



The Washington Flyer  
October 30, 2009

*"The principles of genuine liberty, and of wise laws and administrations, are to be drawn from the Bible and sustained by its authority. The man, therefore, who weakens or destroys the divine authority of that Book may be accessory to all the public disorders which society is doomed to suffer."*

Noah Webster

### **President Signs Hate Crimes**

In an East Room Ceremony at the White House, President Obama signed the hate crimes legislation into law on Wednesday afternoon. The hate crimes language was included as part of the Defense Authorization bill, and caused great controversy as many Congressmen argued that this issue should not be part of a bill designed to support our troops. In a statement released shortly after the President signed the bill, [Rep. Mike Pence said](#), "Every day, our Armed Forces stand in defense of freedom and our cherished way of life. It is deeply offensive to their service and to millions of Americans to pile so-called 'hate crimes' legislation onto a bill that authorizes critical resources for our troops. Hate crimes legislation is antithetical to the First Amendment, unnecessary and will have a chilling effect on religious freedom."

Rep. Pence continued, "The president has used his position as commander in chief to advance a radical social agenda, when he should have used it to advance legislation that would unequivocally support our troops. We should remember why our soldiers put on the uniform, and honor their service by giving them the resources they need to get the job done, without unrelated liberal priorities attached."

The Alliance Defense Fund (ADF) is one of several organizations that fought the passage of hate crimes, repeatedly pointing to the threat this language presents to our religious freedom and freedom of speech. On Wednesday, [ADF Senior Legal Counsel Erick Stanley stated](#), "This law is a grave threat to the First Amendment because it provides special penalties based on what people think, feel, or believe. ADF will be on the front line to defend those whose free speech or free exercise of religion rights are violated by this unconstitutional law and to ultimately overturn this attack on freedom."

Although the bill passed, it did not pass with the margin of support usually given to a Defense bill due to the inclusion of the hate crimes language. In the House of Representatives, 146 Congressmen, including both Republicans and Democrats, voted against the bill; and in the Senate, the final vote was 68-29. Senator Jim DeMint spoke eloquently about the dangers of the hate crimes language in a speech on the Senate floor the night of the vote, stating, "It is very cynical that this bill that funds our soldiers, who are fighting for our Constitution and our country, actually undermines the very principles that they are fighting for." To watch his entire speech, [click here](#).

### **Call to Remove Safe School Czar**

Months after being named the new Director of Safe and Drug Free Schools, Kevin Jennings has received criticism from Americans nationwide as being unfit to lead the office, and Members of Congress are [demanding his removal](#) from the position. Nearly every week more information on this controversial individual emerges placing the Administration and Department of Education in a fragile position. Jennings is a strong advocate for homosexual rights and openly gay himself, and he has begun to push a homosexual agenda in schools. He

founded the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), and [has voiced strong support](#) for members of the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). These connections, along with his history of drug abuse and questionable actions when counseling youth about sexuality, have raised eyebrows and concerns among many Americans.

In a letter being circulated throughout Congress, Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-TN) urged hearings to be conducted on the position, the nominee's qualifications, and whether or not a Senate confirmation is necessary. Earlier in the month another [letter was circulated](#) by Rep. Steve King (R-IA) and has gained the support of more than 50 members. The letter calls for the [removal of Jennings](#) based on his "integral role in promoting homosexuality and pushing a pro-homosexual agenda in America's schools—an agenda that runs counter to the values that many parents desire to instill in their children." In addition, many pro-family groups such as Concerned Women for America ([CWA](#)), the Family Research Council ([FRC](#)), Focus on the Family ([FOF](#)), and the American Association of Christian Schools are working to educate their members on the potential harm that Jennings will impose on school children throughout the nation. Indeed, there is a growing concern that Jennings be removed and replaced with a new Director of Safe and Drug Free Schools who will be safe for all children.

### **Parental Rights Under Attack**

The U.S. Supreme Court has [agreed to hear](#) two cases whose outcome could have a detrimental impact on the nation's view of international law, specifically the underlying threat international law could pose on families and parents. Currently, both are cases from Florida dealing with the sentencing of juveniles who commit a serious crime. Amnesty International (AI) has submitted a brief to the Supreme Court on these cases suggesting that the "life without parole" sentence for a minor violates the United Nation's Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) Treaty. While the U.S. has not signed the controversial CRC Treaty, AI argues it is "customary international law," and the U.S. should adhere to its provisions since 193 other countries have adopted it as law.

A brief opposing this view was submitted to the Supreme Court by Michael Farris, constitutional lawyer and president and founder of [Parentalrights.org](#), along with 16 Members of Congress. Farris believes strongly that should the Supreme Court follow the suggestion by Amnesty International, it would push the United States towards actually signing the CRC Treaty, and this would quickly strip away all parental rights in the United States. The brief submitted by Farris included a list of 23 countries which impose either the death penalty or life sentences to juveniles. Farris stated, "Amnesty International believes that international law, rather than American law, should be used to make this decision. We have been [warning people](#) for some time that this theory could be used to force this treaty upon an unwilling American public. Americans want to retain family-based decision-making and American-made law. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child would undermine both of these principles."

In an effort to protect parental rights in America, Farris has started a campaign to add parental rights as an amendment to the Constitution.

### **Is Abortion the Status Quo?**

For months now, the Administration and Congressional leadership have continuously reported that the issue of abortion in healthcare reform will remain "as the status quo," claiming that no federal funds will be used to cover abortions by referring to the Hyde Amendment which prohibits federal funds from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to fund abortion.

However, just as long as they have been using this argument, pro-life Members of Congress, and pro-life groups have been educating the American people on the [truth](#) behind an abortion mandate in the current health reform bills. Congressional Leadership and the Administration have continued to "[hide](#)" behind the Hyde amendment, as they know that the healthcare reform bills currently being considered will have different funding streams other than that of HHS, and, therefore, will not be subject to the pro-life restrictions outlined in the Hyde Amendment. So what they see as the "status quo" is really a radical expansion of abortion as never before seen since Roe V. Wade.

In fact, with the Senate announcing its plan that includes a public option, or as House Speaker Nancy Pelosi has now coined it, the “consumer option,” it is clear that elective abortion will be covered in the public option. While funding for abortion services provided by the public option won’t necessarily be coming from our taxes, it will still be federally funded through the subsidies that will be paid by American citizens. According to Douglas Johnson, NRLC Legislative Director, “The bill [explicitly authorizes](#) the public plan, a federal agency program, to pay for elective abortions. Democratic leaders, including President Obama, have claimed that no federal funds would be used to pay for abortions, but this is a deception, because the public plan will be a federal agency program that can spend only federal funds. The federal government would pay abortion providers for performing elective abortions — a sharp break from decades of federal policy.”

Johnson believes that the only method for ensuring there are no abortion mandates in the health care bill is to clearly state within the bill that abortion services will not be covered. Allowing federal funds to be used for elective abortion services is not the status quo. Language that explicitly states that no federal funds can be used to cover abortion must be added to the any health care reform bill in order to keep the status quo.

### **Battle Continues Over Same-Sex Marriage in D.C.**

The fight against same-sex marriage is [heating up](#) in the Nation’s Capital, as new legislation introduced this month would legalize same-sex marriage in the District of Columbia. Earlier this year, the D.C. City Council passed legislation recognizing same-sex marriages performed in other states; and with a clear majority of council members in support, there is little doubt that the new bill allowing same-sex marriages to be performed will pass. While Congress still must approve of the council’s actions, the greatest opposition is being found not in Congress, but by the people living in D.C.

This week, opponents testified before the D.C. Board of Elections, arguing the need to allow a ballot initiative on this issue in the 2010 election. The initiative would allow D.C. residents to vote on whether marriage should continue to be defined as between one man and one woman. Nearly 100 people attended the hearing with hopes of voicing opposition to the newly introduced bill. Bishop Harry Jackson, pastor of a church in Maryland, testified before the board and pleaded, “We urge you to let the people vote” on what he stated was the “largest public policy issue of our time.”

Earlier this year, the Board ruled against an initiative to allow a vote on the new law which recognized same-sex marriages from other states, citing a D.C. election law which prohibits a vote on an issue which would violate the D.C.’s Human Rights Act. The Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation, among other things. If the board does rule in favor of the initiative, supporters would have to have at least 5% of the voter population’s signatures within 180 days for the initiative to move forward to the ballot.

### **In Case You Missed It:**

[One World Order?](#)

[Senate Tries to Move HealthCare Forward](#)

[School Choice Ad Receives Criticism from the Administration](#)



Editor: Maureen Wiebe  
Staff Writer: Sarah Griffith  
Legislative Office, 119 C Street SE, Washington, DC 20003  
Phone: 202.547.2991 • Fax: 202.547.2992

