

2 Nov 2017

OAPSB INITIAL RESPONSE TO NEW POLICE SERVICES ACT

The new Police Services Act is the culmination of 5 years of consensus-building among police and community stakeholders, facilitated by the Government of Ontario. Overall, the result represents a balance of those interests.

The Ontario Association of Police Services Boards (OAPSB) has advocated hard over those past 5 years, in the public interest, for:

1. Legislation that features a **more effective** public safety model, bringing together the range of human service providers to address the root causes of marginalization, risk, crime and victimization
2. Legislation that features a **more efficient** policing model, facilitating the selection of non-police service providers for the performance of tasks that do not required a fully trained, fully armed police officer
3. Legislation that features **more relevant** police governance, namely:
 - Clarification of board roles, focussed on **strategic governance of police operations**, rather than human resource management
 - **Mandatory board training**
 - **Better resourcing** of boards in terms of information and advice, and decision-making support – in addition to that provided by police chiefs, and
 - **Meaningful board evaluations** and the provision of feedback to them
4. We've also advocated for more effective oversight of police, and modernized police labour practises that are more reflective of general labour practises across Ontario.

Overall, the new Police Services Act is a momentous attempt at satisfying all stakeholders. It features something for everyone, with relatively minor impositions. It **still needs some fine-tuning**, particularly in the following public-interest areas:

1. The new legislation is extremely prescriptive in what tasks can be **outsourced** to the private sector. The most obvious exclusions are court security and prisoner transport, which are more safely and more efficiently performed by the private sector in other jurisdictions. We suggest any restrictions on out-sourcing should be identified **in regulation, not legislation**, so that those restrictions can be

modernized over time, without the need to create an entirely new Act. We believe this is in the public interest.

2. In preambles, the Government refers to OPP Detachment Boards' role as an "advisory" one. We request clarification that these boards are "**governing**" boards. Otherwise we can't see how this move strengthens governance, as the Government has consistently messaged.
3. The new legislation insists that at least one police board member must participate in police collective bargaining. This imposition doesn't happen anywhere else in any sector in Ontario, and shouldn't happen here. Boards establish direction and audit results; they aren't supposed to take action themselves. In police sector, board members are not recruited nor trained to collectively bargain. No one from Cabinet is required to negotiate directly with the OPP, and no one from a police board should be required to either. This unjustified imposition perpetuates a collective bargaining regime that has resulted in the highest municipal police salaries and benefits in the world, and is not in the public interest. In a recent survey of our members, **92%** of the respondents felt that police boards should be able to **assign the task of bargaining to professionals** inside or outside the police service.

For more information, contact:

Eli El-Chantiry
Chair

Fred Kaustinen
Executive Director