

The Patriots' Truth

Flint Hills TEA Party News

ON OUR CALENDAR

MEDIA COMMITTEE MEETING – MCALISTER'S EVERY WED AT 5:30PM

Everyone is welcome – we ARE the Working Group

JUNE 23 – FHTP Monthly Mtg – Manhattan City Library Auditorum – 9:30AM

KEES Contract Kansas Electronic Eligibility System

Kansas is paying millions of dollars for the KEES Contract. That many believe is just implementation of "OBAMA CARE".

The Brownback administration repeatedly insists that is simply not true. Independent groups have all reported that

Kansas is paying millions of dollars for the KEES Contract. That many believe is just implementation of "OBAMA CARE".

The Brownback administration repeatedly insists that is simply not true. Independent groups have all reported that it lacks but one simple link to connect it with the nationwide information network established by the Affordable Health Care Act (OBAMA CARE), and is partially funded by OBAMA CARE. In addition Accenture the company handling the contract is months behind and demanding partial payment for work that should be done but is not. Kansas TEA Party groups representing taxpayers from all across the state have formulated this list of questions and submitted them to Ks. House and Senate members.

TAX PAYERS WANT TO KNOW ABOUT THE KEES CONTRACT

1. In view of the facts revealed by the independent audit showing substantial contract performance deficiencies, is there any reason this contract should not be terminated for default?
2. Why was this contract awarded to a contractor with a history of bad performance and questionable ethics in the state of Kansas plus Texas and Arkansas?
3. Why was this contractor paid millions of dollars in progress payments without showing substantial progress?
4. Who is actually managing this contract on behalf of the State of Kansas?
5. Why should the State of Kansas continue making payments to this contractor in view of the absence of contract performance?
6. Has the Kansas legislature actually authorized any matching funds as required by the federal grant?
7. Is there a possibility of illegal collusion between individuals who are employed by the state and this contractor?
8. Is this contract actually being managed by the Federal Government?
9. Should the State abandon this Federal mandated health care program and start over with a program tailored to fit the needs of the state only?
10. Should the legislature strengthen its oversight of the Executive Branch regarding major contracts?

The Union of Patriots, Flint Hills Tea Party, Kansans for Liberty, Patriot Freedom Alliance, FairTax KC, Southeast Kansas Conservatives, and 55 other organizations representing the interests of over 100,000 voters, are GREATLY CONCERNED about the problems with this contract – the largest single Information Systems contract in the history of the State of Kansas. Your position regarding this

contract and KEES in general will be noted by all of these groups in the coming primary and general election seasons.

Help us get answers forward this email to all the Kansas House members, and Senate. If no email then ask Kansas House members and Senate directly or via regular mail...BUT ASK.

Owens & Sharia Law & Redistricting.doc

Note: Writer wishes to remain anonymous

I have done another edit..... This is going into the heart of Owens and Vratil's territory. While we know that God wrought the victory, we da'nt cast our pearls before the swine.

Therefore as follows:

Many are still reeling from the shock that the Kansas Senate passed American Laws for American Courts, 303-3!! There were more opposing speeches given than opposing votes! Vicious lies were spewed about the contents and intents of SB 79 during debate. Tim Owens, John Vratil, and Chris Steineger were the most vehement. David Haley changed his mind from signing on in Committee, to opposing, then abstaining, along with Owens who still doesn't even know why he signed on in Committee!!

Great support was given by Senator Susan Wagle, who mentioned the case in Wichita where a Muslim woman is defending her right to keep her child against a Sharia marriage in Lebanon, regarding it as a women's rights issue. Senator Garrett Love spoke about the Interfaith Council endorsing the bill. Senator Mary Pilcher-Cook gave great testimony about the New Jersey case and the sharia billboard campaign by ICNA in KC. Senator Jeff King is one of the key players in this bill as he brought the amendment that helped it get out of Joint Conference Committee and stated he was a proud supporter of the bill. Many other Leaders including Sen's. Abrams, Kelsey, Lynn, and those who voted for it deserve some credit in this process and while I was not present to see first hand I was getting blow by blow commentary from friends. The greatest credit in the Senate goes to Ty Masterson, who picked up the bill and was tenacious!

On Wednesday, the bill had a huge setback! The brother of the Muslim woman in Wichita had asked for a press Conference with the Center for Security Policy, who were the chief engineers of ALAC on the national level. Rep. Peggy Mast held a press conference in Topeka and this guy backed out, and essentially the wheels fell off our wagon. But Mast was poised and forged ahead with a statement and supporters waited to see what the press was to do. They expected the media to "crucify" her, but it wasn't as bad as anticipated, and amid the confusion of all the other fights and melee in the Capital that day, this deal was not so big.

There were questions as to where the report on SB 79 actually was; finally found out Owens was sitting on it. He told Lawrence residents on Thursday he was holding it hostage until the House passed "his" maps! Those maps gerrymander Representative Greg Smith out of Owens' district. Greg is challenging Owens for his Senate seat this fall!!! Owens told others he wouldn't even look at any map coming out of the House. The House must pass the Senate map. (This will insure that these guys hold on to their seats of power!) SB 79 was essentially dead, until Ty Masterson got wind of it! That was Thursday afternoon. In less than 24 hours that bill was passed!

This event could very well be the dynamite that breaks the logjam in the Kansas Legislature. This event is already a defining moment in the coming elections! It may be the defining moment in the future of Kansas!

Obama Mandate Forces First Catholic College to Drop Insurance

by Steven Ertelt | LifeNews.com | 5/15/12 12:07 PM

Franciscan University appears to be the first casualty of the new Obama HHS mandate that requires Catholic colleges, groups and businesses to pay for drugs that may cause abortions and birth control for their employees.

Although President Barack Obama declared “If you like your health care coverage you can keep it,” when it came to passing Obamacare, a Catholic college in Ohio has determined it will no longer offer a student health insurance plan.

“The Obama Administration has mandated that all health insurance plans must cover “women’s health services” including contraception, sterilization, and abortion-causing medications as part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA),” the university [says in a new post on its website](#). “Up to this time, Franciscan University has specifically excluded these services and products from its student health insurance policy, and we will not participate in a plan that requires us to violate the consistent teachings of the Catholic Church on the sacredness of human life.”



“Additionally, the PPACA increased the mandated maximum coverage amount for student policies to \$100,000 for the 2012-13 school year, which would effectively double your premium cost for the policy in fall 2012, with the expectation of further increases in the future,” FUS continues.

“Due to these changes in regulation by the federal government, beginning with the 2012-13 school year, the University 1) will no longer require that all full-time undergraduate students carry health insurance, 2) will no longer offer a student health insurance plan, and 3) will no

longer bill those not covered under a parent/guardian plan or personal plan for student health insurance,” the college said.

Franciscan University says the current student health insurance plan will expire on August 15.

[Writing at CatholicVote](#), Tom Crowe, an employee at Franciscan University, blamed the mandate for Franciscan’s decision.

“Employers, until Obamacare was passed, were not compelled to offer health insurance but they did do because it is expected and good for business—good luck getting top-notch employees if health insurance coverage is not among the benefits. Under Obamacare employers can both assure that employees have health insurance coverage by dumping them onto the exchanges, and can save lots of money and headache. Win-win,” he writes. “But now there is another device by which Obamacare violates the “if you like it you can keep it” pledge: the HHS Mandate.”

Why Representative Arlen Siegfried Must Go Arlen Serves the Interest of “all Republicans” (including RINO’s!)

Arlen has unabashedly served the GOP leadership interests, which are contrary to Republican principles, contrary to his oath of office, and the rule of law. His actions are detrimental to transparency in government, and an affront to We the People as a whole. Arlen Siegfried was a key player behind the assassination of the Kris Kobach E-Verify bill, H.B. 2577, last month.

He told one group of grass roots leaders that he would only support an E-Verify bill that “all Republicans” could support because he represented “all the GOP Caucus.” When asked if that included the “RINOs” that had been bought out by the Chamber of Commerce, the agricultural interests, the hospitality interests, and the construction interests that actively and openly campaigned against bringing H.B. 2577 to the House floor. Rep. Siegfried stated: “You may call them names, but I represent all Republicans.” Even when reminded that he was elected to represent the citizens he insisted he represented all the republicans.

Like many GOP officials, Rep. Siegfried puts his obligations under his oath of office secondary to the GOP bosses.

H.B. 2577 was a “protect the Republic bill.”

Arlen Siegfried Supports Obamacare in Kansas

Arlen Siegfried is supporting the governors’ implementation of Obamacare. ““My position is that (KanCare) was well-vetted,” he said. “I think the Governor’s Office has done exceptional planning on this and it’s ready to go.” Kan-C li S hi Care relies on KEYS which is the electronic infrastructure for Obamacare in Kansas. The Gove4rnor is turning KS health Care over to six out of state insurance companies with questionable backgrounds. Accenture, who was fired several years ago by the KS Sec of State and paid 63.7 million in fines to feds for fraud, is doing the KEYS part of the project. 50 County Commission are calling for a slow down.

Arlen Supports Corporate Welfare and Crony Capitalism

Arlen Does Not Support the Rule of Law

Arlen Does Not Support Transparency and Accountability in Government

Your Civic and Moral Duty is to Oust Arlen and His Buddies

Conclusion:

Any time a “Representative” is not representative he needs to go. One of the surest ways to tell if your “representative” has this

affliction is if he is non-responsive. One cannot be representative without being responsive.

Arlen, O’Neal, the governor and the rest of the House cowards that took action to hide their votes are neither representative nor

responsive (at least to the citizens). They all need to be placed on the curb.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, READ YOUR CONSTITUTION AND VISIT:

<http://RinoHuntKS.com> Issue #2 - May 2012

I had wondered about why both Barack and Michelle Obama NO LONGER have the Law Degrees they worked so hard to have!! Read this to be Educated on this subject before you vote.

I thought you might be interested in this one. Jiml knew they had both lost their law license, but I didn't know why until I read this. This is 100% legit. I checked it out at <https://www.iardc.org> (Stands for Illinois Attorney Registration And Disciplinary Committee). It's the official arm of lawyer discipline in Illinois; and they are very strict and mean as hell. (Talk about irony.) Even I, at the advanced age of almost 65, maintain (at the cost of approximately \$600/year) my law license that I worked so hard and long to earn. Big surprise. Former Constitutional Law Lecturer & U.S. President Makes Up Constitutional Quotes During State Of The Union (SOTU) Address. Consider this:

1. President Barack Obama, former editor of the Harvard Law Review, is no longer a "lawyer". He surrendered his license back in 2008 in order to **escape charges he lied on his bar application.**

A "Voluntary Surrender" is not something where you decide "Gee, a license is not really something I need anymore, is it?" and forget to renew your license. No, a **"Voluntary Surrender" is something you do when you've been accused of something, and you "voluntarily surrender" your license five seconds before the state suspends you.**

2. **Michelle Obama "voluntarily surrendered" her law license in 1993. after a Federal Judge gave her the choice between surrendering her license or standing trial for Insurance fraud!**

3. So, we have the first black President and First Lady - who don't actually have licenses to practice law. Facts. Source: <http://jdlong.wordpress.com/2009/05/15/pres-barack-obama-editor-of-the-Harvard-law-review-has-no-law-license/>

4. A senior lecturer is one thing, a fully ranked law professor is another. **Barack Obama was NOT a Constitutional Law Professor at the University of Chicago .**

5. The University of Chicago released a statement in March 2008 saying Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) "served as a professor" in the law school-but that is a title Obama, who taught courses there part-time, never held, a spokesman for the school confirmed in 2008.

6. **"He did not hold the title of Professor of Law,"** said Marsha Ferziger Nagorsky, an Assistant Dean for Communications and Lecturer in Law at the University of Chicago School of Law. Source: <http://blogs.suntimes.com/sweet/2008/03/sweet-obama-did-hold-the-title.html> ;

7. The former Constitutional Senior Lecturer (Obama) cited the U.S. Constitution the other night during his State of the Union Address. Unfortunately, the quote he cited was from the Declaration of Independence ... not the Constitution.

8. The B-Cast posted the video: <http://www.breitbart.tv/did-obama-confuse-the-constitution-with-the-declaration-of-independence/>

9. Free Republic : In the State of the Union Address, President Obama said: "We find unity in our incredible diversity, drawing on the promise enshrined in our Constitution: the notion that we are all created equal.

10. Um, wrong citing, wrong founding document there Champ, I mean Mr. President. By the way, **the promises are not a notion, our founders named them unalienable rights.** The document is our Declaration of Independence and it reads: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

11. And this is the same guy who lectured the Supreme Court moments later in the same speech? When you are a phony it's hard to keep facts straight.

Keep this moving -- educate others.

No virus found in this message. Checked by AVG - www.avg.com Version: 2012.0.2176 / Virus Database: 2425/5019 - Release Date: 05/24/12

I was doing some additional research which lead me to GovTrack.us and was immediately met with the following alert temporarily blocking access to the site:

This is what GovTrack could look like if H.R. 5882 passes.

The American public can't be trusted with records about what Congress is doing, at least according to [H.R. 5882](http://H.R.5882). The bill may come to the floor this week with a provision that rolls back the clock on transparency.

You are already an upstanding citizen for researching bills in Congress. Now step up to the next challenge and [write your representative](#) to fix the bill.

[Write a Letter](#)

Speaker Boehner and House Majority Leader Cantor have [supported bulk legislative data](#) over the last year. Rep. Honda [has supported bulk data](#) for many years. We need to show that the public cares about this issue too before the bill comes to a vote.

Read [information for legislative staff](#) about H.R. 5882.

REALLY???!!!!

So I took the time and researched, the bill information and then the "about us" info on GovTrack.us...this group says they started out as a "hobby"...and now they are concerned about the appropriations that will stop the American People from being informed...**I SMELL A RAT.**

How much of our tax dollars are we giving to a group or groups in order to get information about what we are entitled to be informed about and that our elected employees have a duty to inform us without bias. Exactly how much **GRANT MONEY (our TAX DOLLARS)** is going to **HOW MANY** of these groups that just started as a "**HOBBY**" ...??? Can we spell SOLYNDRA and how many more???

They want a letter sent to our Representatives...so that these endless appropriations, the sums of which are mind boggling, can continue, so we won't be excluded from knowledge for which we are entitled as citizens of a CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC.

Freeze appropriations, freeze the budgets at all levels of government until the books can be opened and scrutinized and the cost of administrating of this and all groups and areas can be determined. As I see it, **GOVERNMENTAL GRANT MONEY equals SALARIED POSITIONS by STEALING** via funding from one group to allow another group to spend without accountability.

I am not denying a group may have worth, but I am demanding that they be ACCOUNTABLE, I am demanding that those that we elect, and who serve as our elected employees remember that it is a **SERVICE not a right of PASSAGE to our HARD EARNED DOLLARS**...unless there is a change...a change in the tax code to reflect an allowance on our tax obligations for expenses we are paying out of our own pockets to ensure they are doing their jobs and that when we submit legitimate expenses for "holding their feet to the fire" that those expenses are deducted directly from their expense accounts/salaries before they receive compensation.

I am demanding that BLANK checks with my TAX DOLLARS to ELECTED and APPOINTED EMPLOYEES and GROUPS who say one thing and then have no backbone or ACCOUNTABILITY be STOPPED.

Chris

This has been a letter that I thought on and today on the Sunday morning programs... Fox Sunday morning with Chris Wallace, I was inspired with my message for all the groups that espouse a need and expect others to pay for it via our tax dollars. The story shared this morning was that about Mount Vernon, home of George Washington, our first President...I was unaware of the course of events laid out. In 1860, a group of women, known as the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, formed to purchase the home which was falling in disrepair, since that time they have maintained and cared for the home, grown funds in order to build a library to house all the books and manuscripts, provided for the public to be able to enjoy 365 days a year without exception, it is open even on holidays. This has been done for 152 years with NOT one cent from Federal, state, city, and county tax dollars. It has been done because this association, these ladies, felt the need and worked to obtain the private funding and the public joined in voluntarily supporting the cause. It has been done without Federal, state, city, and county dollars "because those dollars come with strings attached".

Those Ladies seen the need, they themselves embraced the need and they have made it work and because they owned the need, others assisted by voluntarily becoming part of the solution through gifts of time and treasure. It has resulted in 152 years of success.

Relying on the government, regardless of the level, for funds is only extinguishing the will of individuals to give, to care for those around them, to personally get involved in something greater than themselves, for individuals to support a cause through the difficulties and into success. It is not only stealing the dollars from others so that others may spend it without accountability, the most outrageous thing is it is stealing self pride of success and perseverance to reach and exceed a goal.

Everyone, has their pet projects, charities that they want to be funded...social causes, the arts, education...all are worthy reasons. But when will the light come on...those causes are NOT being helped or they would become self-sufficient, the problems would become solved and the case for them closed. The funding only goes to pay salaries, and the administration costs and nothing changes...the hands continue to beg and the needs continue to grow...while associations just like the government do not stop the spending.

Until these groups open up their books (ATA, schools, social services, charities all included) and until their administrative costs are carefully scrutinized and plans laid out there should not be even consideration for funding via tax dollars. Dare I say that if administrative costs were reversed from being the largest expenditure to being the smaller, maybe even more volunteers without expense accounts, I think needs would be met and funding would not even be an issue.

Furthermore, government funding has diluted peoples understanding of worth...it has been a conditioned response over decades and until people pay from their own pockets for the causes and needs that they deem worthy there can be no value, no active contributions.

Hats off to the conservatives in the fight to stop the spending that was started by others, to inform and guide the process to civility and prudent responsibility of duties and treasures entrusted to them by the voters.

Chris Tawney

How state lawmakers pump up pensions in ways you can't imagine!!

By [Thomas Frank](#), USA TODAY -----Updated 4/16/2012 12:54 PM

At age 55, [South Carolina](#) state Sen. [David Thomas](#) began collecting a pension for his legislative service without leaving office.

· In session: Texas House members listen to Gov. Rick Perry's State of the State message on Jan. 27, 2009, in Austin. Since 1975, legislators' annual salary has stalled at \$7,200, but a 1981 law allows them to draw a judge's pension of \$125,000.

· Most workers must retire from their jobs before getting retirement benefits. But Thomas used a one-sentence law that he and his colleagues passed in 2002 to let legislators receive a

<http://gannett.gcion.com/?adlink/5111/778079/0/13/AdId=3;BnId=0;itime=365403464;key=state+lawmakers+pump+up+pensions+ways+cant+USATODAYcom;>

INTERACTIVE: [How state legislators inflate pensions](#)

· **MORE: [State-by-state pension rules and methodology](#)**

· **STORY: [States expand lucrative pensions to more jobs](#)**

Thomas' \$32,390 annual retirement benefit — paid for the rest of his life — is more than triple the \$10,400 salary he gave up. His pension exceeds the salary because of another perk: Lawmakers voted to count their expenses in the salary used to calculate their pensions.

No other South Carolina state workers get those perks.

Since January 2005, Thomas, a Republican, has made \$148,435 more than a legislative salary would have paid, his financial-disclosure records show. At least four other South Carolina lawmakers are getting pensions instead of salaries, netting an extra \$292,000 since 2005, records show.

Pension perks aren't unique to legislators in South Carolina.

More than 4,100 legislators in 33 states are positioned to benefit from special retirement laws that they and their predecessors have enacted to boost their pensions by up to \$100,000 a year, a USA TODAY investigation found. Even as legislators cut basic state services and slash benefits for police, teachers and other workers, they have preserved pension laws that grant themselves perks unavailable to voters they serve or workers they direct.

Oregon: Double dipping

This year, the state of Oregon will pay state Rep. Andy Olson \$108,701. That's \$15,100 more than the governor's salary.

Olson gets so much because Oregon legislators allow themselves to collect a public pension while in office. The perk has let Olson, a retired state trooper who is 58, collect \$705,000 from the state since he took office in January 2005. That includes \$560,000 in pension payments.

Most of the 180,000 retirees getting a pension from the Oregon state retirement system are not as fortunate. A retiree who starts working for a local or state agency or for a school district usually is restricted to getting paid for 10 or 20 hours a week.

Olson, a Republican, supports allowing legislators to collect state pensions while in office, saying the policy encourages retirees such as himself with extensive public-sector experience to hold office by not penalizing them financially. Olson is among 10 of Oregon's 90 legislators who have collected \$3.1 million in state pensions while in office.

Photo by David Patton, Albany Democrat-Herald

In some states, lawmakers add expenses, per diem allowances and stipends to their base salaries. That inflates the compensation that's used to calculate retirement benefits, which are typically a percentage of final pay. In other states, legislators have written a special definition of salary that applies only to their pensions. Additional tactics include:

- Basing pensions on salaries legislators are not paid or were paid in non-legislative jobs.
- Collecting state pensions while also collecting legislative paychecks.
- Retiring earlier - at a younger age or after fewer years - than other state workers, or with richer benefits.

"It's mind-blowing hypocrisy," says state Rep. Stephen Webber, a Democrat from Missouri. State lawmakers there meet for roughly five months a year and are paid slightly more on average than a state worker, but records show a typical lawmaker's pension averages 30% more than a state worker's. The reason: rules legislators wrote for themselves.

"The whole two-tiered system really encapsulates how we've operated here in Missouri and in the rest of the country," he says. "Lawmakers treat themselves differently."

The generous systems mean that at least 570 lawmakers in 19 states have qualified for pensions that will pay them as much as — or in one case 17 times more than — their base legislative salaries, USA TODAY found.

That represents nearly 10% of the 5,900 lawmakers in the 40 states with legislative pensions. About 450 are lawmakers in Mississippi, Kansas, South Carolina, Texas and [New Mexico](#), a state where lawmakers receive no salary but can get a pension with five years of service.

More than 100 other lawmakers have collected about \$15 million total in state pensions while holding office, USA TODAY found. They serve in states that allow "double dipping" for legislators but bar or restrict other workers from getting state pensions while holding state or municipal jobs. Most of those lawmakers have retired from jobs such as state police officer or public school teacher, but others are drawing pensions solely for their legislative service.

For South Carolina's Thomas, the choice to trade a legislative salary for a legislative pension was easy.

Most 55-year-olds don't have pensions. Just 26% of people older than 55 get a retirement benefit from a former employer, according to the Employee Benefit Research Institute. The average pension in 2009 was \$13,007 for private-sector retirees and \$25,286 for public retirees.

In Congress, retiring lawmakers get pensions worth up to 80% of their \$174,000 salary — or \$139,200 — if they serve 32 years. The average pension for 455 retired federal lawmakers is \$57,590, according to the [Congressional Research Service](#).

- Discerning the state lawmakers' pensions isn't so easy.
- Legislators must reach a certain age — generally from 55 to 65 — or serve a certain number of years to get a pension. Many states deem an individual's retirement records confidential, however, and will not release details about payouts.
- Lacking that information, USA TODAY reviewed thousands of pages of laws from 40 states to understand how legislative salaries and pensions are computed. The newspaper calculated how much every legislator in the 40 states would get for a pension if he or she retired this year. Ten states do not pay lawmaker pensions.

Several states let lawmakers start collecting their retirement benefits while still in office.

Some states play make-believe. Kansas calculates lawmakers' pensions as if they were paid 372 days a year.

Texas pension calculations stray even further from reality. Lawmakers there haven't raised their pay since 1975. They convene every other year and get a \$7,200 annual salary. But because of a law they passed in 1981, their pension is based on whatever the lawmakers decide to pay Texas trial judges.

Lawmakers say they have increased their pensions to make up for salaries that are meant to be a part-time wage. And they say voting to change an obscure law that hikes a pension payout gets far less attention than a vote to boost pay. "It's hard politically to raise your own salary," says Kansas Senate President Steve Morris, a Republican.

In Kansas, legislators have cast three crucial votes to boost their pensions far above the benefit they would get from a salary that pays \$88.66 each day the Legislature convenes, or \$7,979 for a typical 90-day session.

Lawmakers voted in 1973 to calculate their pensions as if they were paid every day of the year. The vote also declared that legislators were paid 31 days a month for 12 months — or 372 days a year.

"It's a little shocking," says Jane Carter, executive director of the Kansas Organization of State Employees, which represents 10,000 state workers. "Our members have to work every single day for their pensions."

In 1982, Kansas lawmakers boosted their pensions again by adding per diem allowances to their salaries for pension purposes. They also pretended the allowances were paid 372 days a year when in reality they are paid only when legislators are in session. And they added to the pension equation the expense payments they get between legislative sessions.

But many lawmakers could not collect because they, like other state workers, needed 10 years of service to retire. "A lot of legislators in the past didn't serve 10 years and weren't eligible for a pension," says Morris, the Kansas lawmaker.

The Legislature changed that in 2007, voting to let workers retire with five years' service while requiring they pay more into the retirement fund. Though the lower retirement age helps all Kansas state workers, the effect on its 165 lawmakers was profound: an extra 44 of them instantly qualified for a pension. Now, 93 of the state's 165 legislators have qualified for a pension, and another 15 will be eligible if they finish their current terms. Lawmakers now have an \$85,821 salary for pension purposes and get a pension that exceeds their base pay by serving just six years.

"Until we find a way to increase compensation for the rank-and-file legislators, I think it's OK," Morris says of the pension plan. His 19-year tenure in the Senate qualifies him for a pension equal to three-and-a-half times his salary.

Kansas enacted a law this year, sponsored by Morris, that creates a commission to study several ways to cut the state's pension costs. Evaluating legislative pensions "is not part of their charge," Morris says.

The Legislature as 'an aristocracy'

As legislatures have cut state worker pension costs, some have targeted their own benefits. Arizona and Wisconsin enacted laws this year that sharply increase how much legislators and other elected officials must pay into the state retirement fund and cut benefits for new lawmakers.

Seven states have never given their lawmakers pensions, and voters in three states eliminated legislative pensions in the 1990s. "Voters see this as a part-time, citizen Legislature," says

NDAA Resolutions

The Patriot Coalition/Oath Keepers model NDAA resolutions were prepared by Mr. Stewart Rhodes, Founder of Oath Keepers (oathkeepers.org) a Yale Law Graduate who specializes in the application of military law to civilians, and Mr. Richard D. Fry, a constitutional law attorney and General Counsel for Patriot Coalition (patriotcoalition.com).

We are asking you and your organization to endorse the P.C.O.K. resolutions. This entails agreeing to promote the P.C.O.K. resolution to your public servants and other groups, and placing "The Intolerable Acts" [logo](#) with a web site link on your group's page and we will put your group's website and a hot link to it on the P.C.O.K. web page for your state. You will also be listed on the www.theintolerableacts.org site as an endorser. Please contact the following to endorse this comprehensive response to the NDAA:

Solutions@TheIntolerableActs.org

NDAA Joins "The Intolerable Acts"

The Intolerable Acts refers to two time periods in American history. The first such acts were implemented by the British Parliament and the King of England against the American Colonies just prior to the American Revolution, and were also known as the "Coercive Acts." The second such period of tyrannical oppression on the God-given Rights of the People began shortly after the attacks of 9/11/2001, and included several Acts of Congress that were signed into law by Presidents G.W. Bush and Barack Obama. Our legal team has spent hundreds of hours developing the most detailed and indepth NDAA resolutions for state legislators you will find anywhere. There are also resolutions for county sheriffs, and others in the works for other state and local governments, veteran service organizations, grassroots organizations, and more. In the coming weeks and months, "The Intolerable Acts" legal team will also produce and distribute model resolutions and legislation related to the entire spectrum of "intolerable and coercive acts" passed since 9/11/2001.

Senator Lindsey Graham is not alone in his belief that Miranda and due process should be waived because in his words, America IS the battlefield! He should read the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the rest of the U.S. Constitution. Watch the videos below to hear Senator Graham in his own words. Rather than destroy the Constitution, how about we end the VISA Waiver Program that allows foreigners to just waltz in, virtually unannounced? The VISA Waiver Program should be suspended at the very least until "the end of hostilities" since, according to Senator Graham (and others) we "are at war." Hmm... where's that declaration of war? Oh... don't have one. Still leaning on an Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) that Congress approved to go after those responsible for the attacks of 9/11/2001? Is this Groundhog Day, in which every day is 9/12/2001?

THE INTOLERABLE ACTS OF 1774 AND 2012

-John Wallace, Oath Keeper, for Liberty News Online, 2-23-12

On November 29, 1773, a group of angry American colonists threw several tons of British tea overboard into the Boston, Massachusetts harbor, which became known as the Boston Tea Party. The colonists took this action because the British Parliament had eliminated the taxes on tea distributed by the British owned East India Company in order to save the company from bankruptcy (think bailouts of Chrysler, GM, Wall Street firms, banks and numerous Solar companies today), which made British East India Co tea a lot less expensive than Colonial tea because the colonists were still required to pay the tax on their tea.

King George III and the British Parliament responded to the Boston Tea Party with a series of laws (Intolerable Acts) that they passed in 1774 severely reducing and almost eliminating the amount of self-government permissible in the American colonies. The acts sparked outrage and led to increased resistance throughout the 13 colonies to the tyranny of King George III and the British government. When the First Continental Congress was convened on September 5, 1774 in Philadelphia, the delegates pledged to support Massachusetts in case it was attacked by the British army. Eventually, all of the colonies would become involved when the American Revolutionary War began at Lexington and Concord on April 18, 1775.

Throughout the history of mankind, when people were hungry, they went out and

hunted for food, fished or planted crops to grow and eat. Somewhere along the line in America, these simple acts of hunting, fishing, planting crops, etc gradually became subject to the issuance of a license or required compliance with a regulation created by some government entity. There was a time in America when citizens did not need a license to hunt, to fish, to get married, to own a gun or to build a house. Now the people need licenses for all these things and much more. It should be noted that George Washington and Abraham Lincoln didn't have marriage licenses because these license requirements didn't exist when they were alive.

As our federal government (and to a lesser degree our state and local governments) began to grow and expand in the late 1800's and early 1900's, they needed more money so they passed mandatory income tax laws, introduced license fees, gasoline taxes, school taxes, sales taxes and thousands of other taxes, resulting in a significant loss of Liberty that has effectively enslaved the free people of America causing them to work a certain number of days every year just to pay for their governments, which now approaches almost six months of the year.

An increasing number of Federal, State and local government bureaucrats now determine how much liberty and freedom the American people will have when it comes to everyday things such as driving your car, farming your land, eating out, building a house, running your business, hiring employees, how much you must pay them, what kind of health benefits you must provide, how much you can inherit when a relative dies, etc. etc. etc. We sometimes do not see the true extent of the gradual loss of our Liberty and freedoms because the American people are being attacked from a hundred different directions at once by new laws, new restrictions, new regulations, new taxes and fees.

Whether the government is taxing our income, issuing fiat money, re-distributing our wealth, giving free health care and education to illegal aliens, over regulating businesses and farms, issuing deliberately false information to the American people on unemployment statistics, inflation or global warming, subsidizing ethanol production or guaranteeing loans to political cronies who have invested in phony solar companies that are going bankrupt, each one of these actions reduces our individual Liberty.

I know that some loss of individual liberty is necessary for maintaining the social order on which our other liberties depend. We need to have criminals arrested when they break the law. We need to secure our country's borders. We need to have a strong military for defense and we need to pay enough taxes to pay our police and military and to perform other constitutional functions. However, beyond what is authorized in the constitution, the loss of Liberty begins when the federal government unconstitutionally expands their functions while imposing huge costs on American citizens, without any offsetting social benefits.

Many of our state and local governments have also been attacking your Liberty and freedom of choice. The NYC Board of Health voted to adopt the nation's first city-wide outright ban on the use of trans-fats in restaurant cooking, because Mayor Bloomberg deemed it unhealthy. State and federal agencies now issue their own regulations, without state legislative or congressional approval, and have set out to criminalize the sale of raw milk and put small family farms and ranches out of business. Forget the war of crime and drugs, the food police in San Francisco have banned Happy Meals and in North Carolina recently, a 5 year old girl wasn't allowed by a government health bureaucrat to eat a nutritious lunch prepared by her mother. Instead, she was given Chicken nuggets to eat. The total amount of water that flushes in your toilet and even the ordinary light bulb, have now come under the firm control of federal

government bureaucrats. Your right to buy a simple light bulb, buy a toilet for your bathroom, prepare your child's lunch or eat certain foods in a restaurant has been taken from us. Our progressive, socialist tyrants in various government bureaucracies always thought they knew what was better for you than you did, only now they have given themselves the power to make you do what they want you to do. These actions are all unconstitutional and they all have gradually chipped away at our Liberty.

The passage of Obama-inspired health care reform bill took, from all Americans, another huge chunk of Liberty and has provided very little in return. With one stroke of a pen, for the first time in history, American citizens were mandated to buy a specific product – health insurance – or face a fine or worse. Of course, many private and public sector unions, teacher unions and other politically connected institutions that support big government received waivers. The rest of us must conform, or else face the consequences.

Most recently, our federal government has passed laws that are easily as dangerous to our Liberty and freedoms as any of the 'Intolerable Acts' passed by the British government in the 1770's that caused our founding fathers to take up arms and reassert their Liberty. The latest of these is the recently enacted National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (NDAA). President Barack Obama signed the NDAA into law on New Year's Eve 2011, granting himself absolute power to deploy the armed forces of the United States against American citizens. The new law allows the federal government to "indefinitely detain" American citizens suspected (by the federal government) of being "terrorists" (not defined) without the guaranteed rights of the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Amendments of the United States Constitution. No right to an attorney, no right to bail, no right to trial, no phone call, no right to confront your accusers, no rights at all. It is totally unconstitutional, yet it came from our elected representatives and was signed by our president who ignored the unconstitutional nature of the bill. You must remember that this type of legislation is something that dictators, tyrants and communist governments need in place to justify their power and to control the people.

President Obama has also recently issued a mandate to the Catholic Church and other religious groups that they must provide certain birth control and abortion drugs to their employees free of charge even it is against their religious beliefs, which of course is a violation of the First Amendment of the constitution. President Obama's mandates and executive orders are beginning to sound a lot like the mandates of King George III, back in 1774. The U.S. federal government, for many decades, has been encroaching on and trampling on our constitutional guaranteed rights much the same as King George III and the British parliament did in the 1770's. It is now perfectly clear to many Americans that our federal government, rather than protecting our rights as is required in a Republic, has clearly declared war on the constitutionally guaranteed rights of the American people.

My fellow American citizens, when Presidents of the United States issue unconstitutional and illegal executive orders, when federal judges unconstitutionally and illegally make law from their benches and when our elected representatives in congress pass laws that are unconstitutional and illegal attacks on our Liberty and Freedoms, should not these orders and laws also be considered 'Intolerable Acts' against the free people of America?

If your answer to that question is yes, then I have a second question for you.
What are you going to do about it?

"There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations." -----James Madison, speech to the Virginia Ratifying Convention, 1788

Rep. Key Files Resolution Calling for Repeal of National Defense Authorization Act

[Direct Link to This Story](#) Contact: Rep. Charles Key Capitol: (405) 557-7354

OKLAHOMA CITY (February 3, 2012) – A resolution filed by state Rep. Charles Key would petition Congress and President Barack Obama to repeal sections of the National Defense Authorization Act that are in conflict with the U.S. Constitution.

“President Barack Obama has said he would not hold citizens indefinitely, it is deplorable that he would sign into law legislation that contains clauses that would authorize him to do just that,” said Key (R-Oklahoma City). “Oklahomans have taken notice of this repugnant new law and as state lawmakers it is our duty to apply pressure to Congress and the president to undo this debacle.”

House Concurrent Resolution 1025 calls on Congress and President Barack Obama to repeal Sections 1021 and 1022 of the NDAA law.

Key said Sections 1021 and 1022 directly conflict with our constitutional right to a trial by jury and due process.

“It is so clear that this law is unconstitutional and it would be laughable if it were not so serious an issue that President Obama would talk about how his lawyers are ensuring that it would not be misused,” said Key. “Americans all over this country are shaking their heads in disbelief.”

Will the next President Protect our God-given Unalienable Rights?

We the People have Rights that come from our Creator. When our Constitution was being ratified, several States attached both recommended amendments to their ratification documents, over 200 in fact, around 100 of which were unique. North Carolina and Rhode Island refused to even ratify the Constitution without a set of amendments that recognized certain God-given Rights that were unalienable. The U.S. House and Senate reconciled the list down to 12 amendments, ten of which became the Bill of Rights.

What is equally as important to note, is that many of the sovereign states also sent Declarations of Rights. The People of North Carolina, for example, sent a declaration containing twenty Rights, none of which were granted, nor could they be taken away by the "child" borne of the several States, the federal government they created... a more perfect Union, if you will. Mitt Romney said he would have signed the 2012 NDAA into law with the "indefinite detention" provisions intact. Rick Santorum also approves of the "indefinite detention" of Americans. Newt Gingrich was for the global warming hoax and Fannie & Freddie before he was against it, and still believes we should give amnesty to illegal alien invaders who have been here 25 years, despite the fact they already had that opportunity 25 years ago. Since 9/11/2001, nearly 100,000 Americans have died at the hands of illegal alien invaders as our government refused to secure our borders and continues to refuse to enforce the immigration laws already on the books. (See: <http://firecoalition.com/docs/RCG-11-1-11.pdf> and visit: <http://operationbodycount.com>)

Senator Graham is from one of those original States that created our great Republic, but has forgotten from whence he came, and what his oath entailed. It would seem he believes we should be a nation ruled by the "whims" of men, and the supreme Law of the Land, the U.S. Constitution. What a sad day in America.

(Fortunately) There is one, (and regrettably, only one) candidate for President that expresses even the slightest concern about the erosion of our God-given Rights: Congressman Ron Paul. We're not suggesting whom you should vote for. We are suggesting you ask hard questions of ALL the candidates, one of which may be called upon to take the following Oath of Office of the President of the United States next January, found in [U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 1, Clause 8](#):

Pileup at the White House By [Dana Milbank](#), Published: June 11

It has been a Junius Horribilis for President Obama.

Job growth has stalled, the Democrats have been humiliated in Wisconsin, the attorney general is facing a

contempt-of-Congress citation, talks with Pakistan have broken down, Bill Clinton is contradicting Obama, Mitt Romney is outraging him, Democrats and Republicans alike are complaining about a “cascade” of national-security leaks from his administration, and he is now on record as saying that the “private sector is doing fine.”

Could it get any worse?

Early Monday morning, Obama learned that it could. His aides delivered the news to him that his commerce secretary had been cited for a felony hit-and-run after allegedly crashing his car three times over the weekend. In one incident, the previously obscure Cabinet officer apparently rear-ended a Buick, spoke to the car’s occupants, then hit the vehicle again as he left.

Thus did Jay Carney, the oft-besieged White House press secretary, have another briefing carjacked by bad news. And Carney, who either didn’t know the details of the bizarre episode or wasn’t at liberty to divulge them, had to execute a full range of defensive maneuvers.

“I can simply tell you that he was engaged, as has been reported, in a couple of traffic incidents,” Carney began, as if the secretary, John Bryson, had been photographed by a speed camera or two. Bryson “suffered a seizure, was hospitalized. But beyond that I’ll refer you to Commerce for the details.”

“Is the secretary healthy and fit to serve?” inquired Ben Feller of the Associated Press.

“I would refer you to the Commerce Department.”

Ann Compton of ABC News asked whether the White House chief of staff, who spoke to Bryson, considers the incident serious.

“I don’t have a specific response to give you,” Carney said.

CNN’s Brianna Keilar asked about “the timing of the seizure in relation to the accident.”

“I would refer you, as I said in the past, to the Department of Commerce,” Carney answered.

“I’ve been asking them for hours,” Keilar protested.

“I think I would refer you to the Commerce Department,” was Carney’s rote reply.

The former journalist informed the questioners that he “was not a presiding doctor on this case” and could confirm only that “the commerce secretary was alone, he had a seizure, he was involved in an accident.”

“He was involved in several accidents,” called out April Ryan of American Urban Radio.

“Thank you for the correction,” Carney said. He did not sound grateful.

Carney’s non-defense doesn’t suggest much job security for Bryson, who, depending on what caused the episode Saturday, has either a medical problem or a legal problem.

For the White House, it was just the latest entry in the when-it-rains-it-pours ledger. This has been one of the worst stretches of the Obama presidency. In Washington, there is a creeping sense that the bottom has fallen out and that there may be no second term. Privately, senior Obama advisers say they are no longer expecting much economic improvement before the election.

Carney had the unenviable task of confronting the full arsenal of gloom at Monday afternoon’s briefing.

The AP asked about the president’s unfortunate private-sector-is-fine remark. The Reuters correspondent asked about the economic “head winds” from Europe. Ed Henry of Fox News Channel asked about the looming contempt-of-Congress vote against Attorney General Eric Holder. Margaret Talev of Bloomberg News asked about the Supreme Court striking down Obamacare. Norah O’Donnell of CBS News asked about calls for a special prosecutor to probe leaks. Victoria Jones of Talk Radio News asked about the stalled talks with Pakistan.

Carney sought relief by calling on TV correspondents from swing states, but the one from Wisconsin asked about the failed attempt to recall Republican Gov. Scott Walker and the one from Nevada asked about her state’s unemployment rate, the nation’s highest.

Mostly, though, questions veered back to the commerce secretary’s motoring.

AP Radio’s Mark Smith asked whether Bryson “is now on medical leave.”

“I would refer you to the Commerce Department.” (Eight hours later, Carney issued a statement saying that Bryson was indeed taking such a leave.)

Ryan asked about “mandatory physicals” for Cabinet nominees.

“I don’t have any details about that.”

A New York Daily News correspondent asked if Obama has confidence in Bryson staying on the job with a “felony rap.”

This one Carney answered — by not answering. “He is concerned about Secretary Bryson’s health and broadly about the incident,” the spokesman said — in marked contrast to the “absolute confidence” he said a moment later that Obama has in Holder.

Apparently Bryson will have to clean up his own wreckage. This White House has too many other pileups to deal with.

Oath of Office of President U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 1, Clause 8:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United

"The example of changing a constitution by assembling the wise men of the state, instead of assembling armies, will be worth as much to the world as the former examples we had give them. The constitution, too, which was the result of our deliberation, is unquestionably the wisest ever yet presented to men." --Thomas Jefferson, letter to David Humphreys, 1789

If you would like to forward this Newsletter as is on to others – be my guest.
If you would like to send comments (just a sentence or two) to the editor – be my guest.
If you have an editorial to submit – be my guest.

Flint Hills TEA Party contact information: www.flinthillsteaparty.com; facebook or email: fhtp@flinthillsteaparty.com – Flint Hills TEA Party; Manhattan contact – Chuck Henderson, 785-236-1286; Sylva Nichols, editor, email: sylda@gemsandwood.com. Sylva sends the snail mail Newsletter; Flint Hills TEA Party Snail Mail: Flint Hills TEA Party of KS, 1228 Westloop Place, PMB #326, Manhattan, KS 66502-2840. All donations for the Educational Fund (payable to “Educational Fund”) will also be accepted at this address and is tax deductible.

Reprinting of this Newsletter may be done in whole, however, copying any part requires permission given by the persons listed above.