

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3. Business Licensing By-law Review – New and Revised Regulations

- Magdelene, Safe Space – see attached submission.
- G. Brown, 35A-59 Ridout Street South – stating that he was unsure whether he would comment on this issue; noting that he has read comments from women's groups and some seem like advertisements for strip clubs and others are very against this as it is the sex trade; indicating that strip clubs bring crime and drugs to our City; stating that strip clubs have a huge effect on neighbourhoods; noting that the single most transformative thing done in the Old East Village was shutting down The Rendezvous; noting that there is an appeal on the license application for a strip club in Argyle; stating that he would not want a strip club in his community; noting that he understands the argument that strip clubs are safer for women than the industry being underground but it has to be considered whether it is actually a safe space for women; stating that when he looks at the careers that young women are encouraged to go into, stripper is never one of them; noting that being a doctor or a nurse is something to aspire to, not being a stripper; indicating that being a stripper is a product of circumstance; indicating that we should spend our time working to make better opportunities available to young ladies in the community rather than trying to regulate a dangerous trade.
- V. Van Linden, 431 Ridgewood Crescent – indicating that she is speaking on behalf of Animal Alliance Canada and for herself as a long-time animal advocate; stating that she wants to thank staff for the recommendation and that she hopes that the Committee will support it as written; indicating she supports the regulation to source all companion animals for sale from rescue shelter sources; noting that in the past, members of City staff have been very generous in meeting with a number of rescue groups in order to compile a list of approved rescue groups; indicating that the sourcing requirement is already happening across North America; stating that this is meant to address the overpopulation of cats and dogs in the community which will save money and be able to control the rising costs of animal services; noting that this type of sourcing requirement will help to close down puppy mills and it tends to encourage more responsible pet adoption; stating that she would also like to see a move towards a permitted list for exotic animals and wants to thank staff for embracing the idea as it is the most progressive and effective way of managing the sale of exotic animals; noting that the most common thing before was to have a prohibited list and that was difficult as more and more animals needed to be added to the list because more and more animals were being brought into the pet trade; indicating that a positive list creates established guidelines as to what types of animals are available for sale; noting that safety for people and animals will be considered when adding to the positive list.
- M. Deganges, Owner, Mega Cone Creamery Food Truck – stating that he his business has been established and licensed for 11 years in London; noting that he is currently regulated by the refreshment vehicle portion of the Business Licensing By-law; indicating that as a refreshment vehicle owner, he is a lot more restricted in London than he would be in other municipalities in Ontario; noting that the current by-law only allows the ice cream truck to operate on private property, with consent of the owner of the property; stating that this limits the potential of the business; indicating that for all these years he has operated with no complaints; stating that he would just like the opportunity to work in the same way that ice cream trucks work in other municipalities; indicating that there are only a few simple changes needed in the by-law to allow them to reach the true potential of their business.
- T. Leblanc, Cocoville Food Truck – indicating that he is thankful for the considerations regarding the fee schedule in the by-law; stating that the new fees for a mobile food truck is much more reasonable than it was before; indicating that he still does not understand why an stationary food vehicle has an even smaller fee to pay while a moving food truck, that already has considerably more costs associated with it, has a higher fee.
- H. Taylor, Safe Space and ANOVA – stating that she acknowledges that everyone shares the goal of achieving safety for women engaged in exotic dancing and working in strip clubs; noting that we have heard from women who feel empowered and safe working in adult establishments, that perhaps there are things they would change but this is their livelihood and they have choice; indicating that there are many things that could be done to achieve equality for women, such as affordable housing, child care and education opportunities as well as closing the wage gap; stating that this is the oldest occupation and there are women who will do this work

and we need to understand that enforcement of the by-law could push them out into unsafe environments; stating that there was a constitutional challenge launched not too long ago that determined that these laws were impacting the safety of women who are engaged in sex work; noting that by criminalizing sex work and those that engage in that work, we are not making it safe for women doing this work; indicating that enforcing a “no touch” rule will cause customers to stop coming out and will also cause sex workers to be pushed out into the streets; stating that we need to listen to the women in the industry who know what they need to keep themselves safe.

- Daniel, Coin Canada – see attached submission.
- Julie, Safe Space, Dr. J. Hall, and A. Trudell, ANOVA – see attached submission.
- T. Simone, Barrister at Law – indicating that she is representing the entertainers and operators of the adult entertainment establishments in London; stating that it is their position that the “no touch” prohibition should be removed from the by-law; indicating that there is no legal basis for the “no touch” provision; stating that it is unworkable and it creates an enforcement quagmire that causes convictions but that is an improper purpose; stating that it is not the City should impose a provision that is workable and sustainable to the workers that are in these establishments; indicating that it would be ideal if the “no touch” provision was removed, but if not, that it be defined, what sexual touching or sexual contact is and have a prohibition for sexual contact only; noting that other municipalities in Ontario have made that clear and there is no misunderstanding; stating that it is imperative that Council have a provision that is defined and workable and that enforcement is not coming in and changing for touching that is allowable; noting that the Superior Court of Ontario and the Supreme Court of Canada has made it clear that not all touching is prohibited; indicating that there is nothing in the Municipal Act that allows for licensing of individual persons and they have not heard a clear rationale as to why there has to be licensed operators; noting that these establishments have been operating for many years and all of the safeguards that need to be in place for the operation of these establishments have been clearly set.
- C. Vitsentzos, Vitsentzos & Vitsentzos – indicating that he is representing the three adult entertainment establishments in London; stating that he appreciates the dialogue he has had with City staff; noting that he will contain his comments to the issue of the licensing; stating that he agrees with the comments of Ms. Simone; indicating that the proposed by-law notes two categories, an owner and an operator with the owner having to be licensed as both an owner and an operator; stating that when he asked why a second administrative license is required he was told that there have been some historical issues when people have not been at locations to answer questions when the inspections took place; noting that he challenged that and he has not been given any evidence of that taking place; indicating that the management hierarchy in each of the three establishments ensures that there is always someone in charge who can answer questions, deal with issues and ensure that the clubs are properly managed; stating that the reality is that this is an unnecessary secondary class of license and does not fit into any of the four categories; indicating that the duality of license does not occur in any other business in the City of London; noting that food establishments and gas bars very often do not have a manager present at all times; stating that this added license will create a financial burden and an administrative burden on owners that is not necessary; pointing out that the license fee for an adult entertainment business is much higher than other businesses, even a tobacco sale business which is also considered a “sin” business; noting that when he enquired as to the difference in cost for the license he was told that historically there have been issues but there is no data to that effect that he has been provided with; stating that the disproportionate license costs are discriminatory; stating that there are other issues with the by-law related to wording, signage and identification requirements.
- M. Walker, London Abused Women’s Centre – see attached submission.
- C. Roberts, London Anti Human-Trafficking Committee – stating that she is a survivor of human-trafficking in the strip clubs in London and along the 401 corridor and has received a Queens Diamond Jubilee Medal for her work; defining prostitution and gives a detailed account of experience working in adult entertainment establishments; stating that third parties that capitalize on the prostitution of others can start off as benevolent helpers but the economic gain in the prostitution of others creates an environment that cause exploitation in order to maximize profits; noting that establishments that allow this cause the possibility of human trafficking to increase; stating that advertising sexual acts by a third party is illegal, so the signage outside of the establishments is illegal.