



Ontario Libertarian Party

Annual General Meeting

November 2, 2013

The Right Wing Sports Pub

2497 Yonge Street, Toronto, ON – 647-694-1135

Proposed Agenda:

- 10:00 AM – Set-up, Registration and Continental Breakfast
- 10:25 AM – Chair - Call to order – acceptance of the Agenda
- 10:30 AM - Welcome by the Leader
- 10:45 AM - Reports of Officers and Questions from Members
- 11:15 AM – Break – soft drinks, tea, coffee available upstairs
- 11:30 AM - Outline and discussion of Official Party Positions**
- 12:00 PM - Lunch upstairs (A meal and soft drink are part of your ticket. Order off the menu, but no special orders please. (Please pay for your own beer)
- 1:30 PM - Discussion of Official Party Positions**
- 2:45 PM – Break – soft drinks, tea, coffee available upstairs
- 3:00 PM – Chair - Elections of 2 Members-at-Large, 3 Ethics Committee members, Recording Secretary (Matt Belanger resignation), Campaign Manager (Jeff McLarty resignation).

Ethics Committee members to be replaced or re-elected - Chester Brown and George Dance (each have served for 3 years), replace Mark Tordai (resigned April 27/13). ▪ Current Members-at-Large - Christin Milloy, Andreas Maurochos
- 4:30 PM – Chair - Adjournment.

****There are 21 Party Positions that exist in the Internal Platform issued Jan. 2013. These may also be found here: (<http://www.libertarian.on.ca/Positions/list.php>) and these were to be discussed at a Caucus Meeting which did not happen. Those 21 are up for discussion today – or we can proceed directly to the list that follows (pg. 12) the 21 below.****

Policy Positions

The included policy positions are not intended to be an exhaustive list covering every area in which government is involved. If that were true, we would still be writing. Instead, it contains some direction on a number of issues, other than our planks, many are not provincial matters but because the electorate may not be aware of how government “powers” are divided, our active candidates should be.

Where an official position has not been stated, candidates should deal with these and other issues using the libertarian principles that try to limit government involvement, increase choice, defend life, liberty and property, and eliminate coercion.

It should also be pointed out that government adds a cost to services by virtue of the fact that many of the services have no competition.

Justice

Restorative justice rather than rehabilitative justice

Changes Libertarians would make include:

Convicted Criminals must make restitution to their victims or victims’ families

Promote private arbitration between criminal and victim for property crimes. Restitution would have to be paid to the victim by the criminal who would also pay for the process. This would free our courts for more serious cases.

Elimination of "victimless" crimes such as seat belt laws, where no one is hurt, nor property lost or damaged. Free our police officers to fight violent crime.

Have juries set sentences within the limits prescribed in law. This will ensure the guilty take responsibility for their actions.

Remove government-backed legal aid programs, which encourage criminals to use the system to the limit on the off chance they will go free. Criminals should pay for their defense, not the taxpayers.

Free the police from the multitude of politically correct commissions looking over their shoulder. Police should be controlled by their local municipal councils who pay the bills, not political appointees of the provincial government.

Enforce existing laws that deal with violent crime rather than adding more "designer legislation" based on victim gender or race.

Make government and its employees subject to the same laws as everyone else without exception.

Choice and competition are the things that Ontario taxpayers need to get value for the money they are forced to spend.

Libertarians believe that the interests of the people of Ontario are best served when there are competitive forces determining the costs of the goods and services that government now provides through various monopolies. Things like health care, education, electrical power, the sale of alcoholic beverages and more.

"But," you might ask, "Who will take care of education (or health care or culture or the roads)?"

But you probably don't ask who would take care of providing shoes, or fresh vegetables and food, clothing etc. That's because we still believe these are not functions of government.

Internet

A Federal issue, the Ontario Libertarian Party believes the internet is one of the greatest uncorrupted resources on our planet today. We will do everything in our power to defend present freedoms from any restrictive proposed regulations.

Copyright challenges become an issue, when information is treated like property. The Ontario Libertarian party believes information should be treated like any other property, thus any accusations of theft be handled like similar to other thefts. The legal system already has a court system in place to process thieves. Other stakeholders like internet service providers, search engines, and hosting companies should not be forced into any burden, or worse held accountable, for any trespass resulting in copyright infringement claims. The internet should stay free, and unencumbered.

Abortion

The issue of abortion is controversial among libertarians because of disagreement as to when individual life begins. On one side, some libertarians believe life begins at conception, therefore the government should defend a fetus. On the other side, some libertarians believe life begins at birth, therefore the choice resides with the family. While our members are divided, provincially it's irrelevant. In Canada, this is a Federal issue. Currently there is no law, as it should be, government should not be involved. The policy of the Ontario Libertarian Party is that this issue is the personal and individual concern of the woman, her family, and her physician. Public funds (OHIP) should not be used to defray costs for procedures. That should be the extent to which candidates respond to the question, anything said beyond that is the opinion of the Candidate and should be acknowledged as such.

Employment or Pay Equity

This legislation is based on the unproven assumption that the hiring and pay scales of visible minorities are the direct result of racist and sexist attitudes of all employers.

Their implementation has required the creation of expensive bureaucracies, which now dictate who shall be given preference in hiring and what they shall be paid. This is really legislated discrimination. The farcical nature of the legislation now sees many claiming some form of mental disability or ancient link to one of the "disadvantaged" groups to get a job or promotion.

Newspaper articles have noted that the agencies responsible for implementing these programs do not follow their own hiring guidelines. Similarly, teachers' unions with a predominantly female membership are adamant in saying they have no intention of following the law.

Libertarians believe these schemes interfere with the right of individuals to negotiate a private employment contract without government interference. They are unjust, unfair, expensive, and represent more red tape that sends jobs to other jurisdictions. They don't work. Libertarians would see them scrapped.

Immigration

Generally a federal issue, but Libertarians believe in open borders for people who wish to immigrate to Canada. Immigrants must pass security tests and be willing to support our legal system, our freedoms and our liberties. Immigrants must be able to support themselves or access charitable organizations or family help in Canada without relying on any government assistance during their settlement period.

Ontario Lottery & Gaming

The following background information was extracted from CAMH (Centre for Addiction and Mental Health) (<http://www.camh.ca/en/hospital/Pages/home.aspx>) to try and clarify how Ontario has arrived at its present situation with respect to control over gambling. The issue has both Federal and Provincial entanglements.

<http://www.problemgambling.ca/EN/ResourcesForProfessionals/Pages/GamblingAContext.aspx>

“In the 1950's, casinos opened across the border in the United States and an increasing number of Canadians visited US casinos for entertainment. After 1963 all provinces were familiar with legalized low-stakes charity bingo, commonly held in church basements and offered by other social organizations such as the Lion Clubs and Canadian Legion groups. From 1960 to 1969, a review of gambling by the Joint Committee of the House of Commons resulted in the enactment of section 190 of the Criminal Code. Section 190 had a pivotal impact on gambling with the following changes:

- federal, provincial and territorial governments are permitted to manage lotteries (including games of chance such as slot machines)
- provinces and territories are granted full licensing authority for gambling operations
- charitable, religious, and agricultural fairs are permitted to conduct lotteries
- provincial authorities have final discretion in determining what constitutes a charity organization.

The first government lottery by the federal government was held in 1970 to fund the 1976 Montreal Olympics, followed by the first charitable casino in Edmonton in 1969. Manitoba opened the first provincially operated casino, claiming health care as its motivation (Mandel & Doelen, 1999). Casinos in Quebec and Ontario came next, with the Crystal Casino (1993) and Casino Windsor (1994). As gambling expanded, financial returns grew and conflicts between provinces and between federal and provincial jurisdictions arose. As a result, several large regional lottery corporations, including Lotto Canada, were established to manage large lottery events, decreasing legal disputes and competition for lottery sales. In 1985, Bill C-81 was passed, marking the federal government's withdrawal from all gambling activity. In exchange, the provinces would pay the federal government \$18 million a year through the Interprovincial Lottery Corporation.”

Libertarians favour the elimination of laws that interfere with private consensual acts such as gambling. Governments should not be involved in gambling or running gambling businesses or any business. OLG is an agency that Libertarians would sell off, even though many will cry that it is a net revenue source for the province.

Human Rights Commissions

The idea of the Ontario Human Rights Commission (<http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en>) seems contrary to good sense. If our Constitution and Charter already protect our rights, why is there a need for another level of protection, especially one as arbitrary as this?

The Ontario Human Rights Code says everyone has equal rights and opportunities without discrimination for employment, accommodation, goods, services and facilities, contracts and membership in vocational

associations and trade unions.

The Ontario Human Rights Code contains provisions that are anti-discriminatory. Individuals can place a complaint with the OHRC if they are discriminated or harassed because of

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. race | 11. age (18 and over, 16 and over in occupancy of accommodation) |
| 2. ancestry | 12. marital status (including same sex partners) |
| 3. place of origin | 13. family status |
| 4. colour | 14. receipt of public assistance (in accommodation only) |
| 5. ethnic origin | 15. record of offences (in employment only) |
| 6. citizenship | 16. gender identity |
| 7. creed (religion) | 17. gender expression |
| 8. sex (including pregnancy) | |
| 9. sexual orientation | |
| 10. disability | |

Libertarians do not advocate discrimination of any kind. However, individual business owners may have their own very good reasons for discriminating against individuals for any number of those 17 points. The OHRC effectively removes the right of property from a business owner by forcing them to comply with the code or to create some sort of lie to avoid prosecution. The OHRC would advocate that a discriminatory act, a preference, is best corrected by a violation of the real property rights of an owner.

The fundamental rights are life, liberty and property. Being discriminated against is not a violation of any of those, and can be best equated with the rules of trespass.

The injunction “no trespassing” is not a violation of any person’s rights. It is an affirmation of property rights. A Libertarian government would eliminate the OHRC.

Prostitution

Like gambling, prostitution was originally controlled federally (<http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb0330-e.htm#federal>) but because of a recent series of constitutional challenges things are changing. From Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prostitution_in_Canada#Canadian_Criminal_Code_C-46:

“There is a general agreement that the *status quo* of prostitution in Canada is problematic, but there is no consensus on what should be done. There is an *ideological* disagreement between those who want to see prostitution eliminated, generally because they view it either as an exploitative or unacceptable part of society, and those who view prostitution as a transaction between consenting adults and advocate *decriminalization*.” Libertarians are in the latter group favouring the elimination of laws that interfere with private consensual acts such as prostitution.

Sunset Clauses

Legislation should be written such that it will expire at a future date. This should be particularly true of intrusive legislation (which should not be enacted in the first place), where privileges are granted to groups or individual etc. Adding a sunset clause forces the legislature to re-examine the legislation in question and in the light of a new situation. All such previous legislation should have this rule appended. In this way rules are reduced and the legislature has something to do other than think up new rules.

Statutory Holiday Shopping

Sunday shopping was once banned in Ontario. This excerpt was taken from Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sunday_shopping#Ontario) an example of how quickly things can change:

“After the demise of the Lord's Day Act, the Retail Business Holidays Act of Ontario still prohibited most stores from opening on Sundays. However, there were many exceptions to these rules (for example, gas stations, convenience stores, tourist areas). Many store owners who opposed the law decided to open their stores on Sundays, knowing they were breaking the law. Some, such as [Marc Emery](#), were jailed for doing so.

In June 1990, the Supreme Court of Ontario found the act to be unconstitutional. As a result, Ontario had nine months of open-wide Sunday shopping, until the [Ontario Court of Appeal](#)'s reversal of the decision in March 1991.

However, public opposition to Sunday closing continued to rise. Bowing to public pressure, the [Rae government](#) amended the Retail Business Holidays Act in June 1992 to permit Sunday shopping in Ontario.”

This should be an issue left to local municipalities, but generally libertarians view the legal operation of a business of any sort to be up to the owners of said business. Employees should be allowed the option of working or not, again, strictly between employees and employers.

<http://www.cp24.com/news/committee-votes-to-allow-victoria-day-shopping-1.1029519#ixzz2CgFcjhSn>

Unions

Libertarians believe that people should be able to freely associate in work related unions for the purposes of securing better wages, benefits or working conditions by non-coercive means in a free market.

Unionism has played an important role historically in improving working conditions for workers etc. Unions are NOT inconsistent with free market economics.

What is inconsistent with free market economics are the special privileges given to unions by governments, the monopolies created, the sweetheart deals that could only come about by coercion, and the legislated ability of unions to block non-union members in bidding for jobs etc. We believe that unions can operate in a free market, BUT they have no right to control labour within that market.

Unfortunately, there are both Federal and Provincial laws that make this issue very complicated.

Canada Labour Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. L-2) <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/L-2/>

Canada Trade Unions Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. T-14) <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/T-14/index.html>

Ontario Labour Relations Act, 1995 http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_95l01_e.htm

While the current popular American idea of “right-to-work” legislation sounds attractive to libertarians, it means adding new laws to correct existing laws. We would advocate removing existing laws that provide privileges to either employees or employers.

Recall of an MPP or a Bill

Recall is the best way to ensure real accountability of elected representatives between elections. If an elected MPP should turn out to be corrupt, dishonest, or a liability to constituents in any profound way, it is only right that voters have the opportunity to recall that MPP and choose a replacement.

Similarly if a new law proves to be unpopular, or in any way detrimental to the negative rights of individuals, citizens should be able to petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and demand the bill be repealed or set in motion the possibility of a referendum for repeal.

Conspiracy Theories

Of course, Libertarian candidates are free to hold their own personal opinions and views on any number of issues. But in order to be a candidate and a member of the Caucus each person must sign this pledge: **"I will not advocate anything inconsistent with the Ontario Libertarian Party Statement of Principles."**

http://libertarian.on.ca/sites/libertarian.on.ca.d6/files/Membership_App_form.pdf

The party does not represent/advocate/support/recognize any so called conspiracy theories, and candidates must not infer that they represent the party while advocating their own personal views on these issues.

Austrian economist and libertarian Steve Horwitz writing on the subject of CONSPIRACY THEORIES put it this way: *"there is a more fundamental problem with a classical liberal's embracing most conspiracy theories. Ultimately, believing that a small group of evil people are manipulating economic and social processes for their own ends concedes to defenders of government economic planning that controlling and manipulating the economy is in fact possible! In other words, conspiracy theories are a form of socialism. If international bankers really are using the Fed to manipulate the economy to enrich themselves, or if politicians and bureaucrats are using the welfare system to undermine the family or to impoverish African-Americans, then using government to achieve fairly specific ends is apparently possible."*

Government Grants for the Arts

Historically artists of all kinds have had difficulty in gaining traction in their chosen field and thus have had to rely on the kindness of patrons: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patronage#Arts>. But that kind of patronage was generally bestowed on worthy artists (as determined by the patrons). Today governments at all levels have taken on this task; even though there are many corporate entities that are willing to fulfil this niche voluntarily (with tax benefits). In fact what happens is both corporations and governments are involved in many situations.

Because governments have been encouraged (by lobby groups) to take on this role using public tax dollars, artists of questionable talent have chosen to advantage themselves of this benefit. Art has suffered, and money is wasted. Here is the view of one of our own Caucus members Rod Rojas on this issue:

<http://mises.org/daily/4790/Whats-Wrong-with-Contemporary-Classical>

Libertarians would not support arts funding, whether for the production of motion pictures in Ontario, or any other person or entity.

Crime Prevention

While violent crime rates in Canada are unchanged or dropping, sensational media coverage of high profile cases has caused politicians to climb on an anti-crime bandwagon. Many of the changes suggested are outside Ontario's jurisdiction so talk is as far as their suggestions will go.

Libertarians believe that criminals have to take personal responsibility for their actions. Blaming "society", lack of jobs or poverty is a convenient excuse that enables the guilty to escape accountability.

Based on today's welfare rolls, if poverty was the cause of crime, ten percent of Ontario's population would be criminals! We don't need more laws, we need enforcement of what we have! Changes Libertarians would make include:

Promote private arbitration between criminal and victim for property crimes. Restitution would have to be paid to the victim by the criminal who would also pay for the process. This would free our courts for more serious cases.

- Elimination of "victimless" crimes such as seat belt laws where no one is hurt nor property lost or damaged. Free our police officers to fight violent crime.
- Have juries set sentences within the limits prescribed in law. This will ensure the guilty take responsibility for their actions.
- Remove government-backed legal aid programmes which encourage criminals to use the system to the limit on the off-chance they will go free. Criminals should pay for their defence, not the taxpayers.
- Free the police from the multitude of politically-correct commissions looking over their shoulder. Police should be controlled by their local municipal councils who pay the bills, not political appointees of the provincial government.
- Enforce existing laws that deal with violent crime rather than adding more "designer legislation" based on victim gender or race.

Cannabis & Recreational Drugs

Right now, controlling the use of cannabis/marijuana and other recreational drugs is consuming police and legal resources, funding violent crimes, being sold in dangerous environments while destroying the careers of users.

The Ontario Libertarian party acknowledges that making marijuana controlled like tobacco, and taxed like any other product, has sufficient benefit for the majority of stakeholders, and acknowledges that in the short term, the population may not be ready for a decriminalized and unregulated situation.

This is even truer about other drugs. But there is plenty of evidence that suggests decriminalization of all drugs would be beneficial to all concerned, Portugal is a good example:

<http://www.thefix.com/content/decrim-nation-portugal-ten-years-later>

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/erikkain/2011/07/05/ten-years-after-decriminalization-drug-abuse-down-by-half-in-portugal/>

Libertarians would consider the voluntary individual use of any recreational drug a personal decision, and certainly not a crime.

Censorship

Generally, censorship is a federal issue: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Censorship_in_Canada

Libertarians do not support any form of government enabled censorship of any kind. This is one of the most popular ideas, where voters often side with libertarian principles.

Corporate Welfare

Libertarians are often mistakenly lumped together with “conservatives” because they both allegedly favour free markets and business. The truth is that conservatives tend to favour corporations by extending them special favours when they are in power. That’s why corporations are major donors to conservative political campaigns – tit for tat.

Corporations fear competition; libertarians relish it, that reason alone should tell you that libertarians have no great love of corporations. Too often corporate power depends on government intervention in the marketplace. Examples are subsidies/grants, bailouts, and other forms of corporate welfare, which would be against. We also do not favour protectionist tariffs; explicit grants of monopoly privilege; and the seizing of private property for corporate use. Both the PC’s and the Liberals would say that these interventions help create jobs. In fact, all they do is try to pick winners, and any job so created is usually at the cost of another job in another sector of the economy.

Bailing out a company like GM comes with a high price and many unintended consequences:
<http://www.forbes.com/2010/08/09/general-motors-finance-bailout-opinions-columnists-warren-meyer.html>

LCBO & The Beer Store

The LCBO is the Ontario government alcoholic beverage monopoly. It was established in 1927 after a brief attempt at alcohol prohibition.

The supporters of the LCBO monopoly do so, because they claim (based on government and union sources) that it brings in revenue for the province. That's reassuring, even the government can't screw this up. It is no surprise that the government can sell beer, wine, and liquor to the exclusion of most competition and they make a profit! It's a classic case of looking at just one side of the economic equation. The citizens of Ontario are taxed heavily for alcoholic beverages, and the government also fixes the price and eliminates competition, and they make profit. How hard is that? Of course they do.

A run-of-the-mill case of 24 beer cans in Niagara Falls Ontario will cost about \$40 at the LCBO, and across the imaginary line in Niagara Falls, New York, at the Walmart, it costs \$18.

The LCBO is one of the largest bulk buyers of alcohol in the world, so why don't Ontarians get a better price? Several reasons.

- It's for our own good → As part of Ontario's nanny-state-syndrome, our politicians don't think the good people of Ontario are smart enough to handle their liquor. So we get a guilt message each time we purchase. High price is part of the social engineering or as they call it "social responsibility."

- Unionized work force → The Ontario government has a monopoly agreement with the LCBO workers through their union OPSEU. Imagine a mom-and-pop variety store selling beer and liquor in the United States. They make a living if they compete with other retail outlets, but there is no guarantee of salary. It depends on their ability to provide value. Not true at the LCBO. A store manager makes over \$61,000 annually in a 40 hour week with great benefits (see page 90 of the OPSEU collective agreement). I have nothing against unions, but the Ontario Libertarian Party believes that paying a cashier \$55,000 plus benefits is outrageous.
- Backwards Operating Logic → The LCBO also competes for “share of wallet”, that is, discretionary spending. Discretionary spending is money that consumers may decide to allocate towards other retailers for things like Christmas gifts, luxury food, or movies, instead of a bottle of wine with dinner. However, to paraphrase the LCBO, “it’s important that customers visit our stores because they want to, not because they have to. Unlike other retailers, however, we can’t offer deep price discounts. That would not be socially responsible.”
- Low competition → The LCBO claims it has competition. Their own data sources shows that more than 77% of liquor sales are from the government monopoly. See the figure on the next table for a visual breakdown of the monopolistic LCBO accounting for 50% of the total liquor sales in Ontario, and The Beer Store, albeit a private monopoly sanctioned by the government, to sell beer.
- Hidden Costs → The third reason why Ontario has to pay so much for liquor is the ridiculous product mark-ups ranging from 38% to 52%, that’s before the “behind the sticker” 12% to 25% tax rates. \$0.11 of every dollar the LCBO takes in as revenue, goes towards their stores or marketing. The Ontario Libertarian Party questions why a state own monopoly needs to spend any money at all, on advertising. We hypothesize that changing the line item name on their report from marketing, to propaganda, would be a better representation of where some of the hidden costs go at the LCBO.

Corrupt Reporting Methods: Making Up Numbers & Changing the Units

In between annual reports, the LCBO manipulated the numbers to attempt to make themselves appear like a smaller market participant. In past reports they reported channel data using their own sales contrasted against the derived sales based on volume for their ‘competition’. They used the average retail rate in the LCBO stores, to calculate the estimated sales of illegal options. The Ontario Libertarian Party is highly skeptical that the illegal options cost the same amount as the legal options. We hypothesize that the average price of illegal options is lower than the price of legal ones. Using their calculation method, it produced the pie chart shown in the previous section, with what we believe is likely understated total amount of monopolistic sales. When this data was released, the Ontario Libertarian Party is on record pointing out how skewed the numbers seemed.

In more recent annual reports (2011), pg 88, they admit their numbers were inflated. The government actually admitted their own incompetence. However, now, they report the volume sold by each channel. This new data set allows the LCBO to point to the Beer Store as the largest channel. Now, the data shows that monopolistic government liquor sales are 89.5% - by volume.

Our Plan

The Ontario Libertarian Party would quickly and simply sell the LCBO, then legalize competition. Convenience stores, grocery stores, would all quickly become competitors with the LCBO. It’s our belief that the people of Ontario would quickly be given more choices, convenience and quality at a lower price.

Firearms and Gun Control

Libertarians believe that the peaceful possession of firearms should not be a crime, and that the ownership of such firearms is part of every person's right to own and enjoy private property.

Further, the ownership and use of firearms is the right of a citizen, and should only be limited by threats or acts of violence. We believe in the inherent and inalienable right of all people to self-defense including the use of firearms for this purpose.

Libertarians believe that education is the best means of ensuring responsible behavior with firearms rather than legislation and regulation.

The Libertarian Party of Canada would repeal the former gun control Bills C-51, C-17 and C-68 and resulting regulations with the aim of trusting the people to behave in a generally responsible manner, while at the same time severely punishing those who would commit violence by misusing firearms.

Section 92(14) of the Constitution gives provinces responsibility for the Administration of Justice in the province. Section 109 of the Firearms Act gives the Federal government the authority to enforce the provisions of the Firearms Act even if the provincial government opposes such a move.

Provincial governments who may be gun friendly then have at least two choices to resist in this regard:

(1) Challenge Section 109 of Bill C-68 in court, or

(2) Refuse to continue enforcement of the provisions of the Firearms Act. Refusal by the province to enforce the provisions of the Firearms Act would force the federal government / RCMP to take over and incur the full administration responsibility and costs of the Firearms Act regulations that was downloaded on Ontario by the sympathetic provincial governments at that time.

In the short term, Libertarians would declare that if elected as the governing party of Ontario, it would move to opt out of administering the Firearms Act and put the full burden of administering the Firearms Act back on the Federal government where it belongs.

Workman's Compensation

Workplace Safety and Insurance Board (WSIB) is not a smart program in the eyes of Libertarians. The Ontario Liberty Party would favour a private voluntary system to reduce costs but give adequate benefits. This is insurance. Why the government needs to be involved is not clear.

A private system operates in the State of

Nevada: http://www.workerscompquotes.us/pages/workers_comp/nevada_workerscomp.php

Workers compensation insurance in Nevada can be purchased through the private market where companies bid on your policy or through some type of state fund. State workers compensation insurance is

usually the option of last resort because it can be much more expensive than through the private market. The obvious goal is to get the cheapest or a cheap workers comp rate that provides for adequate coverage.

The following additional positions have been identified as positions we could/should have some information on:

Ontario College of Trades

<http://www.collegeoftrades.ca/about/legislation-and-regulations>

<http://blogs.windsorstar.com/2013/04/18/star-editorial-taxing-the-trades/>

Here's a plank for the Ontario Libertarian Party to hammer into their platform.

Star editorial: Taxing the trades

blogs.windsorstar.com - According to the province, the newly instituted Ontario College of Trades is a much-needed agency designed to create a public registry of skilled...

Auto Insurance

Deregulate the car insurance industry:

<http://www.torontosun.com/2013/03/08/deregulate-the-car-insurance-industry>

Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)

Multiculturalism (Theocracy/Religion in government)

Climate Change and Environmental policies from a libertarian perspective

Eco Fees

Green Energy Act (GEA) in Ontario

Payroll deduction of taxes and fees by government

**Government Subsidies in general (to the Arts, Auto companies etc...)
Welfare and Employment Insurance**

M.U.S.H. Sector: Municipalities, Universities, School boards and Hospitals, as well as long-term care homes, children's aid societies (see below) and police.

Child and Family Services – some ideas to reform Children's Aid:

<http://fixcas.com/help/reform.htm#offence>

Emergency Management and Child Protection http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90e09_e.htm

Alternative Energy Sources (solar, wind power, pumped energy)

Rights of Special Interest Groups (Gay, Women's, and Minority Rights)

**Government Interference with Prices (Rent Controls, Minimum Wage etc.)
Marriage (all kinds)**

End of Life Issues (Organ Donations, Death with Dignity, etc.)

**Alternative Methods of Voting: Proportional Representation, Ranked Ballots, Voter Questionnaire
(Gene Balfour)**