

# Town officials should be accountable

The rude behavior displayed by many members of local ratepayer group, Furiously Opposed to Acton Dumping, (F.O.A.D.), during a recent Town council meeting may not be excusable but it is certainly understandable.

A shouting match between F.O.A.D. members and council erupted during the meeting, over the reconstruction issue of the Third Line in the area of the Acton quarry.

F.O.A.D. member Gord Vandevalk appeared before council saying Town Administrator Dan Costea had failed to follow a previously passed council resolution concerning the Third Line reconstruction project.

When Mr. Costea attempted to defend himself he was met with a chorus of F.O.A.D. members chanting "liar, liar!"

Needless to say, this kind of caterwauling or any other type

doesn't befit a council chamber.

However, the peoples' angry response is understandable since Mr. Costea refused to at least acknowledge his error in judgement.

The resolution in question, approved Sept. 30, calls for Town staff to request the province's Ministry of Natural Resources make the Third Line an integral part of the replacement site plan for the Acton quarry.

F.O.A.D. members want the Third Line reconstructed through the quarry in accordance with a 1974 agreement, believing the reconstruction project will prevent the quarry from being converted into a dump.

In the letter Mr. Costea sent to the MNR, dated Oct. 15, the Administrator refers to the reconstruction project in connection with a rehabilitation site plan for the quarry instead of the replacement



Ben's  
Banter  
by  
Ben Dummett

site plan.

When council was first considering the resolution, rehabilitation site plan was used in the wording.

At that time F.O.A.D. members objected to the use of the word rehabilitation. They have always wanted the reconstruction plan in-

corporated as part of the replacement site plan. F.O.A.D. members claim there is a better chance of stopping the dump proposal if the reconstruction project is connected to a replacement site plan.

After much discussion, council changed the resolution's wording to include replacement site plan.

It's not difficult then to understand the ratepayer group's anger when they find out Mr. Costea used the word rehabilitation site plan in his correspondence to the MNR.

To add injury to insult Mr. Costea denied he had done anything wrong.

"The wording of the correspondence is in keeping with the advice of the Town solicitor, and I would prefer to take the advice of our solicitor over Mr. Vandevalk," said Mr. Costea.

Following the meeting, Mr.

Costea further explained the words replacement and rehabilitation are interchangeable.

If Mr. Costea thought the words were interchangeable he should have pointed out that fact when council was first considering the resolution.

If, as he says, he was following the solicitor's advice in using the wording rehabilitation, then he should have provided the solicitor's reasons for this advice.

However, Mr. Costea did none of the above.

In last week's column I wrote how Town staff should be open to public scrutiny and here is a perfect example supporting that article.

Working for the public, Town staff, just as councillors, must answer to the ratepayers for their action and if they can't support those actions they should have to face the consequences, as Mr. Costea has rightly had to do.

# Political affiliation, not issues, of utmost importance

For all of those who watched the developing of the Thomas-Hill affair a sense of dissatisfaction was left lingering in our mouth. There we have, two perfectly credible people, and still we know that one of the two has been lying. Even being more generous we still have to accept that one of the two has a rather strange perception of what really did happen.

Moreover we are left with the feeling that the Senate, that most august body, has not been able to deal with what was, after all, a rather simple issue. And that maybe the wrong person is now sitting on the bench of the American Supreme Court.

Finally we have the reputation of two people lying in shreds, for at least a large part of the popula-

tion.

The guilt or innocence of Judge Thomas has been the subject of discussion without any positive outcome, until finally a point, and I must say a rather obvious one, came to light which at least may teach us something.

Imagine a three Judges Court, where the Judges would not sit as impartial observers of the trial, but would have a vested interest in the outcome. One or two of the Judges are favoring the accused, and do their best to discredit the victim. The other(s) are partisan of the victim and do their best to make the accused look like a monster. A real kangaroo court!

But this rather absurd travesty of justice is exactly what we witnessed in finding the "truth".



Another  
View  
by  
Carlo Testa

They either wanted their man confirmed or they were doing their utmost best to deny him the job. The confirmation hearings are not designed to "discover the

truth". They are, at best, designed to make sure that the President of the USA has not chosen a complete dodo for the job on hand.

The senators are there to win political points, and not to deal with other matters. So, not surprisingly, they did "their" job. They counted the votes, and went with the political wind.

In other words we were not exposed to a travesty of justice, we witnessed a typical political exercise, an exercise which has nothing to do with justice being rendered. In politics it is not right or wrong, which counts is how many votes you can get which carries the day.

For Canada who is considering introducing a similar system of reviewing political appointees, the lesson is clear. Sure our MPs or senators will do their job, but only within the guidelines of their political affiliation. To expect them to perform differently is not only naive, but it goes against the grain. You do not play tennis by the rules of football.

If we wish the past of political appointees, or even politicians at large, to be reviewed in the light of moral or even simple legal standards, we need a different approach. One where, as in the courts, the objective is to get to the truth, not one where the objective is to carry the day or gain political brownie points.

## People's Forum

# Minister gets involved with municipal election

To the Editor:

"Without a vision the people perish." Prov. 29:18.

Well it's election time again! And you may be asking, "What are the issues this election?" Monday night, I had the very agonizing experience of sitting from 7:00 to 10:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers and watching our representatives at work. We were there because of a concern about the development of an existing structure beside the Presbyterian Church in Norval. To my surprise every issue on the agenda, and the four additional delegates, were also there on issues of development.

The process was extraordinary. As an observer I noted that every item of business, without exception was sent back to "Planning." Nothing was dealt with! Every issue has now to come back to another meeting.

Our concern was Norval - and the Planner Ian Keith said that a request for re-zoning had been made "several years ago," but because of "full agendas" - they were not able to address the concern but he hopes to get to it next year. Mr. Keith said to a council room full of irate taxpayers, that the problem is the "complexity of the planning process, between town and region and agent. People are confused about what the role of government agencies in the planning process is." He suggested that all of the agencies and departments involved in the planning process are merely "technical agencies" and they give no concern to the "merits" of any project. What really sent a shiver down my back was, he said there were currently 30 to 40 site plans before him each year "that need to be dealt with as quickly as possible, because in most cases the applicant is only

days away from building."

The thinking then by our council is, that it's far easier to approve an individual application, than it is to plan. This is erroneous thinking. If the town was developed in agreement with the residence, then each application could be approved in terms of its conformity to the overall approved plan. Then, and only then, will the approval of development go through without angry taxpayers yelling and screaming in the council chambers over every proposal.

"If we're not going anywhere, any road will get us there." But if we have a vision of what kind of a community we want to live in, we'll need a plan that we all agree on. I for one will give my right to a councillor for a year, if we could be given a planner who would develop the zoning for Norval. We don't need councillors who can only nod and tell us how it "used to be". We need someone who can make concrete the vision that the people of Norval have for their hamlet.

Mayor Russel has requested that Planning look at putting a freeze on development of the Steeles Avenue and Winston Churchill Boulevard area, because here again development is piecemealed, with no clear direction for the growth that is already taking place. I don't think in our economy we should be talking about stopping the development, but rather addressing our great need in this area for planning. Let's get the planners that are needed to get the job done properly.

Until then it seems to me that our councillors are redundant.

Most of them were very quick to point out that planning was part of their campaign, well, where have they been all year. These

problems are not new, but are becoming increasingly compounded because our current representatives either don't know the wishes of the people they represent or they don't understand the mechanics of how to realize those wishes.

It is time that our politicians become aware that they can not

bend to every individual's desire for aggressive commerce at the expense of the human rights of others. People have a right to live in areas of quiet, with minimal traffic and safety for their children. All development is not inherently good. And the high cost for poor development is paid for by the quality of life of the residence.

The community has a right to protect their standard of living, and our representatives' first concerns must be that standard of life.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rev. Mary Campbell,  
B.A., M.Div.,  
Minister, Norval/Union  
Presbyterian Churches.

Dear Editor:

The Town of Halton Hills deserves better; the residents of the Canada Homes and Fernbrooke Homes subdivisions deserve better.

On October 22nd and 23rd we were invited to hear our elected officials speak about issues that were important to us. This meeting was an excellent opportunity for those three politicians in attendance to make themselves known to the electorate in our area - those who were not invited did not have the opportunity to meet with us. If this information was a year ago, or even six months ago I would not be writing this letter, but for these three politicians to hold this meeting and not invite those running for the same positions as they hold is unfair, to Robert Barlow candidate for Mayor, Linda Walton candidate for Regional Council, Ron Chatten and Peter Norton candidates for Local Council, and it is unfair to residents of Georgetown South.

Will we, and other residents of Halton Hills, have to wait for three more years to have the issues that affect us addressed by our elected officials? Will our elected officials only meet with us to discuss our concerns when

their jobs are on the line? Three weeks before an election is no time to hold a meeting with residents to hear their views about their neighborhood.

Unless we vote for those candidates who were not invited to this election meeting, a meeting held in a developer's sales office with information provided by

town and region staff, we will be stuck with three politicians who are good at listening and talking to the people only once in three years - and then only three weeks before an election!

Sincerely,  
V. Newman,  
Georgetown.

# The town deserves better

## Farm families hurting

To the Editor:

Please take the time to read this letter as it is very important to our livelihood and to Canadians in general.

We are a farm family, involved in a dairy operation in Terra Cotta, for four generations and would like to continue to do so in the future.

The future at this moment seems rather dismal, as disposing of the Canadian farmer seems to be the greatest concern of the government for the past few years, with such issues as:

- supply management and tariffs
- quota changes/merge of fluid and industrial quota
- farm credit
- free trade

reduction in crop prices. We are an endangered species and must constantly stand firm and fight to maintain a decent living.

We urge the government to maintain and support Article XI of Gatt. Tariffs cannot be used for supply management. Without supply management, our country will lose many farmers; Canadians will see unemployment figures rise to an even greater high.

We again urge you, to maintain support for Article XI. Canada must not agree to any deal that does not include a strengthened and clarified Article XI.

Sincerely,  
The Mountain family.