

*Consent is a journal of
ideas and opinions
on
individual freedom.*

#2



Consent

If ever there was an example of how willingly so many individuals would sacrifice their fundamental freedoms for a single political objective, then Ontario's newest political party, the Family Coalition Party (FCP), has got to be it.

With over 45,000 votes received throughout the 36 ridings in which the FCP fielded candidates during Ontario's 1987 election, the party appeared to have made inroads thought impossible till then --- especially for a so-called "fringe" party. In some ridings, the FCP drew as much as 7-9% of the votes cast, which often represented half as many of the number of votes cast for a much better known and much more strongly entrenched political party, the Progressive Conservative Party.

How was this possible, and what does this mean to the future of politics in Ontario?

One advantage the FCP has, as a new party, is its network of pre-established connections with other Christian-based lobby groups, such as Right to Life, Real Women, and OAAIS (Ontario Association of Alternative and Independent Schools), all of whom have extensive mailing lists.

Find out what you should know about the Family Coalition Party and why its influence will have a negative effect on our individual freedoms:

ABORTING OUR FREEDOMS

The goal of The Family Coalition Party

--- by Marc Emery

Abortion.

Mention the Family Coalition Party to anyone who's heard of it, and that's the word that will immediately come to mind. Even though the party claims to have two platforms, "pro-life" and "pro-family", in fact, the Family Coalition Party represents neither.

Apart from being against freedom of choice in abortion, the FCP is little more than a coalition of contradictory ideologies based upon subjective inter-

pretations of things like "family values" and religion. As a consequence, the FCP is against freedom of choice in virtually every other issue as well, something you might never guess by reading its literature.

Impact, the FCP's official newsletter, states that the FCP is "Ontario's only pro-life, pro-family political party. It stands for small, clean government, Judeo - Christian moral

To those who consent, no injustice is done

values, low taxes, and free markets."

Yet, every FCP policy virtually assures a large cumbersome government that will restrict the choices of Ontarians to a much greater extent than is already the case.

The FCP demands conformity. It wants the state to impose its moral view of the world on everyone.

For example, FCP supporters view women as housewives who should be subsidized to stay at home for the "good of society". Because they perceive "pay equity" as a means of encouraging more women to enter the workforce, they're against it. The idea that legislated "pay equity" represents a complete violation of individual freedom and responsibility is completely lost on them.

But the FCP's stand against "pay equity" really translates into a stand against WORK "equity". FCP representatives have actually recommended that women choosing to stay home to look after their children should receive a guaranteed annual income of \$12,000! In other words, even if women choose not to enter the workforce, they should be paid --- by the taxpayer --- for a service they are rendering only to themselves.

This ludicrous and unworkable proposition is being advocated in the name of the "family", that nebulous, undefinable standard on which the FCP bases its entire platform.

For example, to further entrench the "family" as a privileged special interest group, Middlesex FCP candidate Bill Giesen (whom I ran against as FREEDOM PARTY's candidate) advocated increasing the family allowance (baby bonus) to "encourage family life". (So much for small government and lower taxes!) While it was readily apparent what Giesen's supporters would have to gain through such an absurd suggestion (his campaign manager's car had a licence plate which read "7 KIDS"), the impact of what this would do to the many other families and individuals who would have to subsidize

the children of others was not of concern to him.

Despite its stated commitment to "free markets", FCP literature makes no attempt to disguise the party's advocacy of "cradle to grave" socialism --- as long as it promotes the FCP's concept of "family values".

"Yes to family farms and protection of family farms", says the FCP's 1987 election literature. In practice, of course, this means the continued subsidization of the family farm, a policy totally consistent with NDP, Liberal and Conservative policy --- and inconsistent with a belief in "free markets".

"The FCP demands conformity. It wants to impose its moral view of the world on everyone."

As if to highlight its parallel policies with the three traditional parties, Giesen reiterated the FCP's opposition to free trade ("free markets"?!!), saying that such competition to farmers was unfair, and, along with the NDP, offered his continued support of marketing boards, and guaranteed high prices.

So what makes the FCP any different from the other main parties? Apart from its tunnel-visioned stand against abortion, not much.

The bulk of the FCP's support has come from rural areas, where anti-competitive, anti-individualistic policies have already been made popular by the traditional political parties.

And of course, religious and cultural backgrounds played an important role in adding to the FCP's unexpected popularity. Anyone campaigning in Middlesex County during Election '87 would have found it difficult not to notice that virtually every recognizably Dutch-Canadian family had a Family Coalition sign on the property. Members of the Dutch Reformed Church who are

vigorous supporters of Right to Life and Campaign Life, as well as other fundamentalist Christians (with typically large families), were quite eager to support the FCP with both votes and money.

Despite the preaching of their brand of Christian morality and "pro-family" values, one can't help but notice the self-serving advantages to be gained by these "altruistic" rural Christian families, given their support of propping up farm prices, farm subsidies, marketing boards and loan bail-outs.

In the major expenditure areas of health care and pensions, the FCP continues to perpetuate the false socialist notion that such funding is both moral and possible for eternity: "Yes to the expansion of nursing facilities and care at home"; "Yes to major expansion of HOME (Home Ownership Made Easy) program"; "Yes to government sponsored low-cost housing" reads FCP literature.

But the FCP's advocacy of government intervention in our lives doesn't end there. The control of private businesses engaged in their peaceful activities is introduced twice in the FCP platform: "Yes to Sunday as a day of rest" (meaning, of course, forced closings of retail outlets on Sundays---another Liberal/NDP/Conservative policy); "Yes to better government supervision of automobile insurance" (meaning, of course, government control of private insurance rates --- yet another NDP/Liberal/Conservative plank).



While both the above are policies inimical to the NDP/Liberal/Conservative status quo, in health care and housing, FCP policy completely matches NDP policy, with the obvious exception of the abortion issue.

In education, the FCP advocates continued state financing, but with parents directing the curriculum. However, this concern has less to do with the raising of standards of education than it has to do with the ability of parents to weed out unacceptable teachers, "homosexuals, lesbians, feminists, and male chauvinists," according to FCP spokesman Bill Giesen.

"...the FCP sees nothing immoral about compelling homosexuals, unmarried couples, etc. to subsidize its Christian socialist utopia..."

Because the FCP would ultimately like to control the Ontario educational system and simply place religious teaching and the enforcement of "family values" in ALL schools, any mention of accepting individual responsibility for the funding of such schools is carefully avoided.

FCP candidates, during Election '87, never once advocated the withdrawal of the state from education, but in fact, said "more money" ought to be spent on it. Not, of course, THEIR money, but ours.

If FCP supporters were truly interested in directing their education taxes to the school or school system of their choice, then Freedom Party would provide the political alternative they seek. But, like every FCP policy, the legislation they want is aimed at much more than just running their own lives; they want to control everyone else's life as well.

Therefore, it is not surprising that in its support of "public" funding for all schools, the FCP does not consider it an infringement of indiv-

"It is true that liberty is precious --- so precious that it must be rationed." --- Lenin

idual rights to force a childless couple (or a gay couple for that matter) to subsidize their large rural families attending the schools of their choice.

This attitude, in addition to supporting a violation of individual rights, represents a direct insult to many of the groups and individuals whose rights the FCP would restrict. While FCP supporters may not like "homosexuals, feminists, and male chauvinists", it is clear that in their acceptance of public school funding, they have no objections to these groups being forced to subsidize THEIR lifestyles.

Even though the FCP sees nothing immoral about compelling homosexuals, unmarried couples, etc., to subsidize its Christian socialist utopia, woe unto those who would try to exercise peaceful autonomy in their own home with books, television or magazines. Expanding state censorship is high on the FCP's agenda of imposing its "family values" on others.

"in the name of "morality", the FCP advocates an ANTI-moral stance"

To be fair, the FCP positions are no more hypocritical than those of the NDP/Liberal/Conservative parties, but at least the old line parties don't wax on about how "morally superior" they are to other politicians or political parties.

Consider the following comments made by FCP representative Judy Johnson and FP Leader Robert Metz on the subject of what morality is --- and isn't (from a CFRB radio (Toronto) debate):

JOHNSON: "The FCP is talking about some kind of moral principles in government."

METZ: "(But) morality only has to do with those issues that are open to our free choice. That's what morality means: choosing between right and wrong. When an individual or party or anyone imposes their choice on someone else, they're

eliminating the condition of morality. Morality only has to do with choice and by eliminating choice in whatever area of anyone's life, you have, in effect, eliminated morality."

When the FCP speaks of "morality", it refers to the imposition of a predetermined code of behaviour on others, not to the exercise of free choice, which is the necessary precondition of true morality.

Thus, in the name of "morality", the FCP advocates an ANTI-moral stance when its literature reads: "Yes to re-enforcing the rights of communities to protect themselves against pornography and prostitution."

As we all know, a "community" protecting "itself" does not refer to protection from violence or force, but to "protection" from the free expression of ideas, other points of view, and from the peaceful lifestyles of others. Conversely, this "protection" involves depriving a large segment of the community from peacefully choosing its own personal lifestyle and morality.

Since pornography and prostitution can admittedly offend, but cannot threaten or pose harm, the FCP is merely suppressing dissent and other lifestyles. Again, the pervasive theme behind all FCP policies is conformity.

It is ironic that the party whose major beef with the other political parties is "the lack of moral leadership which threatens life and the quality of life" uses a completely false application of the word "morality" and never even takes the time to objectively define what it means when using the term.

For a party that infers "morality" in all its positions, the FCP has nothing to say about the morality of arbitrary taxation --- except when it comes to funding for abortions. The FCP makes no mention, provision or acknowledgement of "individual freedom", "individual rights" or "individual responsibility".

The special interests that the FCP is appealing to can be extrapolated both from its statement of "principles" and its platform.

In its statement of principle, the FCP argues that "the enduring values (of the family) must be protected", not aware of the irony within that statement. Enduring values ENDURE, they do not need protection. Threatened or diminished values, opinions, languages, etc., require political intervention in order to give them artificial support when legitimate support does not exist. We have seen this in government efforts to sustain its definition of "Canadian culture", when Canadians of their own free will, will not support it.

" Responsibility for one's individual choices is precisely what the FCP wants to avoid."

Thus, the FCP would pillage the economic livelihood of all individuals in the same way the other major parties actively espouse. Only the special interest beneficiaries are different in that they largely are comprised of traditional, Christian, conservative, and largely rural voters --- who all happen to be opposed to abortion.

Nowhere in any FCP literature is there any mention or advocacy of individual responsibility. Responsibility for one's individual choices is precisely what the FCP wants to avoid. Instead, it advocates "collective responsibility", where government is to be the ultimate patriarchal extension of the family--- one big "family" ruled by one big "father".

Like the traditional parties, the FCP is quick to advocate special privilege for its supporters, but offers no freedom of choice to those whose lifestyle and priorities are different. Like the old line parties, individuals and individual rights are to be sacrificed --- for the benefit of the vested interests within

the Family Coalition Party.

If FCP supporters simply wanted to have the freedom to control their OWN lives, send their children to the school of their choice, refuse to fund abortions, advocate a Christian lifestyle, have much greater control in raising their own children, these choices would be entirely open to them under Freedom Party's platform of individual freedom and individual responsibility (i.e., that the purpose of government is to protect our freedom of choice, not to restrict it).

So how does all this affect the political landscape of Ontario?

Certainly, the possibility of the FCP actually electing a member to provincial parliament is remote, but getting elected isn't necessary for the FCP to achieve its goals. Just as any new political party or lobby group would like to develop enough electoral clout to push the traditional parties into adopting their platforms, the FCP's influence will be felt by other parties, particularly when that influence translates directly into votes.

Judging by the results of Ontario's 1987 election, the average FCP supporter is almost certainly a former Progressive Conservative, and it was the PC's who had the most to lose to the FCP (particularly in the rural areas where the FCP received 7-9% of the vote).

This fact has not been lost on PC organizers. Tom Long, president of the Ontario PC's has already announced that his party must return "to its roots" and reflect "family values". And of course, interim leader Andy Brandt has already reiterated the theme of "family values" in his party's opposition to Sunday shopping.

Ironically, it seems that it is the FCP that has forced the Ontario Conservatives, at least in rural Ontario, to adopt a "conservative" agenda. If the trend to such "conservatism" continues, it will eventually come at the expense of the few free-market positions that

Conservatives still pay lip service to.

So don't be surprised when you see supposedly "conservative" representatives begin to adopt stricter stances against issues like abortion and Sunday shopping, while spending more and more of our money on programs like universal day care. Already, "conservative-socialists" are very much a part of the Canadian political scene.

And don't be surprised, when the other parties start integrating terms like "family values" into their platforms while, of course, continuing to promote their traditional platforms.

When that happens, Ontario won't need any "family coalition" parties anymore; it will need a refuge from them.

The Right? to Strike

---By Lloyd Walker

On April 9, 1987, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that the right to strike is NOT protected by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. As a result, union leaders have claimed that the door is now open for the government to legislate any strikers back to work. The "labour movement" is in an uproar, but for all the wrong reasons.

Since all of us, even those without union representation, have the right to withhold our services (i.e., quit our jobs), what is the labour movement really supporting by arguing that the "right" to strike be constitutionally guaranteed?

Let's identify the nature of a "job" before we look at the validity of any argument supporting strike action.

The "right to strike" is really not a "right" at all; it is a political privilege. Unions want to be able to withhold labour from management or owners without taking the same risk everyone else must take in effort to increase wages. Organized labour wants jobs recognized as "property" so it can "possess" those jobs and thus prevent anyone else from "owning" those same jobs.

No one has a "right" to a job. Jobs are not property that can be possessed like a house or a car. Jobs are a consequence of voluntary agreements between two parties, an employer and an employee. As such, a job cannot be "possessed" or "owned". In the sense of property, an employer-employee relationship is as intangible as a marriage relationship because if either party left, the agreement, the relationship, and thus the marriage ceases to exist.

In short, unions want to control not only their own members, but non-members as well --- through the form of legislation that protects them from competition in labour.

In a voluntary relationship, either party has the right and freedom to terminate it.

Government legislation is the key to organized labour's willingness to ignore the economic realities of the day and to pursue policies that are detrimental to its members, to employers, and to labour competition. This legal privilege prevents the labour market from being self-regulating, causing the "need" for even more government involvement in employee-employer relationships.

In a free society (i.e., where all relationships are voluntary), governments have no right to impose relationships. Agreements between CONSENTING parties require governments only to arbitrate or enforce the voluntary contract. And the function of government is to be an impartial arbiter of justice.

Philosophically and pragmatically, there is only one way to obtain and

"It may be true... that you can't fool all the people all the time, but you can fool enough of them to rule a large country." --- Will and Ariel Durant

maintain a privilege of this type--- through the use of FORCE.

Admittedly, the use of the word "force" in this circumstance upsets a lot of people, particularly those within the labour movement --- and with good reason. After all, a common expression of force is direct physical violence, something most people condemn, yet something which unions criticize only half-heartedly, especially when they perceive that their interests are at stake.

But regardless of one's personal perspective on unions, it's pretty hard to deny that they get their power to coerce relationships from the very source that should be preventing the use of force --- government itself. Why? Because the labour movement has successfully pressured legislators into ignoring the RIGHTS of individuals and granting some of them (its members)

SPECIAL STATUS. But, special status only lasts as long as you have the legislator's ear. In today's world, power changes hands with each election and thus the voices heard by government also change.

Given these political realities, it is quite possible that legislators could ban the very existence of unions (i.e., even as voluntary labour associations). Of course, this would be just as wrong as what they're doing now, but either consequence would be the result of labour legislation based on pursuing INTERESTS at the expense of the RIGHTS of individuals.

When it comes right down to it, the truth is that all of us have the right to withhold our services. What we DON'T have, and should never have, is the "right" to hold our employer or any other citizen hostage to our desires.

THE JOKE'S ON US!

A Humorous Look at the Words Which Shape Politics

Anarchy: What everybody's supposed to be afraid of if we dare to cut back the size of government.

Balanced Budget: After the government takes enough to balance the budget, the citizen has to budget the balance.

Bureaucrat: A red tapeworm.

Candidate: (1) A man who stands for what he thinks people will fall for. (2) A candidate needs three hats: one to cover his head with, one to toss into the ring, and one to talk through.

Capitalism: The scapegoat for every government program that goes wrong.

Censor: (1) A person who thinks all people are as nasty as himself, and hates them for it. (2) One who loves morality so much that he will commit any crime to maintain it.

Civilization: The question is not where civilization began, but when will it.

Courtroom: A place where justice is usually dispensed --- with.

Democracy: The theory that the common man knows what he wants and deserves to get it --- good and hard.

Diplomacy: (1) Lying in state. (2) The art of letting someone else have your way. (3) The non-publicity of duplicity. (4) The patriotic art of lying for one's country. (5) The art of convincing a man he's a liar without actually telling him.

Diplomat: When a diplomat says yes, he means perhaps; when he says perhaps, he means no; and when he says no, he's no diplomat.

Election: (1) You don't have to fool all of the people all of the time; during elections is sufficient. (2) Every four years or so we have a national election, and every forty years a rational one.

Fair Wage: What everybody wants to be paid, but no one seems to be getting.

Fence: The first resort of stolen goods and politicians.

(continued)

Government Debt: When you think of the government debt the next generation must pay off, no wonder a baby yells when it's born.

History: (1) A record of the evil that men do (2) Something that never happened, written by a man who wasn't there. (3) A series of lies agreed upon. (4) We learn from history that we do not learn from history.

Comparative Advantage

(From: *The Nightly Business Report*, PBS, Nov.13,1987)

Communism: You have two cows. The government takes both of them, and gives you part of the milk.

Socialism: You have two cows. The government takes one of them, and gives it to your neighbor.

Fascism: You have two cows. The government takes both of them and sells you the milk.

Nazism: You have two cows. The government takes both of them, and shoots you.

Bureaucracy: You have two cows. The government takes both of them, shoots one, milks the other, and pours the milk down the drain.

Capitalism: You have two cows. You sell one of them, and then buy a bull.

Outlaw: A menace to society, but not as bad as an in-law.

Politics: (1) Two sides and a fence. (2) Where the path of glory leads but to the gravy. (3) A strife of interests masquerading as a contest of principles. (4) A matter of passing the buck or passing the dough.

Sabbath: The day of arrest.

TAXING CHARITY

--- By David Pengelly

For 1988 the government has changed the tax deduction for charitable donations. Previously any money given to charity was subtracted from your income. The tax treatment was as if you had never made the money.

Under the new law the government taxes you and then gives you a 17% tax credit. Most people are in the 26% tax bracket. If you have \$100 in charitable giving the government will tax you \$26 and then give you a \$17 credit. YOU will owe them \$9. The Ontario government will then ask for its 50% or \$4.50. To give \$100 to charity you will have to pay government \$13.50. Charity is being taxed at 13.5%.

It was due to demands by the New Democratic Party that the law was changed. Why do the New Democrats want us to stop giving money to charity?

HATE LITERATURE

"The thing that keeps this great country together is that everybody hates Ontario; and the thing that keeps Ontario together is that everybody hates Toronto; and the thing that keeps Toronto together is that everybody hates Bay Street." --- Ontario Premier David Peterson, at a First Ministers' Conference dinner.

CONSENT: Number Two, March-April 1988, is published by the **Freedom Party of Ontario**, a fully-registered Ontario political party. Contributions are tax-creditable. **Subscription Rate:** \$25 for six issues. **Managing Editor:** Robert Vaughan. **Consent** welcomes unsolicited manuscripts, submissions, and comments. **Mailing Address:** P.O. Box 2214, Stn. 'A', London, Ontario, N6A 4E3. **Phone:** (519) 433-8612. **Freedom Party of Ontario Statement of Principle:** **Freedom Party** is founded on the principle that: Every individual, in the peaceful pursuit of personal fulfillment, has an absolute right to his or her own life, liberty, and property. **Platform:** **Freedom Party** believes that the *purpose of government* is to *protect* the individual's freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.