

Halton Hills Outlook

"OUTLOOK" is published each Saturday by the HALTON HILLS HERALD, Home Newspaper of Halton Hills, A Division of Canadian Newspapers Company Limited, at 45 Guelph Street, Georgetown, Ontario L7G 3Z6.
 Second Class Mail — Registered Number 0943.
 877-2201 877-8822
PUBLISHER
 Don Brander
EDITOR
 Dave Rowney
ADVERTISING MGR.
 Paul Leishman
STAFF WRITERS
 Brian MacLeod Cheryl Moodler
ACCOUNTING
 Mike Bowen Paulline Miller
SPORTS
 Mike Turner
CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING
 Joan Mannall Elaine Kuzyshyn

MARKETING REPRESENTATIVES
 Sharon Hollingsworth
 Cathy McGough
PRODUCTION SUPERINTENDENT
 Dave Hastings
PRODUCTION ASSISTANTS
 Myles Gillson Mary Lou Foreman
 Annie Olsen
CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
 Marie Shadbolt
PRESSROOM FOREMAN
 Brian Alkman
ASSISTANT
 Rychard McKeown

Their Outlook

Thieves respond to economic 'flows'



Your Business
 By **DIANNE MALEY**
 Business Analyst
 Thomson News Service

Thieves respond to the ebb and flow of the economy in surprising ways, Statistics Canada numbers show.
 In 1979 and 1980, as the boom gathered momentum, thieves broke into people's homes in unprecedented numbers. Break-ins at business premises, by comparison, peaked in 1982, at the height of the worst recession since the 1930s.

It seems that thieves feel less compunction stealing from other people when the economy is on a roll and there's wealth a plenty. When times get tough, many leave their neighbors alone, focusing instead on business, which they seem to believe has more to spare.
 Break and enter offences, as Statscan calls them, have tripled over the past 25 years, and most of them occur in private homes.

Curiously, Toronto, where burglar alarm systems are big business, has one of the lowest rates of break and entry in the country, which goes to show how much perception overshadows reality.

NORTH WORST

On a per capita basis, break-ins were worst in the Northwest Territories in 1986, the latest year for which numbers are available, Statscan says. The territories suffered at a rate of 3,357 break-ins for every 100,000 population.

Next came British Columbia, with a rate of 2,168 per 100,000 population; followed by the Yukon, 2,075, and Manitoba, 1,910. The lowest break-in rates belonged to Newfoundland, with 689 break-ins for every 100,000 population, and Prince Edward Island, with 837.

Of 17 cities surveyed, Vancouver topped the list of B and E's in 1986 with a rate of 3,218 offences for every 100,000 people, Statscan says. Victoria was hard on its heels with 3,166, followed by Regina with 2,902; Quebec City, 2,687; Saskatoon, 2,534 and Winnipeg, with 2,331. Big, bad Toronto ranks down there second to last with a mere 1,031 rating, outdone only by St. John's, with 874. Things were worse in Edmonton, with a rate of 2,208; Ottawa, with 2,147; Halifax, 1,763; Charlottetown, 1,444 and Fredericton, 1,082.

WHILE CAT'S AWAY

Statscan says most break-ins take place during weekdays, when people are at work. Thirty-six per cent of B and E victims do not report the crime because the offence is too minor or because they believe the police can not do anything about it, which is often the case.

Break-ins cost insurance companies more than \$170 million in 1986 for property loss and damages, Statscan says.

The agency blamed burgeoning break-ins on social changes that have resulted in the entire family going off to work, and on expensive, relatively portable consumer goods, such as VCRs.

These have made break and enter a "more profitable crime," Statscan says.

Berry's World



LIFESTYLES OF THE RICH AND INFAMOUS

\$200,000 can buy a lot of Pampers



Weir's View

By **Ian Weir**
 Thomson News Service

It is, of course, a myth that our society offers equal opportunities to all.
 Oh, we all like to talk about egalitarian principles. It's nice, for instance, to be able to say that practically anybody can become prime minister. (The cynics might add that practically anybody usually does.)

But the plain fact is that precious few of us have any chance of growing up to be PM — which doesn't bother us much, since so few of us really want to be PM anyway. It's much better to have a relative become prime minister, so you can get appointed to the Senate.

I digress. The point is that the fundamental inequities in our society can become depressing and demoralizing.

To cite a particularly demoralizing example: if this is supposed to be such an egalitarian society, then how come the rest of us never had the chance to apply for the position of Duke of York?

The truth is that one of my earliest ambitions was to become a member of the British Royal Family. This would have ensured that I was much better treated at home.

I can recall protesting to my mother — on occasions when I was being particularly ill-treated — that Prince Charles was never forced to clean his stupid room before he could go out and play. My mother's reaction was invariably that Prince Charles did not live in this particular house — which, as far as I was concerned, was a lucky thing for Prince Charles.

This sort of confrontation gradually made me abandon my Royal ambitions, and I came to a new career decision. If I couldn't win fair treatment from my mother by becoming Prince of Wales,

then I would become a Mountie and arrest her instead.

In any case, these childhood longings for Royalty came flooding back just last week, as a result of a truly eye-popping little news item.

The annual stipend of Prince Andrew — which more than doubled after he married Fergie and became Duke of York — is now deemed insufficient to meet his expenses. So he has just been handed a further 73-per-cent increase, bringing his annual salary to \$206,000.

Well, we are all aware that becoming a family man involves increased expenditures. But let's be realistic. Two hundred grand buys a whole lot of Pampers.

Let's even concede the fact that it probably costs more to run a Duke's family than a regular family.

The Duchess needs nice clothes, and if family finances get tight, you can't really expect her to host Tupperware parties. Their children will need spending money, and it's highly unlikely that any of them will ever take on a paper route.

All the same, do you know of anyone else who has been offered a 73-per-cent raise — to \$206,000 a year — just for getting married?

Personally, I've been engaged for more than three months, and the editor has yet to mention the words "two hundred thousand" to me. Now, it's possible that this has just slipped his mind, and that he's meaning to get round to it, but one does not hold one's breath.

Let's face it — you don't need \$200,000 to get married. (After a few years, it might take \$200,000 to persuade you to STAY married, but this is another matter.)

And this brings us back to the heart of the issue. If there are actually jobs that offer \$206,000 per annum for getting married, then why don't the rest of us have a chance to apply for them?

To put it bluntly: was this job posted in the Careers section of The Globe and Mail? And if not, why not?

And if only I were Duke of York (it had to be added), she wouldn't be able to make me do the laundry.

Staff Comment



By **BRIAN MacLEOD**

The wonder of weight

With all the advances in modern science and nutrition, I still have to wonder if health agencies have caught up with modern health habits.

The Regional Health Department has released a body weight formula and chart as a part of its "Healthy Weight in '88" campaign.

The chart gives a formula for healthy body weight called the Body Mass Index. The index plots a chart which helps you find out if you're in the danger zone.

The formula works like this. You take your weight in kilograms (multiply your weight in pounds by .454 to find that out) and divide it by your height in metres squared (your height in metres times itself).

That gives you your BMI rating. A Body Mass Index rating of 20 to 27 is set as "boundaries for healthy weights."

Between 25 and 27 is the "caution area" and above 27 and you're dead — almost.

Sounds fair enough, right?

In many cases, it's bunk. I suppose it's okay to use charts like this to come up with a very general idea of body weight — sometimes.

But they should not be taken any more seriously than with passing interest.

I've seen many different charts with body weight ranges for height ranges. Some actually take your bone structure into consideration. Hurray for them. It's a start.

But there's too many exceptions. The formula virtually eliminates anyone who touches weights with any regularity. When you lift weights you get heavier.

Muscle, you see, is heavier than fat.

Then you don't fit into the proper category.

"Relax," proponents say, "it's only a guideline."

That's very true. Many won't fit into these categories.

It would be fine and dandy if it ended there.

But some organizations actually take these things seriously.

Some insurance companies use these charts to determine health risks for life insurance.

In some cases, the results are absurd.

A couple of years back a male steward on an airline in the United States, was told he had to lose 40 pounds or his job. He didn't have a pound of excess bodyfat on him. In fact he was probably in better shape than 90 per cent of the people in North America.

He was a bodybuilder. He appealed the insurance company's decision and lost. They stuck blindly to the charts.

According to that BMI, I'm at 28.92 and dying quickly.

At five feet eleven inches I weight about 200 pounds. Hefty, you might say. But I too hit the weights and much of that weight is, dare I say it, not fat but muscle.

I'm sure, because I'm currently in what's known in weightlifting circles as the "bulking up phase", that I've probably got my fair share of bodyfat. But lifting weights two hours a day five days a week and eating a bit more certainly doesn't put my health in jeopardy as the BMI suggests.

If you really want to find out if you're in shape, go for a run around the block then go home and have a look in the mirror.

Berry's World



Jim Berry
 © 1988 by HEA INC. 3-2

"Yitzhak, let me tell you about TRADING LAND FOR PEACE."