

MINIMIZE GOVERNMENT
Copyright 2013, Paul Spite
For inclusion in newsletters, all other rights reserved

In the legend of King Arthur, the need for law became apparent as the strongest in society used their advantage of strength to rob and plunder weaker members of society. They grew wealthy as highway robbers, making travel both dangerous and expensive. It was only by banding together, effectively creating laws to govern the unlawful, that weaker members of society could regain the freedom to move from place to place and engage in commerce. Government became the answer to highway robbery. How sad when it becomes perpetrators of the same.

Aristocracy assumes the right, by reason of station by birth, to impose their assumed superiority upon lesser members of society of law. They decide for everyone of lesser intelligence what is good and proper for their lives. As a nation, we rejected that method of governing sometime around 1776. Now that approach to government seems to be creeping back into America. Far too many regulations are being passed on the whim of legislators. Worse, they are imposed on all to create unfair advantages for a select few, for whatever reasons.

Given the widespread and seemingly inevitable corruption of power, it is reasonable to believe fewer laws are far better than many laws. This is for several reasons.

Since one of the purposes of government is protect liberty, and all regulations remove some degree of liberty, if we err, it is better to err on the side of liberty.

Every law, even those with good intentions, creates legal loopholes. What does not comply with the intent of the law, but is not included in the language of the law, becomes justified by the language that failed to exclude it. The way we treat one another is most often worsened, not improved, by the passing of legislation. Adding more verbiage to the legislation simply creates more loopholes.

It is also far too difficult to remove bad legislation, once it has passed. For this reason alone, great care and consideration should be used before passing anything new. No laws are better than bad laws.

Inflation can be directly tied to legislation. Every law passed carries a cost that will be passed on to taxpayers in one form or another. There is a reason taxpayers flee from municipalities imposing heavy tax burdens on constituents. What does that mean to the average taxpayer stuck in those locations? It results in fewer hands available to carry the property tax load.

Too many times, regulations are also passed for which exemptions and variances must be sought time and time again. If some form of legislation or regulation is actually necessary, what possible exemptions would need to be granted? These should be built into the language of the regulation to begin with. Citizens should not have to beg for permission to do what should have been already exempted by common sense.

Moreover, if laws are deemed necessary, once passed, they should be applied absolutely equally to everyone. When exemptions are granted to one individual or minority interest, an unfair advantage has just been given to that individual over the majority which elected officials promised to represent. If an exemption is granted, the regulation or legislation should immediately be rewritten to make that exemption part of the law and applicable to all. If too many exemptions are needed, the rule is most probably unnecessary or poorly conceived and should immediately be repealed.

Before any new legislation is passed, a few significant questions might be in order.

- Does this really need to be regulated by government?
- If this is passed, will the majority of taxpayers in the city really desire to be regulated in this fashion? Do citizens really want more restrictions on rights guaranteed them in the Constitution?
- Who will this regulation benefit? Why would taxpayers in general want their employees to pass rules to benefit just a few, at a cost to everyone else?

Here is just one example of where this kind of thinking might lead. Who decided uncontrollable police dogs should be used by law enforcement agencies as weapons against us and our children. These

are animals. They do not think through the consequences of the actions guided by instincts. Why would the citizens of whatever cities use these want hard earned tax dollars repeatedly used for settlements in civil cases involving the attempted and misguided use of these animals?

Governmental agencies should not only accept moral, financial, and ethical responsibility for the actions of employees. They should also take steps to prevent their reoccurrence. There are far too many truthful allegations of abuse of power. There should be a difference between ceded authority and assumed power.

No more taxes should be spent to build larger jails or more prisons. The majority of the offenders currently housed in the jail, and being booked in every day, are there because they violated parole or probation. Every offender should be given the exact same (realistic) sentence for the same offense (no plea bargains). If they then served that time, minus time off for good behavior, the number of offenders housed in jails and prisons would eventually shrink to around thirty-five percent of the current population. Moreover, since only about ten percent of the inmate population actually causes problems in the facility, the other ninety could be housed elsewhere. One idea is to house those, who just wish to do their time, on outlying farmland. They could then work off part of their time, growing food used to feed themselves and others needing assistance. Most inmates would jump at an opportunity to participate in such a program. Any violators who broke the trust thereby extended could always then be housed back in the existing secure facility.

We don't need more taxes, more government programs, more laws, or more and bigger facilities. We need common sense, morally guided solutions to problems. We need a government like the one described in the Constitution.

One that looks out for the common welfare, rather than its own.