

MINUTES  
COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE  
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON  
CHAMPLAIN ROOM

02 MAY 1996

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: M. Meilleur

Members: M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, D. Holmes, A. Loney, B. McGarry, A. Munter, D. Pratt

Regrets: L. Davis

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Community Services Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 18 April 1996.**

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

1. Proposed Changes to the Ontario Building Code

Councillor A. Munter asked that the Health Department provide him with information about the proposed changes to the Ontario Building Code, specifically the effect of change on handicapped persons.

2. Report on Core Regional Services

Councillor A. Cullen inquired whether the report being prepared under the direction of the Chief Administrative Officer on core regional services would be circulated to all stake-holders so they can comment on the directions recommended by the corporate review work-group. The Social Services Commissioner, Dick Stewart, said it was his understanding the report would be tabled with Council in late May. The Community Services Committee will receive the portion of the report which deals with the Health, Homes for the Aged and Social Services Departments and he intent is to share this information with its partners at the earliest moment, as it has been the tradition.

3.      Presidency of the Association of Local Official Health Agencies (ALOHA)

Councillor R. Cantin indicated he was stepping down after four years as President of ALOHA. He suggested it was important that someone serve as a regional representative on this agency since approximately 80% of the Province's population lives in a regional area. The Committee Chair, M. Meilleur, thanked Councillor Cantin for his contribution and his years of service and she asked that anyone interested in being a member of ALOHA contact her office.

REGULAR ITEMS

1.      DRAFT REGIONAL PESTICIDE USE POLICY

- Acting Medical Officer of Health report dated 18 Mar 96

The Acting Medical Officer of Health, Dr. Geoff Dunkley, presented the report. He noted that the policy described in Annex A sets out the process to be followed and is predicated on the principle that the use of chemicals should be minimal and only as a last resort.

Councillor D. Holmes asked what kind of training regional staff who work applying pesticides receive. The Director, Environmental Health Directorate, Mr. Al Raven, indicated an individual has to have a license from the Ministry of the Environment and Energy (MOEE) for large applications but no training is required for small applications. He added it is not the size of the space that is the governor but the type of chemical being used. He noted the majority of applications for the Region is contracted out to private companies.

Councillor A. Cullen wondered why the working group deemed that limited consultation was required given the amount of public interest on this issue and the amount of public access to regional properties. Dr. Dunkley indicated it was deemed that since applications are primarily internal this was primarily an issue for staff. A. Raven added the internal working group felt it should seek direction from Committee and Council before going out for public consultation.

Sharon Skead, Breast Cancer Action, expressed concern about the use of herbicides at child care facilities. She indicated the effects of herbicides on humans have not been researched enough, particularly as they relate to children. She pointed out there is no statement in the report to indicate what chemicals are to be used. She added that spraying boiling water works well on weeds and she suggested this approach could be used instead of chemical products.

Dr. Dana Silk, Friends of the Earth explained this is an environmental group working to protect the ozone layer and one of the greatest threats to the ozone layer is the use of pesticides. Dr. Silk expressed the belief the Region doesn't need a pesticide use policy but rather a pest control policy. He encouraged work to naturalise areas to avoid pesticides, adding the best tool is prevention. Chemical pesticides and herbicides should be used only when all other options have failed. He said the report contains insufficient information for the Committee to make a wise decision and the reference material used to prepare the report is outdated and inappropriate. The report contains no data about the cost of using pesticides or about pesticide policies in other municipalities.

Angela Rickman, Sierra Club Canada said she recognised there is a desire to reduce the use of pesticides but the proposed policy does not go far enough. She expressed particular concern about spraying near child care facilities and she spoke of the effect of pesticides and herbicides on children and pets.

Mr. Mark Jowett said there is a need to look at the environment in a systemic manner. He expressed the belief pesticides and herbicides are generating "molecular garbage". He spoke about the "Natural Step" approach developed by Dr. Robert in Sweden and about the need to get to the heart of the matter in the environmental debate. He argued there are numerous seemingly unrelated questions about the environment however, there is a great deal of consensus about the problems facing it. He questioned whether pesticides are "naturally correct" and chemically stable and he stressed the need to evaluate pesticides carefully, arguing that when mistakes are discovered, it is usually too late.

Ann Coffey, Environmentalist, restated that the principles of the "Natural Step" are violated by the spreading of pesticides. Pesticides are contributing to an ever-growing circle of poisons which are enveloping the earth; they are designed to kill and they don't always hit only their target. They often emerge a fair distance from where they are used originally.. Ms. Coffey added very little research has been done on pesticides and chemicals are released into the environment and imposed on all humankind without being properly tested.

Dr. Dunkley stated the report gives a description of the existing situation with respect to pesticide use, adding that the proposed policy does not advocate the use of chemicals. He noted, in reply to a concern raised by Dr. Dana Silk, that the following groups were involved in the consultation process: the Pesticide Education Network, Citizens for Alternatives to Pesticides, People Against Addicted Lawns and the Allergy and Environmental Health Association; three of the four groups were in support of the proposed policy.

Councillor A. Munter said he wondered why pesticides are not used at the water treatment plant yet they are used at child care facilities. Ms. Martha Robinson, Program Manager, Environmental Health Directorate, indicated that not using pesticides at the water treatment plant stems from concerns about contaminating the drinking water supply in the case of an accidental spill. Councillor Munter asked whether a ban was considered and if so, why was it rejected. Dr. Dunkley expressed the belief that a corporate ban would not be appropriate and that the benefits of the policy outweigh the risks.

Councillor D. Holmes said she believes the policy does not go far enough. She indicated she intends to present a Motion calling for a moratorium on pesticide use, with a report to be brought back on problems that may arise after a period of time. She pointed out it is well known that pesticides cause problems for wildlife and there are indications of links between the use of pesticides and the incidence of breast cancer and problems with reproductive functions. She emphasised the need for more research on the chemicals used in pesticides and on their effects.

Councillor D. Pratt questioned testing procedures and the determination of whether or not a chemical is safe. He spoke about toxicity, noting that in testing, large doses of pesticides are fed to relatively small laboratory animals thereby creating a high level of toxicity. He asked for a staff comment on this. Dr. Dunkley confirmed results are based on toxicological testing of rodents or small animals and the difficulty is there is no human data. He added there is also the question of multiple exposure, since the tests consist of large exposures to one substance; no testing is based on small exposures to a variety of substances over a period of time and the life span of a substance is also a factor.

Councillor R. Cantin said he felt the report clearly states that chemicals should be used only as a last resort and he wondered how one would deal with noxious weeds if not with herbicides. Councillor M. Bellemare pointed out that if the RMOC invests money in beautifying its properties it needs to maintain these assets to protect its investment. Councillor D. Pratt put forth the view the control of pesticides falls under the jurisdiction of provincial and federal ministries, therefore Council is not in a position to make a decision in this regard.

Committee Chair M. Meilleur said she could agree with the Motion presented, as the Region needs to be pro-active and follow the lead of other municipalities in this area.

Moved by D. Holmes

1. **That there be a moratorium on the use of pesticides by RMOC on regional lands with a report in one year on the effects of the moratorium and that the report include local municipalities' by-laws; and**

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Holmes, B. McGarry, A. Munter, M. Meilleur....4

NAYS: M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, D. Pratt....3

2. **That policies be developed for the prevention of the use of pesticides.**

CARRIED

YEAS: M. Bellemare, D. Holmes, B. McGarry, A. Munter, M. Meilleur....5

NAYS: R. Cantin, D. Pratt....2

2.     FALL PREVENTION, SAFETY RECOMMENDATIONS AND BUILDING CODE  
- Acting Medical Officer of Health report dated 17 Apr 96

**That the Community Services Committee recommend that Regional Council write to the Code Development and Technical Training (CDTT) Department of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing endorsing the position of the Ottawa-Carleton Fall Prevention Coalition in regard to the Ontario provincial building codes.**

CARRIED

3.     ATTENDANCE AT 1996 CONFERENCES  
- Community Services Committee Co-ordinator memorandum dated 17 Apr 96

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the attendance of Councillors at the following conferences:**

1.     The attendance of Councillor A. Loney at the Canadian Public Health Association Annual Conference, Vancouver, B.C., July 2 - 5, 1996
2.     The attendance of Councillor R. Cantin as Past-President, Association of Local Official Health Agencies (ALOHA) Annual Conference, Gananoque, Ontario, June 12 - 15, 1996 :
3.     The attendance of a member of a Community Services Committee member, who will be named at a later date, to the Ontario Public Health Association Annual Conference, Toronto, Ontario, November 13 -15, 1996.

CARRIED

4.     ONTARIO WORKS PROGRAM  
- Social Services Commissioner's report dated 02 Apr 96

The Social Services Commissioner, Mr. D. Stewart, explained a report is being presented at this time because staff feel it is important to begin discussion on the emerging reality of the Ontario Works program. He acknowledged that the department does not have all the answers, but the following information is available at this time:

- a formal announcement re: Ontario Works is expected in six-to-eight weeks. The Province will release a series of guidelines for municipalities and it is likely these guidelines and the ensuing amendments to the social assistance legislation will introduce a mandatory, community service element to the continuation of benefits. It is thought the guidelines will recognise the activities of people who are currently working, in training programs or involved in community service on a voluntary basis (Mr. Stewart noted this will apply to thousands of the department's clients);

- because it has been involved in a municipal reference group on the development of Ontario Works, the department believes the initiative will focus on single, employable General Welfare Assistance (GWA) recipients and not on sole support parents, nor on Family Benefit Assistance (FBA) recipients at this time;
- staff expect the guidelines will include some recognition of transportation requirements and, as sole support parents become involved at a later stage, some elements of child care; the delivery agents (municipalities) would provide a range of other employment services; there will be a significant amount of discretion and flexibility in how the program is designed;
- issues relating to legal liability, employment cessation and others as they relate to provincial statutes will need to be addressed as the program is implemented. The Ministry is poised to introduce one more condition to social assistance legislation that already has many conditions, some of which are outlined on p. 21 of the report.

Mr. Stewart went on to say the term workfare has many interpretations, ranging from a single option, compulsory program to a more comprehensive human resource strategy that provides a range of supports for persons in different situations re: employability. He noted the RMOC has been focused on the two fundamental principles of client choice and voluntary participation. He cited the example of Opportunity Planning with its successful three and one-half year “run” resulting in savings of \$3.8 million net for regional taxpayers as an example of this approach.

Commissioner Stewart said that, once the guidelines are released, a community consultation process will begin, with the intent to develop the best model possible, with client choice and voluntary participation as paramount concerns. It is expected there will be a rolling implementation of the program across the Province and that the 67 municipalities with social assistance administrations will deliver the service. Mr. Stewart concluded by saying the department expects to report back to Committee and Council with a proposed model by late October, early November, assuming staff have made the correct assumptions about flexibility in defining service. He made the commitment the program would be developed with this in mind.

Replying to a question from Committee Chair M. Meilleur, Mr. Stewart acknowledged the success rates for this type of program is indirectly proportionate to the employment rate and this is why the program must meet the needs of the Ottawa-Carleton community. The other reality is that the Province has a relatively high unemployment rate. With respect to Chair Meilleur’s question about program costs, Commissioner Stewart said two assumptions are being made at this time: there will be no additional resources for implementation, nor can the department come back to Council with a model that will cost more to deliver than the benefits it generates.

Councillor D. Holmes asked whether it is possible to opt out of the program, citing the City of Kingston as a municipality which has said it will not participate. Commissioner Stewart replied in the negative. He put forth the view that refusing to participate could lead the Ministry to question how the RMOC delivers social assistance as it is required to do by legislation. He reiterated the department does have the option to develop the most flexible model for its clients and the community, and his belief is that this point can be defended.

Councillor R. Cantin asked whether the department keeps data on factors that prevent single, employable persons from finding work. Commissioner Stewart explained some people have a medical certificate saying they are unable to work for periods of time, but all others are employable. He noted that 25-30% would be competitively employable or could be in the short-term; a significant number either do not have the skills, training, education and recent work experience required or their debilitating condition has not been medically-certified. He continued by saying another issue is the availability of work and the fact that, after a period of time on social assistance, feelings of self-worth and lack of confidence in being able to compete in a hard market may affect a person's ability to leave it.

Councillor Cantin inquired about the status of Opportunity Planning. Mr. Stewart replied staff have stopped intake but there is enough funding to support current participants to the end of 1996. He added staff intend to take as much of this program as possible and incorporate it into Ontario Work; Opportunity Planning has been successful because individuals participate voluntarily and receive the support they need to reach their employment goals. In reply to a further question from the Councillor, Commissioner Stewart said employers can be approached with a view to offering employment opportunities in return for work experience, as per the Metro Hope model described in the report.

Councillor M. Bellemare wondered whether there have been consultations between Ministry and regional staff on issues relating to costs, liability, collective agreements. Mr. Stewart replied a Municipal Reference Group was established some months ago and staff have been advised the Province is aware it will need to address these issues. Councillor Bellemare asked whether it was likely the Province would take over the total delivery of GWA in 1996, and workfare by extension. Mr. Stewart said staff have been advised that municipalities will deliver the program at this stage. Replying to a further question about social supports, Mr. Stewart acknowledged it will be a challenge to provide child care services within existing budgetary resources if and when sole support parents are obliged to participate in the program.

Councillor A. Munter asked whether it may be impossible to provide additional services in child care and other areas. Commissioner Stewart replied it is unlikely additional resources will be made available for some time to come. He put forth the view it will be fortunate if the provincial child care review results in retaining current levels of funding. With respect to training, monitoring and support services, the department currently has greater demand than resources and with more clients may come the need to ration service. Mr. Stewart expressed the view there is some capacity, within current child care services, to do things differently and staff will report on this matter at a later date. He noted the "governor", in all instances, will be the regional budget.

A number of speakers were present and their comments are summarised below:

Ms. Sue Clark, Canadian Advocates for Psychiatrized People

Ms. Clark referred to workfare as slavery, and she said she opposed it because participants will have no protection. Many persons with psychological disabilities will have difficulty maintaining for several hours and people with addictions will also face hardships. She asked why Ottawa-Carleton could not opt out when Kingston could. She said she would personally refuse, on a matter of principle, to participate in a slave labour program.

Mr. Kevin Kinsella, a concerned citizen

Mr. Kinsella suggested the RMOC request permission not to participate in workfare but be able to expand its employment programs which provide people with the necessary supports so they can work. He said the numerous examples of employee displacement cited in the staff report illustrate that workfare can affect everybody. He said he suspected the money for additional child care spaces would come from other vital programs. He expressed his concerns about the quality of homemaking services and others if these are provided by persons who are forced to do the work. He thought the Region should at least attempt to opt out of workfare.

Mr. Richard Condo, Ottawa-Hull Relapse Prevention Centre

Mr. Condo spoke in support of workfare in a limited way. He indicated the Relapse Prevention Centre presently has five individuals on social assistance working with the business community, getting job training and being paid \$7.00 per hour. The Centre provides programs on self esteem, job strategy, communications skills and counselling has worked in co-operation with the Dave Smith Centre. The Centre would like to work with the Ministry on the implementation of workfare. In reply to a question from Councillor Munter, Mr. Condo indicated the Centre does not have experience dealing with persons who are forced to participate in programs. The agency operates with an annual budget of \$40,000.

Ms. Linda Lalonde, Social Assistance Recipients' Council

The speaker indicated the SAR Council is opposed to non-productive workfare and supports the department's previous approach and the successful, constructive programs that have been used in Ottawa-Carleton. She asked whether the model would be built on the evaluation of these programs and whether evaluations of Action for Career Training (ACT) and the Youth Employment Preparation Program (YEPP) would be made available to the community to be used as documentation.



Ms. Lalonde said another issue of concern is whether future regional funding will be conditional on agencies participating in workfare; she asked that this question be answered sooner rather than later. She noted that a number of reports, beginning with the Transitions Report, have recommended the Opportunity Planning model as the way to go. She asked why this was not the model being used, noting there is no documentation that indicates workfare is the right model for Ontario. She pointed out there is much documentation that says workfare does not get people out of poverty, does not create sustainable jobs and creates downward pressure on other wages.

Ms. Lalonde spoke about the RMOC's long-standing tradition of honouring client choice and voluntary participation as a more effective means of helping people towards self-sufficiency. She added this is more than just tradition: the programs used to achieve this goal were the result of years of consultation, and represent a made-in-Ottawa-Carleton solution. She put forth the view the Province should be concentrating more on developing real jobs and supporting real training and development as opposed to looking at punitive measures such as workfare.

Paula Speevak Sladowski, Volunteer Centre of Ottawa-Carleton

Ms. Sladowski said the Volunteer Centre does not have an official position on workfare but has directed resources to explore the issue and is interested in being consulted.

She continued by saying the philosophical difficulty with workfare is that it has been confused with volunteer work, and there is a need to make a distinction between the two. The Centre felt that, saying volunteer work and community work are not the same and refusing to have anything to do with it may be discriminating against people on social assistance. The member agencies consulted indicated they would be looking to the Volunteer Centre for leadership, resources and support should they have to deal with the issue, therefore it would be difficult for the Centre not to take a position. The Centre felt it could offer to administer community service, but there were concerns about whether this would protect the integrity of voluntary action, be sensitive to the position of member agencies and whether there would be adequate resources to handle the issues.

Ms. Sladowski concluded by saying it is interesting to note that funding is often provided for private sector placements whereas no funding is provided for the non-profit sector. She re-stated the Volunteer Centre's desire to be included in the discussion and its interest in ensuring there is sensitivity to clients, member agencies and in protecting voluntary action.

Heather Colls, Kanata Food Cupboard

Ms. Colls indicated many of the people working at the Kanata Food Cupboard are on GWA and FBA and are concerned about workfare. These are skilled persons who want employment but who are afraid they may get stuck in jobs that will prevent them from seeking the jobs they really want so they can provide for their families in an adequate way. She asked how child care spaces would be provided for single mothers forced to work. She spoke about abused women who are not ready to go back to work. She noted many persons are frustrated because they cannot get jobs even after retraining

Susan Learoyd, Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton

Ms. Learoyd pointed to the lack of enthusiasm when people talk about workfare in comparison to the degree of enthusiasm that was shown during the recent presentation on Opportunity Planning. She noted the SPC has argued strongly against workfare and is interested in hearing from the community and participating in the debate. She concluded by saying there is not much trust in what the Province intends and it is important to do what is best for the community.

Councillor Cantin asked Ms. Learoyd whether she could see a parallel between workfare and the co-op programs operating in high schools. Ms. Learoyd said she was in favour of supporting individuals and providing opportunities but one also had to look at what is possible in this community job-wise.

Mr. Bill Carne

Mr. Carne spoke on behalf of those who have used mental health services. He said he did not favour workfare but he thought it would still be implemented by the Province. Mr. Carne said that, when it comes to persons with psychiatric disabilities, those who can are working and those who can't, aren't, and workfare will not help. He noted he volunteers extensively because this is something he can choose to do, something which meets his values, needs and time. He indicated that forcing him to do something he does not want to do will damage him and anyone else in the same situation.

Mr. Carne said cutbacks to social assistance are causing a lot of stress and the number of calls from people wanting psychiatric support is increasing constantly. In addition, hospital beds are closing, and there is a nervousness about having the community supports needed to replace the beds. Mr. Carne described a number of issues common to the psychiatrically disabled, which he called SHAPES and described as follows:

STIGMA - the worse factor, it allows things to happen to psychiatrically disabled persons that will not happen to anyone else;

HOUSING- a big issue. If you are mentally healthy and have a room-mate who is unaware he is abusive to you, you cannot stay mentally healthy;

ABUSE - two thirds of females in the psychiatric community have been abused and this is a big factor in their situations;

POVERTY- persons on FBA fare marginally better but those on GWA are not. Many people with a psychiatric history chose to remain on GWA because they do not want the stigma of being permanently unemployable attached to FBA. However, with the recent cuts, many have applied to FBA;

EMPLOYMENT - the impossible dream: it means having a real job, being a real person, getting rid of the stigma and having more money;

SUPPORTS- these are vital for our community, especially if a person on GWA does not show up for work and loses his benefits.

Councillor McGarry asked for clarification as to whether or not workfare will be aimed at persons who are fragile and unable mentally to hold a job. Commissioner Stewart reiterated that the intent in the first instance is to focus on employable persons on GWA. He repeated Mr. Carne's comment about some fragile persons who have chosen to remain on GWA and he noted the department will need to be sensitive to those persons as it develops its model. In reply to a question of clarification from Councillor Munter, Commissioner Stewart said some persons on GWA categorised as employable may have serious mental problems, some may have episodic illnesses and this is one of the factors that make it difficult to accept being on FBA and permanently unemployable.

Ms. Sharon MacKenzie, a concerned citizen

Ms. MacKenzie said she could not support abusing people. She said she felt the RMOC should be able to opt out of the workfare program, which she called slavery and brainwashing.

#### Committee Discussion

Councillor D. Holmes presented a Motion calling for the RMOC to decline participating in workfare and create its own made-in-Ottawa-Carleton solution. She said that many years of consultation and policy development have produced a program such as Opportunity Planning which has been shown to work and save significant dollars. This illustrates the fact that a voluntary system which provides supports to employment is the better model. The RMOC should make it clear to the Province it wants to design its own program in co-operation with community partners and move forward and not implement a provincial program that may be more punitive, may not help people and may not save the dollars the Province wants to save. She concluded by saying it is well documented that Opportunity Planning works, therefore this is the model the RMOC should be using as the basis of its program.

Councillor A. Munter spoke in support of Councillor Holmes' Motion. He noted the Province has cancelled programs that work well and help people get off assistance, i.e., Jobs Ontario and Opportunity Planning. He went on to say there are clear indications people want to work when a business in Kanata has several thousand applicants for 150 jobs or when 15,000 persons line up to work at the Corel Centre. The Councillor said there are indications workfare costs more money than it saves and there should be questions about implementing a program that is dangerous to the local economy. It is a costly idea that does not work and the only reason it is still on the table is that the Province is committed to putting it in place. Councillor Munter said he thought provincial officials should be encouraged to recognise that a mistake has been made and consider other options.

Councillor B. McGarry said he was not prepared to dismiss in an absolute way a program that has not been tried. He noted he has been a supporter of some kind of work-related training and a successful participant, personally and "corporately", in co-op education programs. The Councillor said he could see a parallel between both programs and he indicated he was prepared to see workfare attempted. He added he did not believe the RMOC could refuse to implement the program.

Councillor R. Cantin echoed some of Councillor McGarry's comments. He added he has had first-hand knowledge of students who have had positive work experiences under co-op programs. He said he did not believe people will be forced to work where they don't want to and that this program represents slave labour. He proposed an amendment which deletes the negative statement in Councillor Holmes' Motion and suggests that a program like Opportunity Planning that has saved \$3.8 million, be implemented. He said he felt sure the Province would agree to let the RMOC implement this approach.

Committee Chair M. Meilleur said she would not support any program that forces people to work. She cited the example of similar programs in the Provinces of Alberta and Québec, saying they have displaced people with real jobs. In Québec, 94% of participants were back on assistance after twelve months; in New Brunswick, the cost per person for NB Works was \$19,500. Chair Meilleur noted there have been successes in the United States and Sweden when the unemployment rate was 3%; she reminded those present the unemployment rate in Canada is 10%. She expressed surprise at the fact that 86% of persons consulted in a 1995 survey were in favour of workfare. She said she did not see how the program would work in Ottawa-Carleton unless it is voluntary, unless the department assigns a lot of staff to monitor it and unless the Region provides the necessary supports for people trying to find work.

Councillor McGarry asked whether it is certain the Province will allow the option proposed by Councillor Cantin. Mr. Stewart said he could not answer this question emphatically but he added it is conceivable a voluntary program could be developed for this community. However he added that if Ontario Works is implemented as staff believe it will be, there may be someone who would chose not to participate voluntarily in any of the options. This would mean the department could not avoid asking that person to perform some community service in return for the continuation of his/her benefits. He added every precaution would be taken not to impose this condition on vulnerable persons.

Replying to a question from Chair Meilleur on the number of persons “eligible” for workfare, Commissioner Stewart said he could not provide a precise figure. He noted that between 5 - 6,000 clients per month declare income from earnings and they would not be expected to participate: others who already volunteer or persons involved in school and training would be exempt and as indicated earlier, staff would ensure vulnerable persons do not have to participate. Chair Meilleur said she had heard the number 20,000 cited but she indicated she did not believe staff will be able to find 20,000 jobs in Ottawa-Carleton. Commissioner Stewart said he agreed with the Chair’s last statement. He said municipalities will be expected to facilitate community placements but there has been no discussion with the Ministry about penalties or sanctions against municipalities unable to generate placements.

Councillor M. Bellemare expressed the view the entire discussion is premature. He noted the staff reports contains suppositions, indications, beliefs but no precise information on what the Province will implement. Councillor Bellemare said he believes the voluntary model is the better model and the RMOC is already on record as rejecting workfare because of issues relating to cost, collective bargaining and legal implications. He said he was not ready to decline participation when precise guidelines have not been presented and when there is no information about the degree of flexibility municipalities will be afforded nor on what supports the Province intends to provide.

Councillor Cantin asked that the Committee support the pro-active approach suggested by his amending Motion. He pointed out that, in the past, the RMOC has been able to deliver programs differently because it presented alternatives. He said he thought his Motion would stand a better chance of being accepted by the Province than the Kingston approach.

After some discussion on procedural matters, the Committee considered the following Motions:

Moved by D. Holmes

**That the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton decline to participate in the provincial government’s proposed program “Ontario Works” in order to create a made-in-Ottawa-Carleton solution in consultation with its community agency partners.**

LOST

YEAS: D. Holmes, A. Munter, M. Meilleur 3  
NAYS: M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, B. McGarry 3

Moved by R. Cantin

**That the RMOC negotiate with the Ministry of Community and Social Services for the acceptance of the Opportunity Planning Program or a similar program as its response to the (provincial) Ontario Works program and that it consult with its community agency partners.**

CARRIED

YEAS: R. Cantin, D. Holmes, M. Meilleur, A. Munter 4

NAYS: M. Bellemare, B. McGarry 2

Moved by A. Munter

**WHEREAS Ottawa-Carleton Regional Council has serious concerns about the proposed “Ontario Works” program;**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council advise the Ministry of Community and Social Services that the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton expects, as a minimum, that workfare will:**

- 1. Not interfere with education and job-seeking;**
- 2. Provide training that is actually useful;**
- 3. Come at no additional cost to property taxpayers;**
- 4. Compensate community agencies for their administrative and management costs for being involved in this program;**
- 5. Not be a substitute for paid employment or lead to the displacement of paid workers;**
- 6. Include enough discretion to allow municipalities to tailor the program to meet local needs; and**

**THAT copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Ottawa-Carleton MPP's.**

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING

16 May 1996

---

CO-ORDINATOR

---

COMMITTEE CHAIR