

FAMILY BULLETIN ALERT

Faith, Freedom & Citizenship Class

Kempsville Presbyterian Church

February 22, 2004

The views expressed herein are the views of the Editor, Vernon Fix on the Web at <http://hrcc.exis.net>

Former GOP Staff Attorney Says 'Profit Motive' Drives Judiciary Battles

By Jeff Johnson
CNSNews.com Senior Staff Writer
February 20, 2004

The former Republican counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee has told CNSNews.com that the quest for money, more than liberal political ideology, is what drives the most effective special interest groups - abortion lobbyists, trial lawyers and labor unions - fighting against President Bush's conservative judicial nominees.

"What would be truly shocking to the American people is the profit motive that is involved," Manuel Miranda said.

Miranda resigned under pressure from Democrats angry that he read memos on a shared government computer detailing Democratic senators' and liberal activists' plans to derail those nominees.

He told CNSNews.com Wednesday - during the first in-depth interview since his resignation - that the abortion industry and trial lawyers are behind the most powerful efforts to keep conservative jurists off the federal bench.

Miranda said many Americans would be stunned to learn what he claimed was the driving force behind the groups' efforts.

Miranda claimed abortion clinics make, on average, \$1,000 profit for every abortion they perform. "That's where the money is," Miranda insisted. "That's what is really happening here."

Comment: We need to realize what is really behind the abortion industry, read the full article at the web site: www.cnsnews.com and then call your reps and demand that abortions be stopped. Ed.

The Constitution Restoration Act Of 2004

The Most Important Legislation In The Last Fifty Years
By Chuck Baldwin February 17, 2004

Last week, a bill was introduced in both chambers of Congress to "limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts in certain cases and promote federalism." The House version is [H.R. 3799](#), and the Senate version is [S. 2082](#). The bill is titled, "The Constitution Restoration Act of 2004." Initial sponsors of the bill include Rep. Robert Aderholt (AL), Rep. Michael Pence (IN), Sen. Richard Shelby (AL), Sen. Zell Miller (GA), Sen. Sam Brownback (KS), and Sen. Lindsey Graham (SC). Even though the introduction of this bill received little national media attention, it is the most important legislation in the last fifty years.

You see, what difference does it make who wins a presidential or congressional election if neither party will faithfully discharge their duty to the U.S. Constitution? We have seen Republican and Democratic presidents come and go. The same goes for congressmen and senators. Yet, government continues to get bigger and bigger, while freedom gets smaller and smaller. Neither has either major party done anything to reverse the trend toward socialism and globalism.

One of the major reasons for this unfortunate set of circumstances is an out-of-control federal judiciary. For the last fifty years, federal courts have run roughshod over the Constitution. For all practical purposes, America is now controlled by a tyrannical oligarchy of federal judges.

Thankfully, our Founding Fathers understood this potentiality and prescribed a way for Congress to deal with the matter. Under Article III, Section 2, of the U.S. Constitution, Congress has the power and authority to regulate and except appellate jurisdiction of the federal judiciary, including the U.S. Supreme Court. That is exactly what H.R. 3799 and S. 2082 do.

Accordingly, under Sec. 102 of this bill, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Supreme Court shall not have jurisdiction to review, by appeal, writ of certiorari, or otherwise, any matter to the extent that relief is sought against an element of Federal, State, or local government, or against an officer of Federal, State, or local government (whether or not acting in official personal capacity), by reason of that element's or officer's acknowledgment of God as the sovereign source of law, liberty, or government."

This means, that the federal judiciary would be prohibited from interfering with any expression of religious faith by any elected local, state, or federal official. In other words, federal judges could not prevent the Ten Commandments from being displayed in public buildings or Nativity Scenes from appearing on court house lawns or "under God" from being recited in the Pledge of Allegiance or prayers being spoken in public schools, etc. This bill would limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts in these matters.

Furthermore, Sec. 201 of this bill states, "In interpreting and applying the Constitution of the United States, a court of the United States may not rely upon any constitution, law, administrative rule, Executive order, directive, policy, judicial decision, or any other action of any foreign state or international organization or agency, other than the constitutional law and English common law."

Please contact your congressman and senators (and the White House) and tell them that your support for their reelections is dependent upon their support for this bill! There is nothing more important in politics this year than passing this bill into law! Not even the vote for President is more important. The federal judiciary must be reigned in! It must be "bound down by the chains of the Constitution" (Jefferson). Passage of "The Constitution Restoration Act of 2004" will begin this process. I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support this bill. I hope you will, too.

© Chuck Baldwin

Comment: I believe this law will reign in Judges. We should get on the horn and ask our reps to pass it. Ed.

**"The public cannot be too curious concerning the characters of public men."
--Samuel Adams**

Kerry's record

I have been getting a veritable blizzard of emails about Senator Kerry's record, most of which I don't forward to the list. It isn't pretty and even if only 10% is true he is in trouble. But this didn't stop Clinton did it? Please be informed about Senator Kerry and decide if you would like him for President. As a veteran of Korea and Vietnam I don't like Mr. Kerry at all. Editor.

STOP THE FTAA

Our nation's borders are further endangered by the proposal for a misnamed Free Trade Area of the Americas. This internationalist trap is intended to lead to open borders (as in the EU) and the consolidation of 34 countries in North, South, and Central America, and the Caribbean. Are you prepared to give up the freedoms guaranteed by our Bill of Rights? Are you willing to lower your standard of living to that of a third world nation?
From the John Birch Society.

Comment: Please call or write to our Senators Allen and Warner and tell them you do not want us to join the FTAA. We want to be a sovereign nation under God. Ed.

VIRGINIANS AGAINST HIGH TAXES

I include here several comments from noted Virginians and others of like mind that are opposed to the government taking it all. Editor.

Senator Zed Miller (AL) says he's "angry because of the thoughtless and needless waste of taxpayers' hard-earned money. Angry because soft money - big money - from special interests to both parties controls things in a way that is nothing short of bribery."

The tax increase is a Republican initiative by Chichester that has the support of 12 GOP senators in concert with 14 Democrats who have patroned the Chichester bill.

Let's see ... Republican Sen. Chichester's tax increase is \$5.2 billion biannually.

And Democratic Gov. Warner's tax increase is \$1.3 billion biannually.

Hmm ... with a billion here, a billion there ...

What exactly does the fiscally conservative senator from Augusta County plan on compromising with either tax increase?

Except our wallets.

And please tell me what is the motivation behind senior U.S. senator, VA Republican John Warner, threatening to recommend the removal of military bases in Virginia unless the General Assembly moves forward with a tax increase?

This tax reform doesn't smell right. It never did.

If government cannot make due with the 39 percent of our wages in federal, state and local taxes we pay annually, then there is something wrong with government.

Virginia pro-tax politicians ought to take some advice from a good ol' conservative Southern Democrat like Zell Miller.

Miller wrote: "I got into government in the belief that government can help people. But good government doesn't mean big government. Good government doesn't mean a generous government. Good government means providing basic services efficiently. Good government means not just asking how to make a program more efficient, but asking what would happen if we got rid of the program entirely.

The comments were lifted from the Augusta Free Press and most by Steven Sisson.

THE ARMED CITIZEN

Aman shot and killed a dog menacing his family when the dog charged within a foot of his wife and child. Mother and child first encountered the snarling animal in their driveway. The mother told her child not to move as she used her cell phone to call her husband who was inside the home. When the man tried to get his family inside to safety, the dog charged them and he shot it. Police had warned the dog's owners earlier that day of complaints filed by other neighbors. (*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, Seattle, WA, 12/10/03)

SECOND AMENDMENT

Professor Gary A. Mauser of Canada's Simon Fraser University recently examined the impact of newly enacted gun bans in England, Australia, and Canada, asking a basic question that the gun prohibitionists never want to ask: "Do gun bans work?" Dr. Mauser provides compelling data to back up his definite conclusion that they do not.

Mauser's research shows that since all handguns were banned in Britain in 1997, violent crime has skyrocketed. The United States and Britain had similar violent crime rates in 1997, but since that time, we have seen decreasing rates of violent crime, while the British have seen their violent crime rate double. For the year 2000, the violent crime rate in England and Wales was well over twice what it was in the United States.

Mauser found similar trends in Australia. Following the passage of a sweeping gun ban in 1997, robbery and assault rates have increased steadily and homicide rates hover at historic highs, spiking in the latest year for which data is available.

The findings in Canada show that in spite of the passage of strict gun regulations in 1991 and again in 1995, the violent crime rate has not dropped. During the period between 1995 and 2001, violent crime in the US. dropped by approximately 25 percent, while in Canada it remained virtually unchanged.

Any gun owner who wants ready facts to counter those who argue that the United States should follow Canada, England, and Australia down the gun ban path should read "The Failed Experiment"

It is available on Dr. Mauser's web page, www.sfu.ca/~mauser.