

San Mateo Libertarian

Volume VII, Number 3 Editor: Delmas Gault March 1997

Bond Arguments Due March 24 by Christopher Schmidt

It's Spring, and politicians' thoughts turn to...getting us deeper in debt.

June ballots on the peninsula will contain no fewer than 6 bond measures, in the school districts of Redwood City (\$44 million), San Carlos (\$22 million), Belmont (\$12 million), San Mateo-Foster City (\$79 million), Laguna Salada (\$30 million), and South San Francisco (\$40 million). {*footnote: Several of these school districts encompass neighboring cities.} If all pass, peninsula home owners will find their properties encumbered by an additional \$227 million in public debt and obligated to pay an additional quarter-billion in interest during the period of the obligations. In total, that's almost \$1000 for every man, woman, and child in the affected areas, or enough to fund 5 million square feet of construction at \$100 per square foot. That's 35% larger than the Defense Department Pentagon (at 3.7 million square feet).

The time for action is now! Ballot arguments against these bond measures should be submitted by March 24 to Crystal Bertheau (phone (415) 312-5370) at the County Elections office on Tower Road in San Mateo. The rules for submissions should appear in the "public notices" section of the March 5 issue of the San Mateo County Times. Rebuttals are due April 3.

I plan to submit an argument against the Redwood City measure, but we need volunteers for the other districts. If you plan to submit an argument, please send me email or leave a message on my machine at (415) 369-6986.

In June 1993, arguments by Redwood City Libertarians opposed to similar school bonds appeared on the ballot and both bonds failed. In November 1996 no argument had been submitted against another Redwood City school bond issue and the bond passed. Your action now could make the difference!

Christopher Schmidt (CVASchmidt@ACM.org) is the Secretary of the LPSM.

Should Cloning be Controlled?

Cloning--whether of animals or humans--is one of the "most exciting and important scientific breakthroughs of the 20th Century" and should not be prohibited by the government says the Libertarian Party.

"Politicians should not have veto power over the creation of new life--especially human life," said Steve Dasbach, the party's chairman. "That's why the Libertarian Party supports reproductive freedom of choice for Americans--whether they choose to reproduce using the traditional method, or artificial insemination, or in-vitro fertilization, or cloning."



Cloning, once thought impossible, has suddenly become a hotly debated topic after scientists in Scotland successfully cloned an adult sheep. Biologists say the same technique could be used to clone human beings--making exact genetic duplicates of individuals.

But several groups are demanding that the technology be banned by the government. A 1994 National Institutes of Health panel declared that human cloning is unethical and should not be allowed, and the Biotechnology Industry Organization said this week that it should be "prohibited by law."

"Yes, cloning of human beings does raise serious ethical issues, but those issues are best addressed by individuals, doctors, and scientists--not politicians," said Dasbach. "It would be a shame if frightened politicians slammed the door on one of the most exciting and important scientific breakthroughs of the 20th Century."

"Animal cloning might produce life-saving drugs," Dasbach said. "Human cloning might help eliminate genetic diseases. Do we want to give politicians the power to play God over the lives of suffering people--or, just as bad, give them the power to ban a new, cloned human life before it begins?"

Although the [Libertarian Party Platform](#) does not specifically address the issue of human cloning, it does state: "We condemn attempts at the federal, state, or local level to cripple the advance of science by governmental restriction of research."

Meeting Notes by Christopher Schmidt

February's business meeting was well-attended. It's nice to meet members whom we might otherwise know only as names on mailing labels!

Most of the meeting was spent reviewing the LP of California's annual convention, held the previous weekend in Sacramento. Mary, Mike, Delmas, and Kate represented us and those present related their observations.

Delmas told us about minor changes in the by-laws and platform; election of new state LP officers; and (most exciting!) the proposed unification of our membership with that of the LP National Committee.

At present, there are 2015 dues-paying members of the Libertarian Party of California and 3339 dues-paying members of the Libertarian

Party National Committee in California. You might guess that they are pretty much the same group of people, but you'd be wrong! A recent study conducted by Joe Dehn (of Palo Alto) found that two-thirds of the members of the latter group are *not* members of the LPC! By merging our memberships, both groups will grow to 4257 members in California. If our region (county) is typical, that means growing from roughly 60 to roughly 127 members. This is an excellent prospect because dues-paying members are the primary group on which we draw for candidates and for volunteers to circulate and sign petitions--i.e. the primary function of a local party organization.

Mike commented on the presence of national LP figures such as Steve Dasbach and Harry Browne at the convention. He said they talked up the importance of working more professionally (which means recruiting more members and raising more money), looking towards 1998 and 2000; and working more closely with the LP National Committee office. At this point in the meeting we had a wide-ranging discussion of what people can do locally to increase the impact of libertarian ideas. Mike talked about how effective one or two people can be at city council meetings. I suggested that our volunteer pool would be adequate to support a candidate running for local office like city council or school board.

Delmas related some advice David Nolan (founding member of the party) gave at the convention. He suggested that complex issues, such as the privatization of Social Security are a hard sell because it's usually impractical for the listener to put in the time to understand how privatization would work. He opined that easy-to-understand issues are better for outreach--e.g. the legalization of marijuana, increased protection for private property rights, and reduction of taxes.

People from other regions at the convention suggested that we might do well to move our meetings to a local restaurant and perhaps invite featured speakers. We have done both in the past, but in recent years have not found a suitable venue. If any reader knows of an inexpensive restaurant that will let us reserve a small room for 5-15 people (without a fee), please call or write anyone in the mast head with your suggestion. A mid-county location would be preferred.

Prior to the meeting we discussed the new format of this newsletter. Everyone likes the new design, but the 11" x 17" page costs a mint to print. If anyone knows a south county copy shop that prints this size cheaply, let us know!

Christopher Schmidt (CVASchmidt@ACM.org) is the Secretary of the LPSM.

Top 20 Problems Taxpayers Face when Dealing with the IRS

1. Complexity
2. Accessing the IRS by telephone
3. Unclear or "inappropriate tone" in IRS correspondence
4. Erroneous IRS notices
5. Problems understanding federal tax deposit rules
6. Compliance burden of small businesses
7. Administration of penalties
8. Lack of IRS understanding of taxpayers' concerns
9. IRS delays in compliance contacts
10. Determining and maintaining taxpayers' current addresses
11. Cost to taxpayers of electronic filing
12. Administration of earned income tax credit
13. Abatement of interest due because of IRS delays
14. Problems in mailing forms and vouchers
15. Separate mailing of math error notices and affected refund checks
16. Delays in processing offers in compromise
17. Burden caused by cash management practices
18. Lack of acknowledgment of taxpayers' submissions and payments
19. Lack of one-stop service
20. Inconvenient times and locations for doing business with IRS

Source: IRS

Libertarians in California Office

Peter Barry, MD
Mayor, City of Ross

Jerry Douglas
Virgenes Resource Conservation Dist. Dir.

Bonnie Flickinger
Moreno Valley City Council

Michael Gentry
Lake Los Angeles Town Council

Thomas Gligorea
San Diego County Municipal Court Judge

Eric Henrikson
Tahoe City P U Board

Nyle Keller
Loomis Co. School Board

David McCann
Orangevale Parks And Recreation District Board

Lundi Moore

Morgan Hill School Board
LeRoy Nelson
Manhattan Beach School Board
Art Olivier
Bellflower City Council
Robert Patchen
Mayor Pro Tem, Villa Park
Dennis Schlumpf
Tahoe City PU Director
Thomas Tryon
Calaveras Co. Supervisor
Sandi Webb
Simi Valley City Council

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor,

Advertise widely for applicants for political office. Use rigorous tests, including psychological evaluation, to select the best applicant for the political group for the position of political office.



Rep. Carolyn McCarthy was put in office by an antigun-violence group. So there is no reason why the Libertarian Party cannot do the same.

John Newell

Quotes & Notes

"The 105th Congress has been in session less than two months and more than 200 tax bills have already been introduced."
Lee Monks, Taxpayer Advocate

Pro-CODE Act

US Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA) joined a group of nineteen US Senators in introducing the "Promotion of Commerce Online in the Digital Era (Pro-CODE) Act", a bill designed to promote privacy and security on the Internet by relaxing government controls on encryption technologies.

For more information on the Pro-CODE bill, visit the Encryption Policy Resource Page-- <http://www.crypto.com>