



**Defenders of the Constitution of the United States of America  
Tea Party Boise stands for, limited government, fiscal responsibility, private property,  
state rights and individual sovereignty.**

### IS PROPERTY PRIOR TO LAW OR IS LAW PRIOR TO PROPERTY?

Have we, as individuals and citizens of this nation lost sight of the meaning of property or tempted by enticing reasoning that has caused us to abandon our natural right to property? Have we, over time, allowed the warping of truth to assimilate our being until our rights have fallen into the hands of the law and our legislature?

Our understanding of property is of paramount importance for it determines what position we choose regarding any government action that impacts property. Do we believe that property is a natural right that precedes the law or that property is created by the law. How we stand on proposed legislation, how we choose representation and whether we choose to live under a centralized government or as sovereign individuals is contingent on our understanding of this question.

\* In the mid 1800's Frederic Bastiat, wrote;

“----- this is not, as might be thought, a theoretical and idle question. It is of tremendous, of fundamental importance. Its solution concerns society most urgently--. Economists believe that property is a providential fact, like the human person. The law does not bring the one into existence any more than it does the other. Property is a necessary consequence of the nature of man. In the full sense of the word man is born a proprietor, because he is born with wants whose satisfaction is necessary to life, and with organs and faculties whose exercise is indispensable to the satisfaction of these wants. Faculties are only an extension of the person; and property is nothing but an extension of the faculties. To separate a man from his faculties is to cause him to die; to separate a man from the product of his faculties is likewise to cause him to die. “--- we observe that he cannot live without providing for his wants, that he cannot provide for his wants without labor, and that he will not perform any labor if he is not sure of applying the fruit of his labor to the satisfaction of his wants.”

Man, too, lives and develops by appropriation. Appropriation is a natural phenomenon, providential and essential to life; and property is only appropriation that labor has made a right. When labor has rendered substances assimilable and appropriable that were not so before, I do not really see how it can be alleged that, by right, the act of appropriation should be performed for the benefit of another individual than the one who has done the work.”

All past constitutions proclaim that property is sacred, a fact that seems to indicate that the goal of social organization is the free development of private associations or individuals through their labor. This implies that the right to property is prior to law, since the sole object of the law would be to protect property.

The genius of Frederic Bastiat is illuminating to this day. His essays, periodicals and speeches contain a message to those concerned with preserving and extending liberty and prosperity. Though he wrote during the 1840's the eloquence of his arguments remain timeless and valid.

\* Selected Essays on Political Economy, Frederic Bastiat, pg. 98-100

### VOTE FOR LOCAL AND STATE REPRESENTATIVES THAT PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY

It is up to you and me to seek representation by those who have the insight and courage to turn this country around, to expose the legal plunder and theft of property that defies the founding principles that underlie our natural right to property.

We must take this country back! Rid Washington of politicians that have, over time, implemented policies that place a stranglehold over individuals of this nation. They have delivered us into a state of debt and divisiveness. Share the truth with your children, your neighbors and friends and encourage them to vote. It is our only hope!



REPEAL OF THE 17TH AMENDMENT  
POLITICAL RHETORIC, OR RESTORING STATE SOVEREIGNTY?

By John Anderson

The rights of individual states have been in constant decline since the passage of the 17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1913. It was bad law in 1913 and it is bad law in 2010.

The founders realized early on that if there was no structure in the federal government to provide a counter-balance to popular will, the entire structure of a Representative Republic could be rendered meaningless.

In the Constitution, members of the House of Representatives were to be elected by popular vote, to represent the people's views as well as their passions. There are 435 members of the House of Representatives, so they are close to the people. Popular elections, however, bring pressures to comply with the will of the majority, even when it may not be in the best interest of the states. That is why they are elected for only a two year term.

To counter this risk, the founders set the Senate up as a smaller body, consisting of only two Senators per state (currently 100). These U.S. representatives were appointed by the state legislatures for a six year term. Unlike their House counterparts, Senators were sent to Washington to protect their state from federal intrusion and to have "veto" power over legislation that would necessarily result in the loss of sovereignty for their state. In this setup, the people ultimately control the outcome, by popularly electing both their Congressman and their state representatives. They empowered Congress to vote their issues and they empowered their state legislatures to vote their state's rights.

The 17th Amendment eliminated that balance of power completely. Under this amendment, Senators now pander to all the things that popular elections produce, particularly money and special interest. Now both Congress and the Senate guarantee their re-election by bringing taxpayer money home to their state. They do so in many cases, by sacrificing their state's rights.

The results of the 17th Amendment have been disastrous in terms of state sovereignty. To wit, the federal Department of Education operates as a defacto federal school board, which is unconstitutional. The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) operates as a defacto health management agency, dictating everything from the food we eat, to the care we receive. This role for the federal government is also unconstitutional. The Environmental Protection Agency dictates everything from the air we breathe to the fuel we use in our cars, a role never given to the federal government under our Constitution. The list of unconstitutional infringements by the federal government upon state sovereignty is almost endless today, all a direct result of states not being properly represented in the U.S. Senate.

It is clearly time to repeal the 17th Amendment, returning the appointment of U.S. Senators to their rightful place under our Constitution, the state legislature. Doing this will accomplish two very important things.

- One, it will begin to reverse the destructive trend towards an all-powerful federal government.
- Two it will begin to re-establish the fundamental founding principle that it is the states who give power to the federal government, not the reverse.

Citizens of Idaho should stand up for the repeal of the 17th Amendment. It is today a law that allows an overbearing federal government to trample on their rights to live their lives as they see fit, to educate their children as they see fit and to create a state environment that represents Idaho, rather than the forced homogenized society imposed on us by an all-powerful federal bureaucracy.

Senators Risch and Crapo, as well as Congressmen Minnick and Simpson oppose the repeal of the 17th Amendment. Most challengers to their jobs today say that they support the repeal. What those challengers will support, once elected, has yet to be determined.

Voters of Idaho, know what your Constitution says and why the founders set things up the way that they did. You will not get the truth from the media. You will not get the truth from academics, who are little more than progressive revisionists. You will not get the truth from your federal government. Do your homework and vote the Constitution every time, or one day you will wake up a prisoner in your own home.



FOOD FOR THOUGHT-  
A DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY?  
Continuation of the April 10 Newsletter, iss. 16

Statistics indicate that the majority of Americans have lost confidence in our nations leadership. The president and congress have formed an affront that includes abuse of private property, personal choices through regulations, entitlement programs and taxation, out of control spending and rampant debt.

When reading The Declaration of Independence one cannot help but compare our situation today with that of the colonists who demanded freedom from taxation and control by the British monarchy. Comparing the 1700's with our situation today may seem a bit of a stretch. However, it takes little imagination regarding the political environment today and how it resembles that period in history. With that said, what would you declare today?

DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY

The People of the State of IDAHO, as one of fifty states of the United States of America, Declare the return to the principles found in the Charters of Freedom i.e. The Declaration of Independence, Constitution of the United States and Bill of Rights. It is the belief of the people of this State that these documents protect God given and natural rights of the individual.

We believe in the lasting truths 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.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to re-institute founding principles while diminishing government intervention as to effect Prosperity, Safety and Happiness. Wisdom and experience encourages us to stand valiantly as protectors of the Republic and of State Rights rather than lulled into complacency.

When a long train of abuses, usurpations, fiscal irresponsibility, reducing this State to exist under a sovereign government, it is their right, it is their duty, to appeal the allegiance to God and country to abandon authoritarian policies and return to the Charters of freedom to provide new Guards for their future security.

Recent history shows injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted before all.

- The president and his congress have refused to abide by the Constitution and Bill of Rights
- They have subrogated State Rights with government sovereignty
- They have attacked the free market system by creating crisis' based on false information for the purpose of expanding government.
- They have imposed undue taxation to expand entitlements and dependency upon government.
- They have ignored the Constitution while legally plundering private property and freedoms that affect the culture and history of this State
- They have obstructed the laws of immigration for the purpose of promoting their political agenda.
- They have expanded bureaucracies with the power to regulate business and harrass people and by these actions control and diminish the value of private property.
- They disregard updating the armament of the Military and ignore preparedness should a national emergency arise.
- They have subjected us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws;
  - promoted intervening Legislation
  - imposing Taxes on us without our Consent
  - used monies from national coffers to "bargain" for key votes on specific issues such as healthcare
  - offering stimulus monies to businesses and banks in order to 'save' them from bankruptcy, therefore, controlling interest of said entities
  - creating crisis on arbitrarily based information for the purpose of regulating, taxing and controlling energy
  - regulating land use to prohibit its use by private industry such as drilling for oil
  - intervening in the state educational system promoting ideals that obscure the traditions and culture of the State



declaration of sovereignty continued from page 3-

- obscuring history, fundamental rights and roll of government within our educational system
- intervening regulations on the State such as the EPA Environmental Protection Agency , OSHA, Occupational, Safety and Health Administration that impacts State rights.

- They have incited divisiveness and dissention within this nation rather than embracing the glory of one nation under God.

We, the citizens of the united States of America, appeal to the President and the Congress to desist from federal intervention into the State. We demand that the federal government desist from unconstitutional activities that cripples a free market system. The people spoke in the majority against an ideology that denies the sovereignty of the people while imposing the centralization of power. We, as a Free and Independent State, declare that the federal government desist in all things not prescribed in the Constitution or agreed upon by the State. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we pledge, as citizens of this United States, to each other, have full Power to, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor the welfare of a free society.

Nancy K. Armstrong

### WHY TEA PARTIERS SAY THROW THE BUMS OUT

by Phyllis Schlafly Tuesday, May 04, 2010

Proof that the Tea Partiers and others are on target when they criticize both political parties was supplied by the behavior of the U.S. House on April 29. Demoting all major economic and corruption problems facing our country to the bottom of the agenda, the House devoted a long afternoon and 12 roll-call votes to passing a bill to force U.S. statehood on Puerto Rico.

Of course, this ploy had to be Nancy Pelosi's doing, but she made it bipartisan by getting 39 Republicans to vote with her. They walked like lambs to the slaughter, led by (I'll tactfully omit the appropriate metaphor) Rep. Mike Pence, R-Ind., and Rep. Eric Cantor, R-Va.

Puerto Ricans have voted against statehood in three referenda, most recently in 1998. Congress didn't get the message and plans to make them vote again.

However, the new vote prescribed in the mischievously named "Democracy" bill will set an all-time record for dishonest elections. The plan will require Puerto Rico to hold two new referenda that are rigged to enable some to claim that Puerto Rico voted to become a state.

The first referendum would require Puerto Ricans to vote on whether they want to retain their current commonwealth status or change their "political status." Try asking any Republican whether he wants to change our current political status, and you will see what a ridiculous question that is.

If "change" wins the first referendum, a second referendum will require Puerto Ricans to choose among four options: statehood, independence, "sovereignty in association with the United States" (an obviously vague choice) or retain the current commonwealth status. With four choices on the ballot, the winner would receive only a plurality, not a majority.

The bill would allow persons who were born in Puerto Rico but now live and vote in the United States to vote in these Puerto Rican referenda. That means giving the vote to a group based on ethnicity rather than on residency, and should be held unconstitutional under the 15th Amendment.

One explanation for this dishonest scheme to create a new state is political pandering to the Hispanic vote, yet not only the Hispanics but even the Puerto Ricans are very divided on statehood. The most prominent Hispanic member of Congress, Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., and one of the most prominent Puerto Ricans in Congress, Rep. Nydia Velazquez, D-N.Y., voted no on the statehood bill.

The whole idea of allowing Puerto Rico to decide to become our 51st state is offensive to our constitutional government. We the people of the United States are the only ones to decide whether or not to accept a new state as one of our United States.

A major reason why the American people do not want to accept Puerto Rico as a state is that this would overnight make the United

Full article-See: <http://www.townhall.com>

VIDEOFINANCIAL REFORM-WHAT CAN WE EXPECT BUT MORE LIES!

See: <http://www.heritage.org/Multimedia/Video/2010/04/A-Wall-Street-Bailout-Bill>

DON'T LET WASHINGTON DIVERT ATTENTION AWAY FROM THE REAL FINANCIAL FALL CULPRIT-  
FANNIE AND FREDDIE.!

MORNING BELL: FANNIE AND FREDDIE FAILURE FOREVER

Posted May 6th, 2010, Enterprise and Free Markets

Yesterday, Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT) told reporters about his financial regulation bill, "We've ended the 'too big to fail' debate. So no longer do I expect any argument to be made that this bill exposes the American taxpayer." Really. Someone might want to tell Sen. Dodd that in other news yesterday, Freddie Mac announced that it lost another \$6.7 billion in the first quarter of 2010 and therefore needed another \$10.6 billion in cash from U.S. taxpayers. Since formally nationalizing Freddie in 2008, the federal government has already spent \$50.7 billion bringing the Freddie bailout total to \$61.3 billion so far. Combined with Fannie Mae's raid on the Treasury, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the American people will spend \$389 billion bailing out the two Government Sponsored Entities by 2019. So much for American taxpayers no longer being exposed to "too big to fail."

In fact, nothing in the Dodd bill does anything to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. This despite the fact that Fannie and Freddie were key components in causing the very financial crises Dodd claims his bill will forever prevent. Fannie and Freddie were both created for the specific purpose of making it easier for Americans to buy more expensive housing. Starting in 1993, political forces pushed Fannie and Freddie to loosen their once strict loan purchasing requirements. By 1996, regulations required that 40% of all Fannie and Freddie-bought loans must come from individuals with below median incomes. In 1995, Fannie and Freddie began buying subprime securities originally bought and bundled by private firms. One of these firms was Countrywide Financial who, thanks to their status as Fannie Mae's biggest customer, delivered investors a 23,000% return between 1985 and 2003. By 2004, Fannie and Freddie were purchasing \$175 billion worth of subprime securities per year from Countrywide and their brethren... a 44% share of the entire market. There are other factors that helped contribute to the 2008 financial crisis, but Fannie and Freddie's use of their "too big to fail" status to create and grow the subprime security market was essential.

But Sen. Dodd, who received V.I.P. treatment from Countrywide CEO Angelo Mozilo, never saw any problem with Fannie and Freddie. On July 13, 2008, Senator Dodd said on national television, "To suggest somehow that [Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac] are in trouble is simply not accurate." Less than two months later the bailouts of Fannie and Freddie began. Keep these facts in mind when Dodd says his bill solves the "too big to fail" problem.

The problems with the Dodd bill go beyond its failure to let Fannie and Freddie wither into extinction. While Dodd has agreed to get rid of the \$50 billion bailout fund, the underlying bailout authority still remains. Now taxpayers are expected to front the government money while firms are liquidated. But the irresponsible creditors who let those firms borrow money irresponsibly would still be eligible for taxpayer bailouts. According to The Washington Post, "a failing firm would be forced to pay back the government any money they received above what they would have gotten under a bankruptcy proceeding." But how does the government know what creditors would have got if the company went into bankruptcy? Why not just strengthen the existing bankruptcy system and actually allow these too big to fail firms to, ya know, fail?

But Dodd and the Obama administration would never allow that. It would defeat the whole purpose of this financial regulation bill, which is to transfer as much power to the federal government as possible. Never mind that these are the same government regulators who failed to see the last crisis coming.

See: <http://www.heritage.org>



SLIGHT OF HAND

If politicians can keep the public in a state of chaos and uncertainty,  
They can magically change the facts to fit their agenda  
Believing that the deception will be unnoticed.

Nancy Armstrong

OUR ECONOMY WAS LEGISLATED AND REGULATED INTO THIS MESS  
IN REVIEW-THE DOWNFALL OF THE US ECONOMY

Big-government fingerprints on the murder weapon, by Ernest Istook

The government created a quota system that required lending to people who lacked the ability to repay. Clinton's HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development) decreed that big chunks of mortgages must be issued to borrowers with poor finances. It started at 12 percent of all Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac mortgages in 1996. By 2008, that proportion had more than doubled, to 28 percent.

- Fannie and Freddie dominated the mortgage market, holding about \$5 trillion in mortgages, they dictated mortgage standards. Unless banks made those loans that could be sold to Fannie and Freddie, there was a limit to other loans that would be bought. (In other words, the banks were blackmailed into providing sub-prime loans).

- As HUD wrote in a 2004 report, explaining its post-1996 quotas:

HUD's ... Regulation imposes no requirement for the total number of home purchase mortgages that a GSE [Government-Sponsored Enterprise] must buy. Rather, the rule provides that, however many home purchase loans in metropolitan areas the GSEs buy, a certain percentage must be in each goal category. For example, if a GSE buys 1 million home purchase mortgages in metropolitan areas in 2005, then 450,000 of these mortgages would need to be for low- and moderate-income families.

Under that scenario, for each million loans made in 2005 (when the "very low-income" goal was 22 percent), then 220,000 of those mortgages were required by federal regulation to be among the "special affordable" sub-prime group. Since Fannie and Freddie bought hundreds of billions in mortgages each year, this 22 percent quickly became a huge mandate to make poor-quality loans. Lenders complied by creating the infamous zero-down loans and other loans that proved to be junk. This wasn't a failure to regulate. It was a failure by regulating too much!

- Fannie and Freddie complied with HUD's requirements, increasing their sub-prime loans year after year. Protected by their political friends, especially in Congress, Fannie and Freddie not only met their quotas for backing home loans to people who couldn't afford houses, they surpassed them.

- Helping out was the controversial group ACORN, which joined other community organizations in channeling potential borrowers to banks that would make these special loans while receiving handsome fees.

- The law created penalties that could reach \$25,000 each day if they were not aggressive enough in marketing mortgages to those who had limited ability to pay.

- Congress in 1992 created the requirement (quota system for mortgage loans) that Fannie and Freddie must back loans to very low-income persons. However, the legislation specified only that this goal must be "not less than 1 percent." Starting at 12 percent and scaling up to 28 percent, the Clinton administration went above and beyond this. And the Bush administration did not reverse that course.

The left is aggressively working to convince America that a "failure to regulate" made lenders go crazy and wreck our economy through greed. The truth is that our economy was legislated and regulated into this mess. Even if our economy isn't already regulated to death, it's still attempted murder.

Big-government fingerprints on the murder weapon, by Ernest Istook

First Appeared on WorldNetDaily, October 17, 2008



FINANCIAL REFORM MIRRORS THE HEALTH CARE BILL, THE ENERGY BILL AND MORE---  
ALL BASED ON LIES, DECEPTION AND CONTROL

YOUR MONEY:

The financial regulation bill the Senate is debating contains 1,400 pages of deception aimed for a government-micromanaged economy—and the undoing of your financial privacy. A planned economy thru financial services regulations will implement personal data collection. For proof:

- The "Office of Financial Research" (sec. 152) will have a "Data Center" (sec. 154) that requires submission of data on any financial activity that poses a threat to financial stability.
- This allows the government access into financial activities federal bureaucrats suspect might cause instability and to examine all financial transactions—including yours. Confidentiality is compromised as it is and will be lost with this bill.
- A competitive environment would be replaced for financial data with a uniform government data platform. Financial stability would be placed in the hands of the government, therefore, if their decisions are bad (as they have unequivocally proven) all players in the financial services system fall together.
- The Office of Financial Research itself threatens financial stability when competition in the marketplace is removed.

PRIVACY:

- The "Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection" (sec. 1011) in the bill is a 'peeping Tom' into your personal financial life. Among its mandates is to "gather information . . . regarding the organization, business conduct, markets, and activities of persons operating in consumer financial services markets" (sec. 1022(c)(4)).
- the definition of "person" includes "an individual" (sec. 1002(17)). The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection can investigate your business conduct and activities.
- Section 1071(b) requires any deposit-taking financial institution to geo-code customer addresses and maintain records of deposits for at least three years. The Bureau may "use the data for any other purpose as permitted by law," such as handing it off to other bureaus, like the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection is not about protection, rather, should be called Consumer Financial Deception. It is, about collecting information that allows regulation, intimidation and control of individuals. Nor was the Social Security number about creating a uniform national identifier that facilitates both lawful (excessive) data collection and identity fraud. The construction of surveillance infrastructure is the enemy of individuals who believe in the right to privacy!

Data-driven triangulation on individuals will get easier as data collection grows society-wide. Once this door is opened, rules diminish as 'needs' arise. If we're to maintain privacy, government data collection should be questioned and constrained not growing!

(For a perspective on Anonymity, see, Latanya Sweeney's 2002 "k-anonymity" paper is best known for establishing how anonymous data can be "re-identified," unraveling promised confidentiality and privacy.)

U.S. CONGRESS AND SENATE PROPOSE CREATION OF CFPA TO PROTECT HELPLESS CITIZENS!

As part of their response to the current financial crisis, the U.S. Congress and Senate have proposed the creation of a Consumer Financial Protection Agency (CFPA).

The intent of the CFPA is to unify the supervision and enforcement of existing protection laws in consumer finance and to enhance financial literacy among the public (The government! Who asked them to enhance our financial literacy?). According to the Senate's proposal, the agency is necessary because "the economic crisis (Again, the use of the word 'crisis' to emotionally promote their agenda!) was driven by an across-the-board failure (Not!) to protect consumers." While we believe that the primary cause of the crisis was the risk-taking of banks (it was government blackmail of the banks, if you recall!) consumer protection was certainly lacking, and we therefore strongly support the creation of a Consumer Financial Protection Agency.

See the following if you really want to 'enhance' your confidence in the proposed bill!

See: [http://www.opencongress.org/bill/111-h3126/show#users\\_tracking](http://www.opencongress.org/bill/111-h3126/show#users_tracking)



## SPENDING WON'T CUT DANGEROUS DEFICIT

By Sen. Sam Brownback  
5/3/2010

By creating a National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, President Barack Obama has acknowledged the new political reality: Voters have had enough of this administration's attempts to spend the country's way out of this recession while permanently increasing the size of government. In the wake of unprecedented taxpayer-funded bailouts and stimulus funds, with little to show for them besides a mountain of debt, the American people are insisting that the federal government roll back this spending binge and get its fiscal house in order.

This commission, unfortunately, looks like mere political window dressing, providing cover to the president and the Democratic Congress so they can pursue the same failed course of massive deficit spending and crippling tax hikes. The first indication of the administration's lack of seriousness is that the commission has been instructed to exclude interest payments on the national debt in considering what to do about the yearly budget deficit.

The absurdity of this is highlighted when you consider that, by 2014, interest payments will make up more than half the projected deficit. By 2017, they will make up more than two-thirds of the yearly budget shortfall. This is like thinking that you can pay off your credit card debt by paying only the interest every month or that you can exclude the interest on your monthly mortgage payment when constructing a family budget.

These interest payments on our national debt are not optional. Excluding more than two-thirds of projected deficits from the administration's stated goal of balancing the budget by 2015 seems intentionally misleading.

**Why would the administration suggest such a patently frivolous approach to the most pressing crisis facing us** — which threatens U.S. fiscal solvency and the future we leave to our children and grandchildren? Because, despite the denials, the administration and the Democrats in Congress have contributed mightily to the out-of-control spending that has led to unprecedented debt levels.

In promoting its budget, the White House has repeatedly claimed that the massive debt we face in the coming decade was baked into the cake before Obama "walked in the door." While this diverts attention from the reckless spending in the Obama budget, the claim does not hold up to scrutiny. Though Obama said in his State of the Union address that "by the time I took office, we had a one-year deficit of over \$1 trillion and projected deficits of \$8 trillion over the next decade," Congressional Budget Office data flatly contradict this. The CBO's January 2009 projections showed a 10-year deficit of \$3.1 trillion, while Obama's proposed budget for the same years includes a deficit over that period of \$9.1 trillion — nearly three times that projected by the CBO in the month he "walked in the door."

**The problem is not debt per se; it's spending. And this administration is responsible for most of it.**

Now, Congress has passed a so-called jobs bill, which constitutes the third "stimulus" bill of this recession — and just piles the debt higher. Recommendations already exist from many sources — including the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget and previous administrations — about how to cut the deficit. Creating a redundant commission to provide further recommendations makes no sense — except as a way to get bipartisan cover for tax hikes to close the ever-widening gap.

But few serious analysts think tax increases can cover the gap. Indeed, if the president's pledge not to raise taxes on those making less than \$250,000 is taken seriously, it would require a top income tax rate of 91 percent. The truth is that it is runaway spending and government growth that threaten any potential recovery — and raising taxes is just about the worst prescription for a shaky economy. To get the deficit under control, we must get at the issue of spending and get at it in a way that is not dictated by short-term political considerations. The recent experience in Greece reveals the existence of a tipping point in government debt, and Washington is currently on a path that could lead to a similar lack of confidence and unwillingness of investors to finance debt.

**The only difference is that no one will be there to bail out the United States.**

We must take every measure at our disposal to keep this from happening. In the meantime, let us not be deceived by those who tell us we can dig our way out of this fiscal hole by piling on more debt with a new round of spending. The only thing such an approach will stimulate is the inexorable growth of government.

See: <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0510/36653>



### ARIZONA GOVERNOR JAN BREWSTER DEFENDS THE STATE

30% of the Arizona population is Hispanic. They are an integral part of the Arizona history and culture. Those critics outside the state cannot judge for the people who live within the laws of the land. It is their property to be protected.

George Will states, -- "Misguided and irresponsible" is how Arizona's new law pertaining to illegal immigration is characterized by Speaker Nancy Pelosi. She represents San Francisco, which calls itself a "sanctuary city," an exercise in exhibitionism that means it will be essentially uncooperative regarding enforcement of immigration laws. Yet as many states go to court to challenge the constitutionality of the federal mandate to buy health insurance, scandalized liberals invoke 19th-century specters of "nullification" and "interposition," anarchy and disunion. Strange.

It is passing strange for federal officials, including the president, to accuse Arizona of irresponsibility while the federal government is refusing to fulfill its responsibility to control the nation's borders. Such control is an essential attribute of national sovereignty. America is the only developed nation that has a 2,000-mile border with a developing nation, and the government's refusal to control that border is why there are an estimated 460,000 illegal immigrants in Arizona and why the nation, sensibly insisting on first things first, resists "comprehensive" immigration reform.

Arizona's law makes what is already a federal offense that being in the country illegally is a state offense. Some critics seem not to understand Arizona's right to assert concurrent jurisdiction. The Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund attacks Gov. Jan Brewer's character and motives, saying she "caved to the radical fringe." This poses a semantic puzzle: Can the large majority of Arizonans who support the law be a "fringe" of their state?

The Bill of Rights- the Fourth Amendment, proscribes "unreasonable searches and seizures.

Arizona's statute is not presumptively unconstitutional merely because it says that police officers are now required to try to make "a reasonable attempt" to determine the status of a person "where reasonable suspicion exists" that the person is here illegally. Some liberal critics say Arizona's law is unconstitutional because the 14th Amendment which guarantees "equal protection of the laws"

For more-A Law Arizona Can Live With by George Will, Apr. 28, 2010 See: <http://www.townhall.com>

### THE BIGGER PICTURE-IMMIGRATION OR NATIONAL SECURITY?

Politics, as usual, suggests that solutions to the 'complexity' of the immigration and border security problems are being sought. There are laws in place to protect our borders, yet forty years of liberal leniency, unassertiveness and political cowardice have prevented a commitment to enforcing the law.

Among the limited responsibilities of the federal government is national protection. The feds are obviously busy intervening in our private property, regulating this and taxing that while avoiding their 'uncomfortable' responsibility of implementing the law. The following reference offers solutions, one being to track works

Illegal immigration into the United States is massive in scale. More than 10 million undocumented aliens currently reside in the U.S., and that population is growing by 700,000 per year.

The real problem with undocumented immigrant workers is disregard for our laws. It is also apparent to most U.S. citizens that our borders are 'open' not only to drug trafficking, but to terrorists.

### FORGET THE CAMERAS-CLOSE THE BORDERS & EXERCISE THE LAW

Since September 11, 2001, major cities have greatly expanded the number of surveillance cameras on public streets. New York has over eight thousand, installed at a cost of \$25 million, and Washington, D.C. has over five thousand. London has over a million surveillance cameras with a bill of \$400 million to show for it. Unfortunately, this has not worked as advertised with regard to terrorism. London, the most camera-laden city of the three — probably in the world. Roughly 80% of the crime in London goes unsolved. The cameras did nothing to deter this weekend's attempt in New York.



## IDAHO

### CONGRESSIONAL FORUM Sponsored by TEA PARTY BOISE

On May 1, 2010 Tea Party Boise sponsored a Congressional Forum for all candidates in both the first and second districts of the U.S. House of Representatives. Our compliments and appreciation to the following participants:

#### District #1

Dave Olson – Independent  
Mike Washburn – Libertarian  
Harley Brown – Republican  
Raul Labrador – Republican  
Vaughn Ward – Republican

#### District #2

Mike Crawford – Democrat  
Brian Schad – Independent  
Katherine Burton – Republican  
M.C. Chick Heilesen – Republican  
Russell Mathews – Republican

Both Walk Minnick and Mike Simpson, the incumbents, chose not to participate in this Forum. This is unfortunate as this was the most broadly represented and highly attended Congressional Forum in our State. While Mr. Minnick stated a prior commitment, Mr. Simpson ignored our invitation completely and chose not to respond. We might add that each of these gentlemen also opted out or did not respond to the Tea Party “Report Card”, which was conducted on-line. You can see the results of the Report Card on our website-See: <http://www.teapartyboise.com>.

We ask, as highly paid representatives/employees of the citizens of Idaho, what is required of them to participate in the educational phase of the up-coming election?

The Forum consisted of two sessions of questions. The first being those directly related to Tea Party values and direction in which all candidates answered the same question and were afforded a one minute explanation period of their answer. The second session consisted of questions taken directly from the audience, which had the added enthusiasm of our guest host Mr. Nate Shelman of Radio Station KBOI-670 asking the questions. Also, immediate feedback from the audience was received in the form of approval or disapproval to candidate responses. Loud and lively would be an understatement, as well as just plain fun!

We did not declare “winners or losers” during this Forum. The purpose was to obtain straightforward answers to questions of concern from our members in evaluating whom to vote for in the up-coming primary in the contested races and introduce the uncontested candidates for the November election. Audience comments immediately after the event included; “professional”, “entertaining”, “I almost puked on that answer”, “appreciated the contrasting view points”, “better than I could have imagined”, “I give them all credit”, “great experience”, and so on.

We thank all the volunteers for their time and effort in making this event so successful. It was an outstanding evening highlighting our American right to actively participate in the election of our representatives.

Reported by Russ Smerz

## BOOKS

HOW CAPITALISM WILL SAVE US- Stephen Forbes and Elizabeth Ames

“How Capitalism Will Save Us” transcends labels such as “conservative” and “liberal” by showing how the economy really works. When free people in free markets have energy to solve problems and meet the needs and wants of others, they turn scarcity into abundance and develop the innovations that are the foremost drivers of economic growth. The freedom of democratic capitalism is, for example, what enabled Henry Ford to take a plaything of the rich--the car--and transform it into something affordable to working people. In the capitalist system, economic growth doesn’t mean more of the same--grinding out a few more widgets every year. It’s about change to increase overall wealth and give more people the chance for a better life.

POWER GRAB-Christopher Horner: How Obama’s Green Policies Will Steal Your Freedom and Bankrupt America (Hardcover)  
Bestselling author Horner argues that the Obama administration wants to take critical decisions about the energy and environment out of Americans’ hands and hand them over to politicians, extreme environmental groups, and even foreign governments.



Dear Tea Partiers,

*Tea Party Boise needs your financial support! Several events are planned for this year, such as last weeks Congressional Forum. We need not only your presence at these events, but your financial support.*

*It's been said that freedom isn't free, neither are the expenses of running this organization. Large, modest or small donations will help promote the viability of Tea Party Boise and its impact on the free market and limited government. Sponsorships are both necessary and available.*

*Our influence is limited only by your involvement both as members, volunteers and by your financial contributions. 100% of all donations go directly for the needs of the Tea Party Boise.*

*Click at either <http://www.teapartyboise.com> or send to P.O. Box 901, Meridian, ID 83680*

*Thank you!*

VISIT THE NEW  
TEA PARTY BOISE WEBSITE!

For:  
Updates  
Event information  
Important videos  
and  
Information/Archives for past Newsletters

See: <http://www.teapartyboise.com>



SENATORS:

Mike Crapo: Ph: 202-224-6142  
Fax: 202-228-1375

Web: <http://www.crapo.senate.gov>

James Risch: <http://www.risch.senate.gov>

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:

Mike Simpson: Fax: 202-228-1375  
<http://www.simpson.house.gov>

Walt C. Minnick:  
Ph: 202-225-6611  
Fax: 202-225-3029  
<http://www.minnick.house.gov>

IDAHO REPRESENTATIVES:  
<http://www.govtrack.us>

IDAHO NEWS:  
<http://www.idahoreporter.com>

GOVERNOR C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER  
<http://www.idaho.gov>  
<http://www.Efficiency.Idaho.gov>

The threat against the very essence and core of what the United States of America exemplifies, is real. Our Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights were written to prohibit political and judicial manipulations that bespeak oppressive i.e. big government. This is a Republic (dictionary: A state in which supreme power is held by the people---). We are a nation suffering a threat from within.

If we, in our home towns, our state and nation, are subjugated by the government, our dollar weakened, property diminished, and spirit depressed, does it not indicate that we must act with stronger resolve and greater passion to dismantle the foes of freedom. Contact your congressmen and senators in Idaho. Let them know how they are doing and what you believe will promote freedom from big government. Invite them to join us at Tea Party Boise. Encourage your friends to do the same.

- CONTINUE TOWN HALL MEETINGS,
- WRITE AND CALL STATE REPRESENTATIVES & SENATORS
- CONTACT THE GOVERNOR
- SUPPORT WITH YOUR REOURCES ORGANIZATIONS THAT IMPACT PUBLIC OPINION.
- VOTE!

SIGN UP AND VOLUNTEER YOUR TIME TO SUPPORT LIBERTY.

E-mail: [contact@teapartyboise.com](mailto:contact@teapartyboise.com)