

November 6th Election Issues

Readers: Note the “new look” of Tax Talk. More pages, more print, faster delivery to you.

Enjoy

A number of Placer County agencies are holding, or considering, mail in ballot elections under Prop 218, similar to the method used by the infamous Mosquito Abatement District’s Spring rip-off of Placer County voters. **North Tahoe Fire District** is currently conducting such a vote on an assessment increase. The details are obscure as well as the amount, since Tahoe did not respond to County Clerk Jim McCauley’s request for information. He has no part in the issue.

Similarly, **Foresthill Fire District** is *considering* such an assessment election. Voters should beware of such tactics of not using the County Elections Office for tax issues. The League recommends a **NO** vote on such elections.

Loomis Fire District is also issuing a mail-in ballot assessment, but it will be conducted through the County Elections Department. CED will mail out, receive and count the ballots—no underhanded tactics there. **Loomis Union School District** will request a vote on a bond measure, through normal CED procedures and participation.

- Wally Reemelin

LEAGUE RECOMMENDATIONS NOVEMBER 6, 2007 ELECTION

LOOMIS FIRE DISTRICT - Needs a new board. Fresh ideas and more competency are required.

**VOTER
CHOICE**

LOOMIS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT - \$17.7 million bonds. Better than in 2006, but still needs to cut off more fat.

NO

LOOMIS/OPHIR SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION - Will achieve lower costs and better management.

YES

A Hoax...

continued from page 1

arising from terrorism and proliferation of nuclear weapons. We must not divert so much of our resources on hyped hysteria of the “non-problem.” of man-made warming and direct our attention at these real problems.

- Wally Reemelin

For a free, full text of Dr. Singer’s remarks write to Imprimus, c/o Hillsdale College, 33 E. College Street, Hillsdale, MI 49242. - Ed.

Given...

continued from page 4

egalitarian system where the wealth is nearly evenly distributed, even if this means the complete destruction of productivity. Better that we are all equal and poor than that we are unequal and most of us quite well off, with some even extraordinarily wealthy.

Never mind this last alternative—it’s a loser for sure, and only dreamers who would attempt to remake human nature support it. But what about those who find fault with full, laissez-faire capitalism because of its refusal to allow government to provide for those in dire straits and such? Don’t they have a point? Yes, they do, but they draw inferences from it that do not follow. It is possible in a fully capitalist system for some to be left out. There can be innocent hard-luck cases, no doubt about that. What does not follow is that government ought to do something for such people.

Instead, free men and women would have to resolve to lend a hand where needed. And it’s rank cynicism to deny that they would—after all, it is precisely in semicapitalist systems that charity and philanthropy thrive today. Furthermore, to think that such help would not be forthcoming undermines the very idea that it is used to support: that democratic governments can step in and do the job.

continued on page 6

