

CHAPTER 2. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH AND SUBMISSIONS

(A) Research Findings

The following summary has been prepared from the "Report on Research Findings" published earlier. For a detailed account of each point mentioned in the summary reference should be made to that report.

The Review area comprises 1,060 square miles of the Ottawa valley, at the juncture of the Ottawa, Rideau and Gatineau Rivers. The land is relatively flat, has generally fair drainage, and nearly 60% of the soil is suitable for agriculture. Less than 5% of the area is presently devoted to urban uses. Its location made the area important for fur and timber trades and helped determine its selection as the National Capital.

Employment in the area totals 147,000 with the Federal Government accounting for over a third. Less than 7% of the jobs are located outside the urban municipalities of Ottawa, Eastview and Rockcliffe Park, compared to 15% of the labour force. The employed labour force increased by almost two-fifths in the 1951-61 period, and employment is expected to reach 200,000 by 1976 and nearly 250,000 by 1986.

Since 1956, the population of the Review area has grown at a faster rate than any other major centre in Ontario, reaching 384,000 in 1963; 46% of the growth has been due to net immigration from other parts of Canada and abroad. The suburban municipalities of Nepean and Gloucester accounted for 25% of the area's growth in the 1951-61 period, and for 50% since 1961. Over 10% of the people now live beyond the National Capital Commission's Greenbelt, but less than 3% of the jobs are found there.

Average family income in the area is higher than that of any Census Metropolitan Area in Canada, reflecting proportionally fewer poor families and more with upper incomes. Almost one family in four has an income under \$4,000, however, and such families represent a significant proportion of total families in each of the area's municipalities.

Future population is expected to reach 530,000 by 1976 and 670,000 by 1986. By the latter year, it has been estimated that almost 30% of the population will be located beyond the greenbelt, compared to only 5% of the area's employment.

There are 17 local governments in the Review area with a total of 104 council members in the cities, villages and townships and 19 seats on Carleton County Council. The ratio of population per council members ranges from about 150:1 to over 11,000:1 in the area municipalities. Varying use is made of council committees which total 54, with 268 committee positions.

Local boards and commissions are extensively used. Exclusive of school boards, these number 80, with a combined membership of 519 and total staffs under their direct jurisdiction of 3,752. This may be compared to 3,973 school board employees and only 2,401 on municipal staffs directly under council jurisdiction. The combined local staff total of 10,126 represents nearly 7% of all employment in the Review area.

The impressive number of school board employees reflects a dramatic 132% increase in the area's total school enrolment from about 40,000 in 1951 to over 93,000 in 1963. School age population has grown significantly faster than the other age groups, and the proportion of these children attending school has also increased sharply. Aging of the present pre-school and younger school-age groups in the Review area will produce further increases of 13% in the 5-14 group and 20% in the 15-19 group by 1968. Immigration and still higher attendance be expected to add their impact on enrolment.

Recent improvements in Provincial legalization and school grants will assist the municipalities in providing the necessary schools and teachers, but present deficiencies in the Review area's school system leave no doubt that heavy municipal expenditures on education will be required for many years. Gross per pupil expenditures on elementary

education range from \$170 to \$439, evidence of a wildly divergent standard of education throughout the area. In general, the suburban and outer municipalities are spending more than \$1,000 of assessment on education, but receiving a lower standard of educational service than the urban municipalities.

Welfare needs in the Review area are presently concentrated in Ottawa, Eastview and Gloucester. Only Ottawa, Carleton County, the Ottawa-Carleton Children's Aid Society, and to a lesser extent Eastview, have developed welfare staffs of any magnitude. The Ottawa welfare programme is evidently the only one which goes significantly beyond the mandatory requirements under Provincial legislation.

Health services are provided by the Ottawa Board of Health, Eastview Board of Health, Carleton County Health Unit, and Prescott and Russell County Health Unit, and their attendant staffs. Only Ottawa, and to a lesser extent Eastview, have programmed extending much beyond the essentially preventative health services, but the recently-formed Carleton Health Unit is providing more clinics than the recommended standard and more Public Health Nurses than the Provincial average. Hospital needs in the area have recently been the subject of a thorough study by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. Municipal involvement in the provisions of hospital facilities here is more direct and extensive than in most other centres due to Ottawa's role in providing the Ottawa Civic and Riverside Hospitals.

The history of planning in the Review area is a long one, involving the federal, and more recently, local governments. Although there is a joint Ottawa Planning Area Board plus six other boards, and most of the area is now under subdivision, zoning and building control, it cannot be said that effective regional planning control has been achieved. The prospect of extensive urban development beyond the greenbelt make this a particularly urgent need.

Planned provision of water and sewer facilities to the inner limit of the greenbelt is well under way, but critical decisions with regard to these services beyond the greenbelt are pending. Waste removal, hydro-electric power distributions, air pollution control and street cleaning and lighting do not appear to pose such critical problems, although some are of metropolitan significance.

Provision of roads in the Review area involves the provincial, federal, city, county, village and township governments. Sharp contrasts in quality are evident between some of the respective road systems in the area. Coordination of planning, financing and programming all future road works will be required if past disparities are to be overcome and a balanced road network created.

Public transportation is provided only by the Ottawa Transportation Commission. Growth beyond the city indicates an increasing need for an extended system, which may require permanent relief from some of its costs if it is to provide adequate service at reasonable fares.

Continuous coordination of roads, public transportation, traffic engineering and public parking will be required for an efficient total transportation system.

Provision of municipally sponsored housing for low-income families has been undertaken only by the City of Ottawa. The distribution of such families throughout the area suggests that some of the other municipalities with a considerable need for housing may feel unable to afford it, and that the amount being provided falls considerably short of the area's total requirements.

Ottawa is also the only municipality providing extensive park, recreation and library facilities. Their use by residents of other municipalities indicates an area-wide concern for certain types of these facilities.

Police protection in the Review area is provided by six municipal police departments, the Ontario Provincial Police and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Four municipal fire departments with full-time paid staffs, and numerous volunteer fire brigades provide fire protection. There are many inter-municipal fire agreements and a County Mutual Aid agreement is in effect for Carleton County. Police cooperation appears excellent without formal agreements.

Carleton County, Ottawa, Eastview, and Prescott and Russell County are involved along with the Provincial and Federal governments in the administration of justice in the area. Facilities generally appear adequate at the present time with the exception of Carleton County Jail, which is obsolete, Magistrate's Court space in the City of Ottawa, which, though excellent, is apparently becoming insufficient to handle the growing number of cases, and the Magistrate's Court at Rockland, which is inconveniently located for residents of western Cumberland.

Of the remaining municipal functions which include administrative services (such as finance, assessment, clerks, legal, audit, personnel, property, purchasing and equipment maintenance) and miscellaneous services (such as industrial and tourist promotion), finance and assessment are probably the greatest area-wide significance. Competent financial programming and equitable assessment will be essential if municipal resources are to be used most effectively in meeting the area's needs.

In the present allocation of these resources, education, protection and debt charges account for the predominant share of expenditure. There is wide variation among the area municipalities in both the gross expenditures on various services, and in the net financial burdens carried. This is largely a reflection of significant differences in revenue-yielding assessment. Grants in lieu of taxes on exempt federal properties materially assist Ottawa, Gloucester and Nepean but do not eliminate these differences.

Present deficiencies and anticipated future developments leave no doubt that municipal expenditures will continue to increase significantly. Available projections of capital requirements, assessment, employment and population suggest that present inequalities in the financial capacity of the various municipalities may be expected to continue.

The above findings taken together would seem to imply a need for more effective planning and control over development and service extensions, particularly beyond the greenbelt; for less inequality throughout the area in the provision of services, and in the burden of taxation; for more equitable ratios of population per elected representative; and for more effective and continuous machinery for coordinating federal, provincial and local government activities in the area.

(B) Analysis of Submissions

This analysis is necessarily limited to the essential nature of the submission in relation to the fundamental purpose of the Review. Most of the submission made additional recommendations which are not discussed here. Reference should be made to the "Summary of Submissions", published earlier, for a more comprehensive account.

The 56 submissions received during the first set of public hearings, as modified and augmented by the eight received during the second set of hearings, fall into two main categories: those suggesting change, and those suggesting preservation of the status quo.

Only a minority of the submissions - 8 out of 56, or one in seven - favoured retaining the status quo, i.e. making no significant changes to either the present local governments or their functions. They were received from:

Crystal Beach Community Association

Bell's Corners Property Owners Association

Mr. D.O. Campfield

Parkwood Hills Community Association

Nepean Hydro Commission

Nepean Public School Board

Township of Marlborough

and Township of March

It is notable that six of these are from organizations or residents of Nepean Township and that one of them in turn - the brief of Mr. D.O. Campfield - was endorsed by eleven other Nepean property owners' associations which did not make individual submissions. This certainly suggests a high degree of satisfaction with the present government of Nepean (though the brief from the Township itself favoured some functional changes) and indeed the only change these six submissions suggested as necessary was to increase the number of elected representatives so as to better enable them to bear their heavy workload. Two of these submissions also suggested paying the Reeve or all members of the Council more. Beyond these changes, only Mr. Campfield and the Nepean Hydro Commission suggests a need for more effective inter-governmental coordination; their proposed machinery for this however would depend entirely on voluntary cooperation of present local government units for its effectiveness and would not entail any essential change in present governmental structure or functions.

Similarly, the Township of Marlborough submission, while indicating support for a County Planning Board along with continuation of the present Township Board, did not suggest that any Township sovereignty need be given up to the County, because what is good for one is good for the other.

The Township of March in its brief suggested regional control over certain public utilities such as sewers, water and fire protection, but at the hearing this suggestion was withdrawn because of promising progress in sewer negotiation with the Ontario Water Resources Commission. This left March generally in support of the present structure and functions of local government, with the following exceptions:

a Provincial levy should replace township school levies;

the township would like to establish its own Planning Board, and would also support a County Planning Agency but only so long as it does not attempt to prevent future development in March.

Of the remaining 48 submissions, three neither opposed nor proposed any changes in the structure or functions of local government;

William Teron Ltd.

Nepean Township Hospital Committee

Messrs. D.C. MacPhail, O. Fisher, and Mrs. F.T. Graves

The first two of these were concerned with their specific interests, i.e. the March Ridge development and the need for a hospital to serve Nepean, while the last group was deeply concerned over the duplication of authority between the National Capital Commission and the area municipalities in the field of planning, urging the limits of federal authority in the municipal field be clearly defined.

The remaining submissions - 45, or 8 out of 10 - all proposed some significant change in either the structure or functions of municipal government, or both. These ranged all the way from proposals from a relatively minor shift of some responsibilities - from the township to the county level - to recommendations for the creation of a federal territory or eleventh province in the National Capital area. They fall into the following six categories:

recommending creation of a federal territory -	1
recommending creation of an eleventh province -	1
recommending change in a specific field of municipal service -	8
submissions from the Cumberland area, recommending its alignment with Ottawa-Carleton -	9
recommending retention of the present structure of local municipalities, but the transfer of certain functions -	10
recommending some form of metropolitan or regional government or agency -	16
	--
	45

Only one submission was received recommending the formation of a federal territory - from John H. McDonald, Q.C. On the other hand, several of the other briefs indicated strong opposition to a federal district, usually on the grounds that it would be the antithesis of democratic self-government. It is also significant that Mr. McDonald's brief was the only one urging a completely unified government for the region; all other proposals for a new form of government were based on a two level system comprising a regional government plus local municipalities or districts.

The proposal for creation of an eleventh province covering the national capital region was made during the second set of hearings by the Greenbelt Property Owners' Association. This submission proposed a revised system of local municipalities within the new province; it was also opposed to a federal district, suggesting that provincial status is required to effectively represent and safeguard local interests against federal authority.

Of the eight submissions recommending a change in a specific field of municipal service, four dealt with education, two with hospitals, one with public transportation and one with licensing.

The Ottawa Collegiate Institute Board recommended retention of an appointed board for secondary education, and suggested that the type of agreement in effect with Gloucester and Nepean could be extended if necessary under any forthcoming changes in local government. The Ottawa Public School Board recommended that public education within the outer limits of the greenbelt be brought under its jurisdiction, with extension to substantial areas of development beyond the greenbelt if necessary. Although a Board of Education was ultimately inevitable, the Board did not see it as offering any special benefit, and felt it should not be imposed until the larger area has been brought under one administration. The Ottawa Separate School Board stated the until separate education was given financial resources more equal to those of the public school system, Separate School Boards could not benefit from amalgamation.

Once this was achieved however, some sort of area consolidation for separate schools would deserve consideration. The brief of Mr. A.L. Dubé recommended that the Ottawa Collegiate Institute Board be elected rather than appointed, suggested there is a need for a system of junior high schools in the area, and urged more equal treatment for French-speaking pupils and teachers in the area's schools.

The Ottawa Civic Hospital submission recommended that it become an independent public hospital under the Public Hospitals Act, with a separate board of trustees outside City control, and that its debt and the cost of service to indigent out-patients should be assumed by municipal government. The Ottawa Hospital Council pointed out that all hospitals in the area have serious debt problems of which they should be relieved, along with the cost of services to indigent out-patients, which ought to be borne by municipalities. The Council also supported formation of a regional hospital planning agency.

The submission of the Ottawa Transportation Commission noted a growing need for extension of public transportation service as an essential public utility - a need that is increasingly in conflict with the provision in the Commission's charter which requires it to be financially self-supporting; municipal tax support will be required in future if adequate service is to be provided. A public transportation system penetrating both the Ottawa and Hull areas more effectively was also foreseen as becoming necessary in the future.

The submission on licensing from the Electrical Contractors' Association of Ottawa noted existing or proposed by-laws in several municipalities which require a contractor to establish a place of business in the municipality before he can do work there. The association favoured the principle of requiring a place of business, but felt it should apply to the metropolitan areas as a whole rather than each municipality.

The next of the six categories - submissions from the Cumberland area - comprises submissions from:

Rev. H.C. Vaughan, Rector, Parish of Navan

Planning Committee, Cumberland Community Association

Cumberland Township Public School Board

Dr. I.F. Kennedy, Cumberland Community Association

Lions Club of Navan

Women's Institute of Navan

Parish of Bear Brook

Township of Cumberland

and Nelson Charlebois, Reeve of Cumberland Township

The common theme of these submissions was the urgent need to separate the Cumberland from Prescott and Russell County and realign it with the greater Ottawa area to the west, to which it is tied economically and socially. The need for comprehensive regional planning was also stressed in three of these submissions, one (from the Parish of Bear Brook) warned of the threat to agriculture unless the farm economy is protected against rising taxes resulting from urban expansion.

All submissions in the next category - recommending retention of the present local municipalities but the transfer of certain functions - were received from the County area, and suggested the shift of functions or portions of functions (particularly overall planning) from townships and villages to the County itself. These were from:

Village of Stittsville

Village of Rockcliffe Park

Township of North Gower

County of Carleton

Township of Fitzroy

Carleton County Federation of Agriculture

Township of Gloucester (majority of Council)
and the Township of Nepean

The submission of Rockcliffe Park also mentioned transfer of certain functions to a regional authority as acceptable should the preference for a shift to the County prove not feasible, and the Carleton Federation

of Agriculture suggested, in addition to a transfer generally of 'personal services' to the County, that pooling industrial-commercial assessment for elementary education purposes, and planning and construction of arterial roads, could be on a regional basis for the County and City combined.

The Sittsville and March submission went still further in suggesting that the Province take over all education costs (several other briefs proposed a greater Provincial share of the costs of education), while Fitzroy indicated its opposition to annexation of any township territory by Arnprior, and Nepean suggested a joint parliamentary committee on national capital matters and regular meetings of city and county planning officials with the N.C.C. to obtain better Federal-local coordination. Unlike the submissions from ratepayer organizations and residents in Nepean, the Nepean Township brief did not favour a larger council or adoption of a ward system.

We come thus to the final category - submissions suggesting some form of metropolitan or regional government or agency, which would combine a central authority with local units of government. The eighteen in this group represent the largest single category, or almost a third of all submissions received. In addition, some of the briefs which dealt primarily with a specific field of municipal service, along with some from the Cumberland area, indicated acceptance of or support for this type of solution.

The submissions varied widely and were occasionally indefinite as to the amount of power to be allocated to the regional authority. They also divide into three groups according to the type of local units proposed: those utilizing all present municipalities, those which would eliminate some of the existing municipalities, and those which would replace all the existing units with a system of boroughs or districts more equal in size and resources.

Three of the submissions - from the City of Eastview, the Eastview Planning Board, and the Police Village of Manotick - proposed an 'agency' rather than a 'government' to deal with regional or area-wide problems,

coupled with continued autonomy of local municipalities. The Eastview submissions further suggested that functions should be relinquished to the agency through negotiation, and that all 'services to people' should be retained at the local level, transferring only physical and impersonal services. The Manotick brief in addition and as its main proposal, urged that Manotick be made a Village and subsequently a Town.

The brief presented by the City of Ottawa similarly proposed a regional agency or coordinating unit with limited powers - restricted essentially to regional planning and based on the cooperation of an enlarged City of Ottawa and strengthened County of Carleton extended eastward to Rockland. This proposal would involve the elimination or reduction in size of four existing municipalities through expansion of Ottawa to the inner limits of the greenbelt (including Bell's Corners and Blackburn), provided further study showed such annexation to be advantageous.

At the hearing on the Ottawa submission, however, it became apparent that there was some considerable difference of opinion among the members of the Board of Control, with some of them expressing the opinion that the regional coordinating unit would have to be given significant additional powers, which would in effect make it a regional government.

The remaining fourteen submissions all proposed two-tier systems with a central or regional government having significant powers, varying from control of planning and development plus arbitration of other matters (as proposed, and revised at the second hearings, by Michael Lackner), to control virtually all significant municipal functions (as proposed by Dr. Charlotte Whitton, the Township of Torbolton, John I. Butler, and Messrs MacQuarrie and Barrett).

Seven of the systems were based on the continuation of all existing local municipalities and were suggested by:

National Capital Region Branch,
Community Planning Association of Canada

Study Group of the University Women's Club of Ottawa

Eastview Public School Board

Township of Torbolton

Harold E. Denman

Merivale Gardens Home Owners' Association

Howard L. Perkins

Three others would involve more or less extensive changes to existing municipalities to create a City of Ottawa enlarged to the greenbelt and a strengthened County (similar to the City of Ottawa proposal):

Orleans Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trustees
of Orleans Police Village

Michael Lackner

Ottawa Board of Trade

In fact the latter two of these would transform the County into a unitary municipality by elimination of the townships and villages.

Dr. Whitton's proposal would also enlarge the City of Ottawa but the original annexation line as proposed in 1950 rather than the greenbelt, and omitting Eastview and Rockcliffe Park; these alterations should be made, in Dr. Whitton's view, during a transition or implementation period. All existing local municipalities would thus remain, under her proposal, albeit with some altered boundaries, although some might disappear in time through regrouping.

The remaining three submissions - from John I. Butler, Messrs MacQuarrie and Barrett (representing the minority view of Gloucester Township Council), and the City View Community Association (second hearing) - all proposed replacing the existing municipalities with a set of new boroughs and districts.

In summary then, the final category - submissions suggesting some form of regional government or agency - divides into the following types of proposals:

A central agency with limited powers:

- retaining existing municipalities 3
- based on an existing enlarged city and a strengthened county, eliminating some municipalities 1

A central government with significant powers:

- retaining existing municipalities 7
- based on an enlarged city and a strengthened county: 3
- retaining existing municipalities but with altered boundaries: 1
- replacing existing municipalities with new boroughs or districts: 3

18