

Comment

The Mississauga Times
South Sheridan Way, Mississauga.

Published by Metroplex Community Newspapers, a division of Metroplex Printing & Publishing Ltd.
Publisher: R. W. Desrochers
Editor: Peter Armstrong
City Editor: John Stewart

News Editor: Terry Bourke
Community Editor: Bette Bradley
Sports Editor: Chris Zalkovich
Staff writers: Ed Rodewy, James Adair
Paul Williams, Tom Maloney, Greg Snow, Connie Rae, Jo Ann Stevenson
Photographers: Ken Kerr, Gorm Larsen
Advertising manager: Fay Taylor
Classified manager: Judith Lenon
Classified real estate manager: Fred Dorrington
Display advertising sales representative: Will Wiser, Helen Kaulbach, Doug Mathews
Art/Production Director: Richard Macey

Circulation Manager: David Settle, Assistant manager: Eric Chaffin
Archie Blair, Jim Valasek, Jim Edmonson
Secretary: Lee Chaille

The Mississauga Times is one of the Metroplex Community Newspapers, a division of Metroplex Printing & Publishing Ltd., which includes The Oakville Journal Record, The Halton Consumer, The Etobicoke Advertiser/Observer, The Etobicoke Consumer, The Bolton Enterprise, The Woodbridge & Vaughan News, The Richmond Hill/Thornhill Liberal, The Aurora/Newmarket Banner, The North York Mirror, The North York Consumer, The Scarborough Mirror, The Scarborough Consumer.

Strip scene

The bumping and grinding at some local taverns would probably be described as rude by most Mississauga people.

But then, most Mississauga people probably don't care what goes on — and comes off — at the Mississauga Tavern and other strip joints.

Most people don't frequent the joints. The ones who do either enjoy the shows or don't return, the way other people choose television.

Objections to sex-on-stage as performed by the dozens of girls who work the city taverns usually stems from the self-righteous who take it upon themselves to decide another person's morals.

But such objections are flimsy.

It is an historical fact that moral decay accompanied the fall of some great civilizations. The Romans indulged gloriously in sexual diversions and perversions before their era ended. But there is no indication the sexual freedom was a causal factor or merely a symptom of that decline.

The simple truth of the strip scene is that patrons enjoy it. So do the strippers, who according to a report on the front of today's community section, D-1, make up to \$500 a week.

That is why — unless independent research indicates otherwise — there is nothing wrong with the proliferation of liquor outlets in the city that serve sex with the sandwiches.

Who suffers? Perhaps some competing taverns are hurting, although

the free marketplace allows them to alter their atmosphere, provide competitive entertainment or aim at a different market.

Are the men — and many women — who frequent the strip joints threats to society?

Are the patrons' families suffering? Perhaps the first item a stripper can remove at the beginning of the after-work dance is a sign asking, "Have you phoned home?"

Some would imply that organized crime is connected with such establishments, but there is no indication that is so. There are laws there, too.

There are laws to prevent youngsters from being thrust against what may be a bad influence for the impressionable. There are laws to prevent the grossly vulgar from occurring on stage.

In the case of the Mississauga Tavern, police have warned the strippers that if they appear bottomless they may be charged with public nudity. And there is another section of the Criminal Code that prohibits the dancers from touching themselves on stage.

Under those two laws, police must use their discretion, and the Peel police appear to be acting fairly. Until the patrons start rioting and raping and looting the city and until other crimes in which there are victims are stopped, the police can properly maintain a low-key watch on the strip joints without having to close them down.



From our readers

Nikanna favoritism

I read with interest Greg Snow's account of the rejection by the Mississauga Committee of Adjustment of an application to allow Mrs. D. Nicholson to establish a home for foster children on Nikanna Road.

What concerns me the most is the inconsistency of the committee. As you may recall, the committee voted to allow the Mississauga Association for the Mentally Retarded to establish a group home on Haig Boulevard (R-4 residential) against strong opposition from Haig homeowners.

The committee of adjustment has taken a completely opposite position by choosing to listen to the slightly more affluent homeowners of Nikanna (R-3 residential) and by doing so is keeping out five homeless children. Just where is their sense of justice? Are we not all supposed to be equal under the law? This whole af-

fair screams of favoritism and discrimination.

If Ron Starr, a member of the committee of adjustment, felt that his vote against the foster-home application was against his principles, then why did he vote against it? Also, John Keyser, the vice-chairman, was quoted as saying that there is a place for Mrs. Nicholson and what she wants to do, but he allowed the Nikanna homeowners to have their way.

He, too, voted against the placement of the foster home.

Why don't these gentlemen stand up for what they know is right? If the committee had allowed the application, the neighbors would have had to accept the decision, just as the neighbors of the group home on Haig, after an expensive legal battle, have had to accept the group home for the mentally retarded in their more densely populated area. It is also my understanding that a precedent was set when the Ontario cabinet ruled that the Haig home was to be established.

I think the committee of adjustment should be elected, not appointed, so that if they are seen to be inconsistent or unfair, then we could vote for new members. I also think they have too much power. To my knowledge, there was no minor adjustment to be made in this decision. Their decision regarding Nikanna, from what I can see, was based on the attitudes of the neighbors alone, and not on the suitability of the residence.

Gwen Oakes, Mississauga

Phasing dangers

I read with interest the remarks of the various ratepayer groups in Mississauga which have objected vocally to the action of council in deleting from the Official Plan the procedure of phasing.

I was not present at the time that the remarks were made, but it would seem to me that the fear of the ratepayer groups is that without phasing development will take place all over the municipality in a disjointed manner, thus creating higher costs in the provision of services.

I submit that such thinking is a slight to council and its planning board in that it suggests that in dealing with an application for land development, planning board and council would not have the intelligence and foresight to turn down an application which would be detrimental to the City as a whole.

I submit that council and planning board have demonstrated that they are well able to exercise good judgment in the administration of the affairs of the city.

I feel quite confident that council, in dealing with any application that should come before it, would ensure that services which may be required for a development under consideration would not be a burden on the existing taxpayers of Mississauga.

They have demonstrated this by requiring the applicant to provide those services which may be required at his own cost or by the imposition of levies to pay for such services. In the instances, where services cannot be charged to the applicant and which might be a burden to the city, the developments have been rejected.

In making their comments, the ratepayers have overlooked the fact that the imposition of phasing would:

1 — prevent the implementation of affordable housing since the lands in Phase 1 are too expensive for affordable housing;

2 — create a monopoly to the landowners in Phase 1, thus driving up the price of such lands and the lands in subsequent phases when they come up for development; and

3 — prevent council, both present and future, from maintaining all its options, by restricting it from dealing with proposals from lands outside Phase 1, even though they may be viable propositions to produce affordable housing without creating a burden on the existing taxpayers.

In order to produce lots for affordable housing, two ingredients are necessary: a desire on behalf of the landowners to produce low cost lots and housing; and financial feasibility, that is to say, the cost of the raw land to the developer must be sufficiently low to permit him to produce a low cost finished product.

The owners of the lands in Phase 1, in effect, will have a monopoly which reduces the likelihood of their having the desire to produce low cost lots. As most developers are not altruistic, it is unlikely that any one or more of them would consider producing low-cost lots unless they are forced by the marketplace to do so. With a monopoly, there would be no pressure on them to look for a new product in order to get the jump on their competition, as they will be able to sell any product that they produce at just about any price demanded. The lands which are located in the proposed Phase 1, which council has turned down, are just too expensive in their raw state to be used for affordable housing.

With a monopoly in place, not only is it unlikely that low cost lots will be produced, but the price of serviced lots coming on stream will escalate. There is only one way, short of government intervention, of bringing down the price of any product and that is by oversupply. There is no way that an oversupply would be created with phasing in the Official Plan.

Without the burden of phasing in the Official Plan, present council and future councils, will retain all their options to move in any direction, in the best interests of the city. If an owner of a parcel of land not included in Phase 1 should present to council a viable proposition which would produce reasonably priced lots, without creating any burden on the rest of the city, council would be in a

position to sanction such a proposition. By having all the land in the city available for development, there will be greater pressure on developers to sharpen their pencils which will result in a lower priced product. With phasing, council would be prevented from dealing with such proposals, thus eliminating the opportunity to citizens of Mississauga of purchasing a lower priced product.

I submit that once the populace has chosen a council, it should not then proceed to tie the hands of that council, but should permit it to move in whatever direction best benefits the entire city.

I am not for a moment suggesting that once the voter has elected a council that it should not be heard again until the next election. Most definitely, voters and ratepayer groups should be heard between elections, but I submit that their function is to make council aware by representations on all sides of an issue so that council can act with the benefit of full knowledge.

I submit that the rapid escalation of taxes is not caused by new developments, but by council playing the role of the doting parent who grants all the requests of his children whether or not he or she can afford it.

As you might have gleaned from the foregoing, I am firmly in favor of the resolution of council to implement the Official Plan without phasing.

Joseph A. Chiappetta

Festival defended

I am writing regarding Stewart Page's article, Festival on the Street. In case readers other than myself felt that the organizers allowed, nay, encouraged an air of liberalism toward drug use, or in case they feel put off by Mr. Page's example of society in the stages of veritable decay, let's get some facts straight.

This was the second year the Lennox Street Festival has happened, and to give due where it's deserved it has both times been organized and executed by the NDWT CO!, for the people in the immediate neighborhood of the acting group's theatre (NDWT CO!), in the Bathurst Street United Church building. They make no monetary profit from the festival. It is, in fact, a product of donated time, effort, actors' money and love. The young teenage clowns are not paid a "modest fee." They donate their ser-

VICES, along with the bake-sale person and everyone else, so the festival can be fun for everyone, not just the kids.

The winner of the cake did not stick a finger in his prize, declaring it a "rip-off." He quite graciously announced that he was "donating it to the church supper" — no expression from the drug sub-culture there.

The master of ceremonies said, "Right now you can find dope brownies on sale at the bake sale." They're called dope brownies because they were made by a dope — me." I know this joke verbatim because I was the master of ceremonies, and I made it up the night before when I slightly burned the brownies. I'm glad I didn't mention their "burning" or Mr. Page would have picked up on yet another "rip-off" of the audience.

In reference to folk singer David Baccha — "dirty clothes and long hair" — it is untrue that it took Mr. Baccha five minutes to tune his instrument, or that he performed only for himself. The crowd liked him immensely and several people even asked about him after. While he may have sung a song mentioning drugs, he also sang several songs of his own composition, including one especially amusing to children about a chicken impersonator on the Gong Show.

Mr. Page also said there was no explanation for "political hot-dogs." This is untrue. Had Mr. Page cared to listen, an immediate explanation from the bandstand showed that "the NDP dog came with the bare essentials, wiener and bun; the PC dog had cat-sup and mustard, but not so much relish; and the Liberal dog was loaded, — something spicy for everyone." Not a great joke, but a folksy one, surely fit for a neighborhood get together. Why not emphasize the originality of this festival, Mr. Page, instead of exaggerating an obscene drug reference into a festival theme? Why not encourage others to organize their own street festival, an event that can promote a feeling of real social fabric, that of the united neighborhood? Why not mention the \$300 raised for a needy cause?

After the street dance, where the "blacks" boogied with the "whites," people lingered, wondering when they had last had such a good (pardon the expression) high.

And I'll bet the kids didn't go home and have nightmares about drugs either!

David Ferry



Writer says the committee of adjustment decision prohibiting a foster home at a house (above) on Nikanna

shows "favoritism and discrimination."