

LEGISLATIVE FILE

The Empire strikes back

Sacramento Democrats, taking Republican failure to capture any new legislative seats as a show of cracks in the governor's former supposed invincibility, have declared an in-your-face onslaught of "progressive" (i.e., increasing government power over the people) legislation, including all sorts of no-chance bills passed and vetoed last year.

Gil Cedillo leads the pack with, yet again, driver's licenses for illegal aliens (SB 60). Some Republicans last year doubted the governor's determination to turn back this bad idea. They can rest assured this time. After last year's veto, Cedillo publicly criticized Schwarzenegger, accusing him of deception in negotiations on the bill. This year's Cedillo charge will be no more than whipping a dead and buried horse.

Resurrecting another bad, old idea, Sheila Kuehl announced plans for no-holds-barred socialized medicine in California (SB 2). Kuehl has not unveiled the full measure, but in recent interviews makes it clear this will be full statewide government-controlled healthcare much like Hillary Clinton's 1993 national effort. The Kuehl onslaught comes

on the heels, and flies in the face, of public rejection of Proposition 72, the November referendum on a John Burton scheme, signed by Governor Gray Davis in 2003, to force employers to buy health insurance for their employees whether they want it or not.

Anti-family Assemblywoman Rebecca Cohn, who seems to see every marriage as a battering husband/domestic vio-



lence tragedy waiting to happen, evidently plans a full slate of legal "protections" for women that, if they become law, can most likely be counted on to bring more divorce, more husbands driven to walking away from their families, more family nest-eggs liquidated to finance endless court battles, more wives plunged into poverty, more bitterness, and more children growing up in broken homes.

Cohn also plans related "child protection" bills that will fan fears of "child

abuse" to justify increased state interference between parents and their kids. And finally, as presumably her ultimate statement of concern for "the children," she plans to carry Planned Parenthood's annual resolution "celebrating" *Roe v. Wade* (AJR 3) — death: what surer way to defend little ones against abuse?

Senator Martha Escutia is once again obsessing over the fat content of the diets of California's children (SB 12). Banning sales of so-called junk food in schools has been Escutia's cause for several years, one that has met with mixed success. Her Party embraces it as an excuse to call for increased power to dictate how people will live (you won't hear consideration, for instance, of parental discipline or self-restraint by the nanny-caucus in its deliberations on children's diets).

The serious battle underlying the ideological fantasy is the struggle to see whether the left-wing Legislature or the governor will seize the initiative and set the tone of public debate in 2005. A more battle-hardened Schwarzenegger is likely to veto most of the nonsense sent to him. But he must also keep the public focus on his and his Party's efforts to bring California government under control while diminishing incentives and deflating the forces driving the state toward socialism.

CPR

that conservative Republicans have an “extra chromosome.” She meant that Burkett was a Republican who thinks along the same lines as CBS reporters.

Panel member Dick Thornburgh apparently fits into the category of a Republican of a different chromosome. He was the toothless Republican CBS needed to give its white-wash a patina of fairness. Lou Boccardi added another paint layer of “respectability.” This veteran of bias-denying panels had performed the same service for the *New York Times* after the Jayson Blair debacle by contributing to a report that insisted affirmative action played no role in that scandal.

BUT WHILE Boccardi and Thornburgh are skeptical to the point of stupidity on the question of CBS’s political bias, they demonstrate no such skepticism when dismissing those who first exposed the forgery as “bloggers with a conservative agenda.” CBS’s panel feels free to

muse on the motives of Rather’s critics while interpreting his motives in the most generous light possible.

Were bloggers and conservative journalists “partisan” in coverage of the forgery? Yes, partial to the truth. Why is partiality to the truth the only form of partisanship the old media won’t practice? CBS’s blue-ribbon panelists can turn up their noses at conservatives, but the fact is they ferreted out a forgery liberal partisans faked up — and CBS’s unpunished star reporter still won’t admit it.

A pantheistic press corps doesn’t know what to say about a natural disaster. Desperately trying to find a pious posture on the tsunami catastrophe in January — while making sure to jack up their ratings with the “most trusted news on TV”-style promos — the media had to fall back on finger-pointing, compassion-contest baiting, and Bush-bashing. But the habitual chiding of Bush came with a novel and hypocritical

WHAT YOU HAVEN’T BEEN TOLD ABOUT GUN CONTROL

By SAM PAREDES

Five members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors voted to place on their 2005 November ballot an initiative ordinance asking the voters to ban completely the private possession of handguns, including in their homes or businesses. The Board cites a spiraling increase of crime in the city and they believe that legally-owned handguns are to blame for their crime-wave. They imply that citizens should not be trusted with firearms because they are far more likely to hurt themselves than to defend themselves. And they shouldn’t worry about it anyway because the police will protect them from crime.

Here’s a message to all residents of “Baghdad by the Bay”: the Police will *not* protect you as individuals. The federal courts have ruled that “a government and its agents are

Sam Paredes is executive director of Gun Owners of California.

under no general duty to provide public services, such as police protection, to any particular individual citizen” and that “the duty to provide public service is owed to the public at large, and, absent a special relationship between the police and an individual, no specific legal duty exists.” You’re on your own as far as the courts are concerned.

Why are San Fran’s Supes doing this? Because they are radically liberal dunderheads who act without reference to logic and reality. They act on sheer emotion. But it isn’t that they are naïve. They know the truth; they just don’t care. For instance, they know lawful citizens

use firearms successfully to defend themselves hundreds, if not thousands, of times a year in The City — even former-U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno admitted she knew this is true countrywide. The Board knows it is asking the citizens to vote for an initiative that violates the state’s preemption statute on the subject of regulating and registering firearms. They know the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and, now, the National Academy of Sciences have both found that *no* benefit results from restricting guns. But they don’t care.

And, sadly, they don’t care that many citizens will become crime victims. They know crime rates are skyrocketing in Washington, D.C., the nation’s only city with a total handgun ban — they just don’t care. This is anti-thinking. If it prevails in San Francisco, look for it to spread throughout California. CPR

