

Ontario Libertarian Party  
7-91 Rylander Blvd., Box 121  
Scarborough, ON M1B 5M5  
416-283-7589 1-888-ONT-LIBertarian

[www.libertarian.on.ca](http://www.libertarian.on.ca)

**Bulletin Vol.27 No. 4**  
**Summer 2007**  
Doug Burn, Editor

## Provincial General Election

**October 10, 2007**

Who will you vote for?

Check the list below and if there is a candidate in your riding give him or her a call and offer to help. But what will you do if no one has volunteered to run in your riding? Will you stay home along with the forty-plus percent who couldn't care less? Or are you prepared to do more for the Libertarian cause?

The more candidates we have, the better our visibility and credibility with the media and voters. A party with half a dozen candidates has little of either. A party with candidates in every riding has lots of both. We don't expect to reach that objective this year, but we expect to grow into it. Our objective for this election is 36 candidates (one third of the 107 ridings). If each one results in a few new libertarians who join and contribute time and money to the Party, we will grow.

Becoming a candidate is a simple matter. You need to collect 25 signatures from registered voters in your riding and pay a deposit of \$200. (The deposit is refunded only if you get 15% of the vote.) The Party can help you with both of these. The \$200 should be contributed to the Party who will pay the deposit. This way you will get back \$150 as a tax credit.

What you do beyond that is up to you. Being a candidate should not be an onerous experience. If you aren't prepared to take on the challenge of public speaking, don't participate in All Candidate Meetings. If your work schedule is heavy, you don't need to distribute pamphlets. At least now you will have someone to vote for!

The local newspapers will likely call you for information and a photo. They will be happy if they can get it from our web site. With your input, we will create a page for you with your photo, a brief bio and your comments on the issues you think are important.

If you want to do more, let your friends and relatives know you are running (and why) and ask them if they will contribute to your campaign. Invite your neighbours to a wine and cheese party. Print pamphlets and distribute them in your riding, or knock on doors and speak to residents.

You will likely receive invitations to participate in one or more All Candidates Meetings. They will normally allow 3-5 minutes for opening speeches, one minute to answer each question and 1-2 minutes for a closing speech. You may also be invited to speak on

(Continued on page 2)

## ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

**Saturday November 3, 2007**

**9:00 AM—4:00 PM**

**Ramada Hotel**

**Toronto Don Valley**

Watch for details in the Fall *Bulletin*

## Libertarian Party of Canada

Included with this issue of *Bulletin* is a copy of form EC20036-C. Every three years every party must submit to Elections Canada 250 signed copies of this form in order to maintain their registration as a Political Party. If a party fails to comply it will not be able to issue Official Receipts that entitle donors to generous tax credits and the name of the party will not be included on election ballots.

If you have not already done so, please complete the form and return it in the enclosed envelope, or send it to —  
Libertarian Party of Canada,  
2938E More Crescent,  
Regina, Saskatchewan,  
S4V 0T7

## CANDIDATES

Barrie—Paolo Fabrizio—1-866-237-1310  
Davenport—Nunzio Venuto—416-651-8378  
Don Valley West—Soumen Deb—416-970-9664  
Durham—Ben Blain—905-728-9361  
Eglinton-Lawrence—Tom Gelmon—416-283-7589  
Glengarry-Prescott-Russell—Jean-Serge Brisson—  
613-443-1964  
Kitchener-Waterloo—Larry Stevens—519-896-0908  
Markham-Unionville—Jay Miller—905-472-4037  
Oak Ridges- Markham—Rob Alexander—905-833-3944  
Oshawa—Doug Patfield—905-926-5338  
Parkdale-High Park—Zork Hun—416-531-5928  
Scarborough-Guildwood—Sam Apfelbaum—416-281-0035  
Scarborough-Rouge River—Alan Mercer—416-724-5525  
Simcoe-Grey—Phil Bender—519-833-0201  
Simcoe North—Dane Raybould—705-345-DANE  
Toronto Centre—Peter Cuff—416-488-2754  
Whitby-Oshawa—Marty Gobin—905-665-9223  
York-Simcoe—Caley McKibbin—705-250-0351  
York South-Weston—Marco Dias—416-762-8324

## Reflections on Books and Booze— By George Dance

When I'm at the local mall with friends on a Sunday, I like to point out an irony that says much about how Ontario's values have changed in my lifetime. The library is closed and padlocked; right beside it, the liquor store is open and doing a roaring business.

Today, I found, it's not just Sundays anymore. With some time before an appointment I decided to visit the library; and found that it is closed on Thursday mornings, too. The LCBO was open, though, bright and early to serve the public. I was tempted to buy a bottle, sneak out back, and drink it illegally; but I ended up spending my time thinking about the discrepancy instead.

Why the different service levels? Is the government trying to encourage drinking and discourage reading? No, just the opposite. Which is precisely the problem: First, the government is trying to promote reading, and discourage drinking; second, as it's the government doing it, the consequences are precisely the opposite of those intended.

Because the city wants to encourage reading, it offers libraries as a free service. As libraries do not generate revenue, they cannot make a profit. Therefore they have no funds of their own, other than what they can beg from politicians and bureaucrats; barely enough for present services (never mind new ones!), and all at the mercy of every round of budget cuts.

Because the province wants to discourage drinking, it has legally imposed a monopoly (the LCBO) to charge drinkers high monopoly prices (and levies stiff taxes on top of those). The result is that the LCBO is swimming in profit; it has plenty of funds to expand, extend hours, offer new products, and advertise: all of which encourage LCBO patronage and liquor consumption.

Why can't libraries make a profit? Why can't they charge for their services? Just what would be wrong with paying, say, a dollar a week to rent a book? The publisher and author would like that, if they were paid royalties (which they should be).

What about other services, like Internet time? Libraries pay a hefty monthly fee for that; where is the sense in giving it away?



**Liquor stores thrive and expand, because they make a profit. Libraries stagnate and cut back, because they depend on government subsidy.**

Libraries ration Internet time, while Internet cafes welcome patrons and encourage them to stay all day, because they make a profit from their customers' computer use fees.

Internet cafes add to their profits by selling their customers coffee and other refreshments. Similarly, major bookstores increase both customers and profits by offering reading rooms and selling coffee. With the same sort of clientele, libraries could easily do the same. Simply leasing a bit of space to a coffee chain would boost both service and revenue at little cost.

There are other ways libraries could benefit from little privatizations like that. They could scrap their fleet of aging copiers and lease that space to a private company. Private enterprise can provide a photocopy for under 10 cents; why does a library copy cost double?

Processing payments should present no problem. Toronto libraries, for one, have redesigned library cards along the lines of phone and gift cards. Customers preload dollar amounts onto their library cards, and the card is debited for each copier use. That payment method could be used for all services.

But, some will always object, what about the poor? How will they get to read? Such objections sometimes get tiresome, but one always has to answer them. The best answer here would be to issue library cards with a dollar amount already loaded. That compromise would retain free library services, but only up to a certain level; those who used more services would pay.

Some will also object that commercializing libraries would subject them to the 'whims of the marketplace'; that only government subsidies can give them secure and steady funding. But, as we've seen, the reality is exactly the opposite. Liquor stores thrive and expand, because they make a profit. Libraries stagnate and cut back, because they depend on government subsidy.

If the two were people, we could say: Liquor stores have a well-paying job, while libraries are stuck on welfare. For their good as well as ours, it's time that libraries began looking for a job.

*(Continued from page 1)*

local radio and cable TV. The Party can provide prepared speeches or help you to prepare your own.

Paolo learned a unique campaign strategy from his friend, Lui Temelkovski, Liberal MP from Oak Ridges-Markham. He stood with a 2'x4' election sign (and his kids) on the median waving to the rush hour traffic. This is an effective method of getting your name in front of voters.

If you are ready to help us grow the Party, give us a call (1-888-ONT-LIBertarian, 8:30 AM to 10:00 PM) or email [info@libertarian.on.ca](mailto:info@libertarian.on.ca).

### Libertarian BBQ a Great Success

The BBQ was moved to Paolo and Teresa Fabrizio's new home in Barrie after a small fire burned the barn and deck at the original location in Caledon. In spite of the weather about twenty people showed up, including several declared candidates. Paolo was the consummate chef, grilling steaks, burgers and jumbo hot dogs. Beer was provided compliments of Don Sykes from his brewery, D. Sykes Brewing Co. at 551 Bryne Drive in Barrie (1-800-551-6545). The rain held off until about 3 PM at which point we moved inside.

**Many thanks to Paolo and Teresa for a great party.**

## When Will Our Childhoods End? - By Larry Stevens MSc

In primitive societies, people were initiated into adulthood when they were considered capable of living on their own, making their own decisions, and becoming full contributing members of the community. The initiation often included a rite of passage during which initiates had to prove themselves worthy. This rite often involved surviving on one's own for a period of time or enduring a particularly painful ordeal.

In our society, people are no longer initiated into adulthood at a single specific time or through one specific rite of passage. Instead, there are different times for different aspects of adult life. Some occur at a specific age such as the right to vote, or to become a soldier, or to end one's formal schooling. Others normally occur at a specific age, but with some leeway as with obtaining one's parents permission to marry while underage. Still others have both an age requirement and a rite of passage as with getting a drivers licence – a process that can be as painful as any primitive ordeal for someone who has not previously had to deal with government bureaucrats.

Unfortunately, there are many areas of our lives in which we are never regarded as adults no matter what our age, ability, intelligence or experience happens to be. In these areas, we must always rely on a nanny (a government appointee) to make our decisions for us. Some

examples of these areas include: looking after our medical needs, deciding what our children should learn, saving for our retirement. The list goes on and on.

One major result of this failure of our society to allow people to be adults and make their own decisions is that some people continue to behave as children through their lives. They refuse to take responsibility for themselves. They depend on their government-appointed nannies to make all their decisions and to look after their every need until the day they die.

This perpetual dependence only convinces politicians that more nannies are needed and existing nannies need to make more decisions for everyone. This only makes the situation worse as people become more dependent and less able to look after themselves.

The Libertarian Party will treat people as adults and require that they take personal responsibility for their own lives. When given the possibility of doing so, most people will become responsible, contributing adults. Anyone incapable or unwilling to do so, will have to find someone else to take care of them. I'm certain that if they ask nicely they will be able to convince someone to do so.

## Flick Off Big Brother—By Doug Burn

Does anyone remember those Toronto mayoral debates of the early 90s when contenders for the big chair in the clamshell (City Hall) were quizzed repeatedly on their relative environmental purity? In one, I read the day after, the leading candidates, Barbara Hall and June Rowlands, were bragging about their respective showering routines.

One had said her showers lasted just 10 minutes (or was it eight?) and the other claimed hers were slightly shorter in duration. The first responded that she turned off the faucet while lathering in order to save water. The second effectively silenced her opponent and ended that section of the debate with the revelation she only showered every other day. Commentary after the debate was suitably disparaging even in that very politically correct period.

Sad to say, the end-of-times jeremiads of climate change are now reasserting the 70s feminist claim that 'the personal is political' and Big Brother is as interested now in your habits of personal hygiene as the emissions from the tailpipe of your car.

Recall the reactions back in April to eco-friendly chanteuse Sheryl Crow's proposal to limit the number of toilet paper squares to one per sitting. Crow revealed a day or two later that the suggestion was only a joke to get people talking about solutions to global warming. It was, nonetheless, noteworthy in the interval between the joke and the clarification that talk shows and letters-to-the-editors columns were never at a loss to find defenders of the proposal. It seems only a matter of time before that Rowlands/Hall debate is reclassified as a milestone on

the road to environmental purity rather than the high point (low point?) of political correctness.

But I digress. A 'conservative' Canadian Prime Minister is banning incandescent light bulbs and a 'liberal' Ontario Premier is encouraging young people to 'flick off' (logo suggests another f-word) electrical appliances and 'progressive' Toronto Mayor David Miller will distribute software enabling citizens to calculate their environmental footprint including water use. To paraphrase former U.S. President George H.W. Bush's 'Message: We care.' All three Canadian leaders apparently adhere to the 'Message: Turn off the (incandescent) lights, sh\*t in the dark and don't flush.'

Reasonable people will rightly say the government would never dare to raid our homes for signs of incandescent light bulb use, excessive showering and lights left on when no one is home. Social historians would be equally right to say Big Brother needn't bother because righteous little busy bodies will do the job for them, and for free.

Here's a tip to would-be burglars. Sign up with some environmentally activist community group before heading on down the street to look in windows of well lit but apparently unoccupied homes. With luck the City will award you a medal for investigating energy waste, which you can sell along with the Rolexes, rings and MP3s.

## Libertarianism: Fundamental Principles

*The following is a summary of a presentation given by Professor Jan Narveson at the Libertarian Party of Canada Convention on May 21, 2005*

Jan succinctly formulated the most fundamental Libertarian principle as, "No proactive force or fraud!" Or, "We may use compulsive force against others only to defend people from users of compulsive force (or to prevent those intending to use it from doing so)." In terms of costs, we are not to inflict net costs on others (net: the other party would not allow this transaction if he had his choice)

Jan then made the distinction between "Negative" and "Positive" rights. If person A has a Negative right to do "x", then others are required to refrain from preventing or interfering with A's doing (or not doing) "x." If person A has a Positive right to do x, then others are required to assist A in doing x if A wants to do x but is unable to do so without the involuntary assistance of those others. Your Negative right to life means that I may not interfere in your life. Your Positive right to life may oblige me to provide for your life; compulsory provision of lots of health care (no upper limit to cost), education and welfare. Positive rights are incompatible with Negative rights! The reason for the Libertarian Party is precisely due to this distinction!

Jan then went on to explain that what defines government is its possession of a monopoly of force; governments formulate and pass laws, which they then enforce. There is no inherent restriction on what governments might do. Constitutions do impose some restrictions, but they also provide for their own methods of amendment. They are interpreted by the judiciary of the day, which is likely to be subordinated to the ideological fashions of the day. As a result, government infringes on our freedom with every law that compels us either to do something, or to refrain from doing it. Governments feel perfectly free to tax people for what they claim is the general welfare. Those taxed are not asked, nor are they necessarily compensated. In a proper libertarian society, they would always be compensated. On the libertarian view, they should be compelling only people who, in turn, are compelling persons who are not, in turn, compelling anyone else.

Laws against violence and fraud are acceptable. But what about laws intended to prevent harm due to the side effects of otherwise innocent actions? This raises the question of how harm is related to risk, and cost versus benefits. Green house gases are an example of a poten-

tially harmful side effect of energy consumption. The Kyoto Accord is intended to address the risk of climate warming (ignoring the possible benefits for Canadian agriculture). However, it is expected that if it is successful, it will result in a temperature reduction of 0.15 degrees Celsius, a change too small to be measured! We may achieve an insignificant benefit, but will pay a significant price.

Jan raised the question, How great does the risk of harm to innocent individuals have to be before it is acceptable from the Libertarian point of view to prohibit a

**what defines government is its possession of a monopoly of force**

particular action? What about regulation of pharmaceuticals and drugs? Libertarians believe people should be able to choose their risk levels. Vioxx is a current example. Even if it is true that there is a

risk of heart attack from prolonged use, many whose quality of life is severely reduced by arthritis may consider the risk of premature death preferable to prolonged pain and agony. What about industrial pollution? How much will we accept in exchange for the goods and services that produce pollution? What about gun control? Is the fact that my neighbor has a gun a risk to me? It is if he's crazy. How much and what kind of reason do I have to have to think that he is before I'm justified in compelling him to give up his gun? The answers are not always easy to find.

Jan then addressed some of the challenges facing the Libertarian Party. More than anything else, we are a publicity undertaking. We don't realistically expect to win anything, or to get more than a handful of votes. One must wonder why. The short answer is that it's easy to convince people that government is *doing something for them* - even though it's doing nothing that couldn't be done better without its help.

But this does leave a large question about our Platform. One idea is to run on just one plank: abolish the government! Another would be to call for eliminating most of it - all the social programs, etc., etc. More realistically (relatively speaking), we would look for places where we can propose cutting down without being thought lunatic. He identified some possibilities in Health Care, Drugs, Education, Free Trade, and taxes.

### Aliens Cause Global Warming—By Sam Apelbaum

Compared to the skills of professional journalists and writers, I often feel unable to adequately express the views and ideas you read about in this publication. It is therefore a pleasure to be able to bring to your attention an excellent piece about the hoax of man made global warming (it was global cooling in the 70's) in the form of a transcript of a speech delivered by prominent science fiction author Michael Crichton. He titles it "Aliens Cause Global Warming." It was presented at the Caltech Michel Lecture on January 17, 2003.

Unfortunately, the speech loses some steam when, after correctly bemoaning the politicization of science, Crichton naively invites governments to help fund an "independent" research institute. This amounts to allowing the fox into the hen house. Ultimately we need not fear phony science as long as people who choose to believe the earth is flat cannot use state power to force others to live as though it were. Well worth reading at [www.crichton-official.com/speeches/speeches\\_quote04.html](http://www.crichton-official.com/speeches/speeches_quote04.html).