

The Connecticut Libertarian

June 2001

The Official Newsletter of the Libertarian Party of Connecticut

www.lpct.org

What to do with partial solutions

by James Madison

In the April issue of TCL, readers were asked to consider whether Libertarian officeholders should support legislation that implements partial solutions even if such legislation still leaves enough government in place to cause problems. The question was also taken up at the April meeting.

The general consensus and the meeting and from those who replied was to support such legislation, but do so with great protest.

"I think Libertarian officeholders should support partial solutions, and then loudly advocate further freedom as the solution to the undesirable effects," said George Smith of New Hartford.

Others observed that it has to be considered on a case by case basis because there is no way to determine one sweeping approach in advance.

"It depends on the circumstances and the issues," said Wrascal Thomas of Hartford. "So many governmental 'solutions' go wrong because they try to apply one solution to all problems or take something that they see work in one situation and apply it to all situations."

In the end it is up to each Libertarian, elected or not, to determine his or her own stance on each issue. Even with our rock-solid philosophy, the details can sometimes get quite complex.

•

2001 Bills before the Connecticut Legislature

by James Madison

HARTFORD – Each year, thousands of bills are proposed and considered by the Connecticut legislature. Only a handful pass, some come up for a vote and fail, others die in committee, and most never have any action taken on them.

To help people understand where an elected Libertarian at the state level might stand on real-world legislation, the LPCT occasionally reviews the bills and takes a position on some of the more pertinent ones.

Visit ftp://ftp.cga.state.ct.us/pub/data/bill_info.txt for the full list of this year's legislation. Some of the more interesting ones from this year are below.

If you have a different perspective or would vote a different way if elected, write to tcl@lpct.org with your thoughts.

Bill: SB01402. *Summary:* To eliminate the local pistol permit, while continuing to require the local police to conduct a criminal history check and giving the local police the right to deny a permit, to state that a person must be twenty-one to obtain a gun permit, and to make other corrections. *Position:* Despite all the regulation this proposal leaves in place, it does remove one layer of firearm-owner registration. *Vote:* Yes.

Bill: HB05810. *Summary:* To confer minor party status for all elected offices on a party that has a candidate who receives at least one per cent of the votes cast for a state office. *Position:* This is a fantastic idea. Whatever organization came up this one really knows how make the electoral process more efficient and should be put in charge of everything! (That would be the LPCT for those who missed the saga) *Vote:* Yes.

Bill: HB05127. *Summary:* An act studying the feasibility of a bridge or tunnel to long island. To promote economic development and improve transportation to Long Island. *Position:* If this is a good idea, the private sector will be more adept at figuring it out and implementing it than the government. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05067. *Summary:* To provide a monetary fine for individuals whose use of a cellular telephone while driving contributes to a motor vehicle accident. *Position:* Drivers should be allowed to make their own decisions about whether they can handle a phone in the car. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05141. *Summary:* To make the prevailing wage requirements voluntary instead of mandatory. *Position:* The real solution is to end all government wage controls in any form, but at least this moves in the right direction. *Vote:* Yes

See 2001 Bills, Page 2

2001 Bills

Bill: HB05301. *Summary:* To require health insurers to cover prostate cancer screening for men at risk for the disease. *Position:* Government mandates on health insurance drive up the price and force more and more people to go without health insurance. "To require" does not mean free. It means you have to pay for it whether you want it or not. The resulting rise in price is why 45 million people cannot afford health insurance. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05300. *Summary:* To require health insurers to offer coverage to the dependent child of a policyholder until age twenty-one, instead of the current age of nineteen, if the child is not a full-time student in an accredited school. *Position:* Same as above. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05298. *Summary:* To require health insurance plans to cover hearing aids. *Position:* Same as above. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05299. *Summary:* To require health insurers to cover treatment for temporomandibular joint dysfunction. *Position:* Same as above. *Vote:* No.

[Editor's Note: I'm providing multiple health insurance bills with the same answer for a reason. Statists often point out that 45 million people have no health insurance. But why is that? It is because the government keeps heaping on health insurance mandates. The above bills are just a sample, for just this legislative session, in just our state. Combine them with 49 other states, countless federal mandates, and year upon year of such intervention, and you can see why health insurance is such a mess. So if someone asks for the Libertarian solution to 45 million people without health insurance, tell them: End government mandates on health insurance!]

Bill: SB01384. *Summary:* To provide that the failure of an operator or passenger of a motor vehicle to wear a seat belt does not constitute grounds for a police officer to stop the motor vehicle. *Position:* Driving without a seatbelt increases the danger only to the person doing it and is therefore a personal choice. *Vote:* Yes.

Bill: HB05380. *Summary:* To provide for comprehensive campaign finance reform. *Position:* "Campaign finance reform" is a meaningless term used to disguise further restrictions on how you can contribute your own money. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05137. *Summary:* To correct an overly broad prohibition on campaign contributions that prohibits otherwise reasonable and proper participation in political campaigns by interested citizens. *Position:* indecipherable bureaucracy keeps the average person out and further entrenches the groups in power because only they can afford to hire the lawyers and lobbyists to needed to work the system. *Vote:* Yes.

Bill: HB05290. *Summary:* To include unsubsidized but "affordable" units within the definition of affordable units under the affordable housing land use

appeals act. *Position:* Government should not be in the business of housing at all, but at least this bill supports an often missed reality: the private sector can create housing that is affordable without being subsidized with tax money. *Vote:* Yes.

Bill: HB05278. *Summary:* To broaden the availability of captioned movies to hearing-impaired persons. *Position:* Just as the Americans with Disabilities Act resulted in a decrease in employment of the handicapped and the federal hate crime laws are being used against African-Americans at twice the rate it is being used against whites, this bill will inevitably not do what it is intended to do. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05195. *Summary:* To expand the state Lemon Law to include computers. *Position:* Giving people recourse in the courts is a proper government function. Since most lemon laws focus on clarifying the consumer's recourse after the purchase rather than regulating the producer's rights before, they are generally good. *Vote:* Yes.

Bill: HB05030. *Summary:* To exempt state employees who do not engage in private practice from occupational licensing fees. *Position:* when the government exempts itself from its own regulations, it makes it harder for the rest of us to ever get rid of those regulations. The government and it's employees must live under the same laws as the rest of us. *Vote:* No.

Bill: HB05105. *Summary:* To ensure that citizens' expectation of privacy is not infringed and freedom of speech and association is not inhibited by prohibiting video surveillance by law enforcement officers in public areas unless there is individualized suspicion of wrongdoing and a panel of judges has authorized such surveillance. *Position:* This limits government power and brings the principle of probable cause and judicial review into the modern world. *Vote:* Yes.

Meeting Notice: The LPCT will meet at 9:00 a.m. on Saturday, June 9th in Waterbury. All members are welcome and bringing visitors is *strongly* encouraged. The atmosphere is casual, and all things Libertarian are up for discussion, from the purely philosophical to the painfully practical. Hope to see you there!

Directions:

East/West

- Route 84 to Waterbury
- Exit 20 to Route 8 North
- Route 8 about 1 mile (*Go to North/South below*)

North/South

- Exit 36 on Rt. 8, "Huntingdon/Colonial Ave."
- Right at the light at the bottom of exit
- Go straight through 3 lights up a slight hill
- At the 4th light, take a right onto Cooke Street
- Go up a steep hill
- Take 5th left onto Avalon Circle
- Go halfway up the circle,
- Slate blue house with white garage, #100