



WEST COAST LIBERTARIAN

The Newsletter of the Greater Libertarian Association

MARCH 1987

VOLUME 7, NUMBER 1.

LOCAL ACTIVIST TO CHALLENGE MEDICAL-GOVERNMENT COMPLEX

by Rob Gillespie

There is a forgotten medical crisis in Canada. There is bountiful media coverage of government's efforts to dictate fees and locations to doctors and competitive drug licencing procedures to pharmaceutical manufacturers.

It is hard not to feel sympathy for these groups and individuals, and for their patients and customers. They are victims of government intervention in the marketplace.

However, some medical concerns are themselves right in their meddling in the market and restricting the choices of consumers. The crises we all hear about every day are simply the results of them getting the other side of the coin they want to hand to everyone else.

The forgotten medical crisis in Canada is the crisis of those who want to take responsibility for their own health. It is the crisis of those who want to consume dietary or medical substances or services not recognised or provided by the standard medical establishment. It is the crisis of those who provide

those goods or services. Once in a while we hear about incidents in this crisis, but the popular media have never identified the crisis or its nature.

This crisis is also the result of government meddling in the marketplace. This interference is demanded and directed by the medical establishment for the sole purpose of preventing Canadians from availing themselves of goods and services not provided by establishment members. In many cases the motivation may be greed, but in many more, I suspect it is a sincere belief by the experts in the field that we simple laymen are incapable of making proper decisions about the care and maintenance of our own bodies.

The latest "incident" to be reported, and the one that concerns us here, is the campaign to destroy the health food industry. The offenders here are the bureaucrats of the Health Protection Branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare. In the fall of 1984, those worthies suddenly declared many herbal products, including some teas to be "new drugs", and banned their sale or

commercial importation. After a storm of public outrage, a "Herbal Advisory Committee" was set up. The herbs are still banned, and with them, approximately 20% of the health industry's business.

In December, 1984, the same was done with all amino acids without warning or explanation. This left many manufacturers and distributors with large, unsaleable inventories. Three months later, again after a public outcry, the least in-demand amino acids were released. The government stated that extensive studies had been made on the aminos but would not release the results. In mid-1986, an "Advisory Committee" was set up to study the aminos. Nothing else was done. That took care of another 20% of the health business.

In 1986, a punitive fee assessment was proposed which could, if enacted, drive the remainder of the industry out of business. Every "drug" (and some food items) legally sold in Canada requires a "Drug Identification Number" (DIN) issued by the Food and Drug Administration. Previously, this was

continued on page 3

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR OURSELVES

It could be that we are witnessing the end of the era of "rising expectations" and a return to an ethic of self-responsibility. Our parents, we as children, and our children themselves, have been battered daily through those three generations with the admonitions of our state rulers and their creatures to "leave things to us". They would take care of us, they would protect us, they would see that we would never lack for anything.

Well, it hasn't worked out that way, and many people besides libertarians have noticed - not yet a majority, perhaps, but certainly a large minority. Of those who have noticed, there have been two sorts of reactions. One is an angry, petulant stamping of the foot at reality and a malicious lashing-out at others to take what is believed to be owed, and the other is a manful (in the best, broadest sense of that word) shouldering of the responsibilities of life, expanding and enriching it, and protecting those friends and loved ones who have become part of it and those material goods which have been created out of it.

This issue and the one previous, of the West Coast Libertarian, have detailed the activities of a number of such people, some libertarian and some, most encouragingly, not. Our coverage has ranged from a GVLA member fighting the government for the right to be responsible for his own health, to the Calgary druggist who insisted on being responsible for his own life; from advocates of Canadians taking unilateral responsibility for free trade, to a man taking the responsibility and the risk of selling people the kind of milk they want to buy in the face of state persecution; from a lawyer in B.C. who has publicly disputed the right of the benchers of the Law Society to "represent" him or to extort fees from him for representation he doesn't want, to an international campaign to support a man and wife in South Africa who have taken the responsibility of researching, developing and promoting a plan which will save that country from a racial holocaust and turn it into a showplace of racial harmony for the world to emulate.

Much more than we have room to detail here is going on, and more responsible individuals will be highlighted in issues to come. If any of our readers know of a particular interesting, courageous or worthy project, please tell us about it and we will attempt to cover it.

We find all this responsible activity very inspiring. We hope you will too.

WEST COAST LIBERTARIAN is the official publication of the GREATER VANCOUVER LIBERTARIAN ASSOCIATION. 922 Cloverley St., North Vancouver, B.C. V7L 1N3

The Greater Vancouver Libertarian Association is a local association of the Libertarian Party of Canada and the B.C. Libertarian Party. The GVLA advocates individual freedom and self-responsibility, a free market, and drastically reduced government power. Our fundamental principles forbid the initiation of force, fraud, or coercion against any person or group.

To join the GVLA or the LPC, please use the pink flyer enclosed with this issue.

Membership fees: Full Membership \$25.00/year - includes WCL subscription

West Coast Libertarian subscription only: \$10.00/year

Editor: Rob Gillespie
 Production Manager: Mary Anne Nylen
 Contributing Editor: Paul Geddes
 Proofreaders: Mary Anne Nylen, Rob Gillespie
 Typesetting & Layout: Bruce Clark
 Advertising: Rob Gillespie - call 255-2124
 Circulation: Kurt Pokrandt, Bill & Elaine Tomlinson

SUBMISSIONS: Articles, of interest to libertarians are welcome and appreciated. Please send newspaper clippings, jokes, cartoons, copies of your letters to newspapers, notices of upcoming libertarian events. Send copy to West Coast Libertarian, 810 W. Broadway #363, Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 4C9

EXCHANGES WITH OTHER PUBLICATIONS ARE WELCOME.

REPRINT PERMISSION: Unless otherwise noted, original material may be reprinted freely, accompanied by the following credit: Reprinted with permission from WEST COAST LIBERTARIAN. 922 Cloverley St., North Vancouver, B.C. V7L 1N3 \$10.00/year.

ADVERTISING RATES: These rates are for commercial advertising, where the advertiser supplies camera-ready copy. Ads for libertarian events and projects will be considered for free inclusion on an individual basis. Send copy to West Coast Libertarian, 810 W. Broadway #363, Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 4C9

- Business Card \$5.00 per issue
- Quarter Page \$10.00 per issue
- Half Page \$25.00 per issue
- Brochure Insert \$25.00 per issue (advertiser supplying materials)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
Local Man V's Medical Government Complex.	1, 3, 4.
Editorial	2
Announcements.	4
Voluntary Professional Memberships - Boytink	5, 6.
Bills Parable. Wilson Visit	6
Letters of the Editor	7, 8.
Milk Deliveries by Pellikan	8.
Free Trade - Block	9
Calendar	10

Continued from page 1 . . .

issued upon application at no fee. The proposal is for an application fee of \$5,000.00 and a renewal fee every other year of \$3,000.00. This is far too high to be a user fee. It can be intended only to drive smaller, independent companies out of business. Even a small producer or distributor can carry up to 75 vitamins, minerals and supplements. That would mean a biannual payment to the government of up to \$225,000. Small companies cannot afford this sort of nonsense. Large pharmaceutical companies and drugstore chains can.

Not all Canadians have quietly submitted to this invasion of their right to be responsible for their own health. In B.C., the Health Action Network Society (H.A.N.S.) took action and we were treated to some very interesting TV coverage of activities at the Blaine border crossing. Also in B.C., Errol Abramson, Publisher of The Vitamin Supplement, a magazine dealing with health, vitamin and nutrition issues, has kept up the pressure in a series of articles, editorials, and letters to the Minister of Health.

In Ontario, Dr. David Rowland, President of the Canadian Nutrition Institute Inc., has taken public speaking tours, written magazine articles, addressed the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare, and sent at least ten letters to Jake Epp (Minister of Health), the Prime Minister, and numerous MP's since early 1985. He has received two replies. In February of 1986 he sent an open letter to the Minister disputing 13 claims being made by his department regarding amino acids, herbs, and related issues. This letter was published in the Vitamin Supplement and interested readers were invited to ask Mr. Epp for a copy of this response to it. Those who did received a form letter advising that it was not his practice to release responses to third parties. What Mr. Epp didn't say was that he hadn't responded at all. Nor, apparently, has he yet responded.

May the government, for any reason, interfere with our very

right to exist? This is not a debate about capital punishment: if the state can do this on any group's behalf, it ultimately holds the power to permit or terminate the existence of peaceful, non-aggressive individuals. This is nowhere made clearer than in the case of A.I.D.S. sufferers. There is promise that AIDS responds to Vitamin C therapy; there are many AIDS palliatives available in the United States, but they are denied Canadian AIDS sufferers. The state and the Canadian medical establishment have nothing to offer and yet are combining to deny dying people access to remedies being tested elsewhere. This is literally a matter of people's lives.

This is the kind of issue which cries out for civil libertarian involvement. There is no more basic matter of individual rights than one involving the individual's right to care for his own body in the way he decides is best. Each individual has the right to ingest any substance or submit himself to any procedure by any practitioner he chooses, regardless of the objections of family, friends, community, or any practitioner of other procedures or purveyor of other substances. This attack on the health food industry is part of an ongoing attempt by the state, acting on behalf of some medical interests, to cut off consumer access to procedures, products, services and individuals who are outside the present medical status quo.

Geoff Langhorne is a Vancouver political activist who long ago chose to take personal responsibility for his health and nutrition.

From the beginning, Geoff has been working with various concerned groups on this issue, but he has become all too aware of the problems such collaboration can bring. Most of the organizations are lobby groups, and their lobbying has tended to be on the timid side because they themselves have some special state favours they would like, by way of shutting their competitors out of the market. Most have, or seek state funding, and so are reluctant to bite too hard on the hand that feeds them. Most also start from the premise

that state regulation of issues involving consumers and health is necessary and desirable, and then argue that the regulators are acting "unfairly" in this case. It can be very difficult to persuade them that by granting any of the state's premises they guarantee their own failure.

After over a year of working with existing organizations, corresponding with advocates and interested individuals, talking with lawyers, etc., etc., Geoff is ready to begin his own campaign. What he is going to do is to launch a court challenge to the activities of the Ministry and the Health Protection Branch. This will be no ordinary court challenge, but a civil liberties action cutting right to the heart of the matter. Geoff will contend that, by depriving him, and indeed all Canadians, of access to substances, services, or practitioners which they deem necessary to maintain and enhance their health, the government has violated not only their Charter rights, but their basic right to life which has been recognised long before the Charter, in Common Law.

If such a suit were upheld by the courts, it would end the HPB's ability to protect the status quo in health care by arbitrarily classifying food products and nutritives as drugs, and so restricting their manufacture, prescription and sale to the medical/health care industry, and it might have far broader implications.

With a basic civil liberty issue like this one and a very innovative civil libertarian approach, this campaign raises the prospects for liberty dramatically in Canada. It will not be an easy battle. Our opposition will see the threat to their own interests and will be prepared to expend virtually unlimited sums of their own and our money in fighting it

Geoff is prepared to go it alone. He should have support. He has been consulting with several lawyers and now needs specific legal assistance. A preliminary legal opinion on case law and choices

Conclusion on page 4

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Our congratulations to Lewis Dalby and Lorraine Harding, who were married on January 31. At the Reception, the Best Man toasted Lewis as "the first future Libertarian Premier of Newfoundland." Good luck Lewis.

The first workshop at our June 13, 1987 Annual General Meeting has been planned. This will be a Candidates Workshop, for those planning to run against the pathetic PCs in the next election. For details and registration, please contact Bill Tomlinson, 980-7370.

An alternate SFU student newspaper, titled Liberte, has been published on the campus. The first issue contains articles from the SFU Libertarian Club, the Ayn Rand club, and the SFU Young Socreds. This was featured in an article in the Sun on February 17.

Conclusion of Geoff Langhorne article.....

for challenging the HPB on this issue will cost \$2000.00. I urge everyone who is concerned for their right to take personal responsibility for their own health, to offer whatever support they can. Please write to Geoff Langhorne care of **Coalition Upholding the Right to Exist (C.U.R.E.)**
Box 600
1215 Davie St
Vancouver, B.C.
V6E 1N4

STAND UP FOR YOUR RIGHT TO EXIST

Geoff Langhorne is member of the GVLA, and was formerly active with the Ontario Libertarian Party and the Unparty. He is not rich. I urge all readers of the West Coast Libertarian to send whatever amounts they can. This fight will ultimately benefit all of us.

The GVLA has purchased 100 copies of the new book-form edition of David Bergland's Libertarian in One Lesson. These will be distributed to schools and libraries. If you know of one where it will be appreciated, please tell us and we will see that they get it.

At last December's supper club, Jack Boulogne passed out yellow-slips - pledges to find one new libertarian in 1987. This is a very effective way to grow: if each of us does just a little, we will be millions in 20 years. If you want to pledge to find one new libertarian in 1987, please drop us a line.

We have trimmed 150 names from our mailing list, dropping it to 250. We will only mail to those we have heard from in the last two years. Please check the number in the upper right hand corner of your mailing label. It is the date we last heard from you. If you want to hear from us, please keep your membership up to date.

The Foundation for Economic Education will hold a Northwest Seminar from April 10 - 12 at the Alderbrook Inn on beautiful Hood Canal in Washington. Coordinator is Dr. Stuart Pritchard and speakers will be Dr. John Williams from Australia, Howard Baetier, and Greg Rehmke. For further info contact:

Dr. Pritchard
P.O. Box 4101.
Tumwater WA
98501
(206) 352-4884

If any local libertarians are planning to attend, please let us know: we would like to publish a report in a future issue.

The GVLA are beginning a speakers bureau. If you are interested in being involved send an 8 x10 photograph, a 1 paragraph biography, and a list of topics you are interested in speaking on to Paul Geddes at:

#207 - 6739 Royal Oak
Burnaby, B.C. V5H 3P5

SUPPER CLUB

SPEAKER: Peter Gall
Charles Baldwin's Lawyer

DATE/TIME: Thursday, March 19th, 1987
Cocktails 6.00 p.m.
Supper 6.30 p.m.
Speaker 7.15 p.m.

PLACE: Salons A & B
Century Plaza Hotel
Burrard St, Vancouver

COST: \$20.00 which includes dinner

Voluntary Professional Memberships

December 23rd, 1986

To the Benchers
The Law Society of B.C.
300 - 1148 Hornby St
Vancouver, B.C.
V6Z 2C4

Dear Sirs:

Reluctantly I enclose my cheque in the sum of \$1,925.00 together with the Form O, duly completed. This fee, no doubt to be followed by a further \$1,000.00 in June 1987, is extracted from me involuntarily, is submitted under protest and is paid only to allow me to earn a living. What will you do when insurance premiums rise to \$20,000 per year? Or \$40,000? Will you then not deny countless lawyers the right of earning their livelihood? To a lesser degree, that denial is no doubt already happening now. Should it not be up to the client to decide whether he wishes to retain a lawyer who carries insurance? At most., the lawyer should only be required to disclose to the client whether or not he carries insurance.

While you have donated freely of your time as Benchers, the one thing I do respect, I have done a lot of reading in my past 21 years as a practising lawyer and I wish to submit for your thoughtful consideration the following views:

Ruling 1 of the Canons of Legal Ethics states, inter alia,

"The lawyer . . . is a minister of justice . . ." . . . it is his duty to . . . serve the cause of justice . . ."

It seems to me that the foregoing principle should not only be a guide to the individual lawyer, but it should also serve as a guide to the governing body. You, too, have no doubt tried to live up to this principle. Nevertheless, I am concerned that the cause of justice is being overlooked or forgotten, therefore this letter.

I would like to commence with the

question: What is justice?

Justice is a concrete, recognizable and objective principle. It is not a matter of opinion. A 1958 Webster's Dictionary defines justice as "the quality of being righteous, impartiality".

Black's Law Dictionary says justice is "the constant and perpetual disposition to render every man his due."

Law should be based on Justice

Justice is not based on law, rather, law ought to be based on justice. (This should also apply to the Bar-rister and Solicitor Act, which is usually drafted by the Society and then enacted by the Legislature with few, if any, changes.) That law ought to be based on justice is only common sense, for men lived and worked together before laws were formed. Generally, laws are passed to formalise what has preceded under common practise, what has stood the test of time as being just and equitable. Laws are common practice put down in black and white for all to see and know.

Again, what is justice? Plato in The Republic, said

"Justice is simply doing one's own business, and not being a busy-body. A man may neither take what is another's, nor be deprived of what is his own."

Plato in his book Laws says that

"Justice is the uniting principle of all constitutions".

In other words, without justice, the threads of society unravel and society disintegrates into barbarism. Justice, i.e., natural justice, must precede law and form the basis of law thereon.

John Stuart Mill wrote,

"Injustice consists in taking or withholding from any person that

to which he has a moral right."

Mill further said,

"It is by universal admission, inconsistent with justice to be partial."

It can be seen from the foregoing that just as justice promotes peace and harmony in society, so injustices foment unrest and rebellion. The love of justice should be instilled in every man, woman and child - all should wish to see justice done. For without justice, the rule of men (dictatorship), not of law, assumes power. Without justice there is no security for life, liberty and property.

Should we in the Law Society not be model ambassadors for the cause of justice?

Your actions (e.g. with respect to the advertising issue) in the last few years show that instead of concerning yourselves with matters of justice and injustice, you have instead busied yourselves with such trivial matters as advertising by Jabour, the Law Shoppe, and as stated in the December, 19882 issue of the Benchers' Bulletin whether to permit the listing of a lawyer's name in bold print in the yellow pages (now allowed!).

Should you not decide that the Society for a change would be better off to pre-occupy itself with justice and, perhaps, even with the philosophy of law (and not with e.g. whether or not Fisheries Law should be approved as phraseology to be used in advertising (!) or in what form biographical material can be submitted to a directory (!); see Benchers' Bulletins of November, 1982 and March, 1982 respectively.)

I was pleased to see in the December, 1982 Bencher's Bulletin that you saw fit not to suspend Mr. Jabour as "the member would face probable bankruptcy". I suggest to

Continued next page . . .

Mr Boytinks letter continued

you that your action was only in accordance with Chapter 20 of England's First Charter of Liberties, i.e., Magna Carta 1215, (recently reprinted in 1982 as part of The Revised Statutes of British Columbia), which reads as follows:

"(20) For a trivial offence, a free man shall be fined only in proportion to the degree of his offence, and for a serious offence correspondingly but not so heavily as to deprive him of his livelihood. In the same way, a merchant shall be spared his merchandise, and a husbandman the implements of his husbandry, if they fall upon the mercy of a royal court. None of these fines shall be imposed except by the assessment on oath of reputable men of the neighbourhood."

Clearly this constitutional document, which preceded Parliament, but out of which Parliament was said to have grown (see Chapter 61) was written by a wise man, perhaps during wiser times.

Why did you not permit Jack D. James to continue his "Law Shoppe"? Are your high compulsory fees not already depriving some members of earning their livelihood? From a justice point of view (not the law as set out in the Bar-risters and Solicitors Act) should liability insurance not be voluntary as it is in the State of Washington?

Your references in the Bulletin to the advertising matter constituting a "deliberate flouting of standards" and "that conduct deemed unacceptable by Benchers will not be tolerated" should have been omitted, since the flouting of standards is sometimes desirable when the latter are non-sensical or unjust. History is full of laws (and regulations and so-called standards) that should have been opposed before much damage was done. England's First Charter of Liberties, the Petition of Right 1628, Bill of Right 1689, the American Declaration of Independence 1776 and the U.S. Constitution following it all spring from the hearts and minds of men who questioned authority, never from those who apathetically acquiesced to it.

More recently, why do you oppose a former policeman selling his "Pointts" franchise? Let the market place and those who wish to invest in this venture decide. Why do you spend tens of thousands of dollars, extracted from myself and others compulsorily, to insist that every lawyer is a Canadian citizen? Does a person become a better lawyer simply because the State issues a piece of paper? Can a person not be a good citizen (and lawyer) without that piece of paper?

Why do we have to spend every year several hundred dollars to produce the Form N? Does it ensure honesty? If so, should we then not have a Form N every 6 months or perhaps every month? If not, why not abolish it and save that money.

I did not develop the foregoing thoughts and questions overnight. To lend support to my views, I enclose the following:

- The Freeman - Ideas on Liberty, October 1983
Essay by Ridgway K. Foley, U.S. attorney, "The Myth of Self-Regulation", page 621;
- Herbert Spencer The Principles of Ethics Ch. 16 "The Right to Free Industry" pp. 149 - 151;
- Ludwig von Mises Human Action pp. 283, 285, 287; and Guild Socialism and Corporativism" pp. 816- 820.

Only voluntarism encourages a high ethical and moral standard, something which compulsory membership cannot and does not do. The attainment of "justice" should be the Society's aim. Voluntary membership would be a good beginning.

Thank you for your consideration with respect to the thoughts expressed in this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Walter J. Boytink

Bill's Parable #6

The tour bus was wending its way through the magnificent grandeur of the Rocky Mountains. As it drove down the highway, the Guide described the geological history of the locale, how the formation of the mountains had been going on for the last six hundred thousand years. At this point, one of the passengers nudged his companion. "Amazing, isn't it! I had no idea this was a government project".

VISITING SPEAKER

Robert Anton Wilson, co-author of the libertarian classic *"The Illuminatus Trilogy"*, will be in Vancouver for three events this month. He is a fascinating speaker, likely to be enjoyed by those familiar with his writings and those not, alike.

March 20th, 8:00 p.m.
New York Theatre
639 Commercial Crive
**"The New Inquisition:
A Skeptical Look at
Skepticism"**
\$6.00

March 21st, 10:00 a.m - 3:00
Trout Lake Community Ctre
3350 Victoria Drive
**"The Eye in the Triangle:
Create a Positive Future"**
\$35.00
Pre-Registration: 255-6402

March 24th, 4:00 p.m.
Granvill Book Company
850 Granville St.

Book Signing

Letters to the Editor

Box 431
Boston, MA, 02258
Oct 4, 1986
To the Editor

Paul Geddes (Sept. 1986), while acknowledging the value of libertarian alliances with "special interest groups," warns of the pitfalls. As a former anarchist with cordial relations with the libertarian lunatic fringe (but not the mainstream fat cats), I view the same phenomenon from the other side, drawing some different conclusions.

The Problem with an ideologue like Geddes is that, in the same breath that he discusses concerted action on the basis of limited areas of agreement, he refers to his possible allies as if they had no principles of their own. If you agree with libertarians on the issues 30% of the time, the only possible explanation is that you are three tenths of a libertarian - a fragmentary, a sub-libertarian - much as the U.S. Constitution once reckoned a slave as three-fifths of a man. He doesn't suspect that there are other, principled orientations - some freedom-oriented, some not - with an integrity of their own.

For a fringe ideology to put on such airs is ingenuous if not narcissistic. I for instance am inclined to view libertarianism as a "special interest group" pushing a (from my perspective) rather contrived conjunction of personal freedom, which I espouse, and capitalism, which I don't. But I think it's only fair for me to look upon libertarians as what they are - libertarians - not as well-meaning bunglers, failed adepts of my own nameless world-view.

Thus Geddes thinks it "hypocritical" for the Health Action Network Society to oppose the extension of bureaucratic controls to natural health products, while also opposing a food irradiation plant. This might not be

hypocritical even if HANS (of which I know nothing except what Geddes tells me) were libertarian. "Force" and "fraud" are concepts elastic enough - given the right factual assumptions - to cover both these cases, and lots more. But the main problem is that, as Geddes himself announces, HANS is not libertarian and, I infer, doesn't pretend to be. So where's the hypocrisy? Hypocrites contradict their own professed values, not anybody else's. For all Geddes discloses, HANS has a single, coherent rationale for both positions - paternalism, perhaps. That isn't libertarian, but neither is Geddes' apparently unconscious ideological annexation of everyone who willy-nilly agrees with libertarians on anything as dependencies of his philosophical empire.

Sincerely,

Bob Black

BRITISH COLUMBIA FREE SPEECH LEAGUE

Oct 18th, 1986
Editor, the West Coast
Libertarian:

Paul Geddes's article, 'Some Dangers of forming alliances with Special Interest Groups', not only is inaccurate with its references to the British Columbia Free Speech League, but it damages our common cause for freedom as well.

Gedde's position of vice-president of the GVLA demands a certain responsibility - that of accuracy and fairness, lest his personal prejudices jaundice the Libertarian movement. In his recent article in the September issue of the West Coast Libertarian, Paul was perturbed because the B.C.F.S.L. sponsored a trip to B.C. by Ernst Zundel, and therefore Libertarians should avoid contact with the B.C.F.S.L.

In fact Zundel was sponsored by the Canadian Free Speech League, and association with which the B.C.F.S.L. has no affiliations with.

Mr Geddes was also perturbed that someone had sent him a catalogue from the Institute for Historical Revue. I can assure Mr Geddes that it was not one of the provincial directors of the B.C.S.F.L. who sent his said catalogue. If one of our regional directors or members sent him this catalogue, I do not think it fair that Geddes colours his articles with condemnation of our organization.

I must admit, though, that I find Paul's comments linking the 'Institute of Historical Revue' catalogue with pornography as nothing more than ludicrous, and far beneath Mr Geddes' abilities. I can only wonder if he thinks that history is written in stone-rather than by the victors?

What does he consider historical filth? Could it be 'Imperium', written by Francis Parker Yockey? Or maybe it is 'The Constitution of the United States'? Perhaps it is the 'Decline of the West', or 'Brainwashing', the 'Antichrist' by Nietzsche, the 'Vikings'? Maybe it is 'None Dare Call it Conspiracy', or perhaps it is D.W.Griffiths 'The Birth of A Nation', filmed in 1915 starring Lillian Gish, Mae Marsh, and Henry B. Walthall?

Whatever, Geddes rose-tinted historical glasses belies an introverted historical perspective - a dangerous trait for one who claims to be a fighter for freedom.

Mr Geddes must be aware that there are far too few of us who care about freedom, and that united we will stand, but divided we will certainly fall.

Claude Bouchard
Director
British Columbia Free Speech
League
R.R.#1
Agassiz, B.C.
VOM 1A0

Letters to Editor cont'd

LIBERTARIAN INTERNATIONAL
PACIFIC NORTHWEST OFFICE

ROB GILLESPIE:
REPRESENTATIVE

24 Nov 86

Neil Reynolds
Editor
The Kingston Whig-Standard
Kingston, Ontario

Dear Neil

I just saw a news report on local TV about you and the Whig-Standard's part in getting those five Russian soldiers out of Afghanistan. I think what you've done is tremendous!

In this one act, you have done more for the cause of human rights - because you have likely saved the lives of those men and have certainly caused them to be brought here now where they can exercise their human rights - than any other libertarian in Canada.

What you and your staff did inspired me. I thank you for it. This is what we can all be like, and all should be like.

Warmest Regards
Robin Gillespie

The Whig-Standard
Editor

Dec 3, 1986
Dear Robin,

I thank you for your generous note on our role in the release of the Soviet prisoners of war. It is not often that a project of this kind can have such a happy ending. I am proud that this one did.

You will not be suprised that our efforts did not win universal approval. The response has largely followed predictable ideological lines. And I had one editor attack me personally because I had permitted our paper "to libel the Red Army".

Again, thanks for the note.
Sincerely,
Neil Reynolds

Milk Deliveries by Pellikan

by Paul Geddes

I met a very interesting man over the Christmas holidays. I first heard about Arjen Pellikaan from a story in the Vancouver Sun. He's one of the shrewd dairy farmers that is challenging the regulations of the BC Milk Board. The Milk Board wouldn't let Mr Pellikaan sell his milk to his customers. Not only did he not have a quota, but also his reading of the Bible and his studies of alternate health led him to the conclusion that unhomogenized and even unpasteurized milk was healthier for humans. The experts hired by the Milk Board think otherwise, so much so that the persuaded the Social Credit government to pass restrictive legislation including Order in Council #2240 (Nov 85) that made it illegal to sell unpasteurized "raw" milk in the province.

Mr Pellikaan's canny plan was to sell his cows (or rather shares in his cows) to his customers. Now he only "manages" other people's cows. He organized the Theocratic Party of Canada and the new cow owners have all become members. The party determines the rules and regulations for operating the dairy farm. As part of his management duties, Mr Pellikaan milks and delivers 'dividends' right to the doorstep. Of course, he can do this at a price that beats his government-protected competition.

Needless to say the Milk Board is not amused. They have thrown many roadblocks in Mr Pelikaan's way. A judge threw out the most recent Milk Board injunction attempt (Dec 86) but his major court case is still pending (Jan 23). Mr Pellikaan has lots of legal tricks up his sleeves so readers are advised to keep tuned for future events.

I got in touch with Mr Pellikaan by writing a letter of support to the Vancouver Sun. They didn't print it so I sent a copy directly to him. Within a week he showed up at my front door with a month's worth of reading about the Milk Board, the Theocratic Party and some of the political writings that had influenced him. Due to his many lonely battles against unnamed experts, Mr Pellikaan does not have a high regard for establishment opinion. He traces much of BC's present troubles to the 'evil' centralizing hands of former Premier Bennett's principle secretary Norman Spector. He doesn't like the Fraser Institute 'stink tank' or Jimmy 'Porno' Patterson of any Ph D ("piled higher and deeper"). Rather he places his trust in the Bible and wants

a "God-centered" country. He is convinced that by following the dictates of the Bible we would have prosperity, no inflation and no unemployment. If my three long talks have any influence on him, I hope Mr Pellikaan obtains a copy of Henry Hazlitt's Economics in One Lesson. Just because he has had some understandable difficulties with some Milk Board economists is no reason to dismiss the greater understanding that good economics can produce.

I have always admired people who stand up for their beliefs against strong opposition. In this case the government regulation is particularly galling since it is so unnecessary. Mr Pellikaan is not tying people down and forcing them to drink unwanted milk. In fact the bureacrats make his customers jump through all kinds off hoops just to obtain the milk they desire. Mr Pelikaan has obviously already paid a high price for his independent (stubborn) streak and yet you can tell that he is enjoying his current tussles with the "bureacrats" (one of the worst insults in Mr Pellikan's vocabulary).

Those of you who want to obtain some of Mr Pellikaan's milk should call 325-6800 in Vancouver or 858-6240 in the valley. He charges \$3.75 a jug (a Canadian gallon) for delivered milk. By calling you will be getting legal unhomogenised (but pasteurized) milk but can also get information about becoming a cow owner and how to receive "raw" milk dividends.

I also want to thank Mr Pelikaan for putting me in touch with George Kirby, Caucus Agricultural Critic for the provincial PC party. Mr Kirby is a former dairy farmer with a firm grasp on the policies of the BC Milk Board and has some good ideas for reform. He has promised to speak to a libertarian evening meeting at a future date. He wants to wait until some of the 8 cases against 19 farmers for selling non-quota milk presently before the BC Supreme Court are decided. He expects some of these decisions in the next couple of months.

Ed. Latest word suggests that any court decision may be quite some time in coming.

Unilateral Free Trade - or Negotiated Settlement

Walter Block

A unilateral declaration of free trade on the part of Canada is hardly on the top of the agenda of the Mulroney Government, but it may be of interest to examine this public policy alternative in any case. If the "fast track" negotiations continue to splutter along at their present furious clip, or, more to the point, never get underway at all, lost in a tragic escalating tariff war, this country shall be faced with a dilemma down the road a piece: an end to trade barriers may be in our national interest, but will be out of reach no matter how desirable.

A unilateral end to all tariffs, quotas and other such interferences has at least the advantage that it could be attained without the cooperation of the inward looking Americans. (To say that it will be difficult to convince Canadians of the merits of such a move, however, would be the understatement of the century.) Moreover, it would undoubtedly bring great benefits to this country. Under a regime of this sort, Canadian consumers would be able to avail themselves of good hitherto unimaginably low prices. This alone would be a magnificent spur to our standard of living, and would probably do more for the well-being of the poor in this nation than all the welfare programs on the books put together.

Further, this boon to consumers would likely spill over to our export sector. For the additional funds spent in the U.S. would eventually return to this country, in the form of domestic purchases. And this could not help but spur additional employment opportunities in Canada.

In fact, a unilaterally declared end to trade barriers is such a good idea that it might make sense to adopt this policy right now, and forget all about the negotiation route. This holds true except for one small point: better even than a unilateral declaration would be a

mutual agreement between our two countries (or better yet, between Canada and the rest of the world) to fully open our common borders to commerce.

We can, in effect, gain a smaller amount right now, for sure, under unilateralism (if we could but agree amongst ourselves to take this step), or wait it out, and possibly attain a greater amount later on, if the negotiations succeed, through mutual agreement.

Given this situation, two questions present themselves for analysis.

First is the question of whether a "bird in the hand" is worth more than "two in the bush". Economic theory alone, unfortunately, cannot answer this, because we do not know the size of the immediate (unilateral) payoff, the larger size of the later (negotiated) gain, nor the rate of discount through which one may be meaningfully compared with the other.

Secondly, we must ask whether seizing the "bird in the hand" shall increase or decrease the likelihood of our ever capturing the second which is still lurking "in the bush". That is, will a unilateral declaration of free trade enhance or retard the chances of the U.S. agreeing to end their own trade restrictions?

According to one theory, if we go it alone, we can shame them into following suit. If we blaze the path toward free enterprise, we can expose their otherwise hypocritical allegiance to the marketplace, and thus force them into a golden era of mutual free trade.

According to one theory, they are unembarrassable. Commercial relations between countries are a matter of pure brute bargaining power, in this view. If we throw away our chips (their access to our markets), they will just laugh at our hope of expectation that they will throw away their chips (our access to their markets).

Unfortunately, again, there is nothing in the realm of economics that can provide a definitive answer to this puzzle. Nevertheless, the "dismal science" may be of some use regardless.

For one thing, it clearly exposes and categorizes our ignorance. This helps us to know where and how we must seek additional information. For another, it indicates that there may well come a time when the certain but smaller benefits of unilateralism will start to outweigh the larger but ever receding gains of waiting for a negotiated settlement.

This, it must readily be admitted, seems rather counter-intuitive. It amounts to saying that were we ever fully convinced that the Americas would not under any conceivable circumstances negotiate a free trade agreement with us, we should then declare our borders open to their commercial incursions. It appears uncomfortably close to advocating that we turn the other cheek, tradewise.

Yet, for all of the superficial implausibility of the idea, it is sound public policy. Canadian industry would benefit from stepped up exports, from the ability to increase specialization, to join in an international division of labour, and from the added economies of scale that this would make possible. The domestic consumer, too, as we have seen, would gain from a unilateral dismemberment of trade barriers.

It may seem unlikely, but it is comforting to know that our economic lives are not fully in the hands of the Americans. It would be vastly preferable to be able to negotiate free trade with the colossus to the south. But should things ever come down to such a pass, this country would benefit from a unilateral declaration of economically open borders even if the U.S. failed to follow our inspired lead.

CALENDAR

March 1	Newsletter
March 19	Supper Club - Peter Gall
March 20, 21, 24	Robert Anton Wilson
April 10 - 12	Foundation for Economic Education (F.E.E.) Seminar - Hood Canal, Washington
April 30	Tax Protest Day
April	Newsletter
May 15 - 18	LPC Convention - Toronto
June 13	GVLA Annual General Meeting
	GVLA 1 Day Policy Conference & Federal Election Planning
	Supper Club - Dr Walter Block
June 21 - 27	Foundation for Economic Education (F.E.E.) Seminar - Irvington on Hudson. N.Y.
July 2 - 8	Foundation for Economic Education (F.E.E.) Seminar - Irvington on Hudson. N.Y.
August 29 & 30	Advocates for Self Government Summit '87 - Bellingham WA
September 2 - 6	USLP Presidential Nominating Convention
	"The Culture of Freedom" - Seattle WA.

REGULAR EVENTS

- 1st Sunday of every month** - Board of Directors Meeting - 10.00 a.m. Bill Tomlinson's.
1st Thursday of every month - Issues Discussion Group - 8.00 p.m. Mary Anne Nylen's
Every Tuesday until April 15th - SFU Libertarian Club - 4.30 p.m. Room CC8104

Return Address:

The Greater Vancouver Libertarian Association
922 Cloverley St.,
North Vancouver, B.C.
V7L 1N3

Address Correction Requested