

B.C. ANTI-PROHIBITION LEAGUE

# NEWSLETTER

Issue Number 16, February, 1996

Editor for this issue: Alan Randell

PO Box 8179, Victoria, B.C., V8W 3R9  
604-382-7758

## GREAT NEWS! Letter Confirms That Bill C 7 Is Dead - For Now.

February 6, 1996

Dear Mr. Boston, (Secretary, BCAPL)

*The First Session of the Thirty Fifth Parliament was brought to a close on Friday, February 2, 1996. The Prorogation of Parliament means that Bill C 7, and all other legislation still before Parliament, died on the Order Paper. The Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs will therefore not be meeting again on this Bill. If the Government decides to introduce the same or a similar bill in the next session, the Committee will be able to draw on what it learned in its examination of Bill C 7.*

*The Committee regrets not being able to hear from all those groups and individuals who made requests to appear. Your interest in the work of the Committee is most appreciated. If I can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact me at 613 990 5013 or at the following address:*

*Heather Lank, Clerk of the Committee, Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, Room 706, 140 Wellington Street, Ottawa ON K1A 0A4*

*Yours sincerely  
Heather Lank,  
Clerk of the Committee*

## Vancouver Police raid Hemp Shop

On January 4, 1996, twenty-five Vancouver City police officers raided the Hemp BC store in the Gastown area of Vancouver. They seized over \$100,000 of inventory and supplies and handcuffed and carted off to jail four people, including the owner, Marc Emery.

We understand that Mr Emery is going to fight the case rather than paying a fine as a cost of doing business.

We will keep you posted on this important case.

## Joking Around About Prohibition On The Peter Gzowski Show

We were appalled to hear Mr Gzowski and one of his guests

### Contents in this issue:

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Seizures at Hemp BC   | 1    |
| Joking around about prohibition on the Peter Gzowski show                     | 1    |
| Police report admits drug war causes crime                                    | 2    |
| Two British medical journals urge end to drug war:                            |      |
| The Lancet  | 3    |
| British Medical Journal   | 4    |
| Letter to the Senate on Bill C-7 from Vancouver Island Human Rights Coalition | 6    |
| BCAPL Submits Report to Heritage Committee                                    | 7    |
| Chemical McCarthyism  | 9    |
| Study Program announcement  | 9    |
| Raffle winner   | 9    |

on Gzowski's CBC radio open line show laughing at Marc Emery's position that Canadians should be allowed to smoke marijuana. One participant commented that Mr. Emery need not be worried about the law because "You only have to give up smoking marijuana." Obviously the seriousness of the matter was hidden from these so-called "experts". The state does not have the right to prohibit its citizens from ingesting any drug they want. It is not merely a matter of being inconvenienced by the law. It is that we are *oppressed* by the law.

Prohibition kills as well. Daniel Possee was killed in a police raid at the age of twenty two on May 12, 1992. Steven Gardner died after being shot in a police raid in Ottawa, September 1991. Police Sgt. Larry Thomas Young was killed when investigating a cocaine dealer on February 2, 1987. Peter Randell of Victoria (our editor's son) died at nineteen on February 3, 1993 shortly after ingesting some street heroin. Because of prohibition, many thousands of Canadians are incarcerated in prison and many more cannot enter the US because they carry criminal records for the same reason.

The seriousness of the issue was perhaps obscured by the fact that Hemp B.C., Marc Emery's store, deals almost exclusively with hemp products. The prohibition of cannabis by the Narcotic Control Act is part of a larger issue. The most recent revision proposed by the government, Bill C 7, *The Controlled Drugs and Substance Act*, lists over 250 substances with salts and derivatives which are controlled, and that usually means prohibited from the general public, carrying severe penalties. For most of these substances offenders are liable to a life sentence for trafficking, importing and exporting.

Drug prohibition is the most serious issue confronting Canada to day. The Narcotic Control Act violates the Canadian Charter of Rights and divides our people. How *inconvenient*.

---

## **Police report confirms that they are losing War On Drugs and that the War causes crime.**

We have come across a most interesting report. It is called "Canadian Drug Perspective - 1995" and was

issued by the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police in June, 1995.

This report is a compendium of reports submitted from many police forces in response to a number of standard questions about drug problems. Here are some excerpts:

### **Vancouver, B.C.**

Heroin use/addiction is estimated to be at an all time high in the city, although increases in new addicts have probably slowed over the past year.....Without question, much of the crime in Vancouver is directly attributable to the drug problem. ... Previous studies have estimated that up to 70% of crime can be attributed to the drug problems.

### **Calgary, Alberta**

Unofficial studies conducted by the Robbery Unit in 1986-1987 suggested that as many as 85% of financial institution robberies were committed by persons using at least a part of the proceeds to support drug, predominately cocaine, habits..... Obviously, there is a string relationship between drug trafficking and violent crime.

### **Winnipeg, Manitoba**

There is a drastic increase in the seizures of hydroponic marijuana grow operations.... There is a direct relationship between drugs and crime within the City of Winnipeg.

### **Sault St. Marie, Ontario**

The drug problem is likely the reason for the bulk of property crime on Sault St. Marie.

### **Sudbury, Ontario**

In 1994 there were 171 drug charges in our area, an increase of 55.5% over one year....

### **Windsor, Ontario**

Drugs in Windsor are tied closely to other criminal offences, especially break and enter and other property related crimes where the proceeds are turned over for cash and drugs. There were three murders in Windsor in 1994, one of which involved drug use. There has been one murder in 1995 also involving drug use.

### **London, Ontario**

It is difficult to precisely measure the amount of crime caused by drug use and drug trafficking, but it is clear that many crimes are caused by drug use.

### **Hamilton-Wentworth, Ontario**

There are very few criminal offences which are not impacted by drug addiction and the illegal profits of drug trafficking.

### **Toronto, Ontario**

Crack still remains the most prevalent drug seized on the streets of Metropolitan Toronto.... Robberies, thefts, and assaults are directly attributable to the usage and dependence on crack.... There has been a drastic resurgence of marihuana in Metropolitan Toronto over the past few years.

### **Kingston, Ontario**

We have found a strong correlation between drug activity and property crimes (i.e. Break and Enter).

### **Ottawa-Carleton, Ontario**

The frequency of break and enters, thefts and robberies, in many instances can be tied to the perpetrators' need to obtain cash in order to pay a drug debt or to support a drug habit.

### **Montreal, Quebec**

Within the jurisdiction of the Montreal Urban Community Police Department we have, unfortunately, noted an increase in consumption of both licit and illicit drugs. ... The fact that prices have not changed even though there have been massive seizures within our jurisdiction indicate that the supply has been constant and has also satisfied the consumer demand. ... The surge in popularity of heroin has created a major concern for our department.... The equation between drug abuse and the crime rate seems to be so intertwined that these issues are indivisible.

### **Halifax, Nova Scotia**

There is a definite relationship between the drug problem, cocaine, and other crimes in our

community. There were nine homicides that can be related to the cocaine trade in the past seven years. ... The crack cocaine trade breeds violence in our community and we see it as an epidemic that is out of control.

---

## **Deglamorising cannabis**

An editorial from THE LANCET, Volume 346, Number 8985, November 11 1995.

(The Lancet is a respected British medical journal.)

The smoking of cannabis, even long term, is not harmful to health. Yet this widely used substance is illegal just about everywhere. There have been numerous calls over the years for the legalisation, or at least decriminalisation, of soft drugs, among which cannabis remains the most popular with all social groups. In this highly contentious area, the Dutch attitude has been often mentioned as the voice of sanity. In the Netherlands, customers of coffee shops can buy up to 30 g of cannabis for about 10 pounds (\$15) although the drug is technically illegal. The shops are not allowed to advertise, or to sell cannabis to individuals aged under 16 years.

Prominent among those currently calling for legislative reform- and going further by making constructive proposals - are police chiefs and city medical officers, people who know only too well that the existing policies in most countries are ineffective and unworkable. Meanwhile, politicians have largely remained silent, seemingly afraid of offending powerful segments of the electorate or merely of being perceived as weak in the face of rising crime figures. When the occasional politician raises her head above the parapet - as the British opposition MP Clare Short did recently in calling for a fresh debate on decriminalisation of cannabis - the response is tediously predictable: widespread condemnation from political colleagues and overwhelming support from those who have to cope with the end result of political inertia.

In the case of Ms Short, not only was she speedily reprimanded by the party leader, but also party officials claimed that their non-legalisation stance was entirely logical since legalisation of cannabis would "increase the supply, reduce the price, and increase the usage". According to a Home Office report

earlier this year, the number of people taking cannabis has doubled in a decade - without any help from "liberal" measures. Perhaps the politicians' real fear was that freedom to use soft drugs would automatically progress to increased use of substances such as cocaine and heroin. If so, they must have overlooked the recent Dutch government review which pointed out that decriminalisation of possession of soft drugs has not led to a rise in the use of hard drugs.

If the Dutch approach is so successful, why are changes afoot in The Hague to tighten up that country's drug policy? First Amsterdam's mayor proposed closing down half the city's coffee shops that sell cannabis, and in doing so he rejected a report by his health department in favour of legalisation of soft drugs. Then the Dutch government, which had made an election promise to legalise cannabis, last month issued a discussion paper which mirrored the Amsterdam plan. If, as expected, the Dutch parliament agrees the latest proposals, half the country's 4000 cannabis-selling coffee shops will close and the amount that can be sold to an individual will be cut to 5 g. Since the government's own review provides no ammunition for such a change in policy, the real reason behind the new measures must lie elsewhere. One need look no further than the Netherlands' neighbours and co-signatories of the Schengen agreement, which introduced a border-free zone between the Netherlands, France, Germany, Spain, Luxembourg, and Belgium. When France, in particular, threatened to end the agreement, claiming that the Netherlands was the major supplier of Europe's drugs, some action had to be taken and the coffee shops became the scapegoat.

Leaving politics aside, where is the harm in decriminalising cannabis? There is none to the health of the consumers, and the criminal fraternity who depend for their succour on prohibition would hate it. But decriminalisation of possession does not go far enough in our view. That has to be accompanied by controls on source, distribution, and advertising, much as happens with tobacco. A system, in fact, remarkably close to the existing one in Dutch coffee shops.

Cannabis has become a political football, and one that governments continually duck. Like footballs, however, it bounces back. Sooner or later politicians will have to stop running scared

and address the evidence: cannabis per se is not a hazard to society but driving it further underground may well be.

---

## The war on drugs, prohibition isn't working-some legalisation will help

An editorial from the British Medical Journal, Volume 311, 23-30 December 1995

Drugs, says psychiatrist Thomas Szasz, have taken over the lead role from sex in the "grand morality play of human existence. "No longer, says Szasz, "are men, women, and children tempted, corrupted, and ruined by the irresistibly sweet pleasures of sex; instead, they are tempted, corrupted, and ruined by the irresistibly sweet pleasures of drugs." (Note 1) Because dealing with drugs is viewed as a moral problem, politicians tend to compete in their zeal to banish the evil from the kingdom. Those who talk of legalisation are dismissed as mavericks, and whipped back into line. The British government's drug strategy for the next three years states baldly "There will be no legalisation of any currently controlled drugs." (Note 2) But some legalisation would help.

The politicians fighting the jihad against drugs want to obliterate the enemy. They, of course, make an exception for legal drugs like alcohol, nicotine, and caffeine; indeed, British government last week recommended teetotalers take up drinking alcohol for the good of their health. (Note 3) Yet a world devoid of drugs seems as unlikely as a world devoid of poverty and sin. Thomas Sydenham observed 300 years ago "Among the remedies which it has pleased Almighty God to give to man to relieve his sufferings, none is so universal and so efficacious as opium" (Note 4); and Aldous Huxley wrote "That humanity at large will ever be able to dispense Artificial Paradises seems very unlikely. Most men women lead lives at the worst so painful, at the best monotonous, poor and limited that the urge to escape longing to transcend themselves if only for a few moments, is and has always been one of the principal appetites of the soul." (Note 5) If we accept that a world without drugs is unachievable (and probably intolerable) then the important question, argues drug policy expert Ethan Nadelman, becomes "What are the best means to regulate the production, distribution and

consumption of the great variety of psychoactive substances available today and in the foreseeable future?" (Note 6) To reduce the debate to arguments between "prohibitionists" and "legalisers" is to oversimplify, but it's a useful device for beginning to understand the issues.

The case for legalising drugs begins with the failure of current prohibitionist policies. The United States has been conducting a "war on drugs" for seven decades, during which time there have been steady increases in seizures of illegal drugs, the numbers of people using drugs, and the health and social costs of drug taking. Economists argue from first principles that the war on drugs must fail. Any success in reducing the supply will raise the price of illegal drugs. Addicts must then commit more crime to feed their habit; and a rise in the profit margins of drug smugglers urges them on to greater efforts.

The history of the drug trade is that supply always meets demand. Milton Friedman, the Nobel prize winning economist, puts it thus: "Illegality creates obscene profits that finance the murderous tactics of the drug lords; illegality leads to the corruption of law enforcement officials; illegality monopolises the efforts of honest law forces so that they are starved of resources to fight the simpler crimes of robbery, theft and assault." (Note 7) The main result of the United States war on drugs is a prison system bursting with petty drug offenders, most of them African-Americans.

Britain has never been as warlike as the United States in efforts to control drugs. British policy is, however, essentially prohibitionist, and yet about seven million people in Britain have taken cannabis at some time in their lives. (Note 8) About a quarter to a third of young people have tried solvents or illegal drugs by their 20th birthday (Note 9), and in one survey the proportion of young people who had been offered drugs rose from 2% in 1969 to 41% in 1994. (Note 9) LSD and ecstasy have now also been absorbed into mainstream youth culture, with about 9% of those aged 16 to 19 having used ecstasy and about 8% LSD. (Note 9) These high reported prevalences are likely to be true because seizures of cannabis more than tripled from 23,592 in 1984 to 107,629 in 1994, ecstasy seizures increased from 39 in 1989 to

715 in 1994, and heroin seizures rose from 2,995 in 1984 to 4,480 in 1994. (Note 10)

#### Time to consider going Dutch?

Other countries have been more willing to experiment with decriminalisation and legalization. The Netherlands effectively decriminalised penal possession of drugs in 1976, and cannabis is sold in "coffee shops." The Dutch are now coming under great pressure to reverse their experiment from neighbouring countries, worried that they are being flooded with drugs from the Netherlands. Yet the 1976 changes in the Netherlands seem to have been followed by a fall in use of cannabis: from 13 % of those aged 17-18 in 1976 to 6% in 1985." Monthly prevalence of cannabis use among Dutch high school students is around 5.4% compared with 29% in the United States. (Note 11) Forbidden fruit may, indeed, be sweetest.

One simple argument for decriminalising drugs is often used by governments in the context of tobacco: that the state has no right to interfere with what individuals do in private so long as they don't harm others. Another argument is that legalisation would cut the huge costs of enforcement, prosecution, and imprisonment. Thirdly, a legal market could allow quality control of drugs and education on how to avoid them or use them more safely; drugs might more predictably be prevented from reaching the young and vulnerable. Finally, many of the adverse health effects of drugs stem from criminalisation rather than from the drugs themselves. Anyway, current policy is clearly not driven by totting up the good and bad effects of drugs: few are more harmful than tobacco.

Although, the arguments for legalisation can be expressed forcefully, almost nobody argues for a free, legal, unregulated market for all drugs, and clearly no single policy will cover all drugs. Nadelmann says: "It is imperative that any drug policy distinguishes between casual use that results in little or no harm to anyone, drug misuse that causes harm primarily to the consumer, and drug misuse that results in palpable harm to others - and then focuses primarily on the last of these, secondarily on preventing the misuse of drugs, and little at all on casual drug use." (Note 6)

The key question is how the world would look if drugs were legal. The Australian National Task Force on Cannabis has identified five options for cannabis legislation: total prohibition; prohibition with civil penalties; partial prohibition; regulation of the production, distribution, and sale of cannabis; and free availability. (Note 12) The task force opted for keeping possession, cultivation, and sale in any quantity illegal but decriminalising "simple personal use or possession without compromising activities aimed at deterring cannabis use." Others, for instance, economist Richard Stevenson, have tried to describe a world where large companies produce, distribute, and advertise drugs like heroin and cocaine and invest heavily in research designed to produce drugs that will satisfy customers' wants while making them safer. (Note 13)

Much more work needs to be done on envisaging a world that includes some legalisation of drugs. But it's clear that purely prohibitionist policies don't work and make the problems of drug abuse worse. Governments worldwide have followed illogical and often counterproductive drug policies, primarily because drug use is seen in moral terms. Wars on drugs are doomed to failure, but experiments with decriminalising and even legalising drugs - as in the Netherlands - have shown promising results.

Policies that allow some decriminalisation and legalisation are much more likely than prohibition to succeed in achieving everybody's aim of minimising the harm from drug abuse.

RICHARD SMITH, Editor

Notes:

1. Szasz T. The morality of drug controls. In: Hamowy R, ed. *Dealing with drugs: consequences of government control*. Lexington, Mass: Lexington, 1987
2. Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons, Secretary of State for the Home Department, Secretary of State for Health, Secretary of State for Education, and the Paymaster General. *Tackling drugs together: a strategy for England for 1995-98*. London: HMSO, 1995.
3. Interdepartmental Working Group. *Sensible Drinking*. London: department of Health, 1995.
4. Sydenham T. Quoted from: Merry J. A short history of narcotic addiction and the case for regulated legislation. In: Stevenson R. *Winning the war on drugs*:

to legalise or not. London: Institute for Economic Affairs, 1994.

5. Huxley A. *The doors of perception and heaven and hell*. London: Penguin, 1959
6. Nadelmann E.A. Progressive legalisers, progressive prohibitionists and the reduction of drug related harm. In: Heather N, Wodak A, Nadelmann E, and O'Hare P, eds. *Psychoactive drugs and harm reduction: from faith to science*. London: Whurr, 1993.
7. Friedman M. An open letter to Bill Bennett. *Wall Street Journal* 1989; 7 September. A14
8. Baker O, Marsden J. *Institute for the Study of Drug Dependence. Drug misuse in Britain 1994*. London: ISSD, 1994.
9. Wright J.D., Pearl L. Knowledge and experience of young people regarding drug abuse, 1969-94. *BMJ* 1995; 310:20-4
10. Anonymous. Statistics of drug seizures and offenders dealt with, United Kingdom, 1994. *Statistical Bulletin* 1995: Issue 24/95. (ISSN 0143 6384).
11. Morgan J.P., Riley D, Chesher GB. Cannabis: legal reform, medicinal use and harm reduction. In: Heather N, Wodak A, Nadelmann E, and O'Hare P, eds. *Psychoactive drugs and harm reduction: from faith to science*. London: Whurr, 1993
12. Ali R., Christie P. *Report of the National Task Force on Cannabis*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1994.
13. Stevenson R. *Winning the war on drugs: to legalise or not*. London: Institute for Economic Affairs, 1994.

---

## Letter To The Senate Regarding Bill C 7 From The Vancouver Island Human Rights Coalition

The VIHRC decided at a meeting January 18 1996 to write to the Senate expressing concerns regarding Bill C 7. The President, Ron MacIsaac sent the following to Heather Lank, Clerk of the Senate Standing Committee:

Madam:

Re Bill C 7

The profit motive has empowered Organized Crime to the extent that since the illegalization of alcohol, opium etc., they have been able to organize an international cartel with powerful influence. The cost to all of us has been staggering.

We urge the committee to think about this. Is it worth it to support an ever growing costly

policing process. Think of how few addicts we had, and how little justice cost we had before prohibitory laws were put in place for the benefit of the Mafia.

R. MacIsaac  
President, V.I. Human Rights Coalition.

---

## **BCAPL Submits Report to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage**

If you would like a copy of the entire January 5, 1996 submission, send us \$1 and we will mail you a copy. Henry Boston wrote the submission. Here are some excerpts.

We welcome the decision of the House of Commons to appoint a Canadian Heritage Committee to study Canadian Unity and Identity, and appreciate the concern of the Committee to reach out to all Canadians. We feel honoured and privileged that we have been asked for input how we "can better communicate with one another."

We agree that unity depends on the reception of truthful communication and acceptance, and if possible celebration, of common values. We believe we have these values in the 1982 Constitution Act guaranteeing rights and freedoms in a Charter.

We believe the Canadian Charter respects the rights and freedoms of every Canadian, and that its acceptance is essential to Canadian unity.

The B.C. Anti Prohibition League claims that a person who wants to use a substance, and is not permitted to possess it, is not free, and the law which deprives of this freedom is not consistent with s.7 of the Charter of Rights.

Denying the right to partake of certain substances denies us the right to decide what happens to our bodies. This right is accepted by the medical profession which requires a patient's consent before surgery. The right for a woman to do what she wants with her own body has also been claimed in the abortion debate, and recognized by the law in the early stages of pregnancy. The legal right to take one's own life has also been accepted.

As "controlled" substances, (i.e. prohibition to the general public) carry a penalty for possession, users purchase, hide and use them secretly. An underground drug culture has developed including peer groups and youth. Young people have frequently concealed their involvement from parents. Homes have been divided. This is a consequence of prohibition. It has divided Canadians.

The B.C. Anti Prohibition League believes equality protected in the Charter gives individual Canadians both the right and responsibility to discriminate between substances, what to use and what to avoid. Prohibition teaches us to fear prohibited substances and to think of ourselves as unable to act responsibly in the choice or use of them or of plants which grow naturally. This undermines self-respect and destroys both independence and self-determination. So we see prohibition as destructive of independence, and the assumption that we could do without certain substances as arrogant interference denying s. 15. (1).

S.2 of the Canadian Charter of Rights states: "Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: (a) freedom of conscience and religion; (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression. The prohibition of substances violates these freedoms.

Conscience may require religious use of a prohibited substance in acts of worship as well as in statements of faith. Without this the conscience may not be free. Marijuana has been used in religion. The history of this use is recorded in "Marijuana in Magic and Religion" by Chris Bennett published by Access Unlimited. The Hamilton Church of the Universe is committed to sacramental use of marihuana, consequently its clergy have frequently been in prison. The Canadian Charter of Rights guarantees freedom of expression, and therefore religious practice should not be questioned. even when alcohol was prohibited the sacramental use of wine was permitted.

Freedom of thought may require experimentation in religious practice. A religious person has to practice his or her religion to experience the consequences. Mature opinion will not be established.

The argument presented in the two preceding paragraphs may also be applied to other

substances used to achieve altered states of mind in a religious or life enhancing context, as for example LSD or the psilocybe mushroom. A similar substance, peyote, is not prohibited in Canada, and is used in religion in the United States and in Mexico.

I have tried to show that the Narcotic Control Act violates s 2(a) and (b), s 7., s 12. and s.15 (1). If this is so it follows that we have a right to possess prohibited substances and governments have no right to deprive us of them. This makes search and seizure by police "unreasonable" and in violation of s. 8 of the Charter of Rights: "Everyone has the right to be secure against unreasonable search and seizure." The right to possess prohibited substances also makes incarceration a violation of s.9: "Everyone has the right not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned."

The number alienated by prohibition laws may be difficult to determine. Probably the majority of those convicted of drug offences would agree with the views expressed here, and may feel that they are not guilty, but are victims of a law, designed not to uphold justice, but to enforce conformity to the culture of those in power. Their families and friends may think the same.

A worker at the William Head prison estimated that 80% were there for drug related offences. The Canadian Correctional Service book, Basic Facts about Corrections in Canada reveals that 2,568,912 Canadians had criminal records in 1992. As criminal records are removed with a pardon the number of those who have had them would have been higher. 29,205 pardons were granted in 1992/93. This suggests that between twenty and thirty thousand pardons were given each year, so the number of Canadians who have had criminal records may be close to 3 million. 80% of that would be two million four hundred thousand. If we add sympathizers also alienated we may reach a figure of five million or more alienated by the Narcotic Control Act.

We should not be deceived by the fact that they do not protest publicly. Fear has silenced them, fear of legal penalties, fear of work privileges or opportunities lost, fear for themselves or for loved ones. But their anger and alienation divides Canada perhaps more deeply and seriously than it would be divided if Quebec were to separate.

Alienation is aggravated by fear that the Government is influenced by powerful lobbies and only pretends to be influenced by the electorate in programs such as this. This fear is strengthened by the passing of Bill C 7, The Controlled Drugs and Substances Act on the same day as the Quebec referendum.

We believe that not only national unity, but also identity would be served by a repeal of the Narcotic Control Act, which was introduced following an agreement, signed by our Minister of Health at the time, to implement recommendations of the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. As this Convention has permitted the use of alcohol and tobacco and pharmaceuticals, whilst prohibiting other substances we see it as protecting these industries rather than the health of Canadians.

We suggest a nation wide study exposing the inconsistency of the Narcotic Control Act with the Charter of Rights.

The idea of a nation wide study was previously suggested by Mark Taylor as President of the Addiction Research Foundation. He said, in a submission to the Bill C 7 Committee: "We call on Parliament and the government to undertake a thorough reappraisal of Canada's response to drug use. We strongly urge that this sub committee expand its hearings and talk to people across Canada in order to conduct a full reassessment. If the committee is unable to undertake such a review, we strongly urge that a Royal Commission be established." With regard to the philosophic base of laws continued in Bill C 7 he said: "It is time to re examine that philosophic base because there is little respect for the law as it currently exists."

We have been exposed, for so long, to the supposition that the penal code is the appropriate answer to substance abuse, that it is necessary to inform Canadians that the Narcotic Control Act and prohibition laws in the Food and Drugs Act violate the Canadian Charter of Rights.

It is a running sore, a putrefied cancer, a civil war, which drains our energies, and destroys our national character. This problem cannot be ignored by the House committee to Study Canadian Unity and Identity.



It would seem that as the House Committee is reaching out to hear from all cultural backgrounds that more time should be given, and an attempt made to hear from those who feel that their freedom has been taken away either by denial of a substance they want, or by incarceration for breaking a prohibition ruling.

---

## Chemical McCarthyism

An Article Published In *Justice Report*, A Publication Of The Canadian Criminal Justice Association, Vol. 9, No. 4 (1993).

The 20th century may well be remembered as the century that proved the failure of prohibition. Prohibition of alcohol failed throughout the 1920s. Prohibition of drugs has failed throughout the century. Still, as we prepare to enter the next millennium, we risk perpetrating these disastrous mistakes.

Drug prohibition started in Canada with Mackenzie King's 1908 Opium Act. The decades that followed have seen a pattern of increasingly repressive and irrational measures that have done little to stop the use of drugs. What they have done is to further the profitability and violence associated with the drug trade. These same measure have also forced those unfortunate enough to have chosen the wrong drug -- marijuana, heroin, or cocaine, instead of alcohol, nicotine or prescription drugs -- to be stigmatized, alienated and prosecuted. They have curtailed the hard-won civil liberties, not just of the drug users, but of all Canadians.

One can only hope that, when the next millennium arrives, we will be able to look back on Bill C-85 (precursor to Bill C-7) and other prohibitionist legislation and shake our heads in wonder. As we shake our heads, we will ask how we allowed ourselves to succumb so blindly to the chemical McCarthyism of the 20th century.

---

## Study Program Announcement

Submitted by Henry Boston

The next session of the study program will be on Monday March 4 at James Bay United Church in

Victoria at 7.30 p.m. in the South Room. This may be reached by going up the ramp beside the church and through the office.

The topic will be on Psychedelic Substances and Sacraments. Speakers have been invited who will draw upon their own experience of using psychedelic substances such as the psilocybe mushroom, LSD, peyote or marijuana as sacraments. Relevant literature will be referred to including Chris Bennett's Marijuana in Magic and Religion and David Christie's publication of Jay Courtney Fikes, Carlos Castaneda, Academic Opportunism and the psychedelic Sixties. An interpretation of the Protestant Christian view of the sacrament will also be given.

This is the fourth study in this series, and will be followed on April 1 by the history of the Canadian and International legislation since the second world war, and on May 6th. by a consideration of strategy for changing the law.

While each of these studies is planned as a unit which may be taken on its own, printouts of previous studies can be made for interested persons at a cost of \$1.00 per study.

---

## Rafflemania

Submitted by Judy Smith

And the winner is ---- (in which the raffle draw for the psychedelic pendant advertised in our last newsletter is described).

The scene was a crowded and noisy hemp shop, with a rush of last minute ticket buyers and many watchers-of-the-draw. After the appropriate fanfare, the name drawn was.....Ian Hunter, the proprietor of Sacred Herb where the draw was being held.

Feeling that this could be badly interpreted by anyone who wasn't there to see how honest we were, Ian graciously forfeited his win and another name was drawn -- this time it was...Ian Hunter!! What a knack this fellow had! As Ian was determined not to accept the prize we went back to the hemp hat for a third time -- and the winner was.... Judy Smith! I was delighted! I really wanted that pendant and had bought several tickets on it, and besides, I'd had a feeling that I would win because of an omen that

very morning-- I'd seen a fireball, a large silvery-bright meteorite burning up in the earth's atmosphere, which sighting earned me an interview by one of the astronomers from UVic. So it had been a great day, and this was the crowning glory! I danced with happiness... until someone associated with the League (BCAPL) suggested that it would not look good in this newsletter to announce that the winner of the raffle was the organizer of said raffle! "No," I cried, "I won it fair and square!" I was loath to give the pendant up. Well, a wild discussion ensued, with half the people saying it was rightfully mine, and the other half saying it wouldn't look good. I ranted and pouted, but at last accepted the realization that even though I had won fairly, the slightest suspicion of dishonesty of myself or of the League would take all the joy out of the pendant for me. So with great disappointment and childish behaviour I gave up the pendant.

Another name was drawn ---- Judy Smith!! (I did have several tickets in there!) So the uproar started all over again. I received counsel from both sides: "See, it was meant for you!" and "It won't look good." I appealed to Ian, who had so graciously given up his win, but I knew in my heart that he couldn't advise me to keep it, and he couldn't. My prize, my beautiful prize that I had dreamed of winning, and which the fireball had foretold, was going to have to be given up. So after another tantrum I gave the go-ahead to draw another name.

The fifth and final name drawn, the eventual winner of that unique hand-crafted pendant was - Jessy Oake. CONGRATULATIONS, JESSY - a hard fought battle (believe me!) and a nice Christmas present for you.

The raffle brought in \$135 for the APL and many thanks to Mark Reynolds for donating his work and giving us all the excitement and financial help which ensued.

---

## Monthly Meetings

You are cordially invited to drop in at any of our regular monthly meetings at Monday Magazine's board room at 1609 Blanshard Street, Victoria on the third Monday in each month at 7.00 p.m. Just be at the front door at 7:00 PM.

---

## Funding

Don't forget, we need your donations in order to continue the fight against drug prohibition. The Vancouver Island Libertarian Association (VILA) has agreed to provide directed donation forms which will allow you to receive a tax deduction for your contributions through VILA to us. Just write to the Vancouver Island Libertarian Association, P.O. Box 8245, Victoria BC V8W 3R9, to receive a copy, or phone 595 4105, or pick one up at our monthly meeting.

Or you can simply mail your contribution to us at PO Box, 8179, Victoria, BC, V8W 3R9

---

## Please renew your Newsletter subscription

Subscriptions to our newsletter have been our main source of funding, not only for the cost of printing and mailing, but also for telephone and rally expenses.

Unfortunately, very few of our subscribers have paid a subscription lately. To encourage more of our readers to pay, we have reduced the annual charge for the newsletter to \$8 (four issues), and to discontinue mailing to those who send no subscription.

**If you have not kept your subscription up to date, you will find a renewal letter in your next issue.**

Exceptions may be made for those who contribute in some way or who write to us explaining why they are unable to pay.

---

**The British Columbia Anti-Prohibition League is an umbrella organization advocating the public and government recognition of the individual Canadian's natural, human and legal right to personally determine his or her own religion, lifestyle and consumption.**

You can purchase a subscription to the BCAPL Newsletter from the League or from any of our associates:

The Fans of the Psilocybe  
Mushroom Association  
Box 8179, Victoria, B.C., V8W  
3R8

Hemp Council  
# 106 - 561 Johnson Street  
Victoria, B.C.,

Vancouver Island Libertarian  
Assoc., P.O. Box 8245  
Victoria, B.C.  
V8W 3R9