

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

www.libertarian.on.ca

Bulletin Vol.28 No. 4
Summer 2008
Doug Burn, Editor

Leadership Convention—November 8, 2008

November 8, 2008 is the date set for our annual meeting and Leadership Convention. This is when we will elect a Leader, Deputy Leader and Executive to run the Party for the next three years. All members who have signed the statement, "I support the principles of the Libertarian Party," may run for any of these positions, nominate another member, and vote for nominees. They may also vote on amendments to the Constitution and By-laws. Several such amendments have been proposed (see page 4). We will have two speakers for the morning session. Professor Glen Fox from the University of Guelph will discuss the challenges of getting people to understand libertarian concepts based on his teaching experience. Mrs. Guadalupe Rengifo, Directress of "Discovering Minds" Montessori Preschool, will talk about her encounters with government bureaucracy. Her preschool was included in an investigative report published in the Toronto Star on September 1, 2007.

Registration Fee is \$50 if paid before October 31, 2008, or \$60 after that. This includes a buffet lunch. Since this is a business meeting, the entire fee is treated as a donation to the party and eligible for a political tax credit of up to 75%. Everyone is welcome to attend.

Libertarian Events

June 21 12:00 noon, **First Annual Ottawa area BBQ**, At Rob Alexander's home, 4413 Tranquility Lane, RR#3, Woodlawn. \$15—Call the Party for details.

July 8, 6:30 PM - **Simcoe County Pub Night**, Puck "N" Piza Restaurant And Sports Bar, 4171 Innisfil Beach Rd, Thornton, 705-458-2932. For more information call Paolo Fabrizio at 647-300-8555. (2nd Tuesday of each month)

July 9, 7:00 PM - **Toronto Pub Night**, Fionn MacCools, (at the back of the restaurant) 21 St. Clair Ave. W., 416-925-7827. For more information phone Jim McIntosh at 416-283-7589. (2nd Wednesday of each month)

July 5, 3:00 PM - **Ottawa Pub Afternoon** - South Side Bar and Grill, 1670 Heron Road, (Heron Gate Mall) Phone 613-526-2192. For more information contact Andrew Philips (613-733-8948). (1st Saturday of every 2nd month)

November 8 - 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM, **Ontario Libertarian Party Leadership Convention**, Wyndham Garden Hotel (formerly Ramada Don Valley), 185 Yorkland Blvd. in Toronto (Hwy 401 & 404). \$50 before October 31, 2008; \$60 after —Call the Party for details.

An Anti-communist Confrontation With Socialist Opposition—By Zork Hun

Taking a trip on the Mekong is beautiful. Highly recommended. It is a two day trip from the Thai border at Chiang Khong to Luang Prabang. The boats stop for the night at Pak Beng, a small village that lives almost exclusively on the tourists stopping there for a night on their way South.

Laos is opening up slowly, but it is still, quite clearly, a communist country.

We were, of course, subjected to all the little rip-offs and had to walk our ways around the traps typical to places built on tourism, but that was to be expected. The one I want to talk about, the one with the morals, was the boat trip from Pak Beng.

The scam is to pack two boatloads of people into one boat for the second day of the trip allowing some party hack to pocket the savings. The scam is so well known and pervasive that most websites and travel books mention it.

These all purpose river boats are fitted for travel by putting wooden benches into them with some cargo space in the back and front of them. They can take about fifty people sitting and another thirty sitting on their backpacks or the floor. With no more than eighty people, the boats are still fairly comfortable. Double that and they are not.

When we got to the boat it was already more than full. About thirty of us refused to get into the overcrowded space. Even without us, a trip to the bathroom would have meant climbing over a few dozen people and their belongings. We demanded a second boat. Two boats came – we said – two boats leave. That is what we paid for.

The local official in his KGB style leather jacket (what is it about KGB types and leather jackets anyway?) was trying to cow us into submission saying that if we do not get in, we will have to stay another day risking that the situation next morning will be even worse. It was a three hour standoff. Eventually we (about thirty of us) won. The overloaded boat left and we got an empty one all for ourselves. We had a beautiful and comfortable trip but this little victory is not what I wanted to talk to you about.

About half way through the standoff, I went into the boat to see how much room there was. From the perspective of the people already in the boat, we were just holding up the departure and some of them did not hesitate letting me know about their displeasure. What's your problem? Why can't you be reasonable? If we can put up with the discomfort why can't you? This is a poor country and you

(Continued on page 2)

(Continued from page 1)

are still better off than they are.

I did not get into an argument, I did not point out that the only person likely to benefit from this scam is the guy in the leather jacket, I did not argue that all this is immaterial, they broke the contract not us. I was just taken back by the attitude that was all directed against us, not against the crooks trying to rip off all of us.

We were scorned by the people already having a seat for standing up for our rights, for demanding that we get what we paid for. In their eyes, we were the bad guys, we were the ones holding them back. We were the cause of all the trouble. We were unreasonable. Because we refused to cooperate, refused to be crammed into the boat, refused to be 'nice.'

Why am I telling you about all of this now? Because I met the same attitude, I had the same feeling this morning (May 20th 2008) listening to Andy Barry of the Communist Broadcasting Corporation.

He was interviewing Bruce Cumming whose company is now offering medical waiting list insurance. The service is simple and logical while it is also a sad testimony to the sorry state of our socialized health care system.

In case you fall victim of the system that can watch you die while waiting for the treatment you already paid for through your taxes, his company - for a certain premium - will provide a guarantee that you will get the treatment or test you need. They do this by taking you to a different jurisdiction if necessary.

The idea is laudable, proving yet again that the free market can always find a way to help people where governments fail them.

The venomous reaction of the CBC host was quite amazing to listen to.

"Isn't this illegal?" – "We wouldn't be able to offer it if it was."

"This is immoral, helping people with money to jump the queue" – "Actually, we are cutting down on the queue by taking our clients to different jurisdictions"

And so on through the whole interview without giving any slack to this vile enemy of his beloved system. No counterpoint was acknowledged. I couldn't decide what made him more angry – the way that the very existence of this service proves the failure – or the fact that somebody has the audacity to work around it.

He obviously would not concede. He told us with clear pride in his voice that he was on a waiting list for a year and he had no problem with that. He let us know that HE is a good citizen. He is willing to make sacrifices for the greater good. He is not a sissy who would start whining if he has to wait a little. He possesses the virtue of patience. He was cooperating. He did what he was expected to do. He was nice.

Unlike the selfish, antisocial, undemocratic, free market idolizing rest of us trying to destroy the very fabric of our compassionate society.

What I felt coming from him was the same self congratulating, self righteous indignation that I felt in Pak Beng from the people trying to make a virtue out of getting screwed.

The worst enemy of freedom is not the state, not the bureaucracies nor the politicians. It is the cowed, collectivist attitude of the people that makes them all possible, the media that begs for them and the armies of court intellectuals rationalizing them.

Government and Anarchy—By Larry Stevens

Anarchy is commonly taken to mean disorder. And, over the centuries, government has convinced us that anarchy means the same as anarchism (the absence of government) and is reduced by government control. In reality, the disorder in the world today is, in large part, caused by government rather than the absence of government, and the more powerful the government, the more intense the anarchy.

Government causes disorder by using threats and force to disrupt the normal cooperative interactions between individuals. It does this directly through war, forcible confinement of innocent people, taking people's money against their will, and direct damage to the environment by its agencies. It also does it indirectly by passing and enforcing legislation that prevents people from freely and peacefully cooperating with each other. Some examples of the legislation that causes this disorder include mandatory education, jury duty, taxation, licensing, universal health and day care, gun control and drug prohibition.

A number of societies existed in the past that had no government. These societies were much more ordered and peaceful than those that existed then under government and much less those that exist today. Some examples of such societies are described in "*Property Right in*

Celtic Irish Law" by Joseph R. Peden, "*Private Creation and Enforcement of Law—A Historical Case*" by David Friedman, "*Legal Evolution in Primitive Societies*" by Bruce Benson, and "*An American Experiment in Anarcho-Capitalism: The Not So Wild, Wild West*" by Terry L. Anderson and P.J. Hill. Current examples are described in *Order Without Law: How Neighbors Settle Disputes* by Robert C. Ellickson. These essays and an excerpt from the book are included in *Anarchy and the Law* by Edward P. Stringham.

Many people believe that, because every major country today has a government, government and anarchy (disorder) are necessary. However, over the millennia, the general trend has been toward more individual liberty. The world has seen the elimination of monarchies, a significant decline in dictatorships and a rise in democracy, as well as, the virtual disappearance of serfs and slaves.

Once people realize government is harmful—that it really does cause anarchy, and that society would be far better off without government, much less government (even anarchism) will be a real possibility again.

Chinooks of Change—By George Dance

In May, the winds of change blew through North America's two national Libertarian parties like mighty Chinooks from the west.

On May 17, the Libertarian Party of Canada met at the Holiday Inn Express in Edmonton for its first convention in Alberta since 1974, and elected its first leader from that province since Chuck Lyall 34 years ago.

Dennis Young, of Edmonton, is the new Party Leader. Young is a former Canadian infantryman who saw active duty in the NATO intervention in Bosnia, which helped shape his non-interventionist foreign policy beliefs.

"I was a working soldier for 12 years -- and I care too much about our fighting men and women to be reckless about war. Harper has become a voice for a failed Washington foreign policy. I want to be a voice for Canadian soldiers and their families," he told the delegates in his victory speech.

Young's experience as a military police officer from 1991 to 1997 also led him to question the wisdom of the federal War on Drugs. "We have finite policing resources -- and the time we spend prosecuting people for using marijuana, is time taken away from protecting people from violent crimes," he told the applauding delegates.

Young also took aim at the Canadian Human Rights Commission's investigation of author Mark Steyn and former Western Standard publisher Ezra Levant for alleged hate speech against Moslems, calling the investigations an attempt at "media censorship."

"The Conservative government has abandoned Ezra Levant and Mark Steyn," he declared. "If you care about

**"If you care about free speech...
vote for the Libertarian Party"**

free speech and a free press, you should vote for the Libertarian Party. When we talk about freedom, we actually mean it."

US LP Elects Candidate

One week later, at the Sheridan in Denver, Colorado, the U.S. Libertarian Party chose former CIA agent, federal prosecutor, and Georgia Congressman Bob Barr as its

2008 presidential candidate. Barr prevailed in a grueling six-ballot contest.

As a Congressman, Barr was called variously "one of

**"One of the best friends libertarians
have in Congress"**

the most conservative members" (Reason) and "'one of the best friends libertarians have in Congress" (Liberty). A Ron-Paul style constitutionalist, he told the American Conservative Union this year: "If there was ever, ever any doubt in my mind ... about how to vote on a particular bill, the answer was easy ... you see where Ron Paul stands on an issue, and you know that's the right place to be."

Barr hopes to attract Ron Paul's fervent supporters, plus conservatives dissatisfied with the Republican nominee, John McCain. Already he is receiving more than 5%

"I'm in this to win"

in polling done on a four-man race, leading many Republicans to worry that he will cost McCain the election. However, Barr rejects the spoiler label. "I'm a competitor and I'm in this to win," he told Associated Press. "I do not view the role of the Libertarian Party to be a spoiler and I certainly have no intention of being a spoiler."

Matthew Johnson, "Dennis Young wins Libertarian Party leadership race," Western Standard, May 20, 2008. <http://westernstandard.ca/website/article.php?id=2776&start=1>

George Dance, "At last it can be said: Bob Barr for President," Nolan Chart, May 13, 2008. <http://www.nolanchart.com/article3766.html>

George Dance, "Ron Paul supporter Bob Barr to declare for President," Nolan Chart, Apr. 3, 2008. <http://www.nolanchart.com/article3354.html>

Steven K. Paulson, "Former Ga. Rep. Barr picked as Libertarian candidate," Associated Press, May 25, 2008. http://ap.google.com/article/ALeqM5h__Y67lpXiQ2tpHYzBMDlpRNfqYwD90T730G0

Will the Libertarian Party Need to Compromise?—By Jim McIntosh

Libertarians, especially those running in federal and provincial elections, are often asked, "If you were to form the government after this elections, what would you do about ... (education, health care, the roads, etc.)?"

I usually smile and ask what odds they will give me that the Libertarian Party will form the next government. But then I point out that for us to form the government, a lot of voters, typically at least 40 per cent, would have to agree with our ideas of liberty. Today, less than one per cent do. How will we get from here to there? We can look at other parties that started out in our position and have realized some success.

Take the Green Party for example. They have the advantage of promoting a politically acceptable program, protecting the environment. But if they had only run one or two dozen candidates in the last couple of elections, the media would not have taken them seriously. Running candidates in every Ontario riding showed they were serious, giving them a degree of credibility. In 2007 they ran four times as many candidates as we did, but received almost 40 times as many votes, and a lot more media attention.

Consider the New Democratic Party. They have never formed the federal government, but the federal government has implemented most of the NDP platform; univer-

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

sal health care, Employment Insurance, Canada Pension Plan, Guaranteed Income Supplements, for example.

So how do we achieve as much success as the NDP without compromising our principles?

Our objective in recent elections has been to find people who already agree with us but have never heard of us. We ran 25 candidates, several of them brand new members! Our next milestone is to run candidates in every Ontario riding. We need a lot more members to do this, but it should help to give us credibility in the media.

Before a Libertarian is elected, some will become "spoilers," winning as many votes as the winners margin of victory. When this threatens to keep the Conservative Party, say, from winning the election, they will start to

adopt some of our ideas, giving us more credibility, members and votes.

Eventually one or two Libertarians will be elected, and will be able to offer the media Libertarian alternative solutions to the crisis of the day based on our principles of civil liberty and economic freedom. It will not be our job to figure out how to implement them. That will be up to the governing party. They will need to determine what compromise will keep them in power. That might be education vouchers or "two tier" health care or "High Occupancy Toll Lanes."

If we want to see progress towards liberty, we must stick to our principles and not compromise.

Amendments to the Constitution and Statement of Ultimate Goals —By George Dance

The following are proposed amendments to the Constitution.

I. Moved that a new section be added to Article 4 (Membership) to read:

Section 1. Anyone who has signed the statement, "I'm for individual liberty," and has paid current membership dues, shall be a "Member" of the Party.

and that the rest of Article 4 be renumbered.

II. Moved that a new Section be added to Article 6 (Officers) to read:

Section 8. All Officers must sign an oath of office, which shall read, "I support and promise to uphold the Ontario Libertarian Party Statement of Principles."

- and that a new section be added to Article 8 (Ethics Committee) to read:

Section 5. All members of the Ethics Committee shall sign the same oath of office as the Officers.

III. Moved that a new section be added to Article 9 (Caucus) to read:

Section 5. All Standing Candidates shall sign a candidates' pledge, which shall read: "I will not advocate anything inconsistent with the Ontario Libertarian Party Statement of Principles."

IV. Moved that a new section be added to Article 16 (Election of Party Leader and Deputy Party Leader) to read:

Section 5. No one shall serve as Party Leader or Deputy Party Leader who has not signed the oath of office and the candidates' pledge.

The following is the proposed amendment to the Statement of Ultimate Goals

I. Moved that section A (Statement of Principles) be amended to read:

1. Every individual has the right to his or her own life.
2. Property rights are essential to individual rights.
3. No individual or group has a right to initiate force against any other.
4. Every individual or group has a right to defend his or her own person and property, and every individual has the right to join with others for common purposes. This is the only justification for government.
5. The only rights of groups, including governments, are

those based on the individual rights of their members.

6. Every individual – so long as he or she respects the rights of others – has the right to live as he or she alone sees fit.

Article 14 of the Constitution states; "The enduring importance of the Statement of Principles requires that it shall be amended only by a vote of not less than seven-eighths of the Delegates to a Convention, provided that notice of such amendment(s) has been sent to all Delegates not less than eight weeks prior to the date of the Convention. Amendments to the Statement of Principles cannot be made by Members from the floor of the Convention."

The current Statement of Principles reads as follows.

1. Each individual has the right to his or her own life, and this right is the source of all other rights.
2. Property rights are essential to the maintenance of those rights.
3. In order that these rights be respected, it is essential that no individual or group initiate the use of force or fraud against any other.
4. In order to bar the use of force or fraud from social relationships and to place the use of retaliatory force under objective control, human society requires an institution charged with the task of protecting individual rights under an objective code of rules. This is the basic task of, and the only moral justification for, government.
5. The only proper function of government whose powers must be constitutionally limited, are:
 - a) settling, according to objective laws, disputes among individuals where private, voluntary arbitration has failed;
 - b) providing protection from criminals;
 - c) providing protection from foreign invaders.
6. As a consequence of all the above, every individual -- as long as he or she respects the rights of others -- has the right to live as he or she alone sees fit, as a free trader on a free market.