

QandO

Free Markets, Free People

- [Home](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [QandO Comment Policy](#)

Observations



Check out our live, call-in show Sundays at 5pm Pacific (8pm Eastern)!

Vicious Capitalism



Buy Dale's Book!



QandO Adstrip



[Merkel Win Opens Caucuses Options](#)

[Is Mankiw being completely above board?](#)

[Doc alert: Sustainable Energy](#)

[Waxman Markey/Cap-and-Trade: 397 New Regulations and 1,100 New Mandates](#)

[Who should I follow on Twitter?](#)

[Great News](#)

[Positivity: Leprosy patients from Hawaii to see canonization of Fr. Damien](#)

[Read more...](#)



[Cap and Tax: Government vs. America](#)

[09/28/2009](#)

[Self Defense Handguns](#)

[Random Thoughts](#)

[Massive scientific fraud: Blatant and grossly deceptive data selection \("cherry picking"\) by Warmist "scientists"](#)

['Dead Meat' Dave: 'I Think the Governor Will Decide That He's Not Going to Run'](#)

[Does Meg Whitman's Lack of Voting Disqualify Her From California Governor's Race?](#)

[Read more...](#)

[Advertise to our influential readers!](#)

Support The Blog

watch
community
(yeah, the whole show!)
on  nbc.com



free.
online.
anytime.

Dale's Twitter Feed:

- In Washington state, you're only allowed to buy beer and wine at a grocery store. Liquor, you have to buy from the state. That's just odd. [2 weeks ago](#)
- I really like Seattle. The people are gratuitously friendly. It seems like a pretty relaxed place. [2 weeks ago](#)
- Vacationing. [2 weeks ago](#)
- I'm going into stress overdrive getting everything together in order to leave for Alaska tomorrow. [2 weeks ago](#)
- Today's unemployment rate of 9.7% is misleading. Using the calculation method the BLS previously used, the rate would be about 16%. [3 weeks ago](#)
- [More updates...](#)

September 2009

M T W T F S S[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#)[7](#) [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) [13](#)[14](#) [15](#) [16](#) [17](#) [18](#) [19](#) [20](#)[21](#) [22](#) [23](#) [24](#) [25](#) [26](#) [27](#)[28](#) [29](#) [30](#)[« Aug](#)Search

Tags in Use

[ACORN](#) [AGW](#) [AIG](#) [Al Gore](#) [bailout](#) [bankruptcy](#) [Barack Obama](#) [budget](#) [California](#) [cap-and-trade](#) [CBO](#) [China](#)

[Chrysler](#) [CO2](#) [debt](#) [deficit](#) [EPA](#) [Ezra Klein](#) [GM](#) [health care reform](#) [Hillary Clinton](#) [Honduras](#) [inflation](#) [Joe Biden](#) [leadership](#) [Mahmoud Ahmadinejad](#) [Medicaid](#) [Medicare](#) [Nancy Pelosi](#) [North Korea](#) [nuclear weapons](#) [Obama](#) [Observations](#) [Paul Krugman](#) [protests](#) [racism](#) [recession](#)
[Russia](#) [socialism](#) [stimulus](#) [TARP](#) [Ted Kennedy](#) [Timothy Geithner](#) [torture](#) [UN](#)

Previous Version of QandO

[Home Page](#)

Blogroll

- [Ace of Spades](#)
- [All American Blogger](#)
- [Bearing Drift](#)
- [Belgravia Dispatch](#)
- [Betsy's Page](#)
- [BitsBlog](#)
- [Blackfive](#)
- [Bookworm Room](#)
- [Cafe Hayek](#)
- [Christian Peacenic](#)
- [Club For Growth](#)
- [Confederate Yankee](#)
- [Conservatism Today](#)
- [Coyote Blog](#)
- [Dale's Motorcycle Blog](#)
- [Dean Esmay](#)
- [Econopundit](#)
- [Eschaton](#)
- [Ezra Klein](#)
- [Fausta's Blog](#)
- [Gad-fly](#)
- [Greg Mankiw](#)
- [Hot Air](#)
- [Instapundit](#)
- [Irons In The Fire](#)
- [Jules Crittenden](#)
- [Just One Minute](#)
- [Little Miss Atilla](#)
- [Maggie's Farm](#)
- [Marginal Revolution](#)
- [Master Resource](#)
- [Matt Yglesias](#)
- [Megan McArdle](#)
- [Michelle Malkin](#)
- [Neo-Neocon](#)
- [New Energy And Fuel](#)
- [New Paltz Journal](#)
- [Obsidian Wings](#)
- [Oliver Willis](#)
- [Open Left](#)
- [Outside the Beltway](#)
- [Pirate's Cove](#)
- [PoliBlog](#)
- [Political Byline](#)
- [Polling Report](#)
- [Powerline](#)
- [Protein Wisdom](#)
- [Pundit Review](#)
- [Red State](#)
- [Riehl World View](#)

- [Right Wing News](#)
- [Rightwing Nuthouse](#)
- [Samizdata](#)
- [Say Anything](#)
- [Scrappleface](#)
- [Searchlight Crusade](#)
- [Sharp As A Marble](#)
- [She's Right](#)
- [Sister Toldjah](#)
- [Soldier's Angels Germany](#)
- [Talking Points Memo](#)
- [The Agitator](#)
- [The Corner](#)
- [The Glittering Eye](#)
- [The Moderate Voice](#)
- [The Neoliberalist](#)
- [The Next Right](#)
- [The Volokh Conspiracy](#)
- [This Ain't Hell](#)
- [Townhall Blog](#)
- [Two-Four](#)
- [Viking Pundit](#)
- [Villainous Company](#)
- [Vox Popoli](#)
- [WizBang](#)

Contact Us

- [Billy Hollis](#)
- [Bruce McQuain](#)
- [Bryan Pick](#)
- [Dale Franks](#)
- [Jason Pye](#)
- [Lance Paddock](#)
- [Michael Wade](#)

Mainstream Media

- [Google News](#)
- [LA Times](#)
- [New York Times](#)
- [Politico](#)
- [USA Today](#)
- [Washington Post](#)
- [Washington Times](#)

Neoliberalist Network

- [A Second Hand Conjecture](#)

Resources

- [Blogometer](#)
- [Bureau of Labor Statistics](#)
- [Cato Institute](#)
- [CIA Factbook](#)
- [Congressional Votes](#)
- [Economic Freedom Index](#)
- [Heritage Foundation](#)

- [Libertarian Papers](#)
- [Memeorandum](#)
- [MEMRI](#)
- [NationMaster](#)
- [Open Congress](#)
- [Real Clear Politics](#)
- [Reason Magazine](#)
- [Statistical Abstract of the United States](#)
- [Tax Facts](#)
- [TCS Daily](#)
- [White House](#)

The Bear Flag league



[Absinthe & Cookies \(Monterey\)](#)
[Baldilocks \(LA\)](#)
[BoifromTroy \(LA\)](#)
[CalBlog \(LA\)](#)
[California Republic \(statewide\)](#)
[Cobb \(LA\)](#)
[QandO \(SD\)](#)
[*e-Claire \(NoCal\)](#)
[Infinite Monkeys](#)
[The Interocitor \(LA\)](#)
[The Irish Lass \(Sacramento\)](#)
[Lex Communis \(FSO\)](#)
[Master of None \(Ex-Pat\)](#)
[Miller's Time \(Sacto\)](#)
[Patterico's Pontifications \(LA\)](#)
[Shark Blog \(ex-pat\)](#)
[Tone Cluster \(LA\)](#)
[Window Manager \(OC\)](#)
[Xrlq \(expat\)](#)
[Little Miss Attila \(LA\)](#)
[Pirate's Blog \(LA\)](#)
[Tan Horizons \(RS\)](#)
[Ryan's Head \(OC\)](#)
[Mad Mikey \(SD\)](#)
[Doggy Diaries \(SC\)](#)
[Annika's Journal \(Sacto\)](#)
[Body Parts \(RS\)](#)
[Coffee with Cranky Beach \(Monterey\)](#)
[Moxie \(LA\)](#)
[Professor Chaos \(ex-pat\)](#)
[Drink this ... \(LA\)](#)
[Education Wonks \(SoCal\)](#)
[Caltech Girl \(SoCal\)](#)
[Ben's Law \(OC\)](#)
[*FullosseousFlap's Dental Blog \(Ventura Co.\)](#)
[SoCal Pundit \(LA\)](#)
[*The Jawa Report \(ex-pat\)](#)
[*California Conservative \(SF\)](#)

[In Re: \(OC\)](#)
[Gay Patriot \(LA\)](#)
[California Energy Blog \(LA\)](#)
[Mayor Sam's Sister City \(LA\)](#)
[Balls and Strikes \(OC\)](#)
[Independent Sources](#)
[Ridgecrest Blog \(Kern\)](#)
[Woody's Woundup \(OC\)](#)
[Darleen's Place \(SBdo\)](#)
[Collecting My Thoughts \(ex-pat\)](#)
[Bear to the Right \(LA\)](#)
[*Friends of Dave \(Mend\)](#)
[*Cap'n Bob \(LA\)](#)
[A Swift Kick & A Band-Aid \(ex-pat\)](#)
[The Young Insider \(Sacto\)](#)
[Doc Rampage \(SM\)](#)
[Anthroblogogy \(SC\)](#)
[Hengineer \(Kern\)](#)
[Junto Boyz \(SF\)](#)
[Rules for Rulers \(SD\)](#)
[Flash Report \(OC\)](#)
[Tammy Bruce \(LA\)](#)
[Foo Bar and Grill \(SC\)](#)
[Big Lizards \(LA\)](#)
[Strong As An Ox And Nearly As Smart \(Mendocino Co.\)](#)
[Stop The ACLU \(LA\)](#)
[Deep Keel \(LA\)](#)
[ex-Liberal in Hollywood \(LA\)](#)
[Lex Libertas \(Ex-Pat\)](#)

Powered by

BlogRolling

Old Dominion Blog Alliance



[Commonwealth Conservative](#)
[Sic Semper Tyrannis](#)
[One Man's Trash](#)
[Q and O Blog](#)
[CatHouse Chat](#)
[Reason & Revelation](#)
[SW Virginia law blog](#)
[Spark It Up!!!](#)
[Rick Sincere News and Thoughts](#)
[Brandon Meyer](#)
[The \(not so\) Daily Me](#)
[Shaun Kenney](#)
[Commonwealth Watch](#)
[Bearing Drift](#)
[Too Conservative](#)
[SkepticalObserver](#)
[Elephant Ears](#)
[Below The Beltway](#)
[ImNotEmeril](#)
[From On High](#)

[The Red Stater](#)

[Brown Hound](#)

[novatownhall blog](#)

[Virginia Virtucon \(Virtual Conservative\)](#)

[damnum absque injuria](#)

[Hampton Roads Politics](#)

[TwoConservatives](#)

[Rocinante's Burdens](#)

Categories

- [Abortion](#)
- [Academia](#)
- [Admin](#)
- [Afghanistan](#)
- [Arts](#)
- [Ayn Rand](#)
- [Billy Hollis](#)
- [Blogging](#)
- [Bruce McQuain](#)
- [Bryan Pick](#)
- [Business](#)
- [capitalism](#)
- [Congress](#)
- [Constitution](#)
- [Crime](#)
- [Culture](#)
- [Dale Franks](#)
- [Democrats](#)
- [Economics](#)
- [Economy](#)
- [Education](#)
- [Elections](#)
- [Energy](#)
- [Environment](#)
- [Ethics](#)
- [Examiner.com](#)
- [Farce](#)
- [federalism](#)
- [Foreign Affairs](#)
- [Freedom and Liberty](#)
- [Government](#)
- [Guns and Gun Rights](#)
- [Health Care](#)
- [Hugo Chavez](#)
- [Humor](#)
- [Immigration](#)
- [Iran](#)
- [Iraq](#)
- [Jason Pye](#)
- [Lance Paddock](#)
- [Law Of Unintended Consequences](#)
- [Legal Affairs](#)
- [Libertarian](#)
- [Media](#)
- [Michael Wade](#)
- [Military Affairs](#)
- [Miscellaneous](#)
- [Nanny State](#)

- [National Security](#)
- [NeoLibertarian](#)
- [North Korea](#)
- [Obama Administration](#)
- [Personal](#)
- [Philosophy](#)
- [Photoblogging](#)
- [Podcasting](#)
- [Policy](#)
- [Politics](#)
- [Polling](#)
- [Project Hero](#)
- [Questions and Observations](#)
- [Quote of the day](#)
- [Race](#)
- [Religion](#)
- [Republicans](#)
- [rights](#)
- [Sarcasm](#)
- [Scandals](#)
- [Science](#)
- [SCOTUS](#)
- [Security](#)
- [spending](#)
- [Taxation](#)
- [Technology](#)
- [Terrorism](#)
- [The Left](#)
- [Trade](#)
- [Uncategorized](#)
- [Venezuela](#)
- [War](#)

Subscribe

-  [Posts](#) |  [Comments](#)
-  [Google](#)
-  [MY YAHOO!](#)
-  [Bloglines](#)
-  [Technorati](#)
-  [netvibes](#)
-  [ROJO](#)
-  [newsgator](#)
-  [myAOL](#)
-  [Windows Live](#)
-  [MY msn](#)
- 
-  [SITE METER](#)

Facebook Networking

NetworkedBlogs

Blog:
QandO

Topics:
politics, libertarian,
neoliberalian

Follow my blog

« [The Republicans are lost](#)
[It's Baaaaaaack! VRWC Cause For Obama's Problems](#) »

Smaller Less Intrusive Government?

 September 27th, 2009 |  Author: [Bruce McQuain](#)

Here's the story [from CNN](#):

Lisa Snyder of Middleville, Mich., says she takes no money for watching the three children for 15-40 minutes each day so that the neighbors can get to work on time.

The Department of Human Services, acting on a complaint that Snyder was operating an illegal child care home, demanded she either get a license, stop watching the kids or face the consequences, WZZM says.

Snyder calls the whole thing “ridiculous” and tells the Grand Rapids TV station that “we are friends helping friends!”

A DHS spokesperson tells the station that it has no choice but to comply with state law, which is designed to protect Michigan children.

She's doing a neighborly thing – she accepts no money. She helps her neighbors by watching the kids while they wait for the bus thereby allowing the parents to get to work on time. She doesn't feed them. She provides them a warm place to stay out of the weather until the bus shows up.

For that, the state claims she needs a license? And the state hides behind the law, or at least their interpretation of it to do so.

But if you think about it, couldn't the same claim be made if mom drops off the kids with granny? Mom gets to work and granny keeps the kids until the bus shows up. Other than the fact that granny's a relative, what's the difference?

[David Boaz](#) makes what should be the obvious point:

This is what people mean when they warn that an ever-expanding government threatens the values of neighborliness and community. When the government provides services for free, or when it erects obstacles to individuals' providing those services, it reduces private provision and simultaneously increases the demand for government services. If you make it illegal for neighbors to watch one another's kids, you weaken ties of neighborhood and community.

But the need remains. So it leaves parents with fewer options and, as Boaz points out, it makes neighbors less likely to reach out and help.

Is that government's role?

~McQ

How To Make Electricity :

Don't ever pay for electricity, you can make it simple & cheap at home.

Share This Post On Your Social Networks:



Posted in [Bruce McQuain](#), [Freedom and Liberty](#), [Government](#), [Law Of Unintended Consequences](#), [Nanny State](#)

18 Responses to “Smaller Less Intrusive Government?”



- *Harun:*
[September 27, 2009 at 03:58](#)

Seriously, too many lawyers, too many bureaucrats. Is it just me, or do you guys imagine that some lawyers actually think they can pass laws to solve all problems, because, “its the law?” I am thinking of price controls, guaranteed lending, nanny state, etc.

I think this would be especially prone to lawyers whose only experience is with government, compliance, community organizing, etc.

[Reply](#)



- *Harun:*
[September 27, 2009 at 04:02](#)

This is why I see the rise of Asia over the West – they just don’t have many lawyers doing this stuff. Sure, China has draconian laws that can be enforced at a whim on foreign companies, but they are not down to this level yet. And India’s growth is actually based on getting rid of the license Raj or circumventing it via Internet. Actually so was China’s.

I guess we are setting ourselves up for a golden age when regulations are relaxed later on.

[Reply](#)



- *Wacky Hermit:*
[September 27, 2009 at 05:03](#)

This is totally in-fricking-sane. Do the people who make these laws not have children? Or alternately, do they live some sort of lifestyle so disconnected from reality for the rest of us that they seriously can delude themselves into thinking everyone lives like they do? I mean come ON, the rest of us don’t have nannies who can watch over the children while we go to work or run errands. We leave the kids in a neighbor’s charge (usually a neighbor who also has kids), or we leave an older kid in charge of the younger kids. With my husband on call all the time, this is the only way I can have some “alone time.”

I can’t speak for anyone else, but the ability to get away from the kids for a few minutes does loads for my sanity. They can pry it from my cold dead fingers.

[Reply](#)



- *Rick:*
[September 27, 2009 at 06:22](#)

What about the teenager down the street that you pay to babysit while you go out for dinner? Does she need a license now?

Perfect example of why governemnt needs to leave us alone.

[Reply](#)



- *Rick Caird:*
[September 27, 2009 at 07:25](#)

This a perfect example of Parkinson's law. The bureaucracy does not have enough real work to do, so they go out to find some. Rather than this being a sign of a nanny state, it is a sign of too many government employees with way too little to do.

I haven't figured out yet how Michigan even noticed Lisa Snyder was minding the children for the half hour or so.

Rick

[Reply](#)



- o [Wacky Hermit:](#)
[September 27, 2009 at 11:23](#)

Three words: nosy @\$hole neighbors.

One day, your kid accidentally throws a frisbee onto Mrs. Nogooodnik's yard and knocks over one of her zinnias while going to fetch it. Every day after that, Mrs. Nogooodnik watches your house like a hawk. The minute she sees you swat your kid on the butt when he runs into the street, or turn your back on your 8 year old, she reports you to DCFS. And DCFS of course has to investigate every allegation of child abuse or neglect— and each time she reports you it makes you look worse and worse.

This kind of anonymous neighborly denunciation makes parents utterly paranoid. And it happens a hell of a lot. I've had the cops knock on my door because my 6 year old and 2 year old left the house, walked half a dozen houses down the street, watched a train go by, and walked back into the house, all while I was inside nursing the baby. My 3 year old almost got kicked out of the church nursery because he bit a child, and *some other* parent (not the parents of the child who got bit) took umbrage at it.

Time was, if you had a problem with somebody, you went and spoke to them about it. Now you just call Daddy Cop and Mommy Government to come take care of it for you.

[Reply](#)



- [Diffus:](#)
[September 27, 2009 at 07:33](#)

If my kid goes to Lisa's house to play with her kid, how is the control, care and oversight she's providing materially different from the case described?

[Reply](#)

- [Smaller Less Intrusive Government? | QandO | work4real.net:](#)
[September 27, 2009 at 08:32](#)

[...] Show original post here [...]

[Reply](#)



- [Titus Quinn:](#)
[September 27, 2009 at 09:47](#)

Don't worry — Erb with drive by with a baseless assertion that this isn't totalitarianism. That'll fix things up proper.

[Reply](#)



- [gadfly:](#)
[September 27, 2009 at 10:00](#)

“We all know that raising kids is a full-time job and since most parents work, they are, we are stretched thin. Just think

about what many parents are responsible for on any given day. Packing lunches, dropping the kids off at school, going to work, checking to make sure that the kids get home from school safely, shopping for groceries, making dinner, doing the laundry, helping with homework, paying the bills, and I didn't even mention taking the dog to the vet.

[. . .]

And we have learned that to raise a happy, healthy and hopeful child, it takes a family, it takes teachers, it takes clergy, it takes business people, it takes community leaders, it takes those who protect our health and safety, it takes all of us.

Yes, it takes a village.”

Hillary Clinton's Speech On — “It Takes A Village To Raise A Child”, Aug. 27, 1996

[Reply](#)



• *Joe R.:*

[September 27, 2009 at 10:09](#)

To steal from Carlin: “Selling is legal. F'n is legal. Why isn't selling f'n legal?”

Same principle applies here. A person can watch his own children without a license. But watching somebody else's requires one? Absurd.

[Reply](#)



• *Steverino:*

[September 27, 2009 at 11:55](#)

I wonder if you can get a lawyer to call watching someone else's children a “bailment for hire”. In that case, only ordinary care of the item is necessary... a pretty low standard that would not require licensing.

(taking tongue out of cheek)

[Reply](#)



• *Jeff the Baptist:*

[September 27, 2009 at 12:46](#)

Other than the fact that granny's a relative, what's the difference?

I understand your point that as long as money isn't changing hands, it shouldn't matter. But most of these laws have specifically worded clauses to exempt relatives, but nothing to protect people doing this for free. So it's a big regulatory difference.

One of my cousins ran a day care for her immediate family for years in New England. They even paid her. As long as she paid her taxes properly and all her kids were related to her, the busybody bureaucracy couldn't touch her. She finally did get licensed because she took in a neighbor's kid and because it allowed a family member to use state funds. Once those kids grew up and didn't need daycare, she got out of the business entirely. Between the revenue service nitpicking her and the regulators deliberately trying to screw her up so they could cite her for something, she wanted out.

[Reply](#)



○ *Bruce McQuain:*

[September 27, 2009 at 13:00](#)

I understand the obvious fact that it is a regulatory difference. I'm asking what the logical difference might be. Other than the relationship, there isn't one (and in some cases, your neighbor may have more of a relationship with your kids than granny).

And frankly, I'm further asking what damn business it is of government to begin with.

[Reply](#)



• [Jeff the Baptist:](#)

[September 27, 2009 at 14:02](#)

Depending on the state, family may also be able to make decisions on medical treatment when the parent is absent. There are probably a lot of other "or family" clauses out there they can take advantage of. Saying that family or no family ought to make no difference is missing out on a lot of legal differences.

I have no problem with government licensing of professional day cares. If they're providing a public service for profit (or even for the operator's cost), they ought to be able to stand up to some level of public scrutiny. This doesn't mean that licensing is perfect but it does mean there should be basic checks and balances (like a reasonable caretaker-to-child ratio).

But this case is ridiculous. She isn't charging money, let alone making money. Are they going to charge a Cub Scout den-mother who watches a bunch of boys after school next?

[Reply](#)



○ [Wacky Hermit:](#)

[September 27, 2009 at 14:11](#)

There's a big difference between simple licensing and this scenario, though. I have a friend who runs a licensed day care. She has the license so that she can participate in federal and state reimbursement programs. If the state's paying for the child care, the state surely has an interest in making sure my friend isn't a meth head who's sticking the kids in a closet in the basement and pocketing the money. However, if I am looking for someone to pay to watch my own personal kids, the responsibility falls on me to decide whether that person is qualified. If I'm lazy or in a hurry I'll accept government certification in lieu of getting to know the person. In my case, because of my kids' special needs I have to find someone with a different set of qualifications than the standard-issue day care license.

The parents of these kids had already decided Ms. Snyder was good enough to watch their children and that the adult/child ratio was acceptable. Why should licensing even enter into the picture?

[Reply](#)



○ [Grimshaw:](#)

[September 27, 2009 at 15:52](#)

A license should never be required. Maybe – maybe – it can be an option, a sort of certification (with its commensurate worth to the public), but it should never be required. If I want my neighbor/fellow citizen to watch my kids, it's my f*ck*ng choice and my risks! It's all b*llsh*t and I'll bet all I need is to spend 5 minutes digging up a dozen cases of licensed child care providers abusing children. So what is a govt. license worth? Not a hell of a lot.

B*llsh*t, B*llsh*t, B*llsh*t.

[Reply](#)



• [Inebriated Arsonist:](#)

[September 27, 2009 at 19:33](#)

So, wait a minute, when I was babysitting my neighbor's kids when I was a teenager I would have needed a license? That's insane.

[Reply](#)

Leave a Reply

Name (required)

Mail (will not be published) (required)

Website

[Contact Us](#) | [Terms of Use](#) | [Trademarks](#) | [Privacy Statement](#)

Copyright © 2009 QandO. All Rights Reserved.

Powered by [WordPress](#) and [WebmasterDeveloper.Com LLC](#).

☺