

GRAPEVINE

PA DAY ACTIVITIES

Looking for ways to keep the kids entertained during the PA Day on Friday, February 3?

The Acton Library will be hosting a family story time from 10 to 10:30 a.m. with stories, music and fun for families and small children. There is no need to register. Just drop in.

The town is hosting a PA Day swim at the Acton Pool from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m., and a PA Day Skate at the Acton Arena from 2 p.m. to 3:20 p.m.

FREE TO PICK UP

Beginning March 1, The New Tanner will no longer be available for purchase in stores. However the newspaper will be available for free from the paper box in front of The New Tanner Office at 379 Queen Street East.



A NEW SEMESTER STARTS

Semester two classes begin this Monday, February 6 at Acton District High School.



John Sparrow David Thompson

Source: National Archives of Canada, C-068645

THE NEW TANNER GOES INTERNATIONAL

The New Tanner's January 19 edition, featuring a story about the opening of the Canadians in Chengdu Exhibit at the George Elliot Theatre will be making it's a way to China when Mayor Rick Bonnette shares it with the Town of Halton Hills' sister city Wenzhang.

CANADA'S FOURTH PRIME MINISTER

Conservative Sir John Sparrow David Thompson was a lawyer, judge, politician and university professor, and Canada's fourth Prime Minister.

Thompson took on the role when Sir John Abbott retired due to illness in 1892, and he would serve as Prime Minister until 1894. During his short time in office, Thompson came close to bringing Newfoundland into Confederation, but ultimately did not succeed. Newfoundland would not enter Confederation until 1949. Thompson reduced trade tariffs and dealt with schooling issues in Manitoba and the North West Territories. He also appointed four justices to the supreme court.

Shortly after Queen Victoria made Thompson a member of her Privy Council, Thompson died suddenly of a heart attack at Windsor Castle in England. He was 49 years old.

Thompson was the second Prime Minister to die in office.

LETTERS

The views expressed in these published letters are those of the writer and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of The New Tanner Publishing Ltd.



re: Ageism at Sobeys - Agree with letter

To the Editor;

I agree with Terry Ferguson's letter in the January 26 issue of the New Tanner. It is insulting and offensive to be a senior and be asked for I.D. From now on I refuse to purchase alcohol from Sobeys. Or was that LBCO's plan all along? One has to wonder

about the brain that crafted the policy in the first place. Can't blame the staff for following orders but just the same, a little common sense would go a long way. Last week while shopping at Fortinos I picked up two bottles of wine. Check out was civilized and no I was not asked for ID.

Same with going into any LCBO store: no ID asked for. Makes me wonder why Sobeys would go out of its way to antagonize paying customers. Terry's right: it is insulting. So here's lifting a glass to Terry. Good on, Terry.

Mildred and Steve Ferris

re: Ageism at Sobeys - First world problem

To the Editor;

Dear Terry the Curmudgeon,

I was so sorry to hear about your "irritation of the month". When the Provincial Government recently allowed the public to purchase wine and beer at local grocery stores,

they had to decide the most efficient and fair way to check for legal age during purchases. The necessary system of scanning everyone's ID takes the onus off of the cashier in the situation (the young lad barely 19) and allows for zero error to occur when selling alcohol within a retail location where minors may roam. Would you rather have those young cashiers using their discretion? If I understand clearly, your main complaint is that it's insulting, offensive

and a MAJOR inconvenience to reach into your wallet to retrieve your ID? Wow, life sure must be difficult for you dealing with all these first world problems.

You are opting to take part in a provincially-regulated activity (like driving, boating, voting and yes, drinking). Partake in any of these activities and play by the rules of the government, often of which one of is to show identification. Would a voter casting a ballot have a leg to stand on if it was explained to the voting station staff that he or she had lives in the neighborhood for 50 years and, therefore, shouldn't have to show ID? Of course not. And you wouldn't blame the polling station. Just as you shouldn't blame Sobeys. Your irritation is misdirected.

If you want to be irritated at anyone it should be the Ontario provincial government for implementing the Draconian policy of making you show ID in order to get your suds at the convenience of your local grocery store. But really you should just opt out and show your displeasure by not playing ball at all, leaving that six-pack on the shelf at Sobeys and going for a nice walk instead.

Warmest regards

Your Neighbour
in Acton

P.S. Always listen to your wife. She is probably right.

P.P.S. Hopefully you will be feeling better soon. It's understandable all the stress you must be under since this horrific, submissive incident.

JUST A THOUGHT

A thief amongst us

Like many of my neighbours, I had someone break into my car. Someone went through my things and stole what didn't belong to them. Be it a few loose coins, a forgotten GPS tucked between the seats or the remainder of my Timmy's gift card, something that was mine, and in my space, was taken from me. I felt violated, wronged, unsure and unsafe, and while the situation I found myself in was by no means the result of any wrongdoing on my part, I was in it all the same. I didn't leave my things lying about in public and walk away; although, I would argue that finding something in such a manner and taking it as your own is no more righteous. No, someone in my community was not playing by the same rules as me; the rules our society had dictated. I admit it: I was surprised, disappointed even upset. I felt vindicated in having the entire police department descend in full CSI fashion to catch the vile criminal who had so wronged me, and, by proxy, all Canadians that choose to follow the law of the land. This breach chipped away at my beliefs: in fairness; kindness; safety. How could we allow this felon to just get away with it, I thought? Shouldn't such transgression be punished?



By **Trish Bell**

Aren't we justified, nay, obligated to reestablish the rules? After all, the crook broke them, not me. Wouldn't that make us all feel better? Safer?

Instead, I did what all "good Canadians" are supposed to do; I forgave and forgot. I attempted to rationalize this poor thief's actions: perhaps times are tough for them. Maybe they are struggling or just had a weak moment. It won't happen again, I assured myself, so I can let it go. And I told myself I was a better person for not letting it change me. But, low and behold, it happened again. Police now advised me to be vigilant. Lock my doors. Hide my valuables. Look over my shoulder. Be less trusting and more cognizant of what is going on around me. But, why? Does the law explicitly say that you can take someone's stuff if it isn't locked up or hidden? If I'm the one following the rules, why should I have to change so others, who don't follow them, can't trespass against me? And just like that, I began to change.

I feared that anyone could be guilty. I felt justified because my chunk of space in this world continued to be violated. While the law said I couldn't punish the perpetrators on one hand, it encouraged me to barricade my things and protect myself on the other. I isolated myself with deadbolts and motion lights and cameras. Suddenly, I was an island. My everyday life became distorted; I was now accommodating the criminals instead of them coming round to society's laws. Soon, thievery was happening so often, and to so many, that we all stopped even noticing. It became normal. Accepted. Unchangeable. Most people couldn't even remember why it had seemed like a big deal in the first place. Society had indeed changed, for now not locking your door was more of a crime than stealing.

Today, we live as billions of closed doors, all pretending to be open. We insist everyone is held to the same rules, but instead hold no one to them. The system of trust and safety has long slipped through our fingers, with only the dust of what was remaining. If we wish to live in a world of voluntary compliance, should we choose the rules or the locks?