



***Proposed amendments to the Municipal Act,
2001 to transfer jurisdiction over water and
wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in
Peel Region and a standalone statute to
authorize the establishment of water and
wastewater public corporations***

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Fred Hahn
President

November 21, 2025

The Canadian Union of Public Employees Ontario represents over 90,000 municipal workers in the province of Ontario. Approximately 4,900 of these members work across the affected municipalities in the Region of Peel, City of Mississauga, City of Brampton, and Town of Caledon. These members are represented by CUPE 966, a composite local made up of 15 bargaining units representing various Region of Peel divisions (including March of Dimes Canada, The Mississauga Halton LHIN, Brampton/Caledon Community Living, Salvation Army and the Central West LHIN) and the Town of Caledon, CUPE 66 (City of Mississauga outside workers) and CUPE 831 (City of Brampton inside and outside workers).

CUPE Ontario is the largest public sector union in the province, representing the majority of unionized public sector workers.

Background:

In May 2023, the province introduced *The Hazel McCallion Act, 2023* (Bill 112), which aimed to dissolve the Region of Peel by January 1, 2025. However, in December 2023, the province scaled back the Act's scope, limiting the Transition Board's role to making recommendations on the delivery of regional services. Subsequently, the *Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act* (Bill 185) and the Provincial Efficiencies Review were introduced, targeting the transfer of four regional/upper-tier municipal services—land use planning, water and wastewater, roads, and waste collection—to their respective lower-tier municipalities. Peel Region was designated as the first municipality to undergo this transition, with York, Halton, Waterloo, Niagara, Durham, and the County of Simcoe also identified for future changes. In July 2024, Peel's planning responsibilities were formally transferred to Mississauga, Brampton, and Caledon.

On December 12, 2024, Ontario's Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH), Paul Calandra, introduced Bill 240, the "[*Peel Transition Implementation Act, 2024*](#)," to officially transfer certain regional responsibilities to Mississauga, Brampton, and Caledon. Bill 240 lapsed when the provincial election was called in January 2025.

In June 2025, Ford re-introduced the [*Peel Transition Implementation Act, 2025*](#), proposing the transfer of two public works (water/wastewater and regional roads) services from Peel Region to Mississauga, Brampton, and Caledon (previously Bill 240).

On October 23, 2025, the Ontario Government tabled Bill 60, the *Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025*, a wide-ranging piece of legislation that the province claims will accelerate housing, infrastructure, and transit delivery. If Bill 60 is passed, the key takeaways for developers involve streamlined planning tools, new rules for development charges, and changes to transit station funding and transit-oriented community land. On the same day, the MMAH then proposed [*changes to the regulations*](#) under the Municipal Act, 2001, to transfer jurisdiction over water and wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in Peel Region and posted a standalone statute for public comment authorizing the establishment of water and wastewater public corporations.

CUPE Ontario unequivocally opposes the downloading of regional services being pursued by the province. Our concerns include the formalized privatization of services, specifically water governance, and the absence of clear direction regarding labour relations. Politically, given this government's practice of hastily introducing omnibus legislation, this represents yet another example of a lack of transparency and consultation with the public.

Proposed amendments to the Municipal Act, 2001 to transfer jurisdiction over water and wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in Peel Region and a standalone statute to authorize the establishment of water and wastewater public corporations

The proposed amendments to the *Municipal Act, 2001* transfer jurisdiction over water and wastewater from Peel Region to the lower-tier municipalities of Mississauga, Brampton and Caledon, effective January 1, 2029, or on a different date as prescribed by the Minister. The legislation introduces a framework for a new water and wastewater public corporation ultimately granting the Minister powers to manage and make decisions regarding water governance structures. CUPE Ontario opposes removing water governance from municipal ownership.

The current proposal (Schedule 16 of Bill 60) also calls for water and wastewater to be governed by a public corporation which would be incorporated under the *Ontario Business Corporations Act* at the direction of the Minister who would have the authority to designate the corporation as a water and wastewater public corporation. Under the *Business Corporations Act*, the only possibility for water is for the entity to be “for-profit,” meaning there is no possibility to establish it as a “non-profit.”

This could also strike another blow to polluter-pay municipal fees and regulation. Wastewater is a very expensive service for (mostly) private sector employers and municipal pricing can be leveraged to influence use while generating revenue for the municipality. Additionally, as reported by the Toronto Star, this legislation restricts green roofs, which negatively impacts stormwater management. This is another example of the conservative government failing to address climate change.

Public Corporations: A Threat of Water Privatization

CUPE Ontario remains steadfast in its support for the public ownership of public services, particularly utilities. We have provided written submissions to the province, Region of Peel, and City of Mississauga regarding the review of public water delivery services currently provided through the Region of Peel.

Clean water is recognized by the United Nations as a human right and integral to public health, safety and economic wellbeing¹. According to the United Nations, water and sanitation are intertwined and vital for reducing the global burden of disease and improving the health, education and economic productivity of populations.

Ontario municipalities have a strong record of delivering services and managing these water and sanitation systems. This includes the pumping stations, water treatment facilities, lift stations, and tens of thousands of kilometers of pipes that deliver the clean water Ontarians rely on every day, and that safely collect and treat wastewater for community residents and businesses. This infrastructure represents **decades** of public investment from all levels of government and is worth billions.


There are degrees of privatization with public services and utilities. CUPE Ontario maintains that direct municipal governance is what is best for the service and for residents. The province seeks to create a provincially regulated utility managed by an independent board or establish a public utilities corporation (PUC) to manage Peel’s water/wastewater. While a PUC may be a public

¹ <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/water>

entity on paper, its structure—managed by appointed officials rather than elected representatives—results in a corporatized public utility model. EPCOR, Edmonton’s public utility, serves as an example of this, having acquired water assets in other jurisdictions where it operates as a commercial entity rather than a local public service.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and Municipal Finance Officers’ Association of Ontario (MFOA) recently released a [backgrounder on Water and Wastewater Municipal Services Corporations](#) which clearly illustrates the varying levels of autonomy and governance:

Different Forms of Governance

Degree of autonomy from a municipality 				
Municipality	Joint Service Board	Municipal Services Corporation	Public Utility	Private Utility
<p>Municipalities that deliver services directly, including owning and managing assets associated with the service (e.g., water pipes, treatment plants) have full control.</p> <p>Municipal councils make all key decisions including asset management, capital funding plans, operational funding and user fee rates where applicable.</p> <p>All assets and liabilities are held by the municipality and consolidated on their financial statements.</p>	<p>Local bodies that may be established by an individual municipality, or by two or more municipalities.</p> <p>The municipality or municipalities can decide many key things around governance (e.g., composition, eligibility of persons to be board members, degree of delegated authority given to the board).</p> <p>Depending on the scope of their setup the decisions may not necessarily have to go back to municipal councils.</p> <p>All assets and liabilities are jointly held by the participating municipalities. This includes how debt is distributed respectively impacting participating municipalities financial information returns.</p> <p>Generally, still within the control of member municipalities.</p>	<p>Some examples are in broadband and a few water and wastewater.</p> <p>Established as a municipally owned corporation for municipal services.</p> <p>Planning and board decisions separate from municipalities with non-elected board members. Financial statements may also be separate*.</p> <p>A water or wastewater municipal services corporation <u>cannot</u> issue any private shares (municipalities sole shareholders)</p> <p>Can be for one municipality or cover broad geographic boundaries across municipal borders.</p> <p>Unlike other utilities (e.g., hydro and gas) water & wastewater does not have an economic regulator.</p>	<p>Most common example are Local Distribution Corporations (e.g., Utilities Kingston, Alectra).</p> <p>Established as a municipally owned corporation (i.e., public).</p> <p>Financial statements, planning and board decisions are separate from municipalities with non-elected board members.</p> <p>Can issue private shares to raise capital but <u>has</u> to be publicly owned.</p> <p>Can be for one municipality or cover broad geographic boundaries across municipal borders.</p> <p>Ontario utilities like hydro or gas are regulated by a provincial board - Ontario Energy Board</p>	<p>Most common example are fully private natural gas utilities (e.g., Enbridge).</p> <p>Established as a privately owned corporation.</p> <p>Financial statements, planning and board decisions separate from municipalities with non-elected board members.</p> <p>Can issue private shares to raise capital.</p> <p>Usually covers broad geographic boundaries across municipal borders.</p> <p>Ontario utilities like hydro or gas are regulated by a provincial board - Ontario Energy Board</p>

The chart above clearly demonstrates the erosion of governance inherent in different models of service delivery and operation. The corporate structure separates planning and board decisions from municipalities, placing them in the hands of non-elected board members. CUPE Ontario’s position is that the removal of decision-making from the municipality and its elected councillors is what signals the beginning of marketization of water. Even if a corporation is developed with inclusion of publicly appointed representatives, this is not equivalent to a direct phone line to a councillor.

A prime example of the gradual effect of privatization is Ontario Hydro. What began as a purported reorganization resulted in Ontario Hydro being privatized within ten years. Concerningly, the proposed amendments to Peel’s water and wastewater infrastructure create a faster pathway to privatization than seen with Hydro One. In this case, the proposed amendments are changing the water and wastewater entity from a public service to a company with a fiduciary responsibility to serve shareholders, lacking regulatory oversight the moment the legislation is passed. To be clear, under the proposed framework, the province will need no additional steps to remove water and wastewater oversight from municipalities.

CUPE Ontario calls for the repeal of Bill 60 and related previous legislation, including the proposed amendments to the Municipal Act, 2001 to transfer jurisdiction over water and wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in Peel Region and the standalone statute authorizing the establishment of water and wastewater public corporations. Before implementation, proper studies and consultation with the public as well as relevant stakeholders such as labour,

environmental organizations and experts on how a corporation may be beneficial should be undertaken before implementation. Furthermore, if a corporation is determined to be the best option, direct democratic accountability is only possible if the public retains the ability to appoint the individuals who sit on the corporation's board.

Public Corporation Risks

CUPE Ontario has encountered similar public/municipal corporation models in Ontario and other provinces and has serious concerns about their impacts. CUPE Ontario's experience with separate boards and PUCs has revealed a troubling pattern: loss of democratic governance of service/utility, disruption to residents' services, and higher costs. Furthermore, workers in non-unionized PUCs typically face lower wages and weaker job security due to the profit-driven nature of such models. The province has yet to justify why Peel Region's award-winning water services need restructuring. Notably, Peel's residential water rates are 30% lower than those in other GTA municipalities, making Peel water one of the most affordable in the GTA².

Privatizing water infrastructure and its governance raises significant risks, including:

- **Loss of public accountability and oversight:** The shift of services from elected councils to appointed boards reduces democratic oversight. *Unlike other utilities (e.g., hydro and gas) water and wastewater do not have an economic regulator in Ontario.*
- **Increased rates:** Privatized, profit-driven services (essentially the definition of a corporation) often result in higher costs for residents because of the corporation's board having a fiduciary responsibility to generate profit. This directly translates to prioritizing corporate profits over public interests. Increased rates and a lack of financial transparency go hand in hand, as corporations are not required to disclose salaries and benefits. The provincial government has yet to release any reports or Transition Board recommendations demonstrating potential taxpayer savings.
- **Job insecurity:** Uncertainty about the restructuring of Peel's services has already led to staffing gaps and the departure of experienced senior workers. Moreover, there has also been no guarantee of employment or continuation of working conditions provided to the highly skilled and trained workers who keep Peel's water flowing.

There are also risks associated with the province not abiding by its obligations under the *Clean Water Act, 2006* which calls for the issuance of a Notice to municipal residential drinking water system owners, upon receipt and review of necessary technical work, to support source protection planning for new or changing systems³. This risk is heightened due to the lack of any water regulator and governance model proposed for Peel.

Absent the repeal of Bill 60, CUPE Ontario firmly believes that any introduction of a corporation should be subject to the following requirements:

- Regular reports (quarterly) to the Region of Peel and lower-tiered municipalities that will be made publicly available on:
 - Statistics on usage, billing, complaints, and user rate fees
 - How service cutoffs work
 - The complaints system process, with timelines/stats on remedies.

² <https://peelregion.ca/water/water-billing/rates-charges/way-peel-charges-water-wastewater-has-changed>

³ <https://conservationontario.ca/policy-priorities/clean-water-act>

- Salary disclosure requirements for transparency

CUPE Ontario submits the following examples of problematic/failed privatized utility examples:

Failed Municipal/PUCs:

1. The Walkerton Water scandal was more than a PUC failure; it was a disaster. Walkerton is a stark reminder of the dangers of privatized municipal water testing. The [Walkerton Inquiry](#) (a public inquiry into the bacterial contamination of water supply in Walkerton, Ontario) found that financial priorities overshadowed water safety in the PUC's operations, demonstrating the dangers of prioritizing profits over public safety⁴. As a result, seven people died and 2,300 people became sick.
2. In 1998, the City of Hamilton signed a 10-year P3 deal for their water systems⁵. Soon after, residents woke up to 135 million litres of raw sewage spilling into the harbour, flooded basements and businesses. Hamilton's water service workforce was cut in half, project costs ballooned, and the water contract changed hands four times. Through pressure from the community, the City of Hamilton ultimately took water back into public hands, saving the city and its residents millions of dollars.

Municipal/PUC Examples with negative outcomes:

1. In 1902, the Edmonton Electrical Lighting and Power Company entered a new phase as the first municipally owned electric utility in Canada. EPCOR, a utility provider operating in Canada and the United States, is owned by the City of Edmonton but governed by an independent board of directors. Neither the chair nor the board members are elected officials or city employees⁶.

While EPCOR's profits benefit the City of Edmonton, the corporation operates with full authority to set rates and make strategic business decisions. Similar models, such as British Columbia's hydro system, prioritize profitability over public accountability. In these cases, CEOs' salaries are not subject to public disclosure, and the cost to consumers is often driven by predatory pricing strategies based on location and usage.

In the case of EPCOR, unionized workers in Edmonton retained collective agreements when the utility was separated. However, many EPCOR facilities outside Edmonton remain non-union, with substandard working conditions.

2. In the 1980s, Paris privatized its water by splitting up responsibilities between production, transport, distribution and customer services. In 2000, the contracts were criticized by the regional audit body for a lack of financial transparency. In 2002, an audit commissioned by the city of Paris found that the prices charged by the lease operators were between 25% and 30% higher than the economically justified costs. Re-municipalization of water in Paris began in 2010 and resulted in dozens of other

⁴ <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/inside-walkerton-canada-s-worst-ever-e-coli-contamination-1.887200>

⁵ [Scary stories of privatization – The Council of Canadians](#)

⁶ <https://www.epcor.com/ca/en/about/governance/corporate-governance.html>

large French cities, such as Montpellier, Nice, Rennes and Grenoble, and smaller-to-medium cities, taking water and sanitation systems back into public hands.

3. In 1989, water and wastewater utilities in the UK were privatized under the Thatcher government. Over the last 30 years of privatization, bills have increased 40%, and there have been huge environmental concerns including a lack of urgent responses to leaks and thousands of litres of raw sewage dumping⁷, dividend and executive remuneration has increased drastically along with debts incurred, a lack of tax spending and asset stripping⁸.

The sustainability of Thames Water has plagued British citizens with public headlines of being stripped for cash despite shareholders benefitting from the company's financial gains. Thames Water (the largest corporation) specifically has been cited with almost 17,000 occasions of dumping raw sewage in 2023 because of poor overflow systems that have had insufficient infrastructural investment – a contrast with the rate increases. Privatization has resulted in the company buckling under the weight of unserviceable debt, which over the years had not had sufficient investment, and had value extracted in the form of dividend, which will now likely receive public bailout from the government⁹.

4. In 2018, the province of Ontario chose to restructure and sell part of provincial utility Hydro One. As a result, private companies involved in the electricity system were not motivated to keep people's hydro bills low. A scathing [2017 Auditor General Report](#) found that the Independent Electricity System Operator did not implement repeated recommendations from the Ontario Energy Board, including one that could save ratepayers \$30 million a year. Claims by generators were made and approved for thousands of dollars of frivolous costs.
5. Alectra (a municipally owned electric utility in Canada) found itself in hot water with the City of Hamilton, Guelph, Markham and Vaughan over water billing¹⁰. In Hamilton, Alectra has handled water billing for years but blindsided the city of Hamilton in 2021 by claiming it could no longer handle water billing despite Hamilton paying Alectra \$5.6 million in 2021 to deliver water bills. At the time, Councillor Brad Clark (Ward 9, upper Stoney Creek) stated at an audit, finance and administration committee meeting that the expectation of merging the utilities under Alectra was "going to improve efficiencies and do all these wonderful things." Instead, the decision was made to no longer provide water billing, with no input from the Mayor of Hamilton. Guelph, Markham and Vaughan also found themselves in the same situation.

Less coordination and regional planning

The province has been clear in its intention to expedite home construction with residential and commercial development in Mississauga and Brampton surging. High-density residential

⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2024/mar/27/water-companies-in-england-face-outrage-over-record-sewage-discharges>

⁸ https://www.water.org.uk/sites/default/files/wp/2019/10/Re-municipalisation-case-study-review-25.07.19_FINAL.pdf

⁹ <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2024/mar/28/thames-water-privatised-public-ownership>

¹⁰ <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/alectra-1.6209038>

and commercial projects, however, cannot proceed without access to water, wastewater, and the robust infrastructure required to support them. Water is essential for construction and infrastructure is necessary to deliver water to new developments and sustain their ongoing operations.

The Region of Peel sources its water from three primary channels; the majority is drawn from Lake Ontario and delivered through thousands of kilometers of pipelines. In Caledon and rural areas, water is supplied via four municipal wells and private wells. As development expands throughout the region, the demand for water and wastewater treatment will grow accordingly. This critical system cannot be entrusted to a corporation that lacks regulatory oversight and whose primary focus is profit.

Furthermore, we stand at the precipice of the artificial intelligence revolution, a shift with profound environmental implications. Specifically, the massive need for fresh water to cool data centers and computational infrastructure. As this demand spikes, the commodification of water becomes a critical threat. Handing control to a private entity now would leave Peel residents defenseless against a for-profit corporation that prioritizes lucrative industrial contracts over sustainable public usage. We cannot afford to lose control of our water supply just as it becomes the most critical resource of the coming decades.

CUPE Ontario rejects the premise that the introduction of a PUC for water and wastewater will lead to faster development or construction. AMO's own backgrounder estimates timelines of 1-2 years to set up a municipal services corporation and 3-4 years for the MSC to achieve full operational capacity. The province's constantly shifting plans have already created instability, confusion, and significant challenges for planning and investment.

Regional service delivery has been the standard since the 1970s. Separating upper- and lower-tier responsibilities will disrupt services, create duplication, reduce coordination, negatively impact worker recruitment and retention, and complicate budgeting processes.

Currently, upper- and lower-tier municipalities collaborate extensively on managing regional service delivery and play a vital role in coordinating and managing infrastructure services, such as water/wastewater, roads, and planning initiatives. Removing the Region's coordination of water/wastewater delivery and passing it to a corporation adds an additional level of bureaucracy with a new board of decision makers thus disrupting the logical connection between development planning and servicing. The removal of regional oversight and decision making also contradicts the province's priority to build more homes faster.

Corporatizing governance models serves primarily as an attractive selling feature for potential future privatization. Residents of a Region that previously boasted a world-class system may have to deal with three corporate entities in the future for planning and expansion purposes. This legislation has every likelihood of creating the very delays this legislation purports to eliminate, and residents will pay for the privilege.

Water Infrastructure Costs

Water infrastructure is costly. Municipalities, already starving for cash due to a lack of funding from other levels of government, inflation, and now the slashing of development charges, are still without the power to create new revenue streams for themselves.

To date, the province has not released any of the Peel Transition Board reports, recommendations, or financial analysis/research conducted to demonstrate how a municipal corporation would be a better financial option for the municipality. The province has insinuated that because water infrastructure is expensive, corporatization could be a mechanism to finance new infrastructure. CUPE Ontario rejects this prediction.

A municipality does not need a for-profit private corporation to borrow or finance investments. In fact, it's actually cheaper for governments to borrow money. Creating an entity to manage water services can be done without a for-profit regime by instead utilizing models that leverage municipal borrowing power to increase capacity. Ultimately, the issue with financing infrastructure is exactly that – a financing problem. Peel can borrow money and has held a AAA credit rating (the highest rating a municipal or regional government can receive) since 2002¹¹.

Peel is in an arguably strong position due to the Region's growing tax base, very strong operating surpluses, robust financial management, and exceptional liquidity, which will continue to benefit its credit profile. Growing immigration and benefits from proximity to the GTA also play into the Region's future success.

A for-profit structure will ultimately result in a corporation prioritizing profit generation rather than ensuring that residents have access to a necessity of life at an affordable, predictable cost. CUPE Ontario calls for the public release of all the Peel Transition Board reports, recommendations, or financial analysis/research conducted demonstrating how a municipal corporation would be a better financial option for the municipality.

Lack of Labour Relations Direction

The proposed *Peel Implementation Act, 2025* and regulations under the *Municipal Act, 2001* continue to fail to provide a clear path for the hundreds of employees affected in the Region of Peel, Brampton, Mississauga, and the Town of Caledon. CUPE Ontario has consistently raised concerns about the lack of direction in labour relations, including in previous submissions and in a letter dated June 18, 2024, sent directly to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

CUPE Ontario maintains that the *Public Sector Labour Relations Transition Act, 1997* (PSLRTA) should apply to these transitions and/or partial integrations of affected services. Working conditions established in our respective collective agreements should be protected and follow workers during any download of services, ensuring the retention of superior working conditions. To date, CUPE Ontario has not received a response from the Ministry or any of the affected employers regarding the future of our members.

In the absence of clear labour relations guidance and amidst significant job uncertainty, staffing levels have been severely impacted since the initial announcement of Peel's dissolution. The Region of Peel continues to experience an alarming drain of talent and resources as many employees have left to avoid potential layoffs or job losses.

The legislation introduced under Bills 23, 185, and 240 demonstrates a disregard for the employees of Peel Region's Public Works Department. Many of these workers have served for decades and have been consistently recognized as valued employees by their employer and elected officials. Yet, the province's ongoing restructuring efforts have been rolled out without any clear labour relations strategy, leaving employees in limbo. This failure to provide clear and

¹¹ <https://peelregion.ca/press-releases/sp-global-ratings-affirms-peels-aaa-stable-rating>

timely information to hundreds of workers about the future of their livelihoods is nothing short of reckless.

Dedicated employees who remain with the Region of Peel are grappling with prolonged uncertainty, causing immense stress for them and their families. A large number of these workers are senior employees worried about their ability to transition and find other work, while many are junior – just starting their careers and unable to plan. Similarly, employees in Mississauga, Brampton, and Caledon are raising questions about how the download and integration of planning and roads services will unfold, and whether layoffs will occur.

The province's lack of consideration for the people at the heart of these services undermines the very foundation of a successful transition. Clear direction and communication are urgently needed to ensure the fair treatment of employees and the continuity of essential public services. CUPE Ontario demands that the proposed regulations ensure that affected workers will continue to perform the work they do under their current collective agreement and negotiated working conditions.

Conclusion

CUPE Ontario remains steadfast in its commitment to protecting and enhancing the public services that Peel residents rely on, while respecting and safeguarding the workers who deliver these essential services. CUPE Ontario asserts that water and wastewater services must remain under the direct control of the Region of Peel (and other upper-tier municipalities), ensuring continued oversight from democratically elected councillors who are accountable to residents. Explicitly, CUPE Ontario calls for the repeal of Bill 60 and all related prior legislation that enables the province to introduce PUCs.

The passing of this Bill will formalize the privatization of the last utility in the province. With gas and electricity already held in corporate hands and boards prioritizing their responsibilities to shareholders, Bill 60 paints a grim future for water in the province of Ontario.

CUPE Ontario has observed an increasing trend of municipalities bringing services back in-house, recognizing that public provisions offer greater value and control. The promise of cost savings through privatization has repeatedly proven false. Public services consistently deliver superior quality control, operational efficiency, adaptability, enhanced staff morale, and better support for vulnerable citizens. Moreover, in-house services eliminate issues often associated with PUCs and external contractors. Local governments regain community control over public service delivery when services are managed internally.

Summary of Requests and Recommendations

CUPE Ontario submits the following demands and recommendations in response to the proposed amendments:

- The immediate repeal of Bill 60, all related prior bills, the proposed amendments to the Municipal Act, 2001 transferring jurisdiction over water and wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in Peel Region, and the standalone statute authorizing the establishment of water and wastewater public corporations.
- A moratorium on legislative changes to allow for proper studies and meaningful consultation with the public, as well as relevant stakeholders such as labour, environmental organizations, and experts regarding the necessity and impact of a corporation. The current system works; the province must justify why it is attempting a 'fix' using a model that has failed elsewhere.
- If a corporation is determined to be the only option following this pause, direct democratic accountability is only possible if the public retains the right to appoint the individuals who sit on the corporation's board.
- Regulations must mandate that the municipal corporation establish accountability measures that will be made available publicly, including:
 - Regular public reports (quarterly) to the Region of Peel and lower-tiered municipalities covering:
 - Statistics on usage, billing, complaints, and user rate fees.
 - Protocols for service cutoffs.
 - The complaints system process, with timelines and statistics on remedies; and
 - Salary disclosure requirements for transparency.
 - Regulations must outline protections for the Region and municipalities should problems arise with the corporation, establishing formal processes that include:
 - Mechanisms for municipal intervention if there is an issue with the corporation; and
 - Enforceable methods for corrective action upon the municipal corporation.
- CUPE Ontario calls for the immediate public release of all Peel Transition Board reports, recommendations, or financial analysis/research conducted demonstrating how a municipal corporation would be a better financial option for the municipality.
- CUPE Ontario demands that all affected workers continue to perform the work they do under their current collective agreement and negotiated working conditions. CUPE Ontario must be consulted on discussions related to any shifting of resources needed to operate a water and wastewater corporation (ex: IT, HR, corporate finance, legal, and day-to-day operational staff). A clear plan with defined transition periods is necessary, as reaching full autonomy may take time and must be supported by well-articulated agreements. Information on how the Board is being appointed (by the province or by the Region) along with the governance model must be shared with CUPE Ontario.

Additional Resources:

[BACKGROUNDER Water & Wastewater Municipal Services Corporations](#)

['The anxiety': Peel workers concerned Ford government may privatize water and wastewater service, union says](#)

[Water Privatization: Facts and Figures](#)

[Council of Canadians: GOING BLUE: TURNING THE TIDE ON WATER PRIVATIZATION](#)

[CUPE Ontario Submission to Transition Board on Peel Dissolution](#)