



# ENTHUSIASM! THE EMERLING EXPERIENCE

--- by Robert Metz

"'Changing the world' always begins with one individual. Could that individual be you?"

That's one of the questions that will be answered to all those who choose to attend *Michael Emerling's Art of Political Persuasion Workshop*, which will be hosted by **Freedom Party** during the first weekend in October (October 3-5, 1986).

As a past attendee of Emerling's workshops myself, I *know* that the answer to the above question is a definite *yes!*

When I last attended one of Michael's workshops back in 1982, I was simply one of many curious, relatively uninvolved individuals who merely wanted some practical pointers on how to start influencing others on the benefits of freedom --- without having to go through the frustration and disappointment that so often accompanies any attempt to 'convert' others to one's way of thinking.



Two years later, I found myself acting as president of an officially-registered political party which was influencing people in my community on a scale that I once believed unimaginable. I could see that the work I was doing had a definite impact on the outcome of issues in my community --- and with the help of many others, will continue to do so on an increasing scale throughout the future. Yes, political persuasion *is* an **art and a science**, as the results of using Michael's proven techniques have consistently shown.

Now, **Freedom Party** is offering *you* a chance to discover the simple and common sense truths underlying these techniques, techniques which can be applied not only to the field of *political* activity, but to our *business* and *personal* relationships as well.

The art of persuasion is really the art of *communication*. Most often, it's not *what* you say that will be effective in persuading others, but *how* you say it. For that reason, Michael's workshops deal with the differing approaches necessary to appeal to people of differing backgrounds and philosophies.

Creating a strategy to appeal to people of various political perspectives was the pivotal point that prompted Michael Emerling to formulate his now-famous **Art of Political Persuasion Workshop**.

His experience with political parties and philosophical groups promoting freedom led him to believe that many were going about it in the wrong way.



"We have a really great product, *freedom*, and a lot of people didn't know how to present it in an attractive, sensible, marketable way. And I thought, wouldn't that be something if we could take this great philosophy and make it as palatable and as attractive as possible to the public, and as interesting as possible so that people would say, hey, you folks have something *I* want to have!"



Just what was that ingredient missing from many of those promoting the philosophy of freedom? The secret, according to Michael, is astonishingly simple:

"For some reason, intelligent people seem to downgrade *enthusiasm*. 'Oh that's childish. It's pep rally. It's football games.' It's not either. *Enthusiasm* is *elan vital*. It's a life force, it really is. Happy, enthusiastic people are productive, they have good marriages, they have wonderful relationships, and they share it."

continued on next page...

And sharing this enthusiasm is what Michael's workshops are all about.

"I'm happy. I'm really happy. There have been some studies which show that about 90% of the people in the world don't like their jobs. They're not happy with their lives. They're in marriages that are like ruts. Ruts are just graves with their ends kicked out. How come? Why? You're supposed to be happy! You go through life once, why can't you have a ball? Why can't you have fun? Why can't you do all kinds of dynamic things?"

The answer, of course, is that we all *can*.

"This is a way for me to do it. This is a way for me to share it. You want to be happy? Try giving somebody else happiness. It's twice --- it's *more* than twice as much --- the more you give the more you get and it's wonderful. I love it!"

Michael's approach to marketing freedom is what makes him *unique*. And it creates a particularly difficult task for me. There's simply no way that the printed word can relate all there is to say about the benefits of attending his workshop. It is, after all, an *experience*.

If you've never attended one of his workshops before, all I can reasonably ask is that you accept my personal recommendation to do so; you won't ever forget the experience. And I know that those who've attended before don't need any convincing, but even for them, there are some new surprises in store.

In a recent conversation expressing his eagerness to get started on the London workshop, Michael told us: "I've been working about four hours per day on the new persuasion workshop, so you'll receive so much more than your money's worth you'll be absolutely stunned."

**ONLY  
10 DAYS  
LEFT TO REGISTER**

# **Emerling**

## ***is coming to London!***

**The legendary workshop on political persuasion & the promotion of freedom and individual liberty.**

# **\$35 - Oct. 4-5**

**FRIDAY NIGHT BANQUET  
ONLY \$15**

***Free accommodation & transportation  
provided to all Freedom Party members outside of London!***

see pamphlet for details

## The Great Debate...

### COMMUNISM vs. FREEDOM

**...No Debate at all!**

## Freedom Party & Communist Party on Open-Line Show

When William Kashtan, leader of the *Communist Party of Canada*, publicly debated **Freedom Party** president Robert Metz on the Wayne McLean *Hot Line* program on June 20, 1986, the open-line switchboard was fully lit from the outset of Southwestern Ontario's highest-rated talk show. The central theme of the debate was "Communism versus Capitalism", though much of the discussion's focus was on the issue of free trade, since Kashtan was in London on an anti-free-trade crusade.

In true Communist fashion, Kashtan's tactics revolved around evasion, denial, name-calling, and a show of contempt for anyone who disagreed with his viewpoint --- which included virtually every caller to the program during the two-hour debate.



**"Our aim is to win everything from that system (capitalism) we can, then end it."**

**- William Kashtan**

Kashtan was clearly not prepared and quite unable to deal with the laissez-faire capitalist point of view, as presented by Metz. When he had been booked as a guest on the open-line talk show, he was aware that there would be an "opposing point of view" presented, but the last thing he expected was a *consistently rational* and *principled* opposing point of view.

During the commercial breaks, Kashtan and his campaign manager vented their anger and frustration on McLean for having booked Metz opposite him. Metz was "too politically naive" for their liking; he had no government "programs" that they could criticize and he did not understand "political economy," they argued. It was beyond their understanding that Metz was, in effect, opposed to any concept of *political* economy at all! (It was a *free* economy that Metz was arguing in favour of.) They would have preferred to debate someone from the traditional parties in power who, ironically, shared their viewpoint that government has an important role to play in manipulating national economies.

Which, of course, was central to the entire premise of the debate: in a laissez-faire society, *politics* has no place

in *economic* affairs. Kashtan's own arguments proved the case: virtually every criticism he levied against the West's "capitalistic" system was a criticism of a government's failure at intervention (i.e., "state-monopoly capitalism"). The contradictions in his arguments were glaring.

"Free enterprise doesn't exist!" argued Kashtan (an argument which, much to his surprise, Metz agreed with), yet he blamed this "non-existent" free enterprise system for everything that was wrong in Canada and even used the argument to contend that Metz had no grounds to promote a system that doesn't exist, since, assumably, there was thus no way to prove its worth.

Of course, this line of reasoning didn't stop Kashtan from promoting Communism, which he equally argued didn't exist --- even in the Soviet Union! The Soviet Union, argued Kashtan, was only "socialist", and would not be Communist until there was "sufficient abundance" flooding the land. And of course, again, the fact that no socialist country has ever created such conditions meant nothing insofar as Kashtan's promotion of Communism was concerned.

Kashtan's debating tactics were astonishing: not only did he accuse callers of being C.I.A. or R.C.M.P. fronts, he totally denied that those who experienced suppression under Communist dictatorships ever had those experiences. But his abrasive and offensive approach to discussion served a purpose: it deflected attention from the *issues* to his abrasive *personality*.

Nevertheless, Metz pressed the point that many of the "issues" raised by the *Communist Party* were the very issues pursued by *Liberals*, *Conservatives*, and *New Democrats*: job security, cultural sovereignty, economic independence, American "domination" of the economy, nationalization, and of course, the ever-popular myth of private "monopoly" control.

But the true worth and value of the capitalist system was ultimately expressed by Kashtan himself during a press conference which followed his debate with Metz: "Our aim is to win everything from that system that we can, then end it."

The hypocrisy inherent in wishing to reap the benefits of a social system that one despises speaks for itself. Thus, in his own way, Kashtan has paid tribute to capitalism and freedom --- an acknowledgement that even transcended his own blind hatred of the "system."

We sincerely hope that Mr. Kashtan continues his Communist crusade in the manner he has adopted: No other testimonial could be more effective or convincing as to the merits of capitalism.

# LARGEST PETITION IN LONDON'S HISTORY PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL!

Fresh from a fall municipal election just three months earlier, London aldermen voted themselves a 32.6% increase in pay. Two weeks later, P.U.C. Commissioners obtained a 43% increase in pay. (Normally, annual pay increases to elected municipal officials would range between 5 and 8 per cent.) To make matters even worse, a year earlier, London school board trustees voted themselves a 36% increase in pay.

Enough was enough! Public reaction was immediate and negative.

Why was the issue of pay increases never raised during the municipal election? If the pay or conditions of being an alderman were unacceptable to those who won council seats, why did they bother to run in the first place? --- especially when there were other candidates more than willing to accept those conditions! What about the "integrity" and "fiscal responsibility" they promised in return for being elected?

Although these questions were in the minds of the London electorate, City Council made every effort to evade them. By the timing of their action, it was clear they were counting on the well documented belief that voter memories are very short. With three years until the next municipal election, the voters will surely have forgotten all about it.

Copy of ad promoting Petition campaign as run in weekly shopper.

But not if Freedom Party Action Director Marc Emery could help it! Having barely recovered from his own municipal election defeat, Emery seized upon the opportunity to prove that everything he had been saying about the realities of municipal politics was now being demonstrated by those who denied his claims.

Within the month following the self-awarded pay increases, Emery, in conjunction with the support of Freedom Party, began a city-wide petition drive to protest City Council's action. Ads encouraging public participation were placed in the *London Free Press* and the *London Pennysaver* (a weekly shopper), and the response was overwhelming.

Within five weeks, an army of volunteers managed to collect, verify, document (by name, address, and ward

number), and present to London City Council over 5,000 signatures protesting the increases.

From the start of the campaign, media coverage was prominent; By the time April 30 rolled around (the day the petition was presented to City Council), coverage was given in the *London Free Press*, all the local radio stations, Kitchener television, and in the Ontario pages of the *Toronto Star*.

Despite the fact that the petition contained, in at least one case, over 1,000 signatures from a *single* ward, the petition was completely ignored by Council, thus making its refusal to even acknowledge it a new subject of media attention.

Council was so contemptuous of the petition that alderman Bob Beccaria, during an interview on *CJBK Radio* (London), proclaimed that he "could easily gather 5,000 petitions to support our raise. Besides, has Marc Emery ever been in favour of anything?"

Although, as expected, none of the aldermen rolled back their pay increases, much was achieved. Over 200 Londoners called Freedom Party offices to help out, and hundreds more responded by mail, offering to recruit signaturers. Dozens asked for information about the party behind the petition, while the 5,000-1 plus people who signed up are now on file for future contact should similar issues arise.

Significantly, Emery & Freedom Party were seen by the public as a means through which to channel constructive protest. Ironically, many voters who voted against Emery during the previous municipal election expressed their deep regret at having done so. Needless to add, they will definitely be reminded of Council's action prior to the next municipal election, and of Freedom

Party's support in having helped them express their feelings on the matter.

Special congratulations and thanks must be extended to Steven Sharpe, Lloyd Walker, Harry Dean and Peggy Cross, whose efforts in collecting signatures extended well beyond the call of duty.

In any event, our message was heard loud and clear --- and will be heard again when the opportunity is ripe.

**PROTEST THE  
CITY HALL SALARY  
GRAB!**

**Petition forms available  
NOW**

**To PROTEST the recent 32.6%  
INCREASE FOR ALDERMEN  
And the 43% INCREASE FOR  
P.U.C. COMMISSIONERS**

**CALL MARC EMERY**

433-3305 (days, Mon.-Wed.)  
679-8420 (days, Thurs.-Sat.)  
438-4991 (Sundays, evenings)

OR FILL IN INFORMATION BELOW AND  
SEND IN THIS COUPON

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ POSTAL CODE \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_

send to: MARC EMERY, P.O. BOX 2214, STN. A. LONDON N6A 4E3

# Petition deserved better than council snub

Sir: City council spent more time welcoming Mayor Tom Gosnell back from his honeymoon than it spent discussing a 5,000-name petition asking council to consider rolling back its self-awarded pay increase.

In fact, council refused to discuss it at all; the largest petition ever presented to city council in its 128-year history. Alderman Bob Beccarea added further insult to injury when he publicly (CJBK Radio) claimed that he could "easily gather 5,000 petitions (names) to support his pay increase" and asked: "... has Marc Emery ever been in favor of anything?"

Nevertheless, facts will reveal that Beccarea had no signatures of support either before or after the fact of his excessive self-awarded pay increase and that, despite his boast, he is not bothering to do so. (Thinking back, it is surprising how little evidence of support was actually necessary to justify council's ill-fated plans to spend \$100 million in the hosting of a sports event, during its last term.)

However, were Beccarea able to produce a petition in favor of a 32-per-cent increase for aldermen, I would most certainly accept his contention that certain support exists for his position. But once again, the fact of the matter is that only one letter in *The Free Press* has supported the pay increase and that I met only five individuals out of 670 personally canvassed who felt that the increase and the manner in which it was awarded were justifiable.

Beccarea's arrogance, though directed at me, only served to insult the 5,000 Londoners who signed the petition (their petition — not mine), but at least he should be

congratulated for vocalizing his contempt. Every other alderman simply sat in silence and refused to even acknowledge the work of 200 London citizens who labored in the community to gather the signatures of 5,000 concerned taxpayers.

Council seems reluctant to accept that 5,000 municipal signatures collected over an arbitrarily limited 35-day period was a spectacular achievement, or that double or triple this number would certainly have been possible had we wished to present our petition in June or July. But what would have been the point?

If council could dismiss 5,000 citizens with the blink of an eye, then surely 10,000 signatures would only merit five or 10 additional seconds of murmuring, while 15,000 signatures might net as much as half a minute of "bafflegab." This would hardly justify having several hundred Londoners spend

their evenings to bring a consensus of taxpayer opinion to an unresponsive council.

Though Gosnell made much ado about having an "open-door policy" in a recent issue of *London Magazine*, he certainly slammed the door shut quickly to the 5,000 Londoners who were simply asking for reconsideration of an obviously excessive pay increase. As part of our own "open-door policy," we would have been interested to hear, in lieu of a pay rollback, council's justification for the amount and manner in which its increase was implemented.

If Gosnell wished to show leadership or to demonstrate his "open-door policy," this could have been his moment. We think we made our point. Gosnell and members of council certainly made theirs.

It seems that more than one honeymoon is over.

London MA 5 1986 MARC EMERY

*Reprinted from the London Free Press*

**ABOVE: Freedom Party Action Director Marc Emery addresses Council reaction in a Letter to the Editor.**

**RIGHT: Small item in Ontario edition of Toronto Star was one of the many news agencies to carry the story.**

**BELOW: FP Action Director encourages one of his customers to sign petition at his City Lights Bookshop.**

## Roll back your pay 4,500 tell aldermen

LONDON, Ont. (Special) — The largest petition ever circulated here will ask city council next Monday to roll back pay increases of more than 30 per cent for London aldermen and commissioners.

Bookstore owner Mark Emery says 200 volunteers circulated the protest from March 25 to April 20 and 4,500 residents signed the petition opposing the 32 per cent pay hike aldermen voted for themselves and the 43 per cent raises they granted city commissioners in March. The hike boosts an alderman's annual salary from \$12,500 to \$16,000.

"We're asking aldermen and commissioners to bring a motion to roll back the increases to 4 per cent or the cost of living," Emery said.



# TORONTO & LONDON FP SUPPORTERS FIGHT BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREA TAXES. Find out why...

Toronto businessman and FP supporter *Bob Adams* has a problem we at **Freedom Party** are only too familiar with: he's a member of an "association" he wants no part of --- and despite his protests, his municipal government insists he *continue* to be a member of that association.

With government spending spiralling out of control, the Ontario Government and its municipalities have invented a new way of taxing businesses in order to provide them with the services that should already have been paid for through their regular taxes.

Welcome to the world of the *Business Improvement Area [BIA]*, the name designated to a particularly distasteful government scheme aimed at raising taxes without having to deal with conventions like democratic processes or fair and equal representation.

In addition to education, property, and business taxes, more and more municipal businesses are finding themselves having to pay yet another tax: the *Business Improvement Tax*, which is levied only against those unfortunate enough to have found themselves conscripted as members of a *BIA*.

The money collected in this manner is given to an appointed group of "businesspeople" (within a designated area) to spend largely as they see fit. Although legislation supposedly requires that municipal councils keep tabs on these *BIAs* (there are several hundred now in Ontario), in practice, they are autonomous bodies free to do whatever they like as long as they do not conflict with city council priorities.

The predicament faced by Bob Adams is by no means unique.

In 1980, FP *Action Director* Marc Emery found himself in the same circumstance when he was forced to join a downtown London *BIA*. To protest, he spent three years and \$20,000 attempting to get his *BIA* abolished. Emery petitioned Council three times, citing the fact that the downtown business community wanted nothing whatever to do with a *BIA* --- or the taxes it would incur. Only 22 businesses favoured having a *BIA*, while over 300 signed Emery's petition to have the *BIA* abolished.

Despite this fact, the public was still being told that *BIAs* are being set up with the "support of the business community."

Political patronage was the true driving force behind the establishment of London's *BIA*. All *BIA* appointees were affiliated with major vested interests in the established eco-political structure of the city. Thus, *BIA* employees were hired, a bureaucracy was set up, and funds were spent on "promotion" and "beautification." Many promotions were costly and ineffective. But the *BIA* continued to be openly used for patronage, selective promotions, etc.

City Council's first approved budget (in 1980) for the 16-block area (the largest *BIA* in Ontario) was more than \$100,000, or an average of \$110 per business. By 1986, the budget was \$376,400 (including grants, subsidies from federal and provincial sources, but not including interest-free loans topping \$50,00 from the Province of Ontario). This required an average *BIA* tax on downtown businesses of \$360 per business, representing an increase of 22% a year, whereas normal city taxes have risen an average of only 6% (education taxes 9.5%) during the same period.

In 1980, the *BIA* special tax added 6% to a total business tax bill; today it comprises an amount 20% above total business taxes.

To illustrate the waste inherent in the operation of *BIAs*, consider that, of the \$376,000 1986 budget, \$99,250 is budgeted for *administration* (or 27%). This included \$10,000 for the renovation of the *BIA*'s new office, and \$12,800 severance pay for its last "manager" who quit after it was revealed that a promotional hot-air balloon fiesta budgeted to cost \$10,500 actually cost an additional \$40,000.

While it is true that, occasionally, the *BIA* spends money on useful services like streetcleaning, we must remember that services of this nature should have already been paid for and provided through the city's realty and business tax; the question arises: where are all *those* tax dollars going?

The coercive and wasteful nature of *BIAs* aside, it's easy to see why city councils find them so attractive. *BIAs* force businesses to be taxed again for services the local government should already be providing, while shifting the burden of *responsibility* for providing those services elsewhere. *BIAs* also enable councils to force businesses to pay for services they do not want.

continued on next page...



Freedom Party

Next issue of *FREEDOM FLYER* will report on two very recent developments in London concerning two *BIAs* that are attempting to form in two different London business districts, one very affluent, and one 'budget' retail district. Opposition in both areas to the *BIA* concept are substantial, and Marc Emery and Freedom Party have been asked to speak in opposition to these respective *BIAs*. Our first meeting is on August 20, and we are sure many more will follow as we gather together opposition. These details in your next issue of *FREEDOM FLYER*.



Freedom Party

One of the tragedies inherent in this kind of "democratic" practice is that those who take no political action (i.e., those who mind their own business) are assumed to be in support of the government's action, which may ultimately prove to their own destruction. By the time many businessmen realize what has happened to them, it is too late.

Bob Adams raised enough support from fellow Avenue Road merchants to take over their BIA and to try to have it abolished. However, North York City Council refused to do so despite a 75-2 vote in favour of its abolition by merchants.

# MERCHANTS FIND BIA TAXING AND NOT JUST THEIR PATIENCE

## Hard-hearted North York bugs biz folk

**S**hed a small tear this morning for some business folks up on Avenue Rd. who - in addition to the usual imposed-by-government woes like taxes, mountains of paperwork, taxes, the WCB, taxes, etc. - are struggling valiantly against the incredible intransigence of North York City Hall. For years now, merchants on the upscale stretch of Avenue Rd. between Lawrence and Wilson have been trying to rid themselves of a Business Improvement Area (BIA) which in effect is another level of taxation they can do quite nicely without, thank you. But North York municipal politicians - particularly local Ald. Milton Berger - don't seem much interested in allowing democratic principles to apply to mere business taxpayers. The long-raging battle is over the Avenue Road Business Improvement Area, an agency set up by North York City Hall in the late 1970s through provincial enabling legislation. Its mandate was to make improvements to this particular business section - trees planted on sidewalks, etc. - and charge the costs back to the merchants.

**JOHN McLEOD**

Assistant Business Editor



Critics of the BIA - which initially spent about \$60,000 a year of merchants' money - argue that it was originally set up without proper consultation with the business folk involved and, by arbitrarily spending their money, is an unnecessary extra layer of taxation. In 1982, a group headed by Bob Adams, president of an equipment rental business, presented North York council with a petition - representing 196 of the 300 businesses involved - asking that the BIA be abolished. Council refused. So Adams and his upstarts ran their own slate of candidates, won electoral control of the BIA management, chopped the agency's budget to the bone and called a special members' meeting that voted 75-2 to have the BIA disbanded. Still no action from council.

The battle raged all through 1985, but the best the merchants could do was to get council, in mid-December, to order a survey of Avenue Rd. merchants on the future of the BIA. Trouble is, the survey seems to have been stacked in favor of the BIA by its major supporter - Ald. Berger. In a recent letter to merchants extolling the BIA as "a good tool to keep a business community and the surrounding residential neighborhoods from deteriorating," the alderman explained that any ballots not returned in the survey will be considered votes in favor of the BIA. That, of course, if equivalent to Brian Mahoney saying if you don't vote in the next federal election your ballot will automatically be counted as a vote for his Conservative candidate. And, says BIA critic and current secretary Judy Emslie, correctly, it is "absolutely ludicrous" that North York council would have allowed Berger to slip this vote-stealing rule into the BIA survey.

"We've already had at least 25 calls from people who haven't received their ballots," Emslie reports. "One businessman entitled to three votes discovered that his accountant had thrown the ballots in the garbage." Other anti-BIA types note some merchants on City Hall's mailing list have moved out of the area, while others want to remain neutral. Emslie, who complains that "we've been had" by the alderman who wants to keep the BIA "because it makes him look good with voters to whom he can brag about being responsible for the improved look of the area," vows the fight still can be won. "We expect to still get enough anti-BIA votes despite this tactic," she predicts - adding, however, that "even if we do, council still could refuse" to disband the BIA. "In that case, we'll get a lawyer and fight on, or try to get the Ontario government to intervene." Chief critic and current BIA president Bob Adams insists Avenue Rd. merchants aren't just being cheap.

"A lot of us are spending loads of money for business improvements - there are three major jobs under way on the street right now - and are more than willing to contribute on a voluntary basis to street improvements," he says. "But we're not prepared to put up with arbitrary charges imposed by a BIA that just become another layer of municipal taxation. That's just not proper." In the meantime, Adams says his group will continue to control the BIA's board of management and "keep the budget as small as possible." And Berger? Well, he doesn't seem to want to return calls from a snooping business writer.

To add insult to injury, a March 24, 1986 meeting of North York City Council resulted in the dismissal of all those opposed to the BIA from its Board of Directors. They were replaced by those more sympathetic towards Council's own goals and priorities.

We reprint parts of Bob Adams' own [privately paid for] Avenue Road North business letter of May, 1986:

Mr. Adams successfully convinced an overwhelming majority of O'Connor Drive businesspeople that a BIA would be disastrous --- and it was defeated only a few days ago. Part Two in next issue of Freedom Flyer.



AVENUE ROAD BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, 1864 AVENUE RD. NORTH YORK, M5M 3Z6 May, 1986

Sorry for the delay in getting a newsletter out to you but it has been a busy, confusing time, after what North York council did to us at their March 24 meeting.

To bring you up to date, in December 1985 we, as the B.I.A. Board of Management, presented to North York Council a strong case requesting them to repeal the B.I.A. By-law. We gave a brief history showing that most of the merchants did not want it. After at least an hour's discussion they decided to instruct the City Clerk to conduct a survey to see if the street wanted the B.I.A. or not. Alderman Berger said he would accept the results of the survey.

Mr. Berger did not like the letter we sent to the merchants enclosing an imitation B.I.A. bill. We did not like his letter in which he said "anyone who did not respond would be considered to have no objection to the B.I.A." In his letter he also said "I will be guided by the wishes of the majority as the result of the survey". The results for the survey were as follows:

	IN SUPPORT OF THE BIA REMAINING ON AVENUE ROAD NORTH	NOT IN SUPPORT OF BIA REMAINING ON AVENUE ROAD NORTH
1. Replies received from persons/organizations according to last business assessment roll	28	165
2. Replies received from persons/organizations NOT SHOWN on last business assessment roll	7	28
Total:	35	193

- 3. Replies received but not marked 6
- 4. Replies returned undelivered by the Post Office marked "Unknown", "Moved" etc. 6

Signed E. Robert, City Clerk

We of course then expected council to repeal the By-law, but instead of that they kicked us out and appointed a board that favours the B.I.A. The idea seems to be to have a survey and if council does not like the results, ignore it and do what you want to do anyway. So there is now a board that represents 15% of the street and we who represent 85% are out. This means that the merchants on the street now have "taxation without representation". It would be a good idea for some members of the council to go back to their history books to read about the lengths that patriotic citizens went to to instal and preserve this cornerstone of democracy "no taxation without representation". To compound this act, we also had a verbal agreement made in Mayor Lastman's office in 1983 that the Avenue Road Business Association's Board, elected by the merchants, would also be appointed as the B.I.A. Board. At that meeting were Mayor Lastman, Alderman Berger, Judy Emslie, Bob Adams and our lawyer. This arrangement was confirmed by letter dated March 9, 1983. Apparently Messrs. Lastman and Berger believe that the agreement means nothing and can be broken. We are going to continue to fight legally and politically, the harsh undemocratic treatment received by council over the last 6 years. The Road over the last 6 years, the merchants, support us. It is amazing how much hard feeling the BIA has caused on Avenue situation even more as merchants don't like having their clearly expressed wishes thrown out. It is obvious that most of council does not care what the merchants think or want. We will continue to fight this unwanted taxation. It is typical of governments to so easily waste taxpayers money on surveys, etc.

One of the tragedies inherent in this kind of "democratic" practice is that those who take no political action (i.e., those who mind their own business) are assumed to be in support of the government's action, which may ultimately prove to their own destruction. By the time many businessmen realize what has happened to them, it is too late.

Bob Adams raised enough support from fellow Avenue Road merchants to take over their BIA and to try to have it abolished. However, North York City Council refused to do so despite a 75-2 vote in favour of its abolition by merchants.

### MERCHANTS FIND BIA TAXING AND NOT JUST THEIR PATIENCE

# Hard-hearted North York bugs biz folk

shed a small tear this morning for some business folks up on Avenue Rd. who - in addition to the usual imposed-by-government woes like taxes, mountains of paperwork, taxes, the WCB, taxes, etc. - are struggling valiantly against the incredible intransigence of North York City Hall.

For years now, merchants on the upscale stretch of Avenue Rd. between Lawrence and Wilson have been trying to rid themselves of a Business Improvement Area (BIA) which in effect is another level of taxation they can do quite nicely without, thank you.

But North York municipal politicians - particularly local Ald. Milton Berger - don't seem much interested in allowing democratic principles to apply to mere business taxpayers.

The long-raging battle is over the Avenue Road Business Improvement Area, an agency set up by North York City Hall in the late 1970s through provincial enabling legislation. Its mandate was to make improvements to this particular business section - trees planted on sidewalks, etc. - and charge the costs back to the merchants.

**JOHN McLEOD**

Assistant Business Editor



The battle raged all through 1985, but the best the merchants could do was to get council, in mid-December, to order a survey of Avenue Rd. merchants on the future of the BIA.

Trouble is, the survey seems to have been stacked in favor of the BIA by its major supporter - Ald. Berger.

In a recent letter to merchants extolling the BIA as "a good tool to keep a business community and the surrounding residential neighborhoods from deteriorating," the alderman explained that any ballots not returned in the survey will be considered votes in favor of the BIA.

That, of course, if equivalent to Brian Mahoney saying if you don't vote in the next federal election your ballot will automatically be counted as a vote for his Conservative candidate.

And, says BIA critic and current secretary Judy Emslie, correctly, it is "absolutely ludicrous" that North York council would have allowed Berger to slip this vote-counting rule into the BIA survey.

"We've already had at least 25 calls from people who haven't received their ballots," Emslie reports. "One businessman entitled to three votes discovered that his accountant had thrown the ballots in the garbage." Other anti-BIA types note some merchants on City Hall's mailing list have moved out of the area, while others want to remain neutral.

Emslie, who complains that "we've been had" by the alderman who wants to keep the BIA "because it makes him look good with voters to whom he can brag about being responsible for the improved look of the area," vows the fight still can be won.

"We expect to still get enough anti-BIA votes despite this tactic," she predicts - adding, however, that "even if we do, council still could refuse" to disband the BIA. "In that case, we'll get a lawyer and fight on, or try to get the Ontario government to intervene."

Chief critic and current BIA president Bob Adams insists Avenue Rd. merchants aren't just being cheap.

"A lot of us are spending loads of money for business improvements - there are three major jobs under way on the street right now - and are more than willing to contribute on a voluntary basis to street improvements," he says. "But we're not prepared to put up with arbitrary charges imposed by a BIA that just become another layer of municipal taxation. That's just not proper."

In the meantime, Adams says his group will continue to control the BIA's board of management and "keep the budget as small as possible."

And Berger? Well, he doesn't seem to want to return calls from a snooping business writer.

To add insult to injury, a March 24, 1986 meeting of North York City Council resulted in the dismissal of all those opposed to the BIA from its Board of Directors. They were replaced by those more sympathetic towards Council's own goals and priorities.

*We reprint parts of Bob Adams' own [privately paid for] Avenue Road North business letter of May, 1986:*

Mr. Adams successfully convinced an overwhelming majority of O'Connor Drive businesspeople that a BIA would be disastrous --- and it was defeated only a few days ago. Part Two in next issue of Freedom Flyer.



AVENUE ROAD BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, 1864 AVENUE RD. NORTH YORK, M5M 3Z6

May, 1986

Sorry for the delay in getting a newsletter out to you but it has been a busy, confusing time, after what North York council did to us at their March 24 meeting.

To bring you up to date, in December 1985 we, as the B.I.A. Board of Management, presented to North York Council a strong case requesting them to repeal the B.I.A. By-law. We gave a brief history showing that most of the merchants did not want it. After at least an hour's discussion they decided to instruct the City Clerk to conduct a survey to see if the street wanted the B.I.A. or not. Alderman Berger said he would accept the results of the survey.

Mr. Berger did not like the letter we sent to the merchants enclosing an imitation B.I.A. bill. We did not like his letter in which he said "anyone who did not respond would be considered to have no objection to the B.I.A." In his letter he also said "I will be guided by the wishes of the majority as the result of the survey". The results for the survey were as follows:

	IN SUPPORT OF THE BIA REMAINING ON AVENUE ROAD NORTH	NOT IN SUPPORT OF BIA REMAINING ON AVENUE ROAD NORTH
1. Replies received from persons/organizations according to last business assessment roll	28	165
2. Replies received from persons/organizations NOT SHOWN on last business assessment roll	7	28
Total:	35	193

- 3. Replies received but not marked 6
- 4. Replies returned undelivered by the Post Office marked "Unknown", "Moved" etc. 6

Signed E. Robert, City Clerk

We of course then expected council to repeal the By-law, but instead of that they kicked us out and appointed a board that favours the B.I.A. The idea seems to be to have a survey and if council does not like the results, ignore it and do what you want to do anyway. So there is now a board that represents 15% of the street and we who represent 85% are out. This means that the merchants on the street now have "taxation without representation". It would be a good idea for some members of the council to go back to their history books to read about the lengths that patriotic citizens went to to instal and preserve this cornerstone of democracy "no taxation without representation". To compound this act, we also had a verbal agreement made in Mayor Lastman's office in 1983 that the Avenue Road Business Association's Board, elected by the merchants, would also be appointed as the B.I.A. Board. At that meeting were Mayor Lastman, Alderman Berger, Judy Emslie, Bob Adams and our lawyer. This arrangement was confirmed by letter dated March 9, 1983. Apparently Messrs. Lastman and Berger believe that the agreement means nothing and can be broken. We are going to continue to fight legally and politically, the harsh undemocratic treatment received by council over the last 6 years. The Road over the last 6 years, the merchants, support us. It is amazing how much hard feeling the BIA has caused on Avenue situation even more as merchants don't like having their clearly expressed wishes thrown out. It is obvious that most of council does not care what the merchants think or want. We will continue to fight this unwanted taxation. It is typical of governments to so easily waste taxpayers money on surveys, etc.

On November 2, 1985, a seminar entitled **The Future of Rent Controls in Ontario** was sponsored by Landlords Against Rent Control (see coverage, last issue). Representatives of five provincially-registered parties participated, with each giving a half-hour presentation on his or her party's perspective on rent control.

Keynote speaker for the event was the **Fraser Institute's** senior economist, Dr. Walter Block.

Speakers included the Government of Ontario's Deputy Minister, Ministry of Housing, Gardner Church; Progressive Conservative Housing Critic Margaret Marland; the NDP's Housing Critic Ross McClellan; Chairman of the Ontario Libertarian Party, Bob Cumming; and of course, **Freedom Party** president, **Robert Metz**.

Following is the presentation given by Mr. Metz on behalf of **Freedom Party**. Separate transcripts are available on request.



# THE FUTURE OF BY ROBERT METZ RENT CONTROL

If I had been asked to predict the future of rent controls in Ontario way back in 1975 (when they were imposed), I might have been tempted to say that rent controls were only a *temporary* measure, and would be repealed by 1977. After all, my prediction would not have been made merely on the basis of some ability to determine future events, but upon an *explicit promise* made by the government at that time.

Needless to say, my prediction would have been quite wrong.

Thus, predicting the future has not been, and is not now, one of my favourite pastimes. Even when promises have been made (and to me a promise is a commitment), predicting the future has been, at best, a dubious undertaking --- and indeed, many promises *have* been made.

It is now ten years later and rent controls are still with us. By now, I hope you all know a little something about the nature of political promises. If you didn't know in 1975, then you should certainly be much wiser in 1985.

### *The Future of Rent Controls in Ontario --- 1985:*

You may well imagine my disbelief when, only a few short weeks ago, I heard a news story on the radio featuring Housing Minister Alvin Curling's announcement that "rent controls could be eliminated as early as next year." My disbelief lasted less than a fraction of a second, however, when the sentence was concluded by the disclaimer "...if adequate affordable housing is available by that time."

"Adequate," in Mr. Curling's opinion, apparently represents a rental vacancy rate of 3% or better, and until that rate is achieved, his government would proceed to implement even stricter rent controls by acting immediately to reduce the legally allowable annual rent increase from 6% to 4%!

By placing effect before cause, the provincial Liberal government has not only "put the cart before the horse," but has aggravated matters by "burning the cart" and "shooting the horse"! It has been clearly demonstrated that its intention in the issue of rent control is to *appear* to be playing both sides of the fence while actually catering to the side with the greatest political potential (i.e., *votes*).

In fact, proclamations alluding to the *possibility* that rent controls could be eliminated as early as next year, while simultaneously promising to retain and strengthen rent controls until the vacancy rate reaches an acceptable level, are proclamations that do little more than to help confuse the issue. On the one hand, the government is creating a false hope for landlords in creating the vision of a future without rent controls; on the other hand, it is directly appealing to the *perceived* interests of tenants, for the simple reason that there are more of them, which in turn, means more potential votes.

Unfortunately, neither tenants or landlords are having their best interest served through the existence of rent controls because the only *real* interest being served is ultimately a *political* one.

continued on next page...

Make no mistake about it! *Rent controls are a political invention created to serve political interests and they exist for not other reason whatever.*

A failure to understand this principle will in turn lead to a failure in one's ability to fight and defeat rent controls --- along with the host of increasing interventions made by governments in their haste to invariably do the wrong thing with the best of intentions. It is a process --- to be precise, a *political* process --- that hurts everyone involved. In addition to landlords and tenants, you can add homeowners, builders, taxpayers, consumers, producers, and many others to the list of victims adversely affected by rent controls.

So if you really want to know what the future of rent controls will be in this province, then you'll have to base your prediction upon your past experience with the *actions of governments* --- not of landlords, and not of tenants.

The future of rent controls in Ontario is entirely dependent upon the future of politics in Ontario, and there is no escaping that fact.

INTERESTS vs. RIGHTS

Rent controls didn't come into existence just by accident, or as some inevitable consequence of economic or social circumstances. They arose most directly as a consequence of a currently practised political doctrine that asserts any "majority" may do whatever it likes to any "minority."

As a result of this doctrine, we find ourselves living in what is commonly referred to as a "mixed economy," meaning an economy in which individual freedoms are "mixed" with government controls. Unfortunately, in a mixed economy, there are no consistent principles, rules, or theories available to justify or define the limits of either our freedoms or the controls that may be imposed upon us. The only measuring stick available to us in this regard is the never-reliable "majority-rule"-of-thumb, and if you happen to be unfortunate enough to be in a minority on a particular issue, then don't count on any guarantees of your rights remaining protected.

What's the inevitable result of a "majority-rule, mixed-economy" philosophy? --- a society ruled by pressure groups. And when governments start giving in to pressure groups, they begin to serve political interests and cease to protect individual rights.

Rent controls exist for the simple reason that we, as citizens, allow our governments to cater to special interest groups and to violate individual rights.

CONTROLS BREED CONFLICT

Rent controls, like all government-imposed controls, breed unnecessary conflict. Because they exist, there is now a direct political conflict between landlords and tenants that otherwise would not be present. By creating misleading and irrelevant issues like "affordable housing" (or some such variant), politicians have managed to create a conflict that does not, and should not exist in the sense that we have come to understand it today.

For example, many tenants have been led to believe that their "adversary" in the rental accommodation marketplace is the landlord, but this is an entirely false notion. The real "adversaries" in the accommodation marketplace are other tenants who are willing to pay more than they are for the same benefit.

Similarly, under normal free-market conditions, landlords would compete with other landlords to provide "affordable housing" and they wouldn't be forced to unite to defend themselves by having to launch a common political and legal effort to protect their right to their own property.

That's the basic problem with controls. By their very nature, they breed artificial conflicts. Suddenly, tenants are fighting with landlords, when in reality it is other tenants they are competing with for that increasingly elusive "affordable housing."

Consider the nature of many of the "conflicts" that face Canadians today. Under rent controls, we have seen how tenants and landlords have been forced into a political conflict with each other, and how landlords have been forced to subsidize tenants. But the process doesn't just end with rent controls.

For example, under the guise of "official bilingualism," we have an ever-increasing conflict developing between French- and English-speaking people, in which one culture is being forced to subsidize another. Under the guise of "full funding in education," we have separate school

factions in conflict with public school advocates, where each side is being forced to subsidize the other. And who ever heard of "metric" versus "imperial" before our governments got in on the action?

Such is the current state of politics in Ontario today. And it's becoming very clear what the future of politics will be like in Ontario.

Expect more controls. Expect more conflict.

THE FUTURE OF POLITICS IN ONTARIO

Some of the words and terms necessary to explain what is politically happening in Ontario today (and in much of the world, for that matter) may leave us feeling a bit uncomfortable. But I personally cannot escape the conclusion that right now, Ontario is aimlessly drifting into a gradual state of economic and social dictatorship. That's right --- a dictatorship.

I realize that, to some, this may seem to be a startling or even an offensive observation to publicly make. But I caution you to never allow ignorance or fear of the truth to be the basis of your surprise or offence. If you're going to be offended at all, be offended by the fact that what I have to say is the reality of the situation, and not by the nature of the extreme terms I may use.

For example, rent controls are specifically a fascist measure, and we should never be afraid to use that term to describe them; it is accurate and it has a very clear meaning and effect. (Ironically, rent controls were an offshoot of the federal government's wage and price control package, imposed in 1975 by Trudeau's socialist Liberals.)

Both socialism and fascism involve the destruction of property rights. Having a right to property means having the right of its use and disposal. Whereas socialism seeks to negate private property rights altogether, through the "vesting of ownership and control in the community as a whole," --- which, of course, means the state --- fascism leaves ownership in the hands of private individuals, but transfers control of the property to the government. Sound familiar? It should. This is the political reality behind the existence of rent controls.

Being allowed to "own" something without being allowed to ultimately control it is a contradiction in terms. It creates a situation where citizens end up retaining the responsibility of holding property without having any of its advantages, while the government acquires all the advantages without having any of the responsibility.

Ontario is rapidly becoming a state-controlled society, and Ontarians, like most who have fallen victim to the effects of state-imposed restrictions, are becoming politically impotent in their ability to reverse the trend.

RENT CONTROL THROUGH INTIMIDATION

One of the reasons I've introduced terms like socialism, fascism, or dictatorship to the discussion of rent controls is to give you some ammunition to use in the psychological war of intimidation that surrounds issues of state control.

For example, if, as landlords, you find yourselves inhibited from using a term like fascist to describe a situation where your property rights are being blatantly violated (especially when it's the correct term), then what words do you have left to enable you to defend your rights? And how will you ever be able to protect your rights if you don't even recognize the nature of the political system that is eroding them away at an ever-increasing pace?

Remember that those who are after your rights and your property have done an excellent job of intimidating you through the use of language. In fact, they've even created entirely false issues that you find yourselves fighting needlessly against, and which deflect everyone's attention from the real issue at hand: your rights.

One of these issues is expressed in the term "affordable housing." In the political world of rent controls, "affordable housing" is a highly misleading and manipulative term. If you, as landlords, continue to use it, it will only serve to psychologically and morally undermine your efforts to defeat rent controls and to protect your property rights. After all, the government claims that rent controls are a measure to provide "affordable housing." Thus, when landlords decide to fight rent controls, it is already implied that somehow they oppose the concept of housing that is affordable!

You're beat before you start --- and on an issue that's not the issue!

Don't be afraid to tell it like it is! Rent control is nothing more than the forced subsidization of one interest group

by another. It is a fascist scheme aimed at a very distinct and identifiable group in society --- landlords and property owners.

Another popular technique of intimidation is the charge that landlords are "greedy" or "selfish" when they ask for rents that some people cannot afford. But always remember that those who accuse you of being "greedy" or "selfish" are merely acting in the interest of someone else's "greed" and "selfishness."

Ask yourself a simple question: Which is the greater form of "greed"? The action of a landlord taken in the operation and maintenance of his own property with his own money, or that of governments and tenants who, seeing the product of the landlord's efforts, demand access to it on terms not suitable to the owner of that property?

Yet another extension of the intimidation tactic based on "greed" is the charge of earning a profit. Those who believe that profits are "evil" are suffering from the misconception that the profit of one person necessitates a loss to another. But this is only true if the government is involved in the transaction. As we can clearly see, under rent controls, tenants reap an immediate short-term "profit" at the "expense" of the landlord.

However, in a free market (in which all economic and social transactions are voluntary), a profit to one person in a transaction always means a profit for the other --- otherwise the transaction would never take place!

All of these words and terms ("greed", "selfishness", "profit", "affordable housing") are used in an effort to denigrate your motives for being in the business of providing rental accommodation and to intimidate you into not taking action to defend yourselves. It's up to you to make a point of using the proper terms and adjectives to describe the government's actions. Intimidate them for a change.

Let the government know that what it's doing with rent control is wrong.

FREEDOM PARTY and RENT CONTROL

Freedom Party totally opposes rent controls.

As a political party believing that the foundation of personal liberty and choice is the concept of private property and the right to fully exercise ownership of such property, we have no choice but to condemn rent controls on both practical and moral grounds. Rent controls are objectionable in practice because they do not work; they are morally reprehensible because they violate individual rights.

Rent control is blatant discrimination against the landlord. It prevents landlords from exercising their right to the fair market value (which is, ironically, determined by tenants) of the service they provide. It forces landlords to give an unearned and unagreed-to benefit to tenants, without recompense. It limits landlords' income, but not their costs. It reduces the value of their property, and it erodes their right to property.

The right to keep, use, buy, sell, mortgage, rent, give away, leave to heirs, etc., are just some of the numerous aspects associated with the right to own property. All these aspects of ownership are now under attack by our governments.

We live in an environment where, if the government wants your property, all it has to do is pass a law.

When landlords lose their right to exercise control over their own properties, we all lose, because our acceptance of discrimination against one particular group of individuals merely sets the stage for another group of individuals to be exploited for political gain.

Freedom Party will do anything it can, and use its influence in any way it can, to fight rent controls. As young a party as we are, we are nevertheless the only alternative available on the issue of rent controls.

I realize that many people may be reluctant to support a new political party because they perceive that it has a much longer way to go before it can share the degree of influence shared by the parties in power. But let me ask you this: Wouldn't you rather be supporting a party that has a longer way to go --- but knows where it's going --- than support and subsidize parties that simply drift in circles and consistently make matters worse?

Where's the future in that?

When **Lloyd Walker** first stepped into the offices of **Freedom Party** back in September 1985, he never stepped back out. What began as a casual show of support soon mushroomed to a that earned him an appointment to the provincial executive of Ontario's only political party. Meet **Lloyd Walker**, **Freedom Party's** new provincial vice-president:

1985, he never commitment laissez-faire

My involvement with **Freedom Party** started about fifteen years ago. A major difficulty though, was that **Freedom Party** didn't exist then.

It was that long ago when I first read Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged*. The ideas introduced in that novel and in the writings of other pro-freedom authors were so obvious and so right that I knew this was the way the world had to go.


But it goes without saying that the ideals espoused by such authors were obviously not those being advocated by those in a position of influence and power; in fact, the world was moving in a direction opposite to what I would have preferred. I knew what I *disliked* in the events of the day but I couldn't see a way to do anything about them. I'm sure that most of you are familiar with the frustration that goes with the "you can't fight city hall" attitude I was guilty of having at the time. It took fourteen years before I was to find a focus --- a means of expressing my ideas about freedom in a positive and productive way.

My direct involvement with **Freedom Party** began when I voted for Michelle McColm (London Centre) in the 1985 Ontario provincial election. She was the candidate fielded by the very new and outspoken **Freedom Party**. Despite knowing that she would not get elected, I knew that I had cast the best vote I had ever made. For the first time in my life, I didn't compromise my political choice; there was no need to anymore.

After the election I began reading all the **Freedom Party** literature I could get my hands on. To go into all the ideas which struck a resonant chord within me would require reprinting every piece of information published by the party --- something we needn't do here.

The dedication of **Freedom Party** members to the principles of liberty astounded me. Here was a group of people espousing precisely the philosophy which I had accepted years earlier. I decided to support **Freedom Party** with more than just my vote so I returned to the party's offices.

Lloyd Walker



It didn't take long to relax in the company of people who thought as I did. Robert Metz and Marc Emery were happy to take time out to talk about anything and everything. It was this eagerness to share ideas and information which resulted in my increased involvement. I couldn't help but get involved when I say that "you can fight city hall" in a positive, assured manner --- and *win!* I saw progress being made --- new members joining, favourable coverage in the media, projects completed, new projects started, or simply one question answered for someone who just called out of curiosity --- all of which contributed to an increased awareness of freedom in Ontario.

The greatest thing about working in the **Freedom Party** offices is that you *know* you are making a contribution --- doing something *positive* about situations you previously felt angered and frustrated about. We all know the joy that can come from doing productive work and there can be no question that the self-satisfaction I have experienced is a direct result of doing something that I personally believe is truly worthwhile.

I thoroughly enjoy working with **Freedom Party** and I intend to continue doing so for a long time to come. After all, I'm not only working for **Freedom Party** and its supporters, I'm working for something that I believe in very strongly --- "that every individual in the peaceful pursuit of personal fulfillment has an absolute right to his or her own life, liberty, and property."

### September's Thought

"For some reason, intelligent people seem to de-grade enthusiasm. 'Oh, that's childish. Oh, that's pep rally stuff, football games.' It's not either. It's a life force, it really is. Happy, enthused people are productive, they have good marriages, they have wonderful relationships, and they share it."

-Michael Emerling

### FREEDOM FLYER

**Vol. 2, No. 2, Sept. 1986** is published by the **Freedom Party of Ontario**, a fully-registered political party. Contributions\* are tax-creditable.

**Subscription Rate:** \$15 per volume (6 issues), or contribution\* equivalent.

**Editor:** Robert Metz; **Layout & Design:** Marc Emery; **Contributors:** Marc Emery, Robert Metz, Lloyd Walker.

### 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:** That the *purpose of government* is to *protect* individual freedom of choice, *not* to restrict it.

### Freedom Party of Ontario

P.O. Box 2214, Stn. A., London, Ontario, N6A 4E3

Phone (519) 433-8612

**Provincial Executive:** Ontario President: Robert Metz; Vice-president, Ontario: Lloyd Walker; Chief Financial Officer: Murray Hopper; Action Director: Marc Emery; Action Co-ordinator: Gordon Mood.