

Positions on the state propositions for Nov 3

Opinions of the LP of San Mateo County's central committee

by Christopher Schmidt

At the September 16 meeting, we discussed the upcoming election and voted to make the following ballot recommendations:

Prop 1 Tax Re-Assessment Limitations for Contaminated Properties

Vote: **Yes** (4--0--1) (Y--N--A)

Notes: Allows owners of contaminated property (who didn't cause the contamination) to repair or exchange the property without triggering property tax reassessment, thereby redressing the tax incentive to let contaminated property remain in that state indefinitely.

Prop 2 Transportation Funds Lending Policy

Vote: **Position not taken** (0--3--2)

Notes: Although we were sympathetic to the stated intent of this proposition (i.e., limiting the state's discretionary ability to borrow from transportation funds), most were put off by the provision that makes Local Transportation Funds (and presumably the sales taxes that fund them) a permanent feature of the state constitution.

Prop 3 Presidential Primary Ballots

Vote: **No** (0--4--1)

Notes: Historically, political parties were free to choose delegates to their presidential nominating conventions according to their own rules. Modern law in many states requires that each party's delegation be elected in a state-sponsored winner-take-all primary. Eschewing this system, the LPC's state convention elects the delegates to the LP's national convention. An interesting side-effect of Prop. 198 (which allows *all* voters to vote in *any* party's presidential primary) is that all political parties (by virtue of a U.S. Supreme Court ruling) now have the option to reject California's state-designated delegation and seat a delegation according to their own rules instead--as the LP does. Prop. 3 would not repeal Prop. 198, but additionally specify a state balloting system intended to recreate the exclusion of non-registrants from each party's state-run primary election (to avoid awkward convention rule-making for the big parties). We believe that all parties should be free to select their own convention delegations and oppose this attempt to legislate a state-sponsored system at odds with our own.

Prop 4 Steel-Jawed Trap & Compound 1080 Ban

Vote: **Position not taken** (0--3--2)

Notes: Most of those present argued that land owners are in a better position to judge the relative cruelty of traps, poisons, and other animal control methods than are voters at large. This writer stated that he would be voting "Yes" on a natural rights theory of animal protection, but (along with another member) voted abstention on the grounds that the LPSM shouldn't take a position where a subjective measure of cruelty is called for (and not the objective standards we try to apply to most propositions).

Prop 5 Tribal State Gaming Compacts

Vote: **Yes**(4--0--1)

Notes: We were generally happy with the terms of this initiative. Although it falls short of a libertopian vision of sovereignty, it has the virtue of not forcing its terms on any tribe not electing to adopt the compact prescribed.

Prop 6 Banning Horsemeat for Human Consumption

Vote: **No** (0--5--0)

Notes: No one had any words of support for this proposal to legislate a particular aesthetic/culinary preference and we found the felony classification excessive.

Prop 7 "Air Quality" Board Slush Fund

Vote: **No** (0--5--0)

Notes: Fifteen pages of fine print would create a \$2.8 billion slush fund to be handed out in the form of tax credits to the "private sector" cronies of various state bureaucracies, at the discretion of special boards. A telling table on page 105 divvies up the swag. This is corporate welfare at its worst. The measure also duplicates Prop. 2's provision that would make Local Transportation Funds (and presumably the sales taxes that fund them) permanent.

Prop 8 More State Public School Mandates

Vote: **No** (0--5--0)

Notes: This one's another grab bag of "great ideas" from state centralizers to be forced on local school districts (presumed to be too stupid to adopt appropriate policies on their own). A newly created state bureaucracy ("Office of Chief Inspector of Public Schools") and mandatory pupil expulsion for drug possession (currently discretionary) stood out as reasons we recommend a "No" vote.

Prop 9 Repudiation of Electricity Industry RestructuringVote: **No** (0--4--1)

Notes: Prior to the state's restructure of the electricity industry earlier this year, utilities selected and built power plants in a context created by the state PUC: planned, predictable revenues (stretching over decades); a broad mix of power plant types; and a goal of minimizing CO₂ emissions. To prevent utilities from losing the customers of the more costly power plants under restructuring (mostly the non-CO₂ producers) the state issued \$6 billion in bonds. These bonds pay off the portion of the capitalization costs of those power plants that would otherwise be unrecoverable in an environment of price-driven consumer choice (stabilizing the transition and averting a frenzy of coal and oil-fired power plant construction). This measure seeks to screw utility shareholders by mandating lower electricity prices and by repudiating the electric rate surcharge which goes to pay off the bonds. We recommend a "No" vote because of the basic inequity of the measure, because of the price control, and because (after litigation) the defaulted bonds would likely become the obligations of the state's taxpayers.

Prop 10 New Tobacco Tax; New Commissions; New GiveawaysVote: **No** (0--5--0)

Notes: \$750 million annually. 'Nuff said?

Prop 1A More School Bonds...Vote: **No** (0--5--0)

Notes: \$9.2 Billion Dollars. ...Or roughly \$1,000 per household, to be repaid, *plus* interest, over 4 years. What household couldn't better spend that money on their *own* children? (not to mention fairness to households without children)

Prop 11 Local Sales and Use Taxes Revenue SharingVote: **Position not taken**

Notes: Like Prop. 1A, this measure was put on the ballot after the regular deadline, so detailed information was not available for public scrutiny. To protest this misbehavior (which has become routine) we voted 5--0--0 to recommend voting *against* it. If it's such a great measure, they can always bring it back at the next election for proper consideration.

Mark Hinkle's speech at the September social

by Steve Marsland

Mark Hinkle, the Chairman of the Libertarian Party of California, gave a great talk at the San Mateo Howard Johnson's on Sunday, September 27. In attendance were a number of local party officers, party members, and candidates Mike Moloney and Steve Marsland.

Mark talked about the efforts underway by Juan Ros--the new Director of the LPC--to make contacts and gain influence in the state by identifying and working with allied organizations. He reported that already Juan had secured official endorsements of some Libertarian candidates by the Gun Owners organization mostly thanks to a visit by Juan to the executive director of the Gun Owners.

Mark also explained how his drive for clear goals and increased professionalism of the party was getting results--increased funding and membership, and an increase in the number of candidates.

Mark pointed out that he was successful in meeting his first goals of increasing party membership to 5,000 and doubling the budget of the state party. He also talked about a plan to work with the national party on a version of Project Archimedes. He hoped he could get the state LP to donate some funds to the national LP so they could add things to their mailings on our behalf.

After the talk, Mike Moloney called for increased teamwork between the state party and our region, which has two leading candidates this fall (Mike and Steve Marsland). There was a constructive discussion about how to better link up the efforts of the state and local party. It was agreed that Juan Ros would swing by on his next visit in the area to spend an hour with Mike and Steve. This will enable the state party to learn how Mike and Steve have done so well in their elections.

Moloney campaign poised for finale

by Bernie Jackson

Mike Moloney has returned to the street corners--and, this time, the newsrooms--for the pre-election homestretch. After his top showing in the June primary, Moloney took a break until September 1, when he returned to neighborhood corners from San Mateo to Millbrae with renewed vigor.

On September 25, Moloney attended an anti-Clinton rally outside the San Francisco Hilton, where Hillary Clinton came to speak at a fund raiser for Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer. The protesters, fed up and without a viable Republican candidate, were excited to meet him. On September 27, he discussed strategy with Libertarian State Chair Mark Hinkle, exploring some options for working with the state party as the campaign enters its homestretch.

Moloney has five scheduled appearances so far for the month of October. He will give four policy addresses at community centers around the Bay Area, sponsored by San Mateo High School Adult Education: 10 am October 6 at San Mateo Central Park, 1pm October 14 at San Bruno Senior Center, 2pm October 19 at Hillsdale Manor, and 1:30pm Tuesday, October 27 at the Millbrae Recreation Center.

He will also participate in a KQED candidates' panel on October 28 from 1010:30am, which will be broadcast live on 88.5 FM.

The Moloney campaign has begun to attract media attention. John Horgan of the San Mateo County Times interviewed Mike for an hour on September 29 and promises to feature Mike in his October 5 column. Phone calls to other local news editors have resulted in eager inquiries for more information. Press releases are slated to go out regularly through November 3, at the rate of about two per week, concerning Mike's scheduled appearances, his plans to campaign at upcoming public events, and his comments on current affairs that are likely to break in the news. You can always see the latest releases on the web at <http://www.moloney98.org>.

free ACLU student conference

The Howard A. Friedman First Amendment Project of the [ACLU](#) is sponsoring a free conference open to all high school students at UC Berkeley on October 27 (8:30am-3:00pm). The 5 themes all include topics of interest to libertarian students: "zero tolerance" policies, privacy, freedom of expression, discrimination & tolerance, and a press clinic. For more information, or to register, contact Nancy Otto at 415/621-2006 ext. #37 or at ffp1aclunc@aol.com

September meeting notes

by **Christopher Schmidt**

September's meeting ran a little long--because we had 12 propositions to examine--but I hope you will find the results of our deliberations worth the effort. *[See the article at [top](#).]* In other business, we discussed volunteers and signs for the October 10 "BBQ with the Candidates" at Garin Park in Hayward (11 am-3 pm) and approved a special recruitment mailing to some of the precincts where Mike Moloney garnered one-sixth of the vote back in June.

Next meeting of the LP of San Mateo County:

Wednesday, October 21
Prime Time Athletic Club
1730 Rollins Road, Burlingame (between Broadway and Millbrae Avenue)
Informal chat/dinner: 6:30--7:30pm in the café
Business meeting: 7:30--9:00pm in the multipurpose room.