

Ontario General Election

October 10, 2007

We are making good progress towards our goal of having candidates in one third of the 107 ridings. We are currently at 23% and need another 12 candidates. If you agree with George Dance's views on the next page, give us a call. We will make it as easy as possible for you to be a candidate.

If someone is running in your riding, give him a call and offer your support. (We could use a few women candidates.) Check our web site for updates to the list.

CANDIDATES

Ajax-Pickering—Josh Insang—905-665-9899
Barrie—Paolo Fabrizio—1-866-237-1310
Carleton-Mississippi Mills—Rob Alexander—613-265-4479
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
Essex—Aaron Parent—519-978-1426
Kitchener-Conestoga—Larry Stevens—519-896-0908
Kitchener-Waterloo—Adam Charteris—1-888-668-5423
Ottawa South—Jean-Serge Brisson—613-443-1964
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
Scarborough Southwest—George Dance—416-755-5098
Simcoe-Grey—Phil Bender—519-833-0201
Simcoe North—Dane Raybauld—705-345-DANE
St. Paul's—John Kittredge—416-421-2903
Toronto Centre—Heath Thomas—647-438-5675
Toronto-Danforth—Mark Scott—416-469-0999
Whitby-Oshawa—Marty Gobin—905-665-9223
York-Simcoe—Caley McKibbin—705-250-0351
York South-Weston—Marco Dias—416-762-8324
York West—Jeff Pierce—416-283-7589

What will you do if there is no Libertarian 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?

At the risk of being repetitive, 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

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Saturday November 3, 2007

9:00 AM—4:00 PM

Ramada Hotel

Toronto Don Valley

We have three excellent speakers lined up for the meeting.

- **Gerry Nicholls** is a long time advocate for "more freedom through less government." As one of Canada's top five political minds, he will give us his views on the Ontario Election.
- **Avril Allen** is an advisory board member of the Canadian Constitution Foundation. She will brief us on her constitutional challenge against Ontario's health care monopoly.
- **Brett Skinner**, Director of Health, Pharmaceutical and Insurance Policy Research at the Fraser Institute will update us on the status and outlook for health care in Ontario and Canada.

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. If each candidate finds a few new libertarians who join and contribute time and money to the Party, we will grow.

We are providing unprecedented support for our candidates. Becoming one is a simple matter. You need to collect 25 signatures from registered voters in your riding. Let us know if you need help. The Party will pay the \$200 deposit. (Contributions welcome.)

What you do beyond that is up to you. Have fun with your campaign. If you want to participate in All Candidate Meetings we will give you *Short Answers to the Tough Questions*, sample speeches and 100 pamphlets. We will provide a few lawn signs if you can use them. Even if you do nothing more than get your name on the ballot, at least you will have someone to vote for!

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

Chairman's Report— By George Dance

By the time you read this, the 2007 provincial election campaign will have begun. Once again it's time for all good men and women to come to the aid of their party. If you're a packrat like me, you'll still have last spring's Bulletin, in which I wrote about the kinds of help we will need. If not, please call or e-mail our office to find out how you can help.

The more urgent question, for me, right now is: How can I help? For months I've been exhorting our members to pitch in. Now it's time for me to lead by example.

When it comes to running, I agree with Sen. Michael Fortier: I don't wanna. This is the busy season at my workplace, and I'm spending many a 12-hour day there. My free time is both limited and precious; there are many things I'd rather do than campaign.

At the same time, the increased workload means a small bump in income. And my constant advice has been: If you can't give your time, you can at least give money. Which makes the only question: How much can I afford to give?

I have decided to become a candidate sponsor - meaning that I will be donating \$200, enough to pay the nomination fee of one Libertarian candidate. That's an easy step for me to take, that ties in directly with our major goal in this campaign: to increase our vote total by increasing our number of candidates.

Increasing our vote is a necessary first step to regaining the larger constituency we enjoyed 15-20 years ago. Much of that slipped away to the Tories during the Mike Harris years. However, under new leader John Tory, today's Tories seem determined to erase Harris' legacy and even his memory, preferring to battle McGuinty for the mushy middle. Those voters who forsook us for the Tories, a decade ago, have no reason to stay with them now. Yet they will return to us only if they're aware of us; which requires that we raise our profile a bit.

A Libertarian who simply puts his name on the ballot, while doing nothing else - a 'paper' or 'protest candidate' - will gain roughly 100 votes. Investing \$1000 on a campaign might increase that to 400. It looks clear that nominating protest candidates is the more efficient use of our election funds.

Not that all our money will be spent on nomination fees. We will also be investing limited funds on candidate support and promoting the Leader's campaign. You can read about those latter initiatives elsewhere in this issue or on our website.

Sponsoring a candidate, though, looks like the best use of my \$200. And it won't even cost me \$200. For (as an Ontarian donating to a registered party), I can claim a 75% income tax credit on the full amount - leaving me out of pocket only \$50. For less than the price of two takeout pizzas, I can put an extra Libertarian candidate on the ballot.

What, though, if there is no extra candidate to sponsor? Can I do anything about that? After thinking long and hard about those questions, I have decided to up my commitment. I have agreed to run for the party, as a protest candidate in my riding, should I be needed.

Once again my cost will be minimal. I will have to visit the Returning Office once or twice. I may have to arrange for my own signatures - though the party can help even with that. There will be requests for me to speak to the media, and at All Candidates' Meetings - but I can pick and choose among those. I plan to not do very much; once I'm on the ballot, I will have accomplished my own goal.

So that's my commitment: Candidate sponsor and protest candidate. I would ask every reader to look at doing the same. As I see it, it's the least one can do.

What Will Your Party Do For ...? - by Jim McIntosh

Many special interest groups send every party a questionnaire. They offer to publish the answers for their clients. In effect, they are running "an advanced auction of stolen goods," (H.L. Menken) inviting each party to put forward their best bid for their clients' votes. Such surveys can be difficult for Libertarians, since we want to stop government handouts to such organizations.

We received one such survey from a group of 22 arts and culture organizations. Given our objective is to find more libertarians, and that such a large organization may have a few libertarians who will read our answers, it seemed worthwhile to prepare answers that focus on the positive results of Libertarian policy. So here they are.

Question: What is your party's policy on arts education in the school system and, if elected, will your government reinvest in substantial real terms in this vital component of the total education experience?

Answer: The Ontario Libertarian Party believes the

fundamental problem with education in Ontario is that it is funded and therefore controlled by government bureaucrats. We believe it should be controlled, and therefore funded, by parents. Schools should be free to determine their curriculum and to specialize in arts, science, athletics or academics. Parents will choose the school they deem best suited to the interests and talents of their children. The only role of government (until charities take over) would be to help those unable to pay for their children's education.

Organizations such as the Ontario Arts Council would be able to offer services and programs to any and all schools wishing to include an arts programme as a vital component of their curriculum. Time and money currently spent lobbying politicians and bureaucrats will be put to better use.

Question: If elected, will your government support ongoing and increased funding of the Ontario Arts

(Continued on page 3)

Mixed Member Proportional Voting Bad For Ontario—By Jim McIntosh

On Polling Day October 10, 2007 Ontario electors will vote in a referendum on electoral reform. They will be asked to choose between the current system, “First Past the Post” or FPTP, and the Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) voting system as recommended by the Citizens’ Assembly for Electoral Reform.

With FPTP the candidate who gets the most votes in a riding wins. Some don’t like this system because the party that wins more than half the seats usually gets less than half the total votes. Others are concerned that the small parties are not represented in the legislature even though they might have received 5% of the vote. All of the votes for that party are “wasted” and the people who voted for it are not represented in parliament.

The Citizens’ Assembly believes MMP will make elections fairer. The objective is to ensure that “the share of seats each party wins is roughly equal to its share of the party vote.” It calls for reducing the number of electoral districts from the current 107 to 90. Another 39 seats will be used to “top-up” each party’s share of seats according to the “Party Vote.”

Each voter gets to vote twice; once for a local candidate and once for a party. The voter can choose the candidate from one party and place his “Party Vote” for a different party. For example, in a riding with no Libertarian candidate, a voter could vote for the Conservative candidate and for the Ontario Libertarian Party.

The Ontario Libertarian Party believes that MMP will help it gain visibility, as it will all small parties. The party

name will appear on every ballot, even if there is no candidate in the riding. The media will be more likely to present its platform of strictly limited government. Voters with libertarian tendencies will identify with the Libertarian Party and help the Party to grow.

Unfortunately for libertarians, MMP will likely lead to minority and coalition governments. In 1987 the Liberals won 47.3% of the votes, and since then the winning party has received a smaller percentage, as low as 37.6% for the NDP in 1990. Had MMP been in effect during the 2003 election, the Liberals would have required the support of the NDP to govern. The NDP, receiving only 14.7% of the votes, would have been in a position to control the legislature. In 1999, when the Tories won with 45.1% of the vote, the Liberals (39.9%) and NDP (12.6%) could have formed the government.

The party that wins the most seats will attempt to form a coalition with the party with the fewest seats required for a majority. If the Green Party wins 3% of the vote (the threshold required to get any seats) they could join with the Liberals (with say 47.3%) to form the government. The Green Party could hold the legislature to ransom, threatening an election if they don’t get their way. They will insist that some of their programs be added to the agenda. As a result, the citizens of Ontario will be saddled with more regulations and taxes, dragging our economy down and reducing investment and employment.

(Continued from page 2)

Council?

Answer: For most people, spending on arts comes after food, shelter, clothing, health care, education, transportation, tools, and other essentials. And for most people, taxes come before all of those. Taxes from all levels of government consume almost 50 per cent of the average Canadian’s income.

The Ontario Libertarian Party would substantially reduce the size of government and the taxes they collect, leaving citizens with substantially more discretionary spending for art and other things that make life more enjoyable. It is hard to understand how some bureaucrat can decide how much of the taxpayers money should be allocated to education, health care and art. In every case, it is not enough, although taxpayers believe they are taking too much.

Question: What priority does your party place on the following socio-economic undertakings outlined in the *Status of Ontario Artists’ Act, 2007* and what resources are your party prepared to commit to them? (4 items)

Answer: The Ontario Libertarian Party would expect that organizations such as yours and individual patrons of art would be responsible for doing what they can to improve the social and economic status of artists. All the government can do is take money (under threat of force) from one group of people to give to another. We believe this is immoral. The only money artist should get is money volun-

tarily given in exchange for art or as a gift. When people have more disposable income as a result of lower taxes, more money will flow to the arts in a voluntary and honest way.

Question: If elected, will your government invest in new multi-year capital infrastructure programs for small to mid-sized arts organizations?

Answer: It is a mistake for any organization to rely on government for ongoing funding. The government has changing priorities and faces many demands for money that isn’t theirs to give. The Ontario Libertarian Party seeks to reduce the role of government and its use of force in society to protecting the life, liberty and property of its citizens.

Question: What will your party do to further support and enhance the work of the Ontario Trillium Foundation in the arts and culture sector across the province?

Answer: The Trillium Foundation is one of the many agencies, boards and commissions competing for taxpayers’ money that the Ontario Libertarian Party will seek to eliminate. Why should we pay bureaucrats to decide how “best” to spend our money? If you would not hire pick pockets and thieves to obtain your funding, why would you ask politicians to do it for you?

An Opening On The Right - By Larry Stevens

A Toronto Sun poll at the end of August put the McGuinty government at risk of being reduced to minority status but not because of any surge in support for John Tory's Progressive Conservatives.

It seems that nominally Liberal voters are parking their loyalties with Howard Hampton's NDP and Frank de Jong's Green Party. If Ontarians vote on October 10 in accordance with the survey's results, Dalton McGuinty would remain Premier but only with the support of Howard Hampton's New Democrats. The prospect of such an outcome will likely dominate party strategies at least in the opening days of the campaign set to formally launch (unofficially underway for months) on September 10.

But, can the Progressive Conservatives really capitalize on that and raise their current 34% support beyond the Liberals' 40% to majority country? They should certainly have the centre right voters all to themselves as McGuinty campaigns to the left to regain support lost to the NDP (now at 19%) and the Greens (now at 9%). But, the Tories are hamstrung by their overreaction to the drubbing of former leader Ernie Eves in the October 2003 election that led the old party to disavow Mike Harris' hard right Common Sense Revolution in favour of Mr. Moderate and second place finisher in the 2003 Toronto mayoral election, John Tory. Their election platform appears to promise voters they won't spend a cent less than the profligate Liberals but will deliver tax cuts based on unexplained cost savings.

The SES Research poll for the Sun may explain why the Tories have embraced the mushy middle. Apparently, 52% of Ontarians believe McGuinty's government is on the 'right track' as compared to 30% that say it's on the wrong track and 18% who are undecided. The other rationale for the platform is the public's tepid opinion of McGuinty as Premier. After four years in office and the public profile that brings, only one-in-four respondents said McGuinty would make the best premier. Tory, surprisingly, came a close second at 24% while Hampton and de Jong trailed with 19% and 3% respectively.

Only the possibility of an NDP-supported Liberal minority government bodes ill for Libertarians because libertarian-leaning voters may back the Liberals or the PCs to avoid reliving the worst days of the June '85 to Oct. '90 Peterson-Rae minority government. My guess, NDP support among organized labour swings to the Liberals as McGuinty cranks up industrial grants and the faddish Dippers go Green when they learn more about Hampton's policy compromises: to delay the shutdown of the coal fired generating station in Atikokan; guarantee the forest industry 24 million cubic metres of wood supply; and embed current forestry practices in the Endangered Species Act. The policies will please voters in Hampton's Kenora-Rainy River riding and those of other NDP candidates in northern Ontario but won't impress the Bourgeois Bohemians that elect activists in downtown ridings.

Supposing the polls move towards a showdown between the two big parties, we can imagine John Tory tacking to the centre while emphasizing his private sector leadership skills and Dalton McGuinty urging the left to coa-

lesce with the Liberal Party to maintain a steady-as-she-goes course threatened by Stephen Harper's neo-con 'hidden' agenda in Ottawa and John Tory's untrustworthy team of Harrisite leftovers with their irreconcilable promises of tax breaks but no cuts to spending (beyond the 'wasteful', of course). Just to make things interesting, the media will look for news bites from the up-and-coming Greens who will happily oblige with evidence of the big parties' hypocrisies.

Libertarians should have a field day at all candidates meetings especially among disillusioned Tories that prefer red meat policies to red Tory platitudes. Here, in my opinion, are the key arguments.

All three major parties are irreconcilably wedded to current or increased levels of expenditures, although Ontarians don't appear to be substantially better off despite an 80% increase in provincial program spending over the past decade (i.e. excluding interest on the debt) to \$82 billion.

Since the election of 2003 provincial spending on health, long term care and health promotion increased 55% to \$20.4 billion, spending on training, colleges and universities by 57% to \$4.4 billion and spending on education and school boards by 27% to \$12.4 billion.

Although a strong economy and tax hikes including the infamous reintroduction of health care premiums allowed McGuinty to increase provincial revenues by a third to \$91.5 billion over his four-year term, the provincial debt actually rose by 5% to \$145 billion or \$11,310 per capita.

The Liberal government says those are unfair comparisons because McGuinty was obliged to hike spending dramatically to offset the equally dramatic cuts to spending caused by the shortfall in government revenues arising from Mike Harris' tax cuts. Hmm.

From 1995 when Harris first won office until Eves lost the election of 2003, provincial government revenues and spending rose in lock step by 38% to \$68 billion each. Over the same period, the population increased by 11.5% so government spending per capita rose 26% to \$6,394 and because inflation rose 23% over the eight years, real after inflation spending rose 3%. Clearly not fast enough to please rent seeking groups but obviously no dramatic cuts in program spending overall.

Looking ahead, Libertarians would disagree with the slight majority of Ontarians that feel the current government is on the 'right track' because the size of government has been rising steadily since it most recently bottomed out during Harris' last year in office (2002) when provincial government spending accounted for just 14.4% of economic output (GDP). While the 16.0% share of GDP dispensed by Queen's Park today is a far cry from the 19.2% share of Bob Rae's last year as premier, this government is clearly headed in the wrong direction.