would introduce legislation immediately to establish the new Region effective January 1, 1969.

The restructuring proposed by the Province bore little relationship to that suggested by Jones. He had envisaged a two-tier structure with a dominant upper tier governed by a Regional Council made up of two members from each of the lower tier District Councils and responsible for all legislative, executive and administrative functions with the exception of whatever functions the Regional Council chose to delegate to the District Councils. The Regional Council would speak for the District Councils to both the Federal and Provincial levels and would have sole taxing authority. All of the latter proposals would obviously concentrate considerable power at the Regional Council level and would, therefore, presumably not be greeted with any great enthusiasm by either the existing local municipalities or the Province. The lack of Provincial acceptance of the Jones report (which also contained other unconventional concepts such as providing from the Regional Council current budget a fixed amount to pay for the election campaign expenses of candidates for the position of head of the Council) is perhaps more than anything else an illustration of the basic preference of the Province for the conventional two-tier restructuring which leaves local government review commissioners only limited freedom to suggest innovative reforms.

The Province (3) proposed a two-tier structure similar in many respects to the Metropolitan Toronto form of government which in turn was based, as has been noted previously, on the two-tier county type of structure. The upper tier would be responsible for area-wide functions such as assessment (this subsequently became a provincial function), arterial roads, major water and sewage works, area-wide planning, capital financing and welfare. (It was subsequently decided to assign the entire water function to the Region.) The lower tier would be responsible for the balance of the municipal services provided to the public in the Region. The present distribution of functions between the two tiers is given in Appendix 'D'. The Regional Council would be made up (except for the Chairman) of elected members from the Councils of the local municipalities. As noted previously, some regrouping of municipalities has taken place and the present distribution of representation on Regional Council is shown in Appendix 'D'. The Chairman would be appointed initially by the Province and subsequently by the Regional Council. Both the latter and the local Councils would hold office for three years (subsequently reduced to two years).

The announcement by the Minister did not specify any further details for operating the proposed Regional Council but the ensuing enabling legislation (4) provided for the establishment of an Executive Committee similar in concept to that of a Board of Control. The Committee was subsequently set up by the Regional Council and consists of eight members.

3 Ibid. p. 6.

4 The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act, 1968 (Bill 112) Section 13.
(of whom not more than four may be from Ottawa) plus the Regional Chairman. The Regional Council did not, however, set up the various functionally oriented standing committees such as Planning, Works, etc. that the Niagara Regional Council established. The structure of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional government is therefore not unlike that of a conventional Ontario city with a Board of Control responsible mainly for policy matters, especially of a financial nature, whereas the Niagara structure more resembles a typically county form of government with various committees involved in administrative as well as policy matters.

The following are brief descriptions of the present lower tier municipalities (1972 population in parentheses):

1. City of Ottawa (294,045)
   Ottawa is the economic, social and cultural hub of the Region. It is mostly urbanized. The major employer is the Federal government and there is relatively little industry.

2. Township of Nepean (68,099)
   Considerable suburban development, generally in north-eastern portion, with remainder rural.

3. Township of Gloucester (43,753)
   Suburban municipality with outer rural areas.

4. City of Vanier (22,152)
   This largely French community is completely surrounded by Ottawa and is fully urbanized.

5. Township of Cumberland (11,121)
   Largely rural with some suburban development in the northern portion.

6. Township of Goulbourn (10,000)
   Rural with urban development in Stittsville and Richmond.
7. Township of Osgoode (8,318)
   Generally rural with some dispersed residential development.

8. Township of Rideau (7,307)
   Rural with some residential areas, principally at Manotick. A
   regional forest is proposed for the western half of the municipality.

9. Township of West Carleton (7,045)
   Sparsely populated rural area with small isolated residential
   developments.

10. Township of March (6,615)
    Suburban fringe municipality.

11. Village of Rockcliffe Park (2,160)
    This affluent residential enclave within Ottawa is fully
    urbanized.

    The development of the main regional services, i.e. roads, water-
    works and sewage has been similar to the corresponding process in
    Niagara Region as described in the previous chapter (5). Therefore, only
    a brief description will be given of this development in this chapter.

Roads

    The enabling legislation (6) is even less specific than the Niagara
    Bill as to the extent of the regional road system to be established and
    permits the Regional Council to assume roads in any area municipality
    subject only to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. As
    in the case of Niagara, the regional road system subsequently established
    was based on a Road Needs Study which utilized the criteria for Upper-

5  Perhaps the major difference between the services in Ottawa-
Carleton and Niagara Regions is the general concentration of the sewer
and water facilities in the Ottawa area as compared with the dispersion
of similar facilities among the various urban centres in Niagara Region.

6  Ibid. Section 58.
Tier Road Systems as reproduced in Appendix 'C'. In interviews with Regional officials, it was stated that considerable discussion took place with area municipality officials regarding the correct interpretation of the above-noted criteria but no direct political pressure was used to persuade the Region to take over additional roads.

Again, as in the case of Niagara Region, there has been relatively little planning impact on the development of the Regional Road System. The Official Plan of the Region which recommends a primary road network (7) consisting of roads which may be under federal, provincial or regional jurisdiction, was finally adopted by the Regional Council in October 1974 after several years of preparation. Prior to the latter date, the main inter-relationship of planning with the road network was exercised through conditions imposed on subdivision control, approvals of severance, approvals of area municipal zoning by-laws and direct acquisition.

The Official Plan has not, as yet, (May 1975) been approved by the Province but it is being used as the basic reference document for the Regional planning function.

As regards the actual operation and maintenance of the Regional road system, the same practice is followed as in Niagara, i.e. the Regional roads within the major urban area, in this case Ottawa only, are maintained by the area municipality forces and the cost charged back to the Region. The remainder of the Regional road system, i.e. outside Ottawa, is maintained by Regional forces in a manner similar to the previous county practice.

Waterworks

Bill 112 (8) requires the Regional Council to assume sole

---

7 Official Plan Ottawa-Carleton Region October, 1974 p. 3 - 17.
8 Bill 112. op. cit. Section 39.
responsibility for the supply and distribution of water and it thus differs from the Niagara legislation which only requires assumption of the treatment and trunk distribution functions and leaves the local distribution function with the lower tier. The major reason for the complete Regional assumption in Ottawa-Carleton was apparently (9) the fact that the former Ottawa waterworks system which was the major system in the area, had served, in addition to the City of Ottawa, all of the City of Vanier (Eastview), the Villages of Rockcliffe Park and some portions of the Townships of Gloucester and Nepean. It was, therefore, considered undesirable to split the waterworks function between the upper and lower tier.

The development of the waterworks system which should take place subsequent to regionalization was reported on in a study similar to the "Parc Niagara" study referred to previously and which was completed in early 1970. (10) The study examined the existing and future water needs of the Region and recommended that various treatment and distribution works be constructed in Ottawa and the adjacent suburban areas on a phased basis compatible with both land use development and the pace of construction of sewage facilities.

As previously discussed, the introduction of a uniform water rate caused considerable controversy in Niagara Region. A similar uniform rate was introduced in Ottawa-Carleton in 1970 but did not (11) give rise to any particular political or public controversy mainly because the Regional

9 Interview with Regional Works Commissioner October, 1974.


11 Interview with Regional Works Commissioner October, 1974.
waterworks system is largely confined to Ottawa and the surrounding suburban area and the relatively low cost of supplying small outlying rural areas had little impact on water costs to the urban user. The rural areas did not, of course, object since they were only too glad to receive the benefit of an area-wide rate which was lower than the rate which would apply if the rural areas only were being supplied by a separate system. The Regional water rate is applicable to all water users in the Region and is not restricted to a defined area as in the case of the sewer rate discussed next.

The impact of planning on the development of the waterworks system has, as in the case of Niagara, been minimal to date. However, the new Official Plan (12) states that development of water (and sewer) systems will take place on a priority basis with those areas designated as "Principal Urban Areas" in the Official Plan being first priority. The latter areas are shown on the map included in Appendix 'D' and as will be noted are in or adjacent to the main urban centre of the Region i.e. Ottawa. Expansion of most of the village communities outside the Ottawa area during the planning period will be on individual wells and septic tanks (13).

In general, the development of the waterworks system will henceforth take place in accordance with both the 1970 engineering study previously mentioned and the Official Plan. The latter controls (and the fact that the entire waterworks function is carried out by the upper tier) will very likely ensure that no undesirable proliferation of urban services occurs in the Region.

13 Ibid. p. 3 - 27.
The entire operation and maintenance of the waterworks systems is carried out by Regional forces and there is thus no involvement by area municipality forces in the total water supply function.

Sewage

Bill 112 (14) is similar to the Niagara legislation in that it requires the Region to assume all sewage treatment works but only permits the Region to assume any trunk sewer and further allows the Region to decide unilaterally if any sewer is to be designated as a trunk sewer and thus be eligible for assumption. (15) The sewage function is, therefore, split between the upper and lower tiers with the former responsible for the treatment and trunk sewers and the latter responsible for the local sewers.

Bill 112 also contains provisions similar to those in Niagara for Regional control of standards for local systems. It is of interest to note that the part of Bill 112 dealing with sewage is six times as long as the section dealing with waterworks; this is perhaps indicative of the complexities that are introduced when a function is split between two tiers. The main reason for the splitting of the sewage function in Ottawa-Carleton was apparently the fact that the function was (unlike water) originally divided prior to regionalization between Ottawa and the other urban municipalities and it was not believed desirable to bring it all under one tier. The latter belief was not based on any factor directly related to or peculiar to Ottawa-Carleton Region but rather on the only precedent which existed at the time, i.e. Metropolitan Toronto, in which the sewer function was split between the upper and lower tier

14 Bill 112 op. cit. Sections 40 - 56.

15 The criteria for designation are identical to those given in the previous chapter for designation of trunk sewers as Regional sewers.
and also on a general feeling by the Province that Regional governments should not be concerned with day-to-day servicing functions such as local sewers but rather with the broader issues such as trunk sewer construction and utilization as related to area-wide planning considerations. (16)

The 1970 consultants report referred to earlier in connection with the development of the waterworks system recommended as well a plan for developing the Regional sewage system on a phased basis. The system will also develop in accordance with the requirements of the new Official Plan as discussed previously.

The maintenance, operating and capital costs of the sewage system are provided by means of a uniform sewer rate or Regional sewage levy based on equalized assessment and imposed on a defined Regional Sewer Area as shown on the map included in Appendix 'D'. The following table (17) shows that Ottawa is by far the largest contributor to the sewage system and is an indication of the dominant position of Ottawa in the Region.

**1974 REGIONAL SEWERAGE LEVY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Levy</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>2,716,482.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>98,646.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockcliffe Park</td>
<td>31,543.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>17,763.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>165,326.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulbourn</td>
<td>14,979.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>41,833.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean</td>
<td>437,757.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 3,524,329.00  $ 100,000

16 Interview with Regional Works Commissioner October, 1974.
As in the case of Niagara Region, the activities of the area municipalities in extending sewer networks will be controlled by the capacity available in Regional treatment plants.

A further component of the Regional sewage function is the Pollution Investigation and Abatement Program. This was established by Regional Council early in 1971 to provide specialized skills and laboratory support to assist the area municipalities in tracing sources of pollution within the Region. The program is carried out by a continual surveillance of the Rideau and Ottawa Rivers and smaller creeks and by the activities of "Search and Destroy" teams whose function is to search out sources of sanitary pollution and notify the area municipalities in which they are found that corrective action is required. A total of 42 sources of sanitary pollution were found during 1974. (18) The program is an excellent example of a function which can best be provided by an area-wide government.

The Region has also initiated pilot plant studies on the treatment of storm water and the results of these studies will be used to determine the feasibility of full scale treatment of urban storm runoff in the Region (19).

The complete operation and maintenance of the Regional sewage system is carried out by Regional forces. A small Regional crew maintains the Regional trunk sewer system but this does not apparently give rise to any problems of duplication with area municipality sewer maintenance forces. (20)

19 Ibid. p. 79.
20 Interview with Regional Works Commissioner May 1975.
CHAPTER 5

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Questionnaires were forwarded in mid-1974 to all members of the Regional Council and of all lower tier councils in both Regions. A follow-up mailing was made one month after the initial mailing to all those who had not responded. Details of the number of questionnaires sent out and the response received from each Region are as follows:

**Niagara**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Councillors</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayors of Local Councils (all of whom sit on Regional Council)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly elected Regional Councillors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total questionnaires sent out</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 86 questionnaires, or 64% of those sent out, were returned. Of these, 83 were identified by the respondents with the municipality from which they were sent and 3 were returned anonymously.

**Ottawa-Carleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Councillors</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Councillors who also sit on Regional Council</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total questionnaires sent out</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 50 questionnaires, or 62% of those sent out, were returned. Of these, 46 were identified by the respondents with the municipality from which they were sent and 4 were returned anonymously.

The questionnaires were made up of a combination of open and closed ended questions designed to explore the perceptions, preferences and opinions of elected officials within each of the two Regions towards various aspects of regional government. The questions were very similar in both Regions after making allowance for differences in the structure or servicing arrangements in each Region (such as, for instance, the fact that the water function is split in Niagara but not in Ottawa-Carleton). An additional question was also included in the Ottawa-Carleton questionnaire in order to investigate the degree of dominance exercised by a single large city in a region.

Appendices 'A' and 'B' consist of the texts of the questionnaires together with the aggregate totals of the responses and a listing of all comments (except for three instances where personal remarks were made regarding certain elected and appointed officials) the publication of which would be unnecessary and undesirable.

A preliminary review of the responses summarized in Appendices 'A' and 'B' revealed several results which were interesting not only within each Region but also as providing comparisons between the two Regions surveyed. However, the desirability of adding cross-tabulations to the computer programming in order to seek out as many patterns in the responses as possible was investigated and it was decided to arrange for tabulations of the results under the following two additional headings:

A. Type of Municipality

It will be noted from previous chapters that a fundamental characteristic of regional government development to date in Ontario
is that it (except in the case of amalgamations such as Thunder Bay) puts the formerly separated cities and towns back into the existing County system. This is a significant and radical restructuring since it not only combines a former one-tier form of government with a former two-tier system, but it also combines formerly separated urban and rural types of government. It could reasonably be expected that elected officials from local municipalities which had previously been separated from the county might have different perceptions of regional government from those elected officials in local municipalities which had previously been part of the county system. A programme was, therefore, prepared to provide separate tabulations of the responses from previously separated municipalities and from previous County municipalities. It should be noted that this separation was completely valid in Ottawa-Carleton Region since the geographical boundaries between the two types of municipalities had not been affected by regionalization but in Niagara the geographical boundaries were altered fairly substantially as can be seen from the map of political boundaries attached to Appendix 'C'. The effect that this alteration would have on the results of the cross-tabulation is not known.

The "City" (or previously separated) municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton are Ottawa and Vanier and the "County" (or previously unseparated) municipalities are Rockcliffe Park, Cumberland, Gloucester, Goulbourn, March, Nepean, Osgoode, Rideau, and West Carleton. The "City" municipalities in Niagara are Niagara Falls, Port Colborne, St. Catharines, and Welland. The "County" municipalities are Fort Erie, Grimsby, Lincoln, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Pelham, Thorold, Wainfleet, and West Lincoln.

B. Council Membership

A further fundamental characteristic of regional government development
to date in Ontario is, of course, that it (again except in the case of amalgamations such as Thunder Bay) results in two-tier structures with a Regional Council and area Councils. Considerable debate has taken place on the merits of such a structure and the perceptions and attitudes of the elected officials in each tier are of interest. A programme was, therefore, prepared to provide separate tabulations of the responses from local and local-regional councillors in Ottawa-Carleton Region and from local, regional (directly elected), and local-regional Councillors in Niagara Region.

The results of the questionnaire are divided into the following 8 categories for discussion purposes:

1. **Local-Regional Transfer of Services**
   
   Questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 20 & 21.

2. **Provincial-Regional Transfer of Functions**
   
   Questions 13 & 14.

3. **Levelling-Up of Regional Services**
   
   Question 15.

4. **Regional Expenditures**
   
   Question 19.

5. **Reform Structure**
   
   Questions 11 & 12.

6. **Public Involvement**
   
   Questions 16, 17 & 18.

7. **Regional Planning**
   
   Question 22.

8. **Ottawa Dominance**
   
   Question 23.
The discussion on each of the above categories is broken down into the following three segments:-

A) General Tabulation

This consists of the aggregate results from Appendices 'A' and 'B' tabulated comparatively for the two regions (except for question 23 which only relates to Ottawa-Carleton Region). The general comments made by respondents are also reviewed in this segment.

N = 86 in Niagara and 50 in Ottawa-Carleton for all general tabulations.

B) Tabulation by Type of Municipality

The percentage results are tabulated consecutively for each Region. The response percentages given in each column were computed with the "no-opinion" and "no-answer" responses excluded. In the case of "yes-no" questions the "yes" percentage only is given in order to keep the tabulation as concise as possible. In the case of multiple choice questions, all of the percentages are given.

It should be emphasized again that the term "City" refers to the previously separated municipalities and the term "County" to the previously unseparated municipalities.

C) Tabulation by Council Membership

The percentage results are tabulated consecutively for each Region. As before, the response percentages given in each column were computed with the "no-opinion" and "no-answer" responses excluded.

1. Local-Regional Transfer of Services

A) General Tabulation

Do you think that (check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Too many roads were assumed by the Region?</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Too few roads were assumed by the Region?</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) Correct road mileage was assumed by the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) No Opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Do you think the Region should take over maintenance responsibility for all Regional roads and streets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) (Niagara) Do you think that the local water mains should be operated by the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) (Ottawa-Carleton) Do you think that the local water mains should be operated by the area municipality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Do you think that the local sewers should be operated by the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Do you expect that further services will be taken over by the Region?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Would you prefer that further services be taken over by the Region?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20) Do you feel that one or more of the functions carried out by the Region should revert to the area municipalities?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most obvious finding from the above is the greater preference in Ottawa-Carleton as compared with Niagara for services to be provided by the Region. Only 20% in Niagara would favour local water distribution by the Region whereas 88% would oppose such distribution by the local municipalities in Ottawa-Carleton. Similarly, 56% in Ottawa-Carleton would prefer further takeover of services by the Region as compared with only 19%, or almost exactly one third, in Niagara (1). Furthermore, almost twice as many respondents in Niagara, as compared with Ottawa-Carleton, consider that one or more Regional functions should be reverted to the local level.

1 Interestingly enough, the expectation of regional takeover in both Regions is quite close.
Various comments were made by the respondents from both Regions when replying to the questions in this category. These comments are of a random nature but a review of them indicates at least three basic concerns of the respondents. Firstly, the cost of regional services both as a large and increasing quantity in itself and also as compared to service costs at the local level is obviously of considerable concern. Secondly, the need for preserving local autonomy at the second-tier level is emphasized by several respondents. Finally, the undesirability of duplication of effort in providing services at both the upper and lower tier levels is mentioned several times.

B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. - Roads assumption by Region</td>
<td>too many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. - Region takeover road maintenance -yes-</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. - Region operate water distribution -yes-</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. - Region operate local sewers -yes-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. - Expect Regional service takeover -yes-</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. - Prefer Regional service takeover -yes-</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. - Regional functions to area municipalities</td>
<td>yes-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa-Carleton</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. - Roads assumption by Region</td>
<td>too many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. - Regional takeover of road maintenance</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. - Local municipality to operate water distribution.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. - Region to operate local sewers</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. - Expect Regional service takeover</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. - Prefer Regional service takeover</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. - Regional functions to area municipalities</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures indicate that the Councillors in the city municipalities in both Regions are generally more in favour of assigning functions to the upper-tier than are those in the county municipalities. (An exception however to the latter is the stronger preference by County Councillors in both Regions for the upper-tier to take over maintenance responsibility for regional roads.) It may also be noted that, whereas the City and County Councillors in Niagara are each about equally divided on the question of transfer of regional functions to the local level, the County Councillors in Ottawa-Carleton are much more in favour of such a transfer than their City counterparts.
### Tabulation by Council Membership

#### Niagara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Local: N = 64</th>
<th>Regional: N = 11</th>
<th>Local &amp; Regional: N = 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Roads assumption by Region</td>
<td>too many 22.6</td>
<td>too many 20.0</td>
<td>too many 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too few 33.9</td>
<td>too few 20.0</td>
<td>too few 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correct 43.5</td>
<td>correct 60.0</td>
<td>correct 66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Region takeover road maintenance</td>
<td>yes 48.3</td>
<td>yes 50.0</td>
<td>yes 27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Region to operate water distribution</td>
<td>yes 18.6</td>
<td>yes 36.4</td>
<td>yes 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Region operate local sewers</td>
<td>yes 13.6</td>
<td>yes 27.3</td>
<td>yes 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expect Regional service takeover</td>
<td>yes 79.7</td>
<td>yes 54.5</td>
<td>yes 80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prefer Regional service takeover</td>
<td>yes 11.7</td>
<td>yes 45.5</td>
<td>yes 40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Regional functions to area municipalities</td>
<td>yes 69.1</td>
<td>yes 9.1</td>
<td>yes 40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ottawa-Carleton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Local: N = 30</th>
<th>Regional: N = 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Roads assumption by Region</td>
<td>too many 8.3</td>
<td>too many 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too few 50.0</td>
<td>too few 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correct 41.7</td>
<td>correct 72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Region takeover road maintenance</td>
<td>yes 82.6</td>
<td>yes 38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Local municipality to operate water distribution</td>
<td>yes 7.4</td>
<td>yes 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Region to operate local sewers</td>
<td>yes 56.0</td>
<td>yes 36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expect Regional service takeover</td>
<td>yes 82.1</td>
<td>yes 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prefer Regional service takeover</td>
<td>yes 37.9</td>
<td>yes 89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Regional functions to area municipalities</td>
<td>yes 41.7</td>
<td>yes 16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, the above suggests that those respondents who had been elected either directly or indirectly to Regional Council are more in favour of assigning functions to the upper-tier than are the solely local Councillors. However, the latter observation must be qualified by noting that the local Councillors are more in favour of the Region taking over regional road maintenance and also that in Ottawa-Carleton the local Councillors have a stronger preference than the Regional Councillors for regional operation of local sewers.

2. Provincial-Regional Transfer of Functions

A. General Tabulation

13) It has been said that the Province has not transferred enough functions and powers from itself to the Region.

Would you agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the greater percentage of affirmative answers in Ottawa-Carleton is not immediately obvious. The latter Region has been in existence for one year longer than Niagara and the desire for transfer of responsibility and authority from the Province may increase with time, i.e. as the Regional organization matures.

The comments made in both Regions are varied but a distinct resentment of excessive Provincial administrative control is evident.

B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=36</td>
<td>N=47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of provincial transfer -yes-</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of Provincial transfer -yes-</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high proportion (ranging from one-half to three-quarters of the respondents in each category in both regions) seeking delegation of Provincial powers to the local level is noteworthy.

C. Tabulation by Council Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Local &amp; Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=64</td>
<td>N=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. - Lack of Provincial transfer -yes-</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. - Lack of Provincial transfer -yes-</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be expected, the lack of Provincial transfer of powers to the Regional level is most obvious to the Councillors at the latter level.

3. Levelling-Up of Regional Services

A. General Tabulation

15) Do you think that "levelling-up" of regional services has generally happened in your Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term "levelling-up" should first be explained. It has been defined by Fyfe as meaning that, when municipalities are combined, one does not bring all services to a common level, which, while only improving quality of services for some, might reduce it for others. Rather, the
pressure is to raise the level of services up to what is considered the
best level (2). This level may be at or near the level of service that
prevailed in the municipality or group of municipalities (probably urban)
which offered the widest and most sophisticated range of services before
regionalization. The combining, as part of a restructuring process, of such
municipalities with rural municipalities offering a more limited range
of services may lead to a "levelling-up" effect with the rural areas re-
questing urban type services which they would not or could not have provided
for themselves were it not for regionalization. If "levelling-up" is in fact
occurring and in such a fashion, it could only be avoided by not combining
urban and rural municipalities in regional governments. The latter would
be contrary to the expressed preference of the Province for such a com-

bination (3).

As will be noted from the table, the percentage of respondents in
Ottawa-Carleton who believe that levelling-up has taken place is nearly
twice that in Niagara.

---

Fyfe, Stewart. Waterloo Area Local Government Review Report

3 A typical expression of this preference is found in the address
by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he announced the intention of
the Province to carry out the Niagara restructuring. "We accept the
recommendations made by the Review Commission "that the four cities
should be within the regional government." Although the separation of
cities from the county made good sense in an earlier age when the
distinction between urban and rural was sharper, now the rural areas
with their higher proportions of non-farm families are expecting a con-
siderable range of urban services. Distances today, with modern auto-
mobiles and highways, must be viewed in terms of minutes rather than hours
throughout an area such as this. Cities today influence areas far beyond
their corporate limits. As the most populous areas, they effectively
generate urbanizing trends throughout the whole region. If cities were
left out, many immensely difficult questions of co-ordinating a regional
government and city government would be raised. We would in fact,
perpetuate the present unfortunate conflicts of "rural" vs. "urban."
McKeough, W. Darcy. Address at Niagara-on-the-Lake on The Regional
B. **Tabulation by Type of Municipality**

**Niagara**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=36</td>
<td>N=47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. - &quot;Levelling-up&quot; has occurred -yes-</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ottawa-Carleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12 N=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. - &quot;Levelling-up&quot; has occurred -yes-</td>
<td>72.7 66.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perception in both Regions of levelling-up is somewhat higher among City Councillors than among County Councillors.

C. **Tabulation by Council Membership**

**Niagara**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=64</td>
<td>N=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. - &quot;Levelling-up&quot; has occurred -yes-</td>
<td>34.0  55.6 70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ottawa-Carleton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>N=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. - &quot;Levelling-up&quot; has occurred -yes-</td>
<td>60.0  84.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Regional Councillors in both regions have a noticeably higher perception of levelling-up than the local Councillors.

4. **Regional Expenditures**

A. **General Tabulation**

19) In very general terms, do you feel that your municipality is receiving its fair share of regional expenditures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with the apportionment of regional expenditures in the various lower tier municipalities appears to be fairly high in both regions.

A review of the comments reveals some contradictory perceptions. Rural and urban respondents in Niagara each accuse the other of receiving a disproportionate share of the regional expenditures. Both viewpoints obviously cannot be simultaneously correct.

B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=36</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. - Receiving fair share of expenditures -yes-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The divergence of opinion is considerably greater in Ottawa-Carleton, but in each Region the County Councillors are less satisfied with the sharing of regional expenditures than are the City Councillors.

C. Tabulation by Council Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response %</th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 64</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As might be expected, the Regional Councillors are more approving of the manner in which they have distributed regional expenditures than are the recipients of the expenditures.

5. Reform Structure.

A. General Tabulation

11) Would you like to see a reduction in the number of local municipalities within your region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) If you were now offered a choice as to which form of government you would prefer, which of the following would you choose? (check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present form (i.e. two tier)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All one tier (i.e. complete amalgamation of entire region)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing city separated from one-tier county</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original pre-region form</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of preference for the present form of structure in both regions is about the same but a preference for a one-tier structure or at least a reduction in the number of lower tier units is considerably more noticeable in Ottawa-Carleton. A preference for the pre-regional structure is still quite strong in Niagara but is almost negligible in
Ottawa-Carleton. The low level of preference in Ottawa-Carleton for the existing city to be separated from a one-tier county, i.e. an urban-rural separation, is of interest.

The comments made are extremely varied and frequently contradictory to each other. This divergence of opinion illustrates the continual controversy that surrounds the introduction and operation of regional governments.

B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City (N=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. - Prefer reduction in number of municipalities</td>
<td>- yes</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- one tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- original</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | Ottawa-Carleton          | Response % |
|                |                          | N=12       | N=34         |
| 11. - Prefer reduction in number of municipalities | - yes-        | 75.0       | 35.5         |
| 12. - Format choice: | - present    | 0.0        | 69.4         |
|                |                          | - one tier | 87.5        | 9.4          |
|                |                          | - city + one tier county | 12.5 | 12.5 |
|                |                          | - original | 0.0         | 18.8         |

The greater preference of the City Councillors in both Regions for a reduction in the number of lower tier municipalities and for a one-tier structure, especially in Ottawa-Carleton, is evident. The City and County Councillors in Niagara are each about equally divided on their preference for the present structure but there is a wide divergence of opinion on the same point in Ottawa-Carleton.
### C. Tabulation by Council Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Local &amp; Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niagara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 64</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. - Prefer reduction in municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- yes-</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. - Format choice: - present</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one tier</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>original</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ottawa-Carleton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. - Prefer reduction in municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- yes-</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. - Format choice: - present</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one tier</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>city and one tier county</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>original</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Regional Councillors in both Regions are noticeably more in favour of a reduction in the number of municipalities and of one tier than are the solely local Councillors.

### 6. Public Involvement

#### A. General Tabulation

16) Do you consider that regional government in your region is now more acceptable to the public than when it was first introduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17) Do you feel that the public in your municipality have their complaints and/or service requests responded to (check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) More quickly under regional government than prior to its establishment?</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Less quickly?</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) About the same?</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) No Opinion</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) Do you think that, compared to the pre-regional form of government, regional government is (check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) More easily understood by the public?</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Less easily understood by the public?</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) About the same?</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) No Opinion</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, regional government is fairly widely believed to be more acceptable than when first introduced, especially in Ottawa-Carleton, but also is seen to be less responsive and less understandable to the public than the pre-regional municipalities.

A recurrent complaint in the comments is the failure of the regional government to either promote good public relations or to establish an identity and the consequent tendency of the public to continue to associate municipal government with the local municipalities only rather than with both tiers.
The comments contain a long litany of complaints against and about regional government. However, it is interesting to note that several respondents consider that public attitudes to regional government have been influenced by the critical attitude of local councils, who, it is suggested, are prone to blame the region for what may well be their own shortcomings.

### B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa–Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response %</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=36</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. - More acceptable to the public -yes-</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. - Response to the public - more</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- less</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- same</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. - Public understanding - more</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- less</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- same</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. - More acceptable to the public -yes-</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. - Response to the public - more</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- less</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- same</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. - Public understanding - more</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- less</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- same</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appears to be little divergence of opinion on public impact except for the County Councillors in Ottawa–Carleton who perceive considerably less response to the public than do their urban counterparts.
C. **Tabulation by Council Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 64</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. More acceptable to the public - yes-</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Responsible to public - more</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- same</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Public understanding - more</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- same</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>N=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. More acceptable to the public - yes-</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Response to public - more</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- same</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Public understanding - more</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- same</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The local Councillors in both regions perceive less response to the public than do the Regional Councillors.
7. Regional Planning

A. General Tabulation

Do you consider that the degree of planning control being exercised by the Region over your municipality is (check one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Ottawa-Carleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct amount</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of respondents who perceive too much regional planning control and the correct amount of control respectively are about the same both in each Region and in the two Regions taken together.

The comments are varied but certain basic issues are evident. Firstly, several respondents consider that regional planning decisions are motivated by political rather than planning principles (4). Secondly, the growth versus no-growth controversy is obviously alive and well, especially in Niagara Region where one faction would like to preserve the fruitlands and another would like to expand the urban areas especially around St. Catharines. Thirdly, there is a feeling that the Region over-controls both the broad parameters and also the details of local planning.

4 It is interesting to speculate as to whether these respondents are objecting to any "political" involvement at all in planning decisions. If they are, then surely they are being somewhat unrealistic since planning decisions are merely an output of government and it is clearly impossible for any democratically elected government to operate without regard to political considerations even though these may be somewhat distasteful to the planning purist at times.
B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. - Regional planning control - too much</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- too little</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- correct</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ottawa Carleton</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. - Regional planning control - too much</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- too little</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- correct</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County Councillors in both regions perceive excessive regional planning control more than do their City counterparts. This may arise from the tendency in the past in Ontario generally for planning controls such as zoning by-laws and Official Plans to be applied more frequently and more intensively in urban municipalities than in rural areas. The County respondents would be largely from the latter areas and would likely consider that excessive regional planning control was being applied as compared with the lesser planning controls they experienced before regionalization.

C. Tabulation by Council Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niagara</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local &amp; Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. - Regional planning control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-too much</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-too little</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-correct</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ottawa-Carleton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Regional planning control -too much 62.5 18.8
   -too little 8.3 6.3
   - correct 29.2 75.0

The proportion of local Councillors who perceive too much regional planning control is considerably greater in both regions than the corresponding proportion of Regional Councillors. This is predictable since the latter presumably would not be as ready to agree that they were attempting to overuse their planning powers whereas those over whom the powers were being exercised, i.e. the local Councils, would tend to resent the degree of control.

8. Ottawa Dominance

A. General Tabulation

23) Do you feel that Ottawa dominates the decision-making activities of regional council?

   Yes 60%
   No 28%
   No Opinion 12%

The various comments made are somewhat contradictory. Perhaps the most interesting comments are those referring to the latent power of Ottawa and its capability to dominate.

B. Tabulation by Type of Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Ottawa dominates -yes- 54.5 79.3
As might be expected, the County Councillors who, by definition, represent areas previously independent from the city are more aware of Ottawa domination, if it exists, than are City Councillors.

C. Tabulation by Council Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Local &amp; Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa dominates</td>
<td>-yes- 88.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The local and regional category contains all those members of Ottawa City Council who responded to the questionnaire and, therefore, has a predictably lower perception of Ottawa dominance than the local category. The latter comprises respondents all from outside Ottawa and all of whom are on local Councils with small representation on Regional Council as compared with Ottawa City Council all of whose members sit on Regional Council.
CHAPTER 6

A COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF

NIAGARA AND OTTAWA-CARLETON REGIONS

The preceding discussions on the formation of regional governments and the development of service functions in Niagara and Ottawa-Carleton Regions and also the results of the questionnaire reveal some interesting points of comparison between the two Regions. In general, regional government in Ottawa-Carleton appears to be of a more centralized and more unified nature than in Niagara. This comment is based on the following points:

1) Ottawa-Carleton Regional Council is, numerically at least, dominated by one single large urban municipality, i.e. Ottawa. In Niagara Region, on the other hand, no single municipality, urban or rural, is in the majority on Regional Council and in fact the combined voting power of the four cities on Regional Council would still only produce a majority of one even though the total population of the four cities is approximately 70% of the total population of the Region. In general, as noted before, Niagara is multi-urban centred, i.e. less centralized, whereas Ottawa-Carleton is single urban centred, i.e. more centralized.

2) Ottawa-Carleton Regional Council is formed solely by indirect election (i.e. the members sit on Council by virtue of their first having been directly elected to their respective area municipality Councils) whereas Niagara Council is formed both by direct and indirect election.
(refer to Appendix 'C'). Furthermore, the directly elected members form a majority on Regional Council even though it is extremely unlikely that they would all vote as a bloc in any particular instance. This study has investigated the performance of regional government from a functional rather than a representational viewpoint but it can at least be suggested that a regional council made up completely of members selected by only one method, i.e. indirect election, and with only one type of local government political experience, i.e. service on a local council, is more likely to act in a unified fashion than a regional council made up of members selected by two different methods, i.e. direct and indirect election (1).

3) The committee activities of Niagara Regional Council are dispersed among four separate Standing Committees but the same activities in Ottawa-Carleton are carried on solely by the Executive Committee. The discussion of different regional functions and issues in one committee rather than in four committees meeting separately would likely lead to more unified decision-making and action.

4) Water treatment and supply is a unitary function at the upper tier level in Ottawa-Carleton but is split in Niagara. The fact that a major service is wholly regional is indicative of a more centralized form of government but in addition there is, as noted in the discussion on Niagara

---

1 This suggestion would no doubt be unacceptable to those who would expect a regional council totally indirectly elected to act in a less unified and more parochial fashion i.e. as serving the interests of individual area municipalities rather than those of the Region as a whole. However, this is by no means a foregone conclusion either. For instance, directly elected regional councillors have no involvement in the councils of their own area municipalities and may perceive different needs and goals for their areas than do the indirectly elected regional councillors who also sit on the local councils. This could lead to opposing or different viewpoints on the same area being presented in regional council by directly and indirectly elected councillors and a regional council with both methods of election might ultimately be less unified in its decision-making than a completely indirectly elected body. Further study on the whole question of direct and indirect representation on regional councils is needed.
Region, a definite relationship between the availability of a water supply and the feasibility or possibility of urban development taking place. Regional control of the total water function will tend to promote regional (or centralized) planning control as well.

5) The questionnaire results revealed that there is a greater preference among the elected officials in Ottawa-Carleton than there is in Niagara for services to be provided by the Region, i.e. in a more centralized manner.

6) The questionnaire results also indicated a considerably greater preference among the elected officials in Ottawa-Carleton than in Niagara for either a reduction in the number of lower tier units or a completely amalgamated one-tier government, i.e. a unitary body.

The above points, while certainly not all embracing, at least suggest the existence of a more centralized and more unified form of regional government in Ottawa-Carleton. It would be tempting but not particularly feasible and certainly presumptuous to attempt to conclude as to whether the performance of the Ottawa-Carleton regional government is "better" or "worse" than in Niagara. However the following pluses for Ottawa-Carleton as compared with Niagara may be noted:

1) The Ottawa-Carleton Official Plan was adopted by the regional council with no radical changes. On the other hand, fairly major modifications reflecting local or parochial wishes were made to the Niagara Official Plan at the time of its adoption by the Regional Council.

2) The adoption of regional sewer and water rates was accomplished with no particular dissension in Ottawa-Carleton but was accompanied by considerable controversy in Niagara.

3) Regional government in Ottawa-Carleton is perceived by the elected officials to be significantly more acceptable to the public than in Niagara.
The preceding comparison is not intended in any way to denigrate the progress made by the Niagara Regional government but is merely intended to suggest that the more unified and more centralized form of regional government in Ottawa-Carleton has performed better in some respects at least than the less unified form in Niagara.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

As stated at the outset, the intent of this study is to attempt to identify the major factors involved in selecting an actual form of restructuring and to attempt to determine what form of restructuring, if any, is preferable for Ontario local government generally. Before, however, proceeding with the latter it should be observed that it does not necessarily follow in every case that any restructuring at all is warranted or necessary. It appears to have been a basic assumption by most of the review commissioners that a restructuring should be recommended. Furthermore, some of them have seemed to hold out regionalization as virtually a universal panacea for all the ills which afflict local government (1). The first determination that should be made by a review commissioner is whether a restructuring is necessary at all or whether the existing local government structure, imperfect though it may be, would not be better in the long run than a restructured format. Only if the answer to the latter question

---

1 Mayo, for instance, is led to "the conclusion that some kind of regional government is urgently needed to meet and solve the problems connected with pollution and water supply and the disposal of sewage and industrial wastes." Mayo, H.B. Niagara Region Local Government Review August 1966. p. 54. In 1966, not only the Niagara Peninsula, but many other areas of the Province had a serious pollution problem and the major drive to eliminate this problem was only getting underway. Since 1966 tremendous progress has been made in the Province on construction of pollution control facilities not only in regionalized areas, but also in unregionalized areas especially in South Western Ontario. It has been by no means a proven fact that regionalization is an essential prerequisite to abatement of pollution.
is in the affirmative should the commissioner proceed further. If regionalization is only change for the sake of change, regional governments will be filling a need which does not completely exist and will be continually attempting to justify their existence in the face of public and political criticism.

Assuming however that a restructuring is found to be necessary, it is considered that the following are the major factors involved in selecting the actual form of the restructuring:

1. Allocation of Functions
3. Regional Expenditures.
4. Public Involvement.
5. Regional Planning.

These may be discussed as follows:

Allocation of Functions

As noted previously, the Ontario Committee on Taxation concluded that a two-tier system of local government would best serve the "twin objectives of service and access." This conclusion has, either on its own merits or because it happens to reflect the Metro Toronto restructuring (which in turn was based, as noted previously, on the well established two tier county form of government), been apparently taken as gospel without any real attempt to verify it in light of the particular conditions in each Region being studied and has been followed in every restructuring to date except in Thunder Bay (2). It would seem, however, far more logical and methodical

---

2 It is rumoured that the Province would have preferred Hamilton-Wentworth to be one tier, but pressure from local area municipalities resulted in a two-tier structure. The opposition of existing local area municipal councils to either their elimination or a reduction in their authority by restructuring is perhaps the major unspoken reality of local government reform. The consideration given by the Province to such opposition is very likely one of the prime (but also one of the most
to only determine at the outset if some form of area-wide government is required and, if it is, to then proceed to establish on administrative, technical, political and social grounds at least (and not necessarily in that order either) the functions that should be allotted to the area-wide or upper tier government. At the risk of oversimplification, it can be said that this approach to restructuring is much more logical than a basic and prior assumption that a second tier is necessary since the need for the latter will only become apparent if the investigation of functional allocation indicates that more than one tier is required to carry out certain functions (3).

The whole question of allocation of functions invites almost endless discussion and argument. It is, however, the conclusion of this study that all the major physical services, i.e. roads, water treatment and distribution,

difficult to identify or quantify, factors in local government reform. Interesting speculations abound such as, for instance, the question as to whether the provincial government will give less or more weight to the views of small or rural councils than to those of large or urban councils when deciding on a restructuring format. Part of the growing folklore of regional government in Ontario is intriguing but unverifiable accounts of how political representations were made and pressure was applied to the Province by area councils in an attempt to influence the restructuring process. The whole restructuring study process with its elaborate provisions for public and political input by means of public hearings, briefs, etc., may to some extent represent only the tip of the iceberg with the Realpolitik input to the restructuring process taking place under the surface, i.e. out of public view.

3 An argument sometimes used for multi-tier as opposed to single-tier governments is that each public service can be allotted to that particular tier whose jurisdiction would match the benefit boundary of that service, i.e. there would be no "spillover" of benefits into a jurisdiction which was not being taxed to provide the service. (A common example of this, especially in rural areas, is a town arena being used by residents from the surrounding townships. The town council usually has only indifferent or no success in getting the outside municipalities to contribute a share of the construction and/or operating cost of the arena). However, such a method of allotment is not particularly feasible since each public service has its own benefit boundaries and far too many tiers would be required to provide optimally for each service. The latter point is made by Dr. Anne Golden in her paper The Form of Local Government - What Are The Options For Metro? in Metro Toronto Under Review - What Are The Issues? Bureau of Municipal Research, Toronto, June 1975. p. 15.
storm and sanitary sewers, sewage treatment, solid waste collection and disposal and the traffic engineering function, should be allotted in their entirety to the upper tier. This conclusion is based on the following considerations:

1) Allotment of the entire physical service function to the upper tier would not only eliminate the duplicating need for staff (especially supervisory), equipment and plant at the lower tier to carry out the same type of function but also the need for additional staff time at the upper tier to check and approve submissions of the lower tier for approvals for the construction of services. Furthermore, specialized technical staff could presumably be utilized more efficiently on an area-wide basis at the upper tier level than if they were employed by individual area municipalities at the lower tier level. In addition, the services of such staff could be purchased from time to time from the Region by the area municipalities if the latter needed a particular expertise on an intermittent basis.

2) The "area function" conflict previously referred to would be eliminated. The present system of splitting physical services between two tiers merely leads, in the final analysis, to the creation of rival bureaucracies competing for control of functions.

3) Physical services are basic, essential and usually non-controversial. The average citizen cares little who maintains the streets or who supplies the water or who picks up the refuse as long as it is done to a degree of sufficiency and efficiency which he or she, usually subconsciously, recognizes as adequate. The same citizen may, however, become very concerned as to whether or not a community centre or park is established in their neighbourhood and a more local government unit will respond more sympathetically and more directly to their concern.
4) The placing of all physical services under one level of government would:-

- promote co-ordination of these services with each other and
thus avoid inter-tier or inter-service priority conflicts.

- promote greater utilization of resources through, for instance,
the sharing of equipment used interchangeably for either road
or sewer or watermain construction and maintenance.

- assign total responsibility and thus total accountability to
one level of government.

- reduce or eliminate confusion in the minds of the public as
to which level of government is providing the service and thus
restore some much needed simplicity and comprehensibility to
the whole regional government concept.

- eliminate functional fragmentation of physical service which,
in present two-tier regional governments, has merely replaced
geographical fragmentation.

- reduce inequalities in financial burdens on individual municipali-
ties since the total cost of constructing and operating physical
services would be distributed on an area-wide basis (4).

- possibly lead to economies of scale (5).

4 An example of this occurred in Sudbury Region where the installation
of sewer and water services by rural area municipalities would have in-
creased property taxes by about $230 per year. The sewer and water functions
were assigned in their entirety to the upper tier and the advent of regional
government with its broader financial base and its capability for attracting
larger Provincial grants, permitted the increase to be reduced to about $200.
(Letter from H.R. Akehurst, P. Eng., Sudbury Regional Engineer).

5 "Possibly" because the whole question of economies of scale in local
government operations is controversial and unresolved. As noted previously,
economies of scale may only apply up to a certain point after which dis-
economies may take over. Furthermore, in a recent paper on the subject, it
was stated that "the major conclusion that can be drawn is as follows:- there
is nothing definitive about economies of scale and it is thus not a strong
argument for amalgamation of services" - Lyman, Peter. Efficiency in Urban
Government - Economics and Diseconomies of Scale in Metro Toronto Under Review -
It could be argued that the placing of all physical services of the upper tier would lead to loss of autonomy and control at the lower tier but this could be offset by area municipalities purchasing services on a contract basis or otherwise from the upper tier. Furthermore, even though policy direction and administration of physical services would be centralized at the upper tier, some operational decentralization of these services would not be precluded. It could also be argued that total allocation of physical services to the upper tier would lead to undesirable and costly "levelling-up" effects. However, there are at least two countervailing arguments to this. Firstly, the overall economic constraint, i.e. the finite limit to the financial capability of the Region, imposes practical bounds on the total amount of physical service construction that can be carried out by the Region. Secondly, technical considerations will control, to a considerable degree, the level of service provided in any particular instance. For instance, road pavement widths and thicknesses are dictated by the amount of traffic that uses, or will use, the road and the latter will be built only to service this requirement regardless of what level of government has jurisdiction (6).

As regards the allocation of services or functions other than those discussed above, it is suggested that the more minor and more optional physical services such as sidewalks and street lighting and the more socially oriented services such as recreation and community centres and parks be assigned to the lower tier. These lower tier functions would not only be of a definitely local nature but would also be those services which normally would or would not be provided depending upon local options and preferences and

---

6 Even if "levelling-up" does occur to some extent it is not necessarily objectionable. Socio-economic or environmental considerations may make it appropriate in any event to provide, say, piped water supply to certain rural areas and thus provide a level of services equivalent to that enjoyed by urban residents.
whose operation would be affected by local complaints or requests. The
local planning functions would, of course, be assigned to the lower tier.

The allocation of the above functions to the lower tier would provide
local access and responsiveness and would also placate the jealous god of
"local autonomy." (7).

The remaining local government functions such as health, welfare, public
transportation, fire protection and police (where "spillover" of benefits in
small jurisdictions is most likely to occur) could be tentatively suggested
as upper tier responsibilities. Further study would, however, be required on
this point. The regional planning function would, of course, be at the upper
tier level.

Provincial Delegation of Powers

The centralizing tendency of Ontario local government reform appears
inevitable. If it is, there should undoubtedly be a concurrent decentraliza-
tion of provincial powers and functions to at least the regional level in
order to offset this tendency. Admittedly this would not restore functions
to the second tier level but local government overall would recapture at
least some of the functions now centralized at the provincial level. The
questionnaire results reveal not only a considerable desire in both of the
regions studied for a delegation of provincial powers but also a resentment
of excessive provincial administrative control. It would appear highly

7 The issue of local autonomy can actually be used by those who argue
for stronger upper tiers and those who argue against them. On the one hand,
as discussed elsewhere in this study, a stronger upper tier will be able to
deal more effectively and more as a partner with the senior levels of govern-
ment thus promoting overall local government autonomy. On the other hand,
it can be argued that centralization of functions to the upper tier militates
against citizen contact with local government at the neighbourhood or grass
roots level. This point has also been made by Dr. Anne Golden (op. cit. p 16).
This potential for the same concept to be used both for and against the same
argument seems to be a feature of regional government debate generally. As noted
elsewhere in this study, it can be argued quite convincingly that "access"
(depending perhaps on how it is defined) can be both inversely and directly
proportional to the size of government units.
desirable for the province to delegate at least some functions, especially in the planning and environmental construction approvals areas, to the regional level.

Regional Expenditures

The cost of regional government is, to say the least, controversial (8) as can be deduced from the many complaints or comments in Appendices 'A' and 'B' on the subject. The problem is aggravated by the considerable difficulty involved in making rigorous cost comparisons between regional and pre-regional forms of government. This difficulty relates to such factors as the restructuring of original municipalities, which makes a direct comparison of individual municipalities before and after regionalization impossible, the fact that cities were originally financially separate from the counties whereas towns, villages, and townships were not, the complicated system of transitional adjustment payments, any changes that have occurred in the overall provincial financial support system to municipalities since the inception of regions, the levelling-up of employee remuneration that typically accompanies the formation of area-wide governments, the equalizing of service levels throughout regions, the problem of relating costs to different levels of service as provided in different regions or in unregionalized areas as compared with regionalized areas of the Province, and the redistribution of resources from the "have" area municipalities to the "have-not" area municipalities, e.g. the variations in the water rates previously noted in Niagara Region. Criticism of the cost of regionalization also typically ignores the

8 The Globe & Mail, for instance, comments in an article on the 1975 Ontario provincial election: "Regional government is not a major issue in the campaign. However, the subject has become a focus for resentment over high taxes, the increasing cost of government, fears that government has become too large and too remote and feelings in rural areas that the countryside is becoming part of an urban form of government through regionalization". Grahan Fraser, Regional Government seen as possibly destroying small towns but not as an election issue. Globe & Mail, Toronto, September 1, 1975.
inflationary increase that is and has been occurring in all government 
expenditures and the fact that regional government expenditures tend to 
rise rapidly in the years immediately following regionalization when functions 
are being successively taken over from the area municipalities. It is un-
fortunate that the financial evaluation of regionalization is so difficult if 
for no other reason than that it is presently easier for the critics of regional 
government to point to apparently considerably increased costs resulting from 
regionalization than it is for the supporters of regional government to prove 
that untoward cost increases have not occurred.

The staffing aspects of regional government frequently lead to criticism 
from a cost viewpoint. Critics contend that a whole upper tier staff in ad-
dition to a lower tier staff undiminished in size from the pre-regional organi-
ization is now required at considerable cost to administer the same total 
functional package as in the pre-regional era (9). This criticism, whether 
valid or not, would at least be partially answered by the reduction in total 
staff requirements made possible by the allocation of the major physical 
services to the upper tier.

Public Involvement

As noted previously, the two-tier concept of local government 

---

9 One answer that has been given to this charge is that the lower tier municipalitites, which are usually larger as a result of regionalization, require staff, especially technical, to carry out assignments which, in the pre-
regional era, were carried out by consultants working for smaller munici-
palities who were not large enough to justify hiring their own staff. (Interview with City Engineer W. Rodman of Niagara Falls, April 1974). Another view expressed by a Toronto consultant, who must remain nameless, is that both tiers have built up and maintained their staffs for defensive reasons. Each 
tier is concerned that its position will be weakened if it does not have 
sufficient staff to respond to (or criticise) the actions of the other tier.
restructuring was intended to serve the twin objectives of "service" and "access" (10). It is doubtful indeed as to whether the latter objective has been achieved. The questionnaire results reveal a belief by the respondents that regional government in the two regions studied is both less responsive and less comprehensible to the public than the pre-regional form of government (11). The comments from the respondents also accused the regional government of failing to establish an identity (12) or to establish

10 The service and access concepts, which seem to have become almost sacred symbols of local government reform in Ontario, are so difficult to fully and uniquely define that they are of little use for political, or indeed any other, analysis. One is tempted to cynically suggest that the Ontario government made a fundamental policy decision at the beginning of the whole local government reform process to adopt the basic and long established two-tier county structure but with all municipalities included in it and then looked around for some convenient conceptual clothing for their creation. A distinguishing feature of the access and service concepts is that they can be made to be all things to all people. If a proposed local government structure is claimed to contain both access and service, it is impossible to prove that it does not, mainly because the concepts are so vague anyway.

11 One respondent in Ottawa-Carleton commented that "at the regional level, as at present organized, the popular will is just not seen to operate. The regional council room is a jousting ground for the city and township halls - Knights in armour, squires, fair ladies, and all and the ordinary citizen is no more involved than a medieval yeoman." Bartlett, D.W. Rideau Township Councillor. Some Reflections on Local Government in Ottawa-Carleton June 1973. p. 3.

12 One possible reason for this failure is the lack of the outward trappings of democratic legitimacy at the regional level such as, for instance, a suitable and permanent building in which to operate. Neither of the two regional governments studied has yet constructed or established such a building. The Ottawa-Carleton regional government is housed in the upper floors of an office highrise in downtown Ottawa. The structure is handsome and well-appointed but it certainly does not provide a distinctive physical focus for the allegiance and respect of the people it governs as does, for instance, the Ottawa City Hall or, in a smaller sense, the Goulbourn Township Hall in Stanley Corners with its photographs of the Reeves that have held office since the incorporation of the Township in the last century adorning its walls. Similarly, the Niagara regional government is housed, at least for the present, in a converted building in an industrial section of St. Catharines and contrasts poorly with the dignified and obviously permanent City Hall in an attractive setting in downtown St. Catharines.
and maintain good public relations. The latter accusation, if valid, would not promote "the most widespread participation possible on the part of all or virtually all individual citizens" which, it will be recalled, was the definition of "access" given by the Ontario Committee on Taxation.

Regional Planning

Very considerable effort has obviously been expended on regional planning in both regions and this has no doubt produced beneficial effects at both the regional and local level. However, it is disappointing to note that after over six years of regional government in Ottawa-Carleton and five years in Niagara, neither Region has actually had an Official Plan approved by the Province (13). An even more disturbing matter is the spurning of regional planning concepts by the local municipalities in Niagara Region who, as noted previously, added a large acreage to the Urban Areas proposed by the Region (14). Regardless of which viewpoint was actually correct from good planning considerations, the fact that regional objectives did not prevail in the planning field, which was intended to be a particularly important function of regional government, is a serious indictment of the whole regional government concept and

13 Perhaps this is not entirely surprising. Metropolitan Toronto has never had its Official Plan approved by the Province and if Metro can get along without such approval one would wonder why the rest of the Province would need Official Plan approvals.

14 The Ontario Economic Council anticipated planning problems in Niagara Region: "Although the Peninsula enjoys a recognizable geographic identity, it remains very much a multi-centred area. In terms of regional planning, there are some matters of common concern, but it is not certain that these can be readily distinguished from important and even repetitive, but still local, matters - and emphatically regarded as such by the local municipalities. A further problem may arise in the form of local conflicts, especially among the several strong and competitive urban centres. As a result, a truly regional planning role may be more difficult to establish and maintain." Ontario Economic Council Subject to Approval A Review of Municipal Planning in Ontario. September 1973 p. 13.
certainly appears to suggest that regional governments should be so constituted and structured that their decisional outputs in the planning field especially will be area-wide rather than parochial.

The preceding discussion provides a basis for drawing conclusions on the restructuring of Ontario local government. The various possibilities for restructuring may be visualized as lying along a continuum ranging from the least centralized, i.e. the existing unregionalized form of local government consisting of two tier counties side by side with separated urban municipalities, to the most centralized, i.e. complete single tier amalgamation as in Thunder Bay. Intermediate possibilities, again moving from the least centralized to the most centralized are firstly, the enlargement by annexation or amalgamation of lower tier county municipalities or separated municipalities. Secondarily, the formation of conventional two-tier regional governments as instituted in a dozen areas in Ontario to date and thirdly the formation of two-tier regional governments with strong multi-functional upper tiers and with lower tiers with limited responsibilities.

It is the conclusion of this thesis that the restructuring of Ontario local government, if it is found to be necessary in the first instance, should be moved closer to a centralized format, i.e. towards a stronger upper tier, and possibly eventually to only one tier, i.e. complete amalgamation. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- as noted previously, the major physical functions should be allotted in their entirety to the upper tier.

- the strengthening of the upper tier, both politically and administratively, would hopefully encourage the Province to entrust it with at least some of the functions and responsibilities which the Province itself now retains. Furthermore, an upper tier stronger and more in control of its own destiny would be more
equipped (despite the subordinate position of local government in the Canadian constitution) to deal as a partner with the other levels of government.

- the cost aspects of regional government will always remain controversial. However, the enlargement of upper tier responsibilities would likely lead to financial savings through the streamlining or reduction of total staff, equipment and plant requirements. In general, efficiencies would result from the elimination of overlapping jurisdictions.

- public involvement or "access" could hardly be any more minimal than it is now and could well be better. The public are now confronted with a hybrid consisting of a functionally reduced lower tier and a remote upper tier with considerable administrative powers but with only obscure public status as a legitimate political body all of which is an unwelcome combination indeed in a professedly democratic form of local government. Regional governments should not either be, or appear to be, sterile administrative entities constituting just another level of bureaucracy.

- the regional planning function which at present, as shown by the experience in Niagara Region, is vulnerable to parochial pressures, would carry much more weight if provided by a stronger upper tier with total responsibility for the major physical functions which have, as noted previously, considerable impact on the planning function. The present arrangement of split services merely makes the regional planning function more difficult to carry out effectively since area municipalities can exercise considerable impact on development through their
responsibility (albeit subject to regional approval) for local sewer and water extensions.

- the upper tier would at least have "the power to govern." At present all that has really happened is the fragmentation between two levels of government of what were originally fairly limited powers anyway. Neither level now has adequate "power to govern" or sufficient decision-making authority and in effect are not politically viable units of government or suitable vehicles for democracy. The present state of affairs is due to the widely accepted and long-established myth that mere proximity of government guarantees satisfaction to its clientele. It definitely does not, and what is really required instead, is a government with power (which denotes not only political strength and legitimacy but also such attributes as financial stability and specialized technical expertise). Only governments with visible power will command the interest and respect of their citizenry.

- a continuing dilemma of local government reformers is the problem of designing jurisdictional areas which are not too large for personal service or too small for planning. A strong upper tier with major responsibilities for servicing and planning and a lower tier for functions directly affecting local lifestyles would go a long way towards resolving this dilemma.

This study has concentrated on the functional, rather than the representational aspects of local government and it would be presumptuous to theorize on the optimal way in which to provide for representation in a strengthened upper tier format. However, a tentative suggestion would be direct election to both tiers with the upper tier representative sitting
ex officio on the lower tier council. This would, if nothing else, provide the vital informational link between the upper and lower tiers and help to ensure that the decisional outputs of one tier did not contradict those of the other. Furthermore, the upper tier, which even now (15) is responsible for the major proportion of the total municipal government expenditures of public funds in regionalized areas, would be directly and totally accountable to the public through the electoral process (16).

The development of regional governments in Ontario has been an innovative and, in many ways, successful process. However, it has not been without defects and it is surely now necessary to re-examine the original concepts on which regional governments were developed and to review the performance of these governments so that the flaws of past restructurings will not be repeated in the future.

15 "In the average Ontario Region, 75 per cent of the financial resources are spent at the regional level and 25 per cent at the local level" - Hon. John White, Ministry of Treasury, Economics & Inter-governmental Affairs in a statement in Guelph, Ontario. January 14, 1974.

16 Assignment of the taxing function to the upper tier rather than to the lower as at present would tend to emphasize this accountability.
Appendix 'A'

Niagara Region

Regional Government Questionnaire

Summary of Responses

N = 86

1) You (please check one):
   (i) Sit on a local council only 64
   (ii) Sit on Regional council only 11
   (iii) Sit on both a local council and Regional council 11

2) The population of the municipality you represent is (check one):
   (i) Under 10,000 14
   (ii) 10,000-50,000 47
   (iii) 50,000-100,000 10
   (iv) 100,000 + 15

3) In the municipality you represent (check one):
   (i) More than 50% of the population live in rural areas 24
   (ii) More than 50% of the population live in urban areas 62

4) A certain portion of the total street and road network in your region was assumed by the Region when the latter was created. Do you think that (check one):
(i)  Too many roads were assumed by the Region?  21%
(ii) Too few roads were assumed by the Region?  28%
(iii) Correct road mileage was assumed by the Region?  45%
(iv) No Opinion  6%

Comments:

a) Roads are assumed by Region based on certain criteria.
   (Any other approach is subject to political bargaining.)
   These criteria are adequate.

b) Regional services on streets and roads have been constantly upgraded. Very little duplication now exists.

c) Assumption by Region is ongoing process.

d) Gross example of duplication in cities since city must retain all essential services and can service its regional roads more efficiently.

e) Far too much duplication of effort (especially extra bookkeeping).

f) Roads poor - generally more red tape.

g) Regional roads assumed in cities can create a problem - it then is necessary to have a strong Regional philosophy on the Regional Council with a clear understanding that local councils are somewhat subservient.

5) Some of the Regional roads and streets in your region are maintained by the local municipality in which they are located and the cost charged back to the Region. Do you think the Region should take over maintenance responsibility for all
Regional roads and streets?

Yes 42%
No 50%
No Opinion 8%

Comments:

a) All roads will be taken over by Region because costs for maintenance by local municipality are too high.

b) Regional takeover would create double function. In some cases regional snow plows travel half a road and local plows have to travel over regionally plowed roads to reach local roads.

c) It is illogical for a regional vehicle to travel a great distance to plow a road when we go right by it. Greater efficiency if local municipality involved in snow removal. Regional forces too far away.

d) Urban area roads should be maintained by area municipality in interests of economy and to avoid duplication. Also would make local operation more viable.

e) Area municipalities with an adequate Roads department should be permitted to take over maintenance of all roads and streets within that municipality. Poor alternate -- Region takes over maintenance of all roads and streets.

f) Either one tier or the other should carry out all maintenance.
g) Chargeback system more feasible.

h) Chargeback method works well in small village areas especially snow removal and ice control.

i) Regional takeover would disrupt local workforce. Local men and equipment can be dispatched more readily. Region would not give early attention.

j) If Region took over all maintenance responsibility minor repairs would never get done.

k) Generally I feel the less the Region does and the more the local municipality does the better.

l) Maintenance should be done by government that can do it most efficiently or economically.

m) Doubtful if Region should control any roads in the cities.

n) When it is economically correct - when the local municipality sufficiently reduces its staff and equipment and the region can phase it in.

o) The arrangements have improved since being introduced and are working satisfactorily now.

6) The water treatment plants and trunk mains in your Region are operated by the Region and the local water mains by the local municipality. Do you think that the local water mains should be operated by the Region?

Yes 20%

No 74%

No Opinion 6%
Comments:

a) Water treatment and distribution would be more efficient if completely under regional control—eliminate duplication and misunderstanding regarding responsibility.

b) Region should have taken over all water or none.

c) All water should be at one level so as to avoid excess costs and duplication. Region should look after from "cradle to grave".

d) Water distribution should be handled under one administration to avoid split service.

e) Takeover will require time, but is coming.

f) Both governments should be involved as local costs become astronomical if the responsibility does not remain local.

g) Local water mains should be operated by local municipality and not by Regional councillors who are primarily interested in improving their own municipalities.

h) Local forces more readily available to handle this. We would lose local control and subdividers contributions towards local water costs.

i) Local municipalities more aware of their expansion priorities.

j) Local municipality must retain sufficient responsibility to be the author of their destiny. Too much control removes the freedom of the local council to plan properly and also to coordinate sewer and water projects for the same year the Region has funds in their budget.
k) Local watermains can be operated more economically by local municipality (three responses).

l) Local municipality can respond more promptly.

m) Local watermains and local sewers would have to be taken over together in those municipalities where one work force looks after both.

n) After Region took over plants and trunk main costs spiralled especially due to extra jobs which Region created.

7) The sewage treatment plants and trunk sanitary sewers in your region are operated by the Region and the local sanitary sewers by the local municipalities. Do you think that the local sewers should be operated by the Region?

   Yes  15%
   No     79%

   No Opinion  6%

Comments:

a) Would be more efficient under Regional control — eliminate duplication.

b) Takeover will require time, but is coming.

c) Sewers should be operated by Region just like water but if this is done how does local municipality control subdivision development and accelerate growth against wishes of Region?
d) Local service better and less costly (two responses).

e) We could do work faster and cheaper and respond more quickly to problems (two responses).

f) Cost since takeover has climbed and soared.

g) Local sewers should be operated by local municipality and not by Regional councillors who are primarily interested in improving their own municipalities.

h) Local development brought about by sewer and water extensions should be left to discretion of local council.

i) Local sewers should be operated locally so that those who benefit also pay.

j) Region could never satisfy them all if the responsibility was not their own for local requirements.

8) Police protection and traffic engineering have been taken over by the Region since its inception. Do you expect that further services will be taken over by the Region?

   Yes 71%
   No 22%
   No Opinion 7%

Comments: (a - g services expected to be taken over
- number refers to times mentioned by respondents)

a) Refuse Disposal - 8
b) Fire Protection - 7
c) Hydro - 4
d) Subdivision Control - 2
e) Transit - 2
f) Land Severance - 1
g) Industrial Development Department - 1
h) Expect one tier in a few years - than all services will be Regional (two responses).
i) Two tier structure must be minimised to reduce local government costs and eliminate duplication of overlap.
j) Slow erosion of local Council's responsibility which will ultimately result in one tier. Further removing of government away from the average citizen to the detriment of the individual benefit.
k) Smaller municipalities pay too much for police protection (two responses).
l) Our municipality pays portion of police costs - but receives no benefits (four responses).
m) Police services are horrible.
n) Police protection is the most rotten thing of all. Charged for Regional Police - but no service received.
o) It was a sad day for our municipality when police was taken over. Poor service with costs tripled.
p) No other service has skyrocketed in our municipality like police protection. Since the inception of regional government costs have increased many times over with the level of services received substantially reduced.
q) Police should come under Regional Council - not a Commission. If latter is to remain, it should have
a majority of elected officials (two responses).

r) Regional government tends to grow to be more and
more at the expense of the autonomy (what there is
left) of the local municipality. The Region has done
a good job on water, sewers, and welfare and if they
get straightened out by the Province, they may do a
good job on planning. Policing has been extra
expensive and with no bloody benefit.

s) If they take any more we'll only have garbage and
cemeteries left.

t) No advantage to region taking over more services -
just costs more and gives poorer service (four responses).

u) Cost of regional fire service would probably be
prohibitive and would take too long to move equipment
from one area to another.

v) Appears Region striving to assume such services as
waste disposal and storm sewers - this may or may not
be in the best interests of the Peninsula. Before such
steps are taken, the wishes of the area municipalities
should be followed. If the facilities do not have a direct
bearing on the Peninsula (or at least more than one area
municipality) the facility should remain under the
jurisdiction of the area municipality. In that way, a
municipality which has more of a feel for local needs will
be able to provide the services needed and will not be tied
into policies of a general nature.

w) I anticipate that the number of municipalities will be
reduced from 12 to 6 within 10 years and certain other
services will then be taken over by the Region.

9) Would you prefer that further services be taken over by the
Region?

Yes  
No
No Opinion

10) If you answered 'yes' to the preceding question, please
list below the services you would prefer taken over and
why:

Comments: (a - h services preferred to be taken over
- number refers to times mentioned by respondents)

a) Refuse Disposal - 6
b) Fire Protection - 3
c) Municipal Drains - 2
d) Hydro - 1

e) Storm Sewers - 1
f) Parks - 1
g) Industrial Commission - 1
h) Regional Transportation Authority - 1
i) Services would be more efficient if regional. Far too
much duplication now.
j) Refuse sites should be regional so as to reduce number
of sites and increase efficiency.
k) Not now - timing would be bad. Regional government
is too new and it has not been reviewed to analyse
its qualifications - service wise and cost wise.

1) Takeover by Region too expensive for local municipality (two responses).

m) Hydro should not be taken over.

n) Pelham, West Lincoln, Lincoln have joint refuse disposal site in operation now. Preferable to a regional site - cheaper.

o) Everything except Fire Protection should be taken over.

11) Would you like to see a reduction in the number of local municipalities within your region?

Yes  16%

No  79%

No Opinion  5%

Comments:

a) Eventually only one tier.

b) Twelve is too numerous for efficient administration - insufficient community of interest.

c) Should be reduced by at least four. Thorold and St. Catharines represent all the troubles existing prior to regionalisation.

d) Advantages to reduction. Local councils are too large for amount of responsibility left to them. Eventually local municipalities will disappear but this should not happen right now.
e) Eliminate small towns.

f) St. Catherines and Thorold should be merged (three responses).

g) Lincoln and West Lincoln should be merged.

h) Should have been three cities instead of Region.

i) Areas adjoining cities should be annexed thereto. Also Regional Council should be reduced in size.

j) Rural areas would be better if lumped together.

In our municipality split is 55% urban, 45% rural. The urban representatives don't understand rural problems and seem to care less. Preoccupied with their own problems - result a very, very unhappy marriage.

k) Rural sections should be separated from the larger centres.

l) Rural municipalities which were sliced and came under the city government were much neglected.

m) Grimsby should be in Hamilton-Wentworth. Local council originally afraid of Hamilton dominance.

n) Should be reduced on account of the failure of local municipal government to reduce their staff and budgets following the assumption by Regional Government of many of their responsibilities. This has created a detrimental attitude towards Regionalism.

o) Local municipalities have a much closer relationship with the people now than if they were reduced in number and I feel there is a smoother operation of
affairs when local municipalities are involved.
p) Government is becoming too impersonal already.
q) Reduction would cause more problems and we have too much to accomplish at this time without causing additional political problems. (two responses)
r) Reduction unwelcome because representation would be reduced. Used to have 5 votes among 19 in County days - only 1 vote in 29 now. (two responses)
s) Representation would be reduced.
t) No reduction required since one tier will come within ten years.
u) Smaller municipalities create buffer zone between much larger urban centres and should be preserved. (two responses)
v) Retain political structure but reduce unstable situation with staff. Why did City not reduce staff at time of regional takeover?
w) Region should encompass a smaller area.
x) Future regions should, like Hamilton-Wentworth, give much larger representation to the largest centre in the region.

12) Regional government has been in effect in your region for over four years. If you were now offered a choice as to which form of government you would prefer, which of the following would you choose? (check one):

(i) Present form (i.e. two tier)  43%

(ii) All one tier (i.e. complete amalgamation of entire region)  3%
(iii) Original pre-region form 40%
(iv) Other (please specify) 14%

Comments:

a) Regional government is basically good if it allows the province to pass some of its duties along. Also, it should help the overall planning of large areas. However, the only fear is that it will become a monster eating up the small municipalities and resulting in more bureaucracy and defeat its original purpose.

b) It is my opinion that regional government over the years could prove beneficial to the small municipalities. I cannot see any benefits to a well organised, well staffed city in excess of 100,000. Regional Niagara is building a monster that is very costly to maintain.

c) Present form acceptable but at a slower pace.

d) Present form preferable but modified to give more equitable tax structure (especially police).

e) Regional councillor elected at large should sit on local council so as to give better representation (two responses).

f) Regional desirable – but with change in geography (rural west half not included). Necessity or not of two tier depends on whether or not Province will delegate responsibility - if it does there has to be two tier e.g. planning.
g) No government is perfect, but let's keep what we have and try to make it better.

h) I was against regional government, but it is my duty to try and make it work even though costs etc. and no visible benefit to taxpayer. I stated four years ago that "in five years there will be no local government except a 'caretaker' mayor and a few aldermen". Why not go all the way and have one tier?

i) Definite move towards one tier in all regions. Will evolve through process of giving the regional governments more and more responsibilities.

j) One tier expected in future (because of area-wide levys).

k) Original pre-region form preferred, except that an upper tier with a planning function only is desirable. (two responses)

l) Original preferred with small amalgamations and some joint services. (two responses)

m) Original preferred, but with addition of overriding Committees to control growth, planning, and services.

n) Regional government has proven too expensive. Any area going regional should ensure there is enough money put on the table first. Province should assume more of costs of regional government.

o) Regrouped and stronger area municipalities to administer area services. Regional administration of limited services.

p) Regional government should not have been created but instead only reduction from 25 to 12 local municipalities with sewage, water, and roads going to Province and policing.
left alone.

q) No region but 12 municipalities reduced to 4.

r) I feel that regional structure which presently exists is too large as "Communication" is one of the chief problems we have here. I would like to see the region divided into two parts and have an updated County-like system.

s) Region too large.

t) Water and sewer better under region - other services operated well under County system.

u) We had no choice - bulldozer McKeough forced us. We were O.K. - not now. It's a wonderful way for the government to save money (re. police) at the people's expense. I can't see anything good about it.

v) Would agree with present form but representation needs a change. I would need assurances of the type of services to be retained by the area municipalities and the costs involved. What may appear cheaper from a Region impost viewpoint may not be the cheapest when similar area municipality costs are considered. Such things as Union contracts and service to the taxpayers must be considered also.

13) It has been said that the Province has not transferred enough functions and powers from itself to the Regions. Would you agree?

Yes 47%

No 36%

No Opinion 17%
If you answered 'yes' to the preceding question, what functions and powers would you like to see transferred from the Province to the Regions and why?

Comments: (a - k indicate the functions to be transferred; number refers to number of times function mentioned by respondents)

a) Planning - 19
b) Subdivision Approvals - 11
c) Traffic By Laws - 7
d) Rezoning Approvals - 5
e) O.M.B. Approvals - 4
f) Official Plan Amendments - 4
g) M.T.C. Approvals - 4
h) Watermain Design Approvals - 3
i) Sewer Design Approvals - 3
j) Assessment - 2
k) Ambulance Service - 1

l) Transfer to Region would reduce provincial procedures and "mandarins".
m) Red tape on Provincial Planning approvals is ridiculous. Provincial civil servants make decisions based on old data and on complete ignorance of area.

n) Escarpment Commission function would have been better handled by Region.
o) Province should leave us alone. Municipal Board is ruining us.
p) Transfer of powers from Province should not be accompanied by reduction in Provincial grants. Time
will see more responsibility turned over when there is more experience at Regional level.

q) Province should transfer more funds to Region for such purposes as land banking, industrial parks, regional parks, and playgrounds.

r) Provincial financing of sewer and water schemes should be completely controlled by either Province or Region - not by both as it is now.

s) If the Province transferred powers to Region, the latter would increase staff, but would the Province decrease staff?

t) If Region accepts its responsibilities it has enough in front of it for years to come. Let's consolidate before we suggest duties and responsibilities that we cannot handle. (two responses)

u) Regional Council should assume a little of the same powers the O.M.B. had over local municipalities. However, as long as aldermen are responsible only to themselves, the O.M.B. will be required. In particular, the O.M.B. should be consulted regarding large money matters and Official Plans.

v) M.T.C. and M.O.E. design approvals should be looked after by Region as soon as latter has adequate staff.

w) More approvals of actions of local councils should be transferred from Province to Region.

15) It has been said that introduction of regional government causes a "levelling-up" i.e. regional services such as roads,
water, and sewers, instead of being averaged, are all brought up to the level that prevailed in the municipality with the highest standard before regionalization. Do you think this has generally happened in your region?

Yes 35%
No 49%
No Opinion 16%

Comments:
a) At great cost to the municipalities which enjoyed such services, the other municipalities, have now attained these new standards. (two responses)
b) We are moving in direction of levelling-up which was one of the main ideas behind regional government being instituted.
c) Levelling-up probably more true with policing than with any other function.
d) Has not occurred, except for police which has been ridiculous.
e) Water and sewers have been levelled up but not rural roads.
f) Water and sewers have been levelled up but not roads and police.
g) Levelling-up has occurred — but not in the rural municipality. Large urban areas control balance of voting power so they receive preferential treatment in most respects.
h) Levelling-up has occurred especially in employee remuneration.

i) Our municipality has 33% of the assessment and is now providing for the upgrading of service throughout the region.

j) It is one of the real dangers of regionalism that with uniform wholesale water and sewer rates, development takes place in uneconomic areas. Regional councils don't have the guts to refuse a local municipality services which are uneconomic to the specific community. Nor do they have the guts to overcome the problem by planning controls.

k) Levelling-up causes increased cost to cities.

l) Levelling-up has occurred to a degree — will increase in time.

m) I would suggest the Public Works Committee in the inception allowed the Public Works Department to walk all over them and now they have set up an empire.

n) Water and sewage plants are fully assumed by the Region with their high-priced help.

o) Levelling-up has not occurred — road construction has not proceeded as quickly as under former county road system.

p) That's a lot of bull (that levelling-up has occurred). Maybe ultimately — after twenty years or so.

q) Regional policies re. standardisation of service are permissive in many cases.

r) Levelling-up has not really happened but I can see where
it easily could if Regional Council followed engineers' ideas instead of keeping them tempered with existing local conditions.

s) Lincoln and Grimsby have been waiting for a new sewage plant since the inception of the Region and which the former municipalities were ready to proceed with.

t) A tendency towards this, but we have a level of services procedure and a maintenance management procedure which governs quality of services.

u) Some of the water and distribution facilities were not properly maintained as the establishment of the Region approached and hence were taken over in poor condition.

16) Do you consider that regional government in your region is now more acceptable to the public than when it was first introduced?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a) Attitudes have matured recently. It takes time for acceptability to happen.

b) Too many local politicians still blame the region for any cost increases - many of which would have taken place anyway if the local municipalities had
faced up to their responsibilities and provided a good adequate standard of services. People hearing these charges and faced with increased costs blame all on Regional government. (two responses).

c) Most of the criticism comes from local councils who believe that the Region should do everything that they request - and also the Provincial and Federal Governments.

d) Change of any type meets with a negative response initially. Public relations are a must for regional government. My experience is that critics are critics because of their political party affiliation rather than that they are being objective or conservative.

e) Accepted - but not by much. We as elected officials are probably most guilty in this respect.

f) Accepted - but not approved. Apathy was the inception of our Regional Government.

g) People still apathetic. With time almost everybody accepts a change.

h) The trauma over Regional government is more psychological than real. To the people an interesting challenge - to the small town politician - a nightmare.

i) Regional government has resulted in a tremendous increase in costs to taxpayer and has placed municipal government at a greater distance from the people.

j) Most of the public very dissatisfied - they see no improvement of services only increased cost.

k) How can anyone accept inefficiency?
1) Public originally accepted idea that regional government would result in earnings of tax dollars and increased service. Now the public is not seeing the savings and are not impressed with the regional services.

m) Public still blames regional government for the escalating costs which have to be borne by the taxpayer.

n) People realise they have no choice — it was forced upon them.

o) People can still not see any purpose in regional government. Seems to be just another hurdle in politics.

p) People resent more bureaucracy — they will never accept regional government.

q) It was never properly explained and therefore the public do not really have any input. (I receive calls regarding regional duties and when I refer the caller to a regional representative, they, in most cases, don’t know we have any). (two responses)

r) People are still not aware of what regional government is.

s) Will take another ten years before it is accepted.

t) Absolutely NO. It might be O.K. for the cities but not my township — we are a disaster area.

u) Not acceptable — people do not like the amount of police protection compared with previous.
v) If any Regional government is not functioning properly, it must be due to administrative failures, lack of decision making, lack of policy, and just plain stupidity. Regional Government is merely a means to handle larger Provincial and Federal grants.

w) As far as road upkeep is concerned, I could probably say yes. But when we are billed for a police force that we don't have, I would have to say no.

x) Regional government gets the blame for all problems whether it is the fault of it or not. I feel all municipalities have achieved more through regional government than they would have on their own e.g. roads, bridges, improved water and sewer plants, etc.

y) A little more acceptable by the local municipal councillors who, in my opinion, were the loudest critics of regionalism. The general public has little knowledge of basic facts regarding local government structure.

z) A generalised statement might be that Regional government is here to stay. We must do our best to make it work in the interests of the people. We must also remember that municipal government was established by the Baldwin Act in 1849 and since that time no major revisions have taken place.

17) Do you feel that the public in your municipality have their
complaints and/or service requests responded to (check one):

(i) More quickly under regional government than prior to its establishment? 7%
(ii) Less quickly? 55%
(iii) About the same? 37%
(iv) No opinion 1%

Comments:

a) Complaints too often get mired in red tape. (two responses)

b) Slower because public have to go through more channels for approvals.

c) Duplication of effort - complaints are still channelled through local municipalities and then to the region.

d) Whole Regional system seems removed from the people. Even Regional Councillors do not have same close contact with citizens. (two responses)

e) Lack of response is related to size of new level of government and the fact that representatives from one municipality show little interest in problems experienced by people in other municipalities.

f) Less services, expensive, and little response to individuals.

g) Tardiness at all levels of government.

18) Do you think that, compared to the pre-regional form of government, regional government is (check one):
(i) More easily understood by the public? 7%
(ii) Less easily understood by the public? 70%
(iii) About the same? 20%
(iv) No opinion 3%

Comments:

a) Most only understand that there is too much duplication.
b) "Something new - something troublesome" for public.
c) People sore and hostile as it definitely not proved out for us.
d) Most people are lost.
e) Urban residents find it harder to understand regional government than rural areas formerly under county system. Misunderstanding will slowly diminish.
f) They didn't understand "County Government" either - and most are not interested.
g) Public relations important. Regional government superior to county system.
h) Majority of public are not that much interested unless something affects them personally. Residents had not noticed substantial increase in water rates (due to rate equalisation).
i) After 150 years of County Government most people had only a vague conception of its function. After 150 years of Regionalisation the same percentages will probably be evident.
19) In very general terms, do you feel that your municipality is receiving its fair share of regional expenditures?

Yes 55%
No 37%
No Opinion 8%

Comments:

a) Yes – but as compared to some areas that had inadequate services as a local municipality it could be said that they are getting more. Our own appointed officials fight to get our fair share and Council supports their efforts.

b) No – because urban municipalities get all the attention and money.

c) No – we are a rural municipality and require less than urban municipalities but we are still assessed the same.

d) We are a rural area with no immediate prospect of sewer or water charged with capital regional expenditures for plant.

e) Police and road services are more extensive in large urban areas.

f) No – because we only have six representatives out of twenty-eight and because St. Catherines is viewed with suspicion and contempt by many regional councillors. We do not receive a fair deal.

g) The large municipality with more representation seems
to receive the lion's share of money to be spent.

h) We have policing to only 25% of the municipality, but pay for 100%.

i) Not at this time. We will within two years as priorities are met. Financial burden of regional government is so substantial that many projects are left undone.

j) There should be a method of balancing the amount of funds spent on roads in each municipality according to their financial participation in the Region over a five or ten year period. If a municipality turns down a regional project, the money in the budget is spent elsewhere.

k) Definitely not. We have been hard hit in many areas i.e. grants from Province to Region etc. due to unfavourable equalisation factor and Toronto is unwilling to look at our problem.

20) Do you feel that one or more of the functions carried out by the Region should revert to the area municipalities?

   Yes  50%

   No  38%

   No Opinion  12%

21) If you answered 'yes' to the preceding question, list below the functions you consider should be reverted and why:
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Comments: (a - h list functions that should be reverted; number indicates times mentioned by respondents)

a) Police - 14
b) Water Treatment - 9
c) Sewage Disposal - 7
d) Urban Road Maintenance - 7
e) Land Severances - 6
f) Urban Traffic Operations - 5
g) Planning - 4
h) Health - 1
i) Our share of public costs would have had a policeman on every corner before region took over, now we hardly ever see a policeman and we are not happy about it. (five responses)
j) Faster and more efficient police service was provided by municipality. Now takes three switchboards for public to get a patrol car. Cost increased and efficiency reduced.
k) Land severances are being judged by a majority of members who do not live in area or have expert knowledge of the situation. (three responses)
l) Land severance committee too harsh. Father to son or daughter or owner wishing to retain a retirement lot are falling by the wayside.
m) Regional traffic control methods show little concern for pedestrian safety.
n) All functions should be reverted. They are more costly under regional government than a well run city.
o) Everything except planning and sewage treatment should be reverted.

p) Cost of police, water, and sewer has gone up 2, 3, 4 times without any improvement in service.

q) Water pumping stations should never have been taken over because of considerable cost increase.

r) St. Catharines seldom benefits from regional service, particularly with regard to cost.

s) Regional government has a tendency to do things big - a study of waste disposal systems at a cost of $60,000 gave little or no information to the municipalities they didn't already have.

t) Assessment is not regional, but in any event it should be reverted to the local municipality. Now takes 4-5 months for assessment to be done and records changed.

u) Certain works which are obviously not of a "Regional" nature should be reverted. All road maintenance should be done by local municipality if latter has necessary manpower. Region should be more involved in planning and coordinating various functions throughout the Peninsula rather than trying to do the actual detailed work such as sewer design etc. The Region should be assuming functions previously done by the Province not the area municipalities.

22) Planning has been referred to as the central thrust of
regional government. Do you consider that the degree of planning control being exercised by the Region over your municipality is (check one):

- Too much 40%
- Too little 7%
- Correct Amount 40%
- No Opinion 13%

Comments:

a) Our experience has been excellent with the staff and committee of the region on planning except that occasionally overall goal has been clouded by purely neighbourhood problems.

b) Planning advantages take time to become apparent.

c) Niagara Policy Plan is a good one and a guide to build on.

d) Planning control is area of greatest benefit to area municipalities.

e) Planning should be major task of regional government but too many political decisions are presently being made.

f) Planning is a mess because it is a real political foot- ball and the succession of planning directors have been real political animals instead of planners.

g) If there is a way to take the "politics" out of planning, it should be investigated. Political decisions are made in lieu of good sound planning principles.
h) Region has effectively stifled growth in St. Catherines by declaring unreasonable boundaries in their planning control. Because of politics and politicians, St. Catherines has been outraged on many issues - planning and growth is just the last in a long string. St. Catherines should have room in which to grow. Restrictions on housing development in St. Catherines will push up price for housing throughout entire region.

i) Main thrust of planning must be to preserve the prime fruitlands. Regional plan will do little in this respect - growth ethic still dominant and overriding all other considerations.

j) We were forced to have an Official Plan, but all growth has been stopped. We have 250 lots - can't build one house.

k) Region and province act as dictators to local municipalities.

l) Nothing left for us to decide and we have also the Escarpment Committee to contend with now.

m) Under new Policy Plan, region will have too much to say. Approvals for subdivisions fronting on regional roads now more time consuming.

n) Much duplication conflict, red tape, politically divided interests. (two responses)

o) Not enough input by public even though efforts have been made.

p) Too much planning; regulations and controls causes inflation in housing.
q) Planning control being exercised in wrong areas.
   Regional planners are trying to throttle planning
   at local levels, primarily the larger municipalities who have
   had their own adequate knowledgeable planners.

r) Don't seem to know where they are going - lack staff -
   'choking on red tape. Toronto says one thing,
   Escarpment Commission another, region something else,
   local council caught in the middle with local taxpayers
   giving you HELL.

s) City people don't understand rural planning.

t) Planning should be reverted to local municipality
   - large areas control rural area's policy.

u) Region extremely slow and cumbersome in planning.

v) Regional Planning Committee seem to want to become
   involved in details which should be left to local
   councils.

w) As Warden of the County of Lincoln in 1963 I formed
   a Planning Committee as I felt that the one problem
   in the county was lack of planning and if we didn't do
   something about it, the Province would. I still feel that
   planning was the main reason the Province instituted regional
   government.

x) Perhaps if Regional planning actually planned with
   an open mind it would be beneficial, however, it is
   obvious that unwritten but definite orders have been
   conveyed from Toronto.
   We must control development, but always keep in mind
   that we are planning for people - the people who make
up the community.

Another thrust which is a hardship in Niagara-on-the-Lake is:

Save the fruitland, save the escarpment, save the old character of Niagara-on-the-Lake (for the culture freaks). What has it done for us? Brought a lot of people and headaches - but here is the crux; Toronto and Ottawa have not contributed one dollar for its preservation while they have given over 1 1/2 million to the Shaw Festival plus low interest loans to provide tourist facilities. Not a cent has come to the municipality to help us carry the cost of fulfilling the demands they have put upon us through all the controls.

Works shall be the last function undertaken in Regional Government. The 'central thrust' as you call planning has in fact been the most neglected in Regional Niagara, resulting in all of our problems, both political and operational. We will agree that municipal restructuring is necessary and long overdue. I contend that government action to date has been ill-advised by theoretical technicians whose theories are great but because of inexperience in the field are unworkable.

Unfortunately, once regionalism is imposed, attempting to change it is virtually impossible.

In my opinion Regional government would best serve its citizens by emphasising planning in this manner:

- Once Regional boundaries have been established, amalgamate and reduce the number of local municipalities
logically (as opposed to politically).

- Make each one of these new local municipalities effective viable communities.

- As you have now reduced the number of small uneconomic communities into viable municipalities with the wherewithal to adequately serve its citizens, Region now turns itself to planning land use.

- As this proceeds and hard decisions are taken, it will become apparent what hard services should be assumed by the Region i.e. you plan for services, rather than assume services and then plan around them.

What we have presently in Niagara can best be described as a mess. A costly duplication in many areas. Poorly led administratively, inadequately represented (rural vs. urban), and so deeply entrenched the only way to move it in my opinion would be to start again.

2) Regional Niagara Planning Committee is now finalising the urban service area boundaries for the 12 local municipalities following close liaison and many public meetings. When completed, approved by the Minister, and related to decentralisation of some of the planning functions by the Province, improvements will take place.
Appendix 'B'

Ottawa-Carleton Region

Regional Government Questionnaire

Summary of Responses

N = 50

1) You (please check one):
   (i) Sit on a local council only  30
   (ii) Sit on both a local council
        and Regional council  20

2) The population of the municipality you represent is (check one):
   (i) Under 10,000  17
   (ii) 10,000-50,000  16
   (iii) 50,000-100,000  7
   (iv) 100,000+  10

3) In the municipality you represent (check one):
   (i) More than 50% of the population live in rural areas  11
   (ii) More than 50% of the population live in urban areas  39

4) A certain portion of the total street and road network in
   your region was assumed by the Region when the latter was
   created. Do you think that (check one):
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(i) Too many roads were assumed by the Region? \textit{10\%}  
(ii) Too few roads were assumed by the Region? \textit{28\%}  
(iii) Correct road mileage was assumed by the Region? \textit{46\%}  
(iv) No opinion \textit{16\%} 

Comments:

a) At inception of Region only main roads should be assumed and others, if any, should fall in only after an Official Plan is considered.

b) Region assumed too many roads originally - transfers now taking place to and from Region.

c) Even if it had been half of one road it would have been too much.

d) Assumption of roads by the Region should be continuous.

e) The ratio of the road mileage assumed in the local municipality to the total Regional road mileage should be the same as the ratio of the equalized assessment of the local municipality to that of the entire Region.

f) Rural municipalities cannot build or maintain arterial roads. (two responses)

g) Major arteries should be given more priority.

5) Some of the Regional roads and streets in your region are maintained by the local municipality in which they are located and the cost charged back to the Region. Do you think the Region should take over maintenance responsibility for all Regional roads and streets?
Comments:

a) Cooperation between regional roads departments amicable and constructive.

b) Present system working well in Ottawa. Any other arrangement would cause duplication of personnel and very serious problem of coordination in winter maintenance. Cooperation effects economies.

c) Makes good sense for staffs to complement each other. Bigness on logical grounds not always best - familiarity with local problems and ability to respond quickly are far more important and possible for a smaller organisation.

d) Present chargeback of road maintenance best under two-tier system.

e) Small municipalities do not have men or equipment to do any more than their own roads. Overhead and rentals charged by municipality would add to actual cost if maintenance carried out by them.

f) Region should not be in maintenance business at all with the exception of a rural unit to accommodate those rural municipalities that may desire the region to provide service. Region should be responsible for determining road standards priorities and reconstruction. Makes little sense to have two maintenance organisations operating in the same area.
g) Regional road department much more inefficient than local municipality and cost might be prohibitive. Regional system is overstaffed and perhaps under-equipped. Local municipality can do better road maintenance at lower cost.

h) Local roads are very clearly a local responsibility which requires greater sensitivity to wishes of local residents and should not be assumed by Region.

i) Local priorities are not always regional ones. Urban areas present different problems to those of rural areas.

6) All of the water supply and distribution facilities in your Region are operated by the Region. Do you think that the local distribution system should be operated by the local municipality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a) Regional system working very well - no problems. Most people happy with the water service.

b) Capital costs too high for local takeover of water. Integrated system is mandatory. (two responses)

c) Too costly for local municipality to look after.

d) Region should limit its jurisdiction to planning, trunk construction, and trunk maintenance. Local water mains construction and maintenance, hydrant service, and
water billing should be local. Region should sell bulk water to municipalities.

7) The sewage treatment plants and trunk sanitary sewers in your region are operated by the Region and the local sanitary sewers by the local municipalities. Do you think that the local sewers should be operated by the Region?

Yes 42%
No 46%
No Opinion 12%

Comments:

a) Presently confusing duplication of functions.
b) Foolish to have duplication of engineering, maintenance and operating overheads. Should be similar to water i.e. entire function by Region.
c) Local response is of paramount importance. Local standards stricter than those of regions and maintenance much better. To go regional would be more costly and certainly not as efficient.

8) Services such as police and fire protection, parks and recreation, public housing, solid waste disposal, traffic engineering, transportation, and hospital financing were originally left with the local municipalities. However, the last three have been taken over by the Region in the intervening period. Do you expect that further services will be taken over by the Region?
Yes 84%
No 10%
No Opinion 6%

Comments: (number refers to times function mentioned by respondents)

a) Solid Waste Disposal - 9
b) Police - 8
c) Public Housing - 6
d) Fire Protection - 3
e) Parks and Recreation - 1
f) Regional governments that assume too much will become large unresponsive bureaucracies.
g) Region should not involve itself in municipalities as much as it has. Local councils can still give good service.
h) Very much opposed to further takeover. Region should coordinate services - not take them over.
i) No need for regional police or fire (already have efficient volunteer fire services).
j) Truly regional services should be under region. Rural areas that do not need high quality service should not have it forced on them i.e. fire protection.
k) All services - except parks and recreation, should be assumed by the Region.

9) Would you prefer that further services be taken over by the Region?

Yes 56%
No 40%
10) If you answered 'yes' to the preceding question, please list below the services you would prefer taken over and why:

Comments:

a) Police - 13
b) Fire Protection - 11
c) Solid Waste Disposal - 9
d) Public Housing - 8
e) Recreation - 2
f) Planning (all) - 1
g) Land Severances (all) - 1
h) By-law Enforcement - 1
i) Public Transportation Planning - 1
j) Traffic - 1
k) All functions (i.e. one tier government) - 3

l) Services which meet the following criteria should be taken over by the Region:

i) Substantial economies of scale or improvement in planning or operating effectiveness where a large area is involved.

ii) Those types of services which can be carried out on a highly standardized basis without having to respond to substantial differences in needs as perceived by separate communities (i.e. nobody cares where his garbage goes, as long as it goes - but each small community is
likely to see its recreation needs differently),
m) Takeover would reduce duplication of administration
   and provide uniform service.
n) Regional area is going in debt at such a rate that
   all services will soon be taken over by the region
   - which would then be one tier government. Rural
   areas in latter would be exempt from certain charges.
o) Takeover of police and fire would centralise adminis-
   trative costs and afford greater protection. Regional
   police would be closer to Provincial jurisdiction.

11) The number of municipalities in your region was recently
    reduced from 16 to 11. Would you like to see a further
    reduction?

    Yes   44%  
    No   50%
    No Opinion   6%

Comments:
a) Reduction of number of municipalities would reduce
   local input which is necessary for good government.
   Big municipalities would have little local input.
b) The larger the area the poorer and less efficient
   the service.
c) Population increasing too fast for any further,
   reduction.
d) Further amalgamation would give less representation
   to rural municipalities and increase the existing
degree of dominance by urban areas.

e) Existing number of municipalities gives greater
   diversity of opinion.

f) Regional government is urban in nature and rural
   municipalities cannot obtain fair representation
   and should be allowed to secede.

g) Rockcliffe Park and Vanier should be amalgamated
   with Ottawa. (three responses)
h) Reduce to five with more equality and vitality.
   Ottawa dominance is unhealthy.
i) Reduction should only take place if necessary to
   avoid one tier government. Residual problem is that
   Ottawa retains voting power.

j) Reorganisation of urbanising communities required
   but nothing major. Suggest repartitioning of
   Ottawa to avoid dominance of one municipality.
k) Redistribution but not necessarily reduction.
   Growth nodes desirable.

l) Region should first be reduced in size and then
   restructured into one tier or two tiers with 3 or
   4 area municipalities.

m) Enlarge area and form ten municipalities, five urban
   and five rural.

n) Present system is ridiculous. Region should be
   divided into seven equal sized (by population)
   boroughs on geographic and ethnic grounds and
   start all over. We are still fighting our local
   independent municipal battles.
o) Complete reorganisation of boroughs is necessary based on present boundaries by population and geography.

p) Amalgamate all municipalities inside a greenbelt so as to form rural and urban areas.

q) Eastern municipalities could amalgamate.

r) Complete amalgamation.

12) Regional government has been in effect in your region for over five years. If you were now offered a choice as to which form of government you would prefer, which of the following would you choose? (check one):

(i) Present form (i.e. two tier) 40%

(ii) All one tier (i.e. complete amalgamation of entire region) 24%

(iii) Existing city separated from one-tier county 10%

(iv) Original pre-region form (i.e. city separated from two-tier county) 12%

(v) Other (please specify) 10%

(vi) No Opinion 4%

Comments:

a) One tier would be better for all concerned.

b) One tier with ward system and representation by population would be desirable. Regional chairman should be elected at large. Presently duplication of staff,
c) Two tier does not work for betterment of citizens.
d) Two tier preferred but more equitable boundaries and smaller local municipalities.
e) One tier would be too impersonal and unresponsive - possibly inefficient.
f) Region should have planning but not operating function.
g) Murray Jones recommendations preferred.
h) Fullerton Report should be studied before making any changes.
i) Creation of federal district preferred (two responses).
j) Regional government is redundant and has abused its authority by depriving the municipality of its autonomy.
k) Regional government is one level of government that in my mind serves no useful purpose.
l) Under regional government smaller municipalities end up subsidizing a lot of services they have no access to. In pre-region times, no such subsidy occurred.
m) Regional government would not be needed if Province assumed all sewer and water services.
n) Core area should have strong say in what is happening on its immediate periphery.

13) It has been said that the Province has not transferred enough functions and powers from itself to the Regions.
Would you agree?

Yes 62%
No 24%
No Opinion 14%

14) If you answered 'yes' to the preceding question, what functions and powers would you like to see transferred from the Province to the Regions and why?

Comments: (number refers to times function mentioned by respondents)

a) Planning - 12
b) Ontario Municipal Board
   individual project approvals - 10
c) Subdivision and Rezoning approvals - 8
d) Assessment - 3
e) Traffic Sign Controls - 2
f) Housing - 1
g) Social Services - 1
h) Province should set grant policy and leave details to be worked out locally.
i) Problem not so much Provincial as the way powers are exercised. Too much trivial interference or supervision over purely local matters. Detailed powers of supervision should be transferred or simply dropped.
j) General loosening of apron strings required.
k) Provincial approval cycle too long and authority
too remote.
1) Assessment so confused now that it should be
   turned over to the Region.
m) If all commercial and industrial assessment were
   regional, better planning would be possible.
n) Present transfer of powers sufficient.
o) Region requires time to mature, to develop regional
   rather than parochial perspective.

15) It has been said that introduction of regional government
    causes a "levelling-up" i.e. regional services such as
    roads, water, and sewers, instead of being averaged, are
    all brought up to the level that prevailed in the
    municipality with the highest standard before regionalization.
    Do you think this has generally happened in your region?

    Yes  62%
    No   26%
    No Opinion  12%

Comments:
   a) Question ambiguous - 'yes' if regional government
      services - 'no' if local services. Norms different
      between urban and rural - what would urban areas
      do with a warble fly programme?
   b) Rural services as good as old County system.
   c) Levelling up process has not occurred across entire region.
   d) Provincial grants have caused levelling-up process.
16) Do you consider that regional government in your region is now more acceptable to the public than when it was first introduced?

Yes 62%
No 28%
No Opinion 10%

Comments:

a) Only marginally more acceptable. People still don't understand the divided jurisdictions. They identify with local municipality and direct their enquiries there.

b) Only marginally more acceptable. Old habits - and politicians - die hard. Until all old boundaries disappear internecine strife will continue.

c) Is more acceptable, but people have a great deal of trouble identifying regional responsibilities and local responsibilities. Another level of government to deal with.

d) Accepted, but not liked or understood.

e) Acceptable in the sense of tolerated or not objected to. Regional government is not a focus for identity like a township or city and accordingly attracts limited public interest.

f) Time is a great healer. (two responses)

g) Regional government certainly not more acceptable to me.

h) Local Councils do not accept Region.
i) Large and unresponsive - alienates public.
j) Not really understood by average taxpayer.
k) Resentment has been building up - how can Province be so insensitive to wishes of the people?
l) Taxes have skyrocketed - regional government unreachable by ordinary citizen.
m) Operating costs of Region extremely high and benefits not that noticeable in rural areas - creates a poor image of regional government.
n) The cost of operating was to level off after 3 to 4 years of operations but I can't see any savings (real) after 5 years.
o) Region has been fortunate in having very good department heads and has done very good work but it is not efficient.
p) Most regional publicity deals with problems confronting it. Achievements have not been communicated to public hence one-sided view.
q) Public generally sees regional government as a hindrance to local decisions.

17) Do you feel that the public in your municipality have their complaints and/or service requests responded to (check one):

(i) More quickly under regional government than prior to its establishment? 8%
(ii) Less quickly? 40%
(iii) About the same? 40%
(iv) No Opinion 12%
Comments:

a) Response depends on regional (council) representative.

b) More quickly as far as former County Council functions are concerned - less so for former functions of lower tier.

c) A big machine takes longer to move.

d) Size alone is the reason for slower response.

e) Larger area takes longer to cover.

f) Most complaints go to the local municipality and are then referred to Region.

g) Very difficult to get through to them.

h) Administrative nightmare. Decision making slow and frustrating.

i) Confusion as to which jurisdiction applies is a constant dilemma.

18) Do you think that, compared to the pre-regional form of government, regional government is (check one):

(i) More easily understood by the public? 6%

(ii) Less easily understood? 62%

(iii) About the same? 20%

(iv) No opinion 12%

Comments:

a) People that wish to take the time to understand will find out no matter what type of government you have.

b) Electorate are well informed in Region.
c) Too much politics being made around this question - larger municipalities would rather annex than be part of Region.
d) Not enough public relations by Region. Some people don't understand who does what, where, or when.
e) A good explanatory program has never been done - people are still confused.
f) Regional government is urban dominated and does not seem to keep itself informed about rural problems.
g) Region is identified with City.
h) County Council system was never really understood at all. Regional government is even larger and more complex.
i) Regional government is more confusing. Average citizen does not know who looks after what.
j) In the case of Ottawa-Carleton Regional government almost no real identity has been established. They expect their local municipality and councillors to look after all their problems.

19) In very general terms, do you feel that your municipality is receiving its fair share of regional expenditures?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a) Fair, except for transportation. Road expenditures
inequitable to some municipalities.
b) Receiving fair share, but greater overall cost to
taxpayer when provincial expenditures taken into
account.
c) Local municipalities probably come off fairly
well on the deal.
d) Cost sharing unfair to rural municipalities.
e) Road and sewage disposal expenditures low.
f) Lack of sewer and water prevents development.
g) Every municipality fending for itself.
h) Competition by each area municipality for disproportionate
share of expenditures.

20) Do you feel that one or more of the functions carried out
by the Region should revert to the area municipalities?

Yes 26%
No 58%
No Opinion 16%

21) If you answered 'yes' to the preceding question, list
below the functions you consider should be reverted and
why:

Comments: (number refers to times function mentioned by
respondents)
a) Day Nurseries - 6
b) Social Welfare - 3
c) Road Maintenance - 2
d) Land Division Committee - 2

e) Health Services (but under regional policies) - 1

f) Rural planning should be reverted. The agricultural sector of rural living is not adequately covered by people familiar with farming.

g) Services (except day care and nursery) better done by local municipality - rest are coming up to standard at terrific cost. This whole system is ineptly conceived and operated.

h) All functions which were once local should be reverted.

i) Present balance acceptable except for Regional Tourist Bureau.

22) Planning has been referred to as the central thrust of regional government. Do you consider that the degree of planning control being exercised by the Region over your municipality is (check one):

- Too much 36%
- Too Little 6%
- Correct Amount 38%
- No Opinion 20%

Comments:

a) Very happy with regional planning.

b) As long as all parties receive adequate representation, the amount of planning is correct.

c) Regional planning now reasonable - originally restrictive.
d) Good cooperation from Region, but slow response.

e) Regional planning policies only now beginning to become effective.

f) Region has caused delays in growth. Changes in planning process extremely slow.

g) Region should show more flexibility to individual needs of local municipalities. Residential municipalities require industrial assessment. Blanket planning policy cannot be adhered to for the entire region.

h) Regional planners do not know local areas well enough and should not be second guessing every little detail. Regional Official Plan should not usurp local functions.

i) Rural planning delayed by all levels of government. Developers and land owners frustrated.

j) Communication gap between local and regional planners.

k) Planning is the key. Local Official Plans are suffering due to lack of communications with such a great population which differ on needs.

l) Very poor planning at both local and regional level. Fault of politician who knows nothing about planning rather than fault of planner.

m) Regional planning is one helluva constraint. Cannot plan or zone until Regional Plan adopted - meanwhile local municipality must mark time.

n) Ideally, one tier government with total planning control could make for a better region. At the
moment I see each representative fighting to protect their own political base.

o) Planning is a mockery if everybody is competing for industrial assessment and planning is local only to everyone's detriment.

p) Extensive areas zoned mineral deposit without adequate testing to determine quantity or quality.

23) A common fear expressed when regional governments are formed is that the largest municipality will dominate. Do you feel that Ottawa (which has a majority on regional council) dominates the decision-making activities of regional council?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a) I have the opinion that "domination" occurs more in rhetoric than in fact. A city caucus had carried a few issues, but it is not a consistently cohesive group and alliances in the regional government cut across municipal boundaries.

b) On the contrary, there is more evidence of domination by other municipalities acting together - but has not been a problem.

c) Bloc voting almost non-existent.

d) It is common place opinion - fostered by some
'politicians' that this is the case. In fact, statistics do not bear this out and the contrary condition exists. The smaller more rural municipalities are gravely influencing Ottawa’s decision making power.

e) Does not dominate in day-to-day matters, but always a latent threat on gut issues.

f) Ottawa dominates indirectly, if not directly, in that everyone knows Ottawa can muster a vote for self-interest at any time.

g) Fear is that Ottawa will dominate on major issues. Evidence of this in earliest years - but greater objectivity on all sides recently. So far so good, but concern lingers. We will see how Official Plan is supported. No one municipality should have capability to dominate.

h) Ottawa has rarely voted in bloc and has been very considerate on some issues. However, they do dominate the committees and many key appointments. Also they achieve a great deal by intimidation.

i) Ottawa controls the Executive Committee (where the real power is).

j) Ottawa generally has not dominated. Councillors have endeavoured to think regionally. Ottawa members may have dominated - but not selfishly except on one occasion (bridge over canal).

k) Blocs do occur, but there are always those who vote fair and reasonable.

l) Ottawa votes as a bloc to distribute costs to other municipalities.
m) Urban people dominate and do not understand rural problems.

n) No two tier system should be dominated by one municipality - causes a lack of public acceptance.

o) Elected rural representatives must stand up and be counted.

p) Mechanics rather than concepts responsible for imbalance of voting power.

q) Large meaningful projects are stalled by Ottawa's reluctance to let go.

r) Ottawa trying hard to dominate others but their position is not the best with their past performances and in Ottawa it is a different situation with the N.C.C. and the Federal Government - Thank God.

s) One tier preferable because Ottawa dominates two tier. Councillors should be elected directly, cannot wear two hats.
Appendix 'C'

Niagara Region Data

A) Summary of Main Recommendations of Mayo Report

"We recommend:

(1) A two tier system of local government for the Region comprising a regional municipality to be called the Municipality of Metropolitan Niagara, and 12 member municipalities, four of which would be cities and eight would be boroughs.

(2) That the composition of the Metropolitan Niagara Council be:

a) the mayor and each city and borough council -- 12

b) a metropolitan member elected at large from each city and borough ---- 12

c) an additional metropolitan member elected at large from each city and borough for each 20,000 of population ------ 11

Total ---------------------------------- 35

(3) That the term of office for all councillors on the Metropolitan and local councils be three years.

(4) That the chairman of the Metropolitan Council be selected for a three year term by the councillors from among their own members who are directly elected.

(5) The selection by the Metropolitan Niagara Council, from
among its directly elected members, of an Executive Committee of, say, four members.

(6) That the councils of the existing municipalities which are to be consolidated, set up joint committees to decide such matters as the size of council and the ward system.

(7) That the members of each city and borough council select their mayor from among their own members.

(8) That the members of each city and borough council select an Executive Committee from among its own members.

(9) That the functions of the Metropolitan Council be those which are best performed on a regional basis, as detailed in Chapter 12 of this Report.

(10) That the city and borough councils continue to perform a substantial number of functions, as detailed in Chapter 12 of this Report.

(11) That a two tier school system be established for the Region similar to that established under Part VII of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act, 1966.

(12) That, under this school system, a Metropolitan Niagara School Board be set up as a co-ordinating body for the Region with nine city or borough boards of education.

(13) That the composition of the Metropolitan Niagara School Board be:
   
a) the chairman of each board of education in the Region, "ex officio"

b) two members of and appointed by the Board of Education of the City of St. Catharines
c) two members of and appointed by the Board of Education of the City of Niagara Falls - - - - - 2
d) one member of and appointed by the Board of Education of the City of Welland - - - - - - -1
e) two members of and appointed by the Metropolitan Niagara Council - - - - - - - - - - - - - 2
f) three members of and appointed by the Separate School authorities - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 3
Total - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 19

(14) That the term of office for all school trustees be three years.

(15) That the Metropolitan Niagara School Board, at its first meeting each year, select a chairman from among its members to hold office for that year.

(16) That the Metropolitan Niagara School Board approve the capital and current budgets of boards of education.

(17) That the division of responsibilities between the Metropolitan School Board and the boards of education be as set out in Chapter 13 of this Report.

(18) That the Metropolitan Council and the city and borough councils set up "service areas" so that only those areas receiving certain physical services will be taxed for them.

(19) That the Metropolitan Council issue all debentures for all municipalities, school boards, and other local special purpose bodies in the Region.

(20) That the Metropolitan municipality assume all school debt outstanding on the date the municipality commences
operations, and assumes all outstanding municipal debt in respect of any assets transferred to it.

(21) That the Region should not suffer a reduction in municipal and school grants, because of the re-organization of its municipal and school system.

B) **Distribution of Representation on Regional Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>4 - Mayor + 3 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Colborne</td>
<td>2 - Mayor + 1 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines</td>
<td>6 - Mayor + 5 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>3 - Mayor + 2 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Erie</td>
<td>2 - Mayor + 1 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>2 - Mayor + 1 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>2 - Mayor + 1 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara-on-the-Lake</td>
<td>2 - Mayor + 1 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>1 - Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorold</td>
<td>2 - Mayor + 1 directly elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wainfleet</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lincoln</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) **Local Councils**

Range in size from 13 in Welland to 5 in Wainfleet. Both ward and at-large system used. Two year term coincident with regional council term.

D) **Distribution of Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Upper Tier</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lower Tier</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
<td>Local Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Plants and Trunk Mains</td>
<td>Local Watermains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Local Watermains</td>
<td>Local Sanitary Sewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Plants and Trunk Sanitary</td>
<td>Storm Sewers and Watercourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Local Sanitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Roads</td>
<td>Local Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Engineering</td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Homes</td>
<td>Licencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Nurseries</td>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>Solid Waste - Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>and Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Tax Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Measures</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation and Community Centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E) Criteria for Upper-Tier Roads

"Upper-tier roads should, by the shortest practicable route along existing roads or streets, do one or more of the following:

1) Connect urban centres of more than 150 persons in 500 acres or less, to each other and to the King's Highway unless such a service is now provided by the King's Highway.

2) Connect the King's Highway to:
   a) The King's Highway, and
   b) crossings of the Provincial boundary, and
   c) major commercial and industrial areas, and
   d) major institutional complexes such as universities, hospitals etc.

3) Provide service close to consistent major attractors or generators of heavy vehicles such as refineries, steel plants, mines, quarries, commercial gravel pits and sawmills in continuous operation, etc.

4) Provide service parallel to and, where justified, on crossings of major barriers to free traffic movement.

5) Provide service close to major resort and recreational areas.

6) Connect upper-tier roads to:
   a) the King's Highway or its connections under 2 above, and
   b) crossings of the Provincial boundary, and
   c) major commercial and industrial areas, and
   d) major institutional complexes such as universities, hospitals etc.
7) Provide service in urban areas within the cells formed by the King's Highway and its connecting links and the streets selected by the above criteria, provided that the traffic demand existing on the street considered is predominately for through movement as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Density Within Cell</th>
<th>Additional Service Required When Spacing of Roads is Greater Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 15 persons per acre</td>
<td>6,600 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 15 and 50 persons per</td>
<td>4,000 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 50 persons per acre</td>
<td>3,000 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Provide service on those roads which are extensions of streets selected by the above criteria in urban areas, to the first intersection where the annual average daily traffic is below 400 v.p.d., then connect either to an upper-tier road, or to the King's Highway by the shortest route.

9) Provide service in rural areas within the cells formed by the King's Highway and the roads selected by the above criteria as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Density Within Cell</th>
<th>Additional Service Required When Spacing of Roads is Greater Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 2 persons per sq. mile</td>
<td>no additional service required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Maximum Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 persons per sq. mile</td>
<td>16 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 2 and 10 persons</td>
<td>12 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per sq. mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 10 and 20 persons</td>
<td>9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per sq. mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 20 and 40 persons</td>
<td>6 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per sq. mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 40 persons per sq. mile</td>
<td>4 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 'D'

Ottawa-Carleton Region Data

A) Distribution of Functions

**Upper Tier**
- Regional Planning
- Water Treatment & Distribution
- Sewage Plants & Trunk Sanitary Sewers
- Approval of Design & Construction of Local Sanitary Sewers
- Arterial Roads
- Traffic Engineering
- Health
- Public Transportation
- Solid Waste Disposal
- Welfare
- Senior Citizen Homes
- Day Nurseries
- Hospital Financing
- Borrowing
- Emergency Measures

**Lower Tier**
- Local Planning
- Local Sanitary Sewers
- Storm Sewers & Watercourses
- Local Roads
- Sidewalks
- Ambulance Service
- Licencing
- Solid Waste Collection
- Tax Collection
- Parks
- Recreation & Community Centres
- Fire Protection
- Police
B) Distribution of Representation on Regional Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>16 (Entire Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>2 (Mayor + 1 Alderman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockcliffe Park</td>
<td>1 ( Reeve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townships</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>1 ( Reeve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>2 ( Reeve &amp; Deputy Reeve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulbourn</td>
<td>1 ( Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1 ( Reeve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean</td>
<td>3 ( Reeve, Deputy Reeve + 1 Councillor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgoode</td>
<td>1 ( Reeve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideau</td>
<td>1 ( Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Carleton</td>
<td>1 ( Mayor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) Local Councils

Range in size from 16 to 5. Both ward and at-large system used.
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