

My testimony for why HCR 3021 is before you is as follows:

In 2015 in a case of Obergefell versus Hodges, Supreme Court Justice Kennedy made a ruling accusing Christians of animus. Animus is having hatred or hostility for believing marriage is defined as the union of one man and one woman.

The purpose of the Supreme Court is to determine constitutionality of a law, not to create a law, nor demand a law, nor reinterpret the constitution in light of culture or political pressures.

We might ask how did the five majority justices make that ruling, where an over 4000 year old foundational Judeo-Christian value was able to be treated like that?

They abused the 14th amendment to grant a privilege to redefine the institution of marriage.

The 14th amendment was also where they very maliciously created a fake "right to privacy" in Roe V wade. Which that was an effort trump the unborn child's right to be recognized as a person, so essentially, they could murder children in the womb.

We know this has been an egregious ruling, and we know that in ND law, if a child in the womb is killed along with the mother, that that constitutes a double murder, or if a child in the womb is killed by anyone else even if the mother survived, we know they would be charged for murder, but because of a Supreme Court case from 52 years ago, that life was reduced to being a type of property, a property that has had no legal protection as long as the mother choose to murder the child herself or by an abortionist.

Fortunately, Roe V wade has been overturned, and States think this battle belongs to them, but murder of the innocent is getting the scrutiny it deserves. Justice is being demanded and trying to prevail. The topic is not over.

Then we have the Supreme Court lemon test, which was a Supreme Court ruling in Lemon versus Kurtzman. Where the 1st amendment was used to remove Christian doctrine and action in public square, in the name of a violation of the Establishment Clause. However this Terrible Supreme Court ruling was also just recently overturned and the Supreme Court has given the test new guidelines that decide Constitutionality based on history and tradition as the new plumbline of scrutiny.

Then we have actions that have recently occurred specifically in North Dakota, where a justice overturned our law for a partial ban on abortion. We are awaiting a final Supreme Court decision. But why I bring that up, is because it will be interesting what occurs, and whether we will render that law constitutional or unconstitutional, because either way, it

still will allow for murder, even if it's reduced down to only the mother being allowed to be the murder. The question still needs to be asked, is any of this legitimate ruling, since our federal Constitution protects life? That is why this resolution is needed.

Another reason is because not too long ago I sat in a North Dakota Supreme Court case where all matters of facts seemed to favor the plaintiffs, but it appeared because of who was being sued, that politics may have played a larger role in the Supreme Court ruling against the plaintiffs. That ruling appears to depict that true justice was never going to play a part as much as politics was going to. This too is wrong. And there is testimony in support on the record that explains that case and ruling more deeply and the violations of justice and attorneys.

For these reasons I find it important to scrutinize the ND Supreme Court. It is time we review the actions done by our judicial system! We need to recognize if there is an abuse of power, as there seems to be an intent to ignore, reinterpret, or politicize our constitution of the United States, as well as the constitution of North Dakota, and interpret things however the wind is blowing on a particular matter and one particular justices choices versus the standard of the Constitution.

Without scrutiny by We the People, the Supreme Court will be left on a trajectory that is a great danger to the future of sound justice for North Dakota law.

Justices are supposed to be adhering to a strict constructionism view and original intent in determining Constitutionality, but those tests seem to be overlooked. If they are allowed to be overlooked, for whatever reason, whether political favoritism, or shadow penumbras, where they claim revisionist ideas and new rights enable them to create law, then original intent and strict constructionism will be disregarded then we no longer have our state Constitution checked against the light of our Federal Constitution, And it should be, because that should be the Plumb line to determine how things should be understood and ruled upon in regard to constitutionality. Anything else continues to be a violation.

If you wonder how good justices should operate, Lets go back to the same sex marriage topic and ask how they would go about deciding constitutionality on that matter. They should look to the historical intent of our federal constitution! Then they can logically conclude a state constitutional matter on an issues like same sex marriage would Logically conclude that our founders could not have ever intended our document to afford same sex marriage as a right, because sodomy was already decided in that culture to be a crime in all 13 colonies. It's that easy. Constitutionalism isn't cultural relativism, its concrete, sound and timeless.

How would a matter like abortion be approached? Well Likewise you would look at historical facts and those facts would point out that our founders would have never considered murdering babies as Constitutional. Why? Because they never would have believed that murder was OK for one class of individuals, since it was wrong for every other class of individuals. They were Neither so woke and weak as to wonder if that inside the mother's womb was a human or not! They knew life was valuable, and they knew in order to populate a society in their new world that every child would be a blessing and need equal protection and a right to life, so as to further the future of their new world and society. Again, it should be that simple.

So to my point, if the Supreme Court deters from proper scrutiny of strict constructionism of the constitution, or scrutiny to original intent, bad things get ruled as constitutional when they shouldn't be, and we need to recognize that those things need to be challenged, held accountable and where needed rendered null and void!

Maybe you wonder what Supreme Court judges would do if the constitution wasn't clear on a matter, well they should look to The Federalist Papers to ascertain intent of law and constitutionalism, versus turn to legal scholars with a contemporary relativistic or revisionist theory mindset, and who think our constitution is ever changing and fluid. Because it is NOT.

You may wonder as I do if Justices have decided they are above the law! It appears that in some instances they might have begun to think so, and in so doing have made our constitutional interpretations, protections, privileges, rights, and liberties to mean whatever the majority of justices feel like they should be and that has done egregious things and caused many violations to our freedoms and they should be accountable and not immune from civil liability because there is no statue or Constitutional authority for judicial civil immunity, it violates the equal protection clause of the Federal Constitution.

Our nation and ND are a constitutional republic, and to protect our rights we need to resist the new age of fluidity approach to the constitution. It cannot mean what the judges decide it means, we must return to the standard of scrutiny.

If we don't then we allow justices to become false witnesses, who will knowingly lye about what the Constitution says, and that violates their oath of office, just like we violate our oath of office by intentionally passing unconstitutional laws. When we or they do that it brings destruction to justice in the courts, and to due process of law, and that all violates our rights!

Violations of judicial integrity need to be held accountable! We cannot allow good to be evil and evil to be good!

So, I ask you to stand with me on this resolution to bring light and accountability to the judicial system. I ask that we have courage to do this and that we not just turn a blind eye to our judicial system and its flaws!

I just want to leave you with something to remember, and that's that the constitution has been removed from public education for decades. Why? Because that document contains power, wisdom, and authority! It is time we take up that sword again and remove the violations and violators from power if need be! The judicial system is about to collapse unless we act swiftly.

The Supreme Court may be supreme over other courts, but it is not supreme over We the People, or over other branches of government, and it's time we recognize this again!

The Supreme Court's corrupt rulings we've been told are "the law of the land," but NO, No it they are not!

The sixth article of the constitution says the constitution is the Supreme Law of the land and the judicial branch is bound by that supremacy!

The executive branch and legislative branch are Co-equals with the Supreme Court, but above all is a Supreme Judge, the Judge of all judges, God. Who is the hand of Providence spoken of in forming this nation and referred to in our Declaration of Independence and pledge of allegiance.

Supreme Court justices and judges shall not be allowed to ignore facts, ignore evidence, and continue to violate our rights and distort constitutional law or God's law. North Dakota Supreme Court regulates the industry of attorneys, there lies a conflict of interest in having the Supreme Court as the disciplinarian of attorneys. And that is why that power is being removed. Because at this rate if a judge or an attorney violate the law, Constitution, or rules of Civil Procedure, the citizens have no recourse! Why? Because the courts are in charge of disciplining attorneys and since they are regulated by them, nothing gets done to punish any corruption!

This resolution is here because the citizens need their right to constitutional access to the courts. Right now there is a Fraternity of judges and attorneys which leaves the citizens without true justice, without judicial remedy, and without fair representation, and thus no right upheld for due process of law. The epic conflict of interest violates our citizens and needs to change.

Lastly there is a problem that our citizens can't get lawyers to defend them against the state, a city, political subdivision, or state agencies, because those lawyers are in fear of losing their license if they defend a citizen against the government. There again the citizens

no longer have their constitutional right to due process and cannot access the courts with justice, it is denied because of weaponization.

If our citizen's rights to due process of law and justice is violated then this problem demands correction, and this resolution seeks to address the injustices.

Mr. chairman and members of the judicial committee that is the sum of my testimony for my resolution I will stand for questions.

