

1. What is your understanding of your prescribed constitutional role and duty as a U.S. Senator? (please elaborate).

Highlighted in red are my comments, the black is some factual information blended with my views:

In addition every area listed in black you can include the following statement' that Congress has express powers which are easily interpreted but they also have implied powers and inherent powers which have been based on one's perspective all patriots should demand that a perspective of all individuals (leaders) of the United States should come from the vantage point of our Framers, their writings, and the writing of the Constitution. Some would suggest that the constitution is a living document and needs to be added on to, from other countries constitution or even from Sharia Law. We have always been a Judaic Christian Country and our Constitutional values have been taken from our Framers values, our freedoms are from God and no man has any right to take them away. We also have a right to the pursuit of happiness, whereby the Government cannot impose its will on the will of the people, this is a Government that is ruled by the people and when you preview the Constitution and laws from the eyes of local government/people free markets interpretations are much different from the eyes of those that want big government or socialist programs or mandates from big government over reaching courts or rules from other government and Sharia Law.

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they are equally divided. As the presiding officer of the Senate, the vice president may vote only to break a tie.

The Senate shall choose their other Officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the Absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the Office of President of the United States.

Except for the Vice President, the Senate elects its own officers. The President pro tempore is usually the longest-serving member of the majority party. Other elected officers include a chaplain, secretary of the Senate, and sergeant at arms, who are not senators. The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no Person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members, and a Majority of each shall constitute a Quorum to do Business; but a smaller Number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the Attendance of absent Members, in such Manner, and under such Penalties as each House may provide

The House and Senate decide whether their members are qualified to serve and have been properly elected, and determine any disputed elections. One-half plus one of each house is necessary to make a quorum to conduct business.

Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

The Senate and House each publish journals listing bills passed, amendments offered, motions made, and votes taken. In addition to these journals, Congress publishes an essentially verbatim account of its debates, called the *Congressional Record*. Videotapes of floor proceedings are deposited at the National Archives.

Neither House, during the Session of Congress, shall, without the Consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other Place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.

This section was included to prevent either chamber from blocking legislation through its refusal to meet. Each chamber takes very seriously its independence of the other body. To avoid having to ask the other chamber for permission to adjourn, the Senate and House simply conduct pro forma (as a matter of form) sessions to meet the three-day constitutional requirement. No business is conducted at these sessions, which generally last for less than one minute.

The Constitution gives Congress all the law making powers for the Federal Government but it does not give all these powers in the same way. The express power of the Constitution are listed in article 1 section 8 of the Constitution, these powers are the most important ones, they deal with such subjects as taxation, bowering money and declaring war. Other express powers concern foreign and domestic commerce, national defense, coinage, and the courts.

The implied powers are not listed in the constitution but article 1 section 8 says that Congress can pass all laws that are "necessary and proper to carry out the express power."

This means that they have power to pass tax laws, set punishments for persons who break tax laws (although this is an ongoing debate).

Other powers Congress has do not come from the Constitution are inherent powers. Congress uses inherent power when granting or cancelling a person's citizenship.

The first is the power to tax and to spend the money raised by taxes, to provide for the nation's defense and general welfare. This section was supplemented by the 16th amendment, which permitted Congress to levy an income tax.

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

Congress can borrow money through the issuance of bonds and other means. When it borrows money, the United States creates a binding obligation to repay the debt and cannot repudiate it.

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

The "commerce clause" is one of the most far-reaching grants of power to Congress. Interstate commerce covers all movement of people and things across state lines, and every form of communication and transportation. The commerce clause has permitted a wide variety of federal laws, from the regulation of business to outlawing of racial segregation. The "Indian

commerce clause” has become the main source of power for congressional legislation dealing with Native Americans.

To establish an **uniform Rule** of Naturalization, and **uniform Laws** on the subject of **Bankruptcies** throughout the United States;

Acts of Congress define the requirements by which immigrants can become citizens. Only the federal government, not the states, can determine who becomes a citizen. Bankruptcy laws make provisions for individuals or corporations that fail to pay their debts/ our government violated in principle this section GM/Banks (“uniform” is key word).

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures; to provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

These clauses permit Congress to coin money and to issue paper currency. By extension, under its ability to enact laws “necessary and proper” to carry out these powers (as stated at the end of Article 1, Section 8), Congress created the Federal Reserve System to regulate the nation’s monetary supply. This responsibility for the most part has not always been fully enforced by Congress as it should be. We know Governments in other countries have ignored counterfeiting within their own borders such as N. Korea for many years counterfeited our 10’s and 20’s with no retaliation.

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

The postal powers embrace all measures necessary to establish the system and to insure the safe and speedy transit and prompt delivery of the mails. Congress may also punish those who use the mails for unlawful purposes.

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

Copyright and patent protection of authors and inventors are authorized by this clause, although it uses neither word.

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

The Constitution provides only for a Supreme Court, and left it to Congress to create lower (“inferior”) courts, and to set their jurisdictions and duties. This regulation allows Congress to set up guidelines with courts other than the Supreme Court. One such guideline should be that the Constitution is our base document, no other documents such as Sharia law can be used to adjudicate cases. Judges that legislate from the bench should have impeachment proceedings applied, furthermore the 9th Circuit Court should be broken up and all courts should be reviewed for their enforcement or lack of enforcement of our Constitution.

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy; to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

The “war powers” are defined here and in Article 2, Section 2. Congress declares war, while the president wages war. However, presidents have committed U.S. forces leading to conflict without congressional declaration of war in Korea, Vietnam, and other places, provoking national argument over the meaning of these powers. Congress’ control of funding the military provides another check on the executive branch.

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions; To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

Under these provisions, the right of the states to maintain a militia, including what is now the National Guard, is always subordinate to the power of Congress. In 1795 Congress first gave the president authority to call out the militia to suppress insurrections. Presidents employed this power to enforce federal law during desegregation disputes during the 1950s, and later during the civil disturbances in various cities during the 1960s

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

This clause enables Congress to govern the District of Columbia. Congress has now delegated that power to a locally elected government, subject to federal oversight. Congress also governs forts, arsenals, and other places obtained from the states for the federal government’s purposes.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The “elastic clause” enlarges legislative power by enabling Congress to use any means it thinks reasonable to put these powers into action.

This clause also authorizes Congress to enact legislation necessary to carry out the powers of the other branches, for example to organize and reorganize the executive branch.

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

Habeas corpus is a judicial device by which jailed people may require their jailer to justify their imprisonment to a court. It is a fundamental safeguard of individual liberty, and the Supreme Court has interpreted it to give federal courts review over state court convictions and to enforce federal constitutional guarantees. It is generally accepted that only Congress has the power to suspend *habeas corpus*. President Abraham Lincoln’s suspension of the right during the Civil War met with strong opposition.

No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed

A bill of attainder is a legislative act declaring the guilt of an individual or a group of persons and punishing them. Only the courts may determine whether one has violated a criminal statute. An *ex post facto* law declares an act illegal after it has been committed, or increases the punishment for an offense already committed.

No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

Direct taxes are poll or "head" taxes and taxes on land. The Supreme Court once held that income taxes were unconstitutional direct taxes, a result overturned by the 16th amendment.

No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.

To prohibit discrimination against any states or regions, Congress cannot tax goods exported from a state to foreign countries or those that move between states.

No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another; nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.

Congress cannot favor one state against another while regulating trade.

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

The departments and agencies of the executive branch may not spend any money that Congress has not appropriated, or use federal money for any purpose that Congress has not specified.

No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

This clause was designed to end the aristocratic tendencies that the American Revolution had been fought against. Federal officials must turn over to the government all but minimal gifts from foreign nations.

No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

These provisions protect national powers from state incursions.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Control of the Congress.

States may not interfere with the international trade of the United States.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

States cannot levy tonnage duties, which are taxes charged for the privilege of entering, trading in, or remaining in a port. States may come together to work on common problems, such as pollution of a river passing through several states, but the agreements or compacts they reach are subject to congressional consent.

To amend the Constitution comes in two ways; the most standard device is for both houses of congress to pass by 2/3 vote a proposal which is then sent to the states for ratification, or authorize a national convention when 2/3 of the state's petition Congress for such a convention.

Congress has the power to authorize the Federal Government to send in Federal troops into a State to guarantee law and order.

Congress is in charge of public lands within the State such as wetlands. Congress also governs at the acquiring of territories such as Puerto Rico.

By act of Congress newly settled or acquired areas will be done by act of Congress.

2. Do any Senate ratified treaties take precedent over the US Constitution? If so why? If not what would you do to repeal their effects?

The Constitution provides that the president "shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur". The Constitution's framers gave the Senate a share of the treaty power in order to give the president the benefit of the Senate's advice and counsel, check presidential power, and safeguard the sovereignty of the states by giving each state an equal vote in the treaty making process. As Alexander Hamilton explained in, "the operation of treaties as laws, plead strongly for the participation of the whole or a portion of the legislative body in the office of making them." The constitutional requirement that the Senate approve a treaty with a two-thirds vote means that successful treaties must gain support that overcomes partisan division. The two-thirds requirement adds to the burdens of the Senate leadership, and may also encourage opponents of a treaty to engage in a variety of dilatory tactics in hopes of obtaining sufficient votes to ensure its defeat.

The Senate does not ratify treaties—the Senate approves or rejects a resolution of ratification.

If the resolution passes, then ratification takes place when the instruments of ratification are formally exchanged between the United States and the foreign power(s).

Most treaties submitted to the Senate have received its advice and consent to ratification. During its first 200 years, the Senate approved more than 1,500 treaties and rejected only 21

At least 85 treaties were eventually withdrawn because the Senate never took final action on them. Treaties may also remain in the Senate, Foreign Relations Committee for extended

periods, since treaties are not required to be resubmitted at the beginning of each new Congress. There have been instances in which treaties have lain dormant within the committee for years, even decades, without action being taken.

In addition to treaties, which may not enter into force and become binding on the United States without the advice and consent of the Senate, there are other types of international agreements concluded by the executive branch and not submitted to the Senate. These are classified in the United States as executive agreements, not as treaties, a distinction that has only domestic significance. International law regards each mode of international agreement as binding, whatever its designation under domestic law.

The challenge of obtaining two-thirds vote on treaties was one of the motivating forces behind the vast increase in executive agreements after World War II. In 1952, for instance, the United States signed 14 treaties and 291 executive agreements. This was a larger number of executive agreements than had been reached during the entire century of 1789 to 1889. Executive agreements continue to grow at a rapid rate.

In recent years, the growth in executive agreements is also attributable to the sheer volume of business conducted between the United States and other countries, coupled with the already heavy workload of the Senate. Many international agreements are of relatively minor importance and would needlessly overburden the Senate if they were submitted as treaties for advice and consent. Another factor has been the passage of legislation authorizing the executive branch to conclude international agreements in certain fields, such as foreign aid, agriculture, and trade. Treaties have also been approved that authorize further agreements between the parties. According to a 1984 study by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "88.3 percent of international agreements reached between 1946 and 1972 were based at least partly on statutory authority; 6.2 percent were treaties, and 5.5 percent were based solely on executive authority."

The Constitution is silent about how treaties might be terminated.

The breaking off of two treaties during the Jimmy Carter administration stirred controversy. In 1978 the president terminated the U.S. defense treaty with Taiwan in order to facilitate the establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. Also in 1978 the new Panama Canal treaties replaced three previous treaties with Panama. In one case, the president acted unilaterally; in the second, he terminated treaties in accordance with actions taken by Congress. Only once has Congress terminated a treaty by a joint resolution; that was a mutual defense treaty with France, from which, in 1798, Congress declared the United States "freed and exonerated." In that case, breaking the treaty almost amounted to an act of war; indeed, two days later Congress authorized hostilities against France, which were only narrowly averted.

When a treaty is submitted to the Senate for approval, the Senate has several options for action. The Senate may approve or reject the treaty as it has been submitted or it may make its approval conditional by including in the resolution amendments to the text of the treaty—reservations, understandings, interpretations, declarations, or other statements.

The president and the other countries involved must then decide whether to accept the conditions and changes in the legislation renegotiate the provisions, or abandon the treaty. Finally, the Senate may choose to take no definitive action, leaving the treaty pending in the Senate until withdrawn at the request of the president or, occasionally, at the initiative of the Senate.

3 .Do you agree that restoring the federal government to its constitutional mandates will reduce adverse manipulation of our capitalistic economy, intrusion on our property rights and shrink the scope of government and its cost to the American People? How do you propose to implement your goals?

Of course smaller government on the surface seems to be the answer, the question as a whole becomes ambiguous and open for interpretation, especially from our liberal friends. Even a smaller government when running a 15T deficit could be interpreted as a 12T deficit or a 10T deficit, which in our liberal friends eyes means a compromise or consensus, but none of these were the solutions of our liberal friends come even close to the mandates of our constitution as it was originally intended by the Framers. When politicians like Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the House who receives wages and benefits well above all of her constituents can say what she said about Obama Care “just pass the bill and we will see what is in it after it is passed”, this speaks to the issue that it is not about health care, it is about instituting new socialist government programs regardless of what the people want, even though there are free market solutions.

Our liberal friends and maybe our own party including our tea party groups in one fashion or another continue to ignore the constitution and our freedoms. You have to be selfless and altruistic when representing the people of the United States, you are a servant to them. When people get into power they seem to assert their own will, they like to limit free speech, free opportunity for advancement, justify monopolies, they like to restrict one group over another (or one person over another), they like to give endorsement to one person over another without consensus of the people. On the other hand most of our leaders know that if they close the doors, pick certain days of the week, they will never be discovered for their indiscretions.

How do we solve these problems; first we need to re-educate the people about the Constitution, it should be a requirement for all peoples in the United States and there should be a test provided before graduation from High School. It is the right of every citizen to understand and be provided with his/her rights in this country and any group or organization that denies or stands in the way should be fined. Next we should raise the debate in this country, if 8 people are running for the Senate the leaders of both the tea party and the republican party should push those candidates to every meeting, every home, every organization/group and let them talk about their conservative values, the Constitution, free market you may not personally like

the candidate but his/her values match the Framers values and the values of the American public. We should start using the media to talk about the virtues of capitalism, and free markets.

We should present awards, today we give awards to actors who probably have the easiest job in the world, make huge sums of money when we should be giving awards to people who have done great things on behalf of the United States, the Constitution, and free markets capitalism. Our motion pictures and TV shows continually to be filled with propaganda pushing liberal agendas and values, we should work hard to institute organizations that support the people that push our values.

Most importantly, it was the Framers, including Washington, that believed in Devine providence at the hand of God, I see in the Constitution where it says that the Government will not set up a religion yet our government has set up their own religion which is that of Atheism, they demand that we are not allowed to speak, pray or acknowledge God in any way, infringing on our rights of free speech and religion.

4. Are there any executive orders implemented by the Executive, (any of them) that you know are an affront to the Congress and the Constitution?

The "war powers" are defined here and in Article 2, Section 2. Congress declares war, while the president wages war.

However, presidents have committed U.S. forces leading to conflict without congressional declaration of war in Korea, Vietnam, and other places, provoking national argument over the meaning of these powers. Congress' control of funding the military provides another check on the executive branch.

President Obama continues to stretch the spirit of the law when it comes to many of the powers provided to him by the Constitution, recess appointments is one, although other presidents have done this it was done sparingly however, with President Obama every cabinet has been headed by a recess appointment or by a Czar, bypassing Congress and the vetting process. Going into Libya and bombing under the UN or any other country also stretches his powers. Another is Lynden Johnson adding social security to the budget.

President Obama made an unprecedented grab for power yesterday by circumventing Congress and turning his nose up at the constitutional separation of powers. He installed Richard Cordary to regulate the American economy with little oversight from Congress. He ignored the advice of his own Justice Department and went around the elected representatives of the American people - saying, "I refuse to take 'No' for an answer." It is more proof that this administration views the Constitution as a speed bump on their road to an America ruled by elites. This is why we need to elect a strong congressperson from the state of Michigan. One who will stand up to the elites of Washington? Someone like Chuck Marino, who will fight for the

future of America, for the Constitution, for Free Markets and for the People! I believe 2012 is the fight for freedom!

Although they may be an affront to Congress, Congress has the purse strings and at any time they can stop the Executive Branch in its tracks, I always question their courage to do the right thing under our constitution

5. Do you believe the Framers were in error in providing for the election of Senators by the State Legislatures and if so do you believe the 17th Amendment (ratified during the Wilson administration) is the proper solution. Would you introduce/support a repeal of the 17th Amendment?

The original system of having state legislatures elect U.S. senators began to break down with the growth of political parties in the mid-19th century. Disagreements between and within parties produced deadlocks that delayed state legislative business and left states without their full Senate representation, often for lengthy periods. This amendment provides for senators to be elected the way members of the House are—by direct election of the people.

Both sides of this issue have some positive and negative effects. It's like college football the bowl system as opposed to a playoff system, both have redeeming qualities. The reason for the 17th amendment not working during the times they were under two different protocols was due to man's lack of selflessness and not being able or willing to put country first and understanding by our leaders they are servants of the people have a government that is by the people. Since the latter or the present system is in place I would continue to support it Maybe those people with virtue and altruistic character might have an opportunity to represent us.

The original Senate configuration which the legislation would elect I am sure our framers thought that they could represent the people best through the state legislators whereby the state needed to pull equal access from the federal government. There were issues within the state that they (the state) needed expertise at the federal government to argue their state issues.

Debbie Stabenow and Carl Levin are both senators from Michigan, during their time in office Michigan has been a donor state regarding money sent to Washington and what is given back the state of Michigan, even during Michigan's rough economic years 2006-2009 which found Michigan in a depression and last place to all the other states.

Under this system there are two problems that come to the forefront; the first being the position is filled through cronyism. Secondly, the process like in the years it was instituted, it would be difficult to get a confirmation due to by-partisanship.

We have groups and party affiliates that before the primary season start meeting and selecting a candidate thus circumventing the process.

We have cronyism, instead of selecting the person with the qualifications to fix the problem we coronate the person based on favors we owe them. We create an unlevelled playing field by limiting speaking opportunities, by giving unions rights that groups of similar makeup do not have, we let some candidates speak at some churches while other churches are threatened with loss of 501C.

We insert ourselves into the process causing the process not to net the desired results needed to send qualified people to Washington that can truly produce legislation based in the Constitution and free market principles.

6. Describe your plan for solving illegal immigration. Are we being invaded on our Southern border? Is the military a probable first step to solving this problem?

The bigger question is why our elected officials including our current and our past President's refuse to secure our borders? I believe this is a question that should be asked in the press, our liberal friends and should be made part of every debate.

We are the greatest nation with some of the greatest security personnel the police, FBI, DEA/Border Security. We have laws in place that are not being enforced, we have the greatest technology in the world, we are looking for shovel ready jobs, and 68% of the American people want our borders secured. These facts point to the fact that we are willing and able to get this job done. We must keep in mind that legal immigration has always been one of our best resources, and we should continue to encourage in by putting a process in place to enable (another shovel ready job for process workers). One more question on the table is how did 11M people cross over our border illegally, somebody or some organization need to be held accountable.

The only thing I will discuss is securing our borders. If this cannot be done or other people want to discuss other things it is only a distraction. There is no reason to discuss sending people home if they just come back over the border. There is no sense discussing enforcement as long as we prosecute enforcement agents and not illegal aliens.

One other thing I may consider is to find a way to charge the country of origin for them not containing their own border, either deducting it from imports or from foreign aid. I would give them a two strike program, first strike "shame on us" but the second strike would enforce the charge back.

The military should be used as a last resort, I have seen our border patrol and local police when left unrestrained and unencumbered by the attorney general or our president, are perfectly capable to handle the situation respectfully. Inserting our military in this action at this time would be a slippery slope and would divert the attention from the real problem, which is "why won't our politicians protect this country and secure our borders".

7. There have been recent disclosures of agenda driven research on Global Warming/Climate change, do you believe global warming is real? To what extent would you devote government resources and monies to this area?

Throughout my lifetime I have served in writing international standards which gives me the unique ability to understand technical papers as well as white papers, which lends it to be able to decipher between junk science, theoretical science and proven science.

There is no such thing as man-made global warming. I do know a little about thermal dynamics and its effect on a building, some principles have the same effect on the earth.

I will say there is global warming through the cycles in our earth where there are years, parts and full decades or centuries where the cycle of the earth may have been different from the previous or future cycles. There are many contributing factors to this such as, jet streams, sun flares, volcanic actions just to name a few. Recently an erupting volcano sending tons of ash into the atmosphere which can change the climate and cause global warming, when scientist can control volcano's I will believe they can then influence climate change.

Man-made global warming is junk science because they refuse to let all the scientist in on the debate, they refuse to name it causal effect even when we have summer in the past year to be cooler than all other years or a plateau in temperature.es, they want to blame it on global warming. They use photo- shop pictures from the North Pole, and then the main spokesman is Al Gore who owns a major stake in a battery car company (at very least conflict of interest).

During my life time there have been three government hoaxes or misleading information provided to the people of this land regarding this type of subject. First in the 1960's government put out a piece talking about the big freeze and that our planet was cooling off. This was headed up mainly the zero population people and the environmental people. Second; during the 1970's Jimmy Carter observed that we had peaked in oil reserves in the world, and we were on the decline thus we would be out of oil by the mid 1990's. Of course Amy Carter told the country "if we all put on sweaters we could solve our problem." Third; was that Freon causes holes in the atmosphere, which to this day has not been proven and regulation destroyed an entire manufacturing industry and the new AC with puron system is three to four times bigger in footprint using more materials and from my personal experience puron appears to be more corrosive (having to replace two coils in 7 years), as well as more expensive (double the price) to run, (this has been proven through studies). So the question beckons to be ask; after destroying an industry was it worth it?

I could write extensive books on the government instituting market changes and regulations based on junk science. Just take florescent light bulbs as opposed to incandescent light bulbs. When the latter was the recyclable one, which is the one they banned in 2010.

So, what is the governments' ulterior motive; simply stated; it is to limit your freedoms through their scare tactics and junk science, they think we will not read about it or understand it. The present group of politician ultimate goal is to find new revenue streams to line their own pocket, create new taxes, change a government of the people..... to a government over the people and this will lead to a one world government by the U.N.

Thus far in the This administration along with the UN have been successful through cap and trade, although we all want an environment that is clean, safe and efficient as possible there are free market techniques to achieve this without confiscating money from the public for socialist programs and agendas.

8. Describe what you know about Agenda 21 and ICLEI, what is it, who is involved, is it an effort you would support and use Federal monies and resources to further?

Despite the devastating financial impact it will have on all American households and businesses, President Barack Obama desperately wants to resurrect and implement Cap and Trade, if not through Congress then surreptitiously through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). As with suggestions for better-structured health care reform, there is a way to clean the planet without imposing dire financial hardships on its inhabitants. Specifically targeted to foot the bill, are American taxpayers. Yet, President Barack Obama yields to the strident call of radical environmentalists such as Al Gore, reportedly desirous to become the first global-warming billionaire, and UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. With extreme hyperbole, Ban warns of war and pestilence to come if the United States does not throw billions of Americans' tax dollars into an increasingly deceptive environmental abyss.

In a dispassionate disconnect, Obama proclaimed that American's energy costs would necessarily "skyrocket." Even after being confronted with the environmental embarrassment known as climate-gate, with revelations of fraud and erupting scandals among man-made global warming scientists, Obama continues today to bow to a fascist far-right business agenda and a far-left environmental agenda based on international wants instead of looking out for America's needs.

Enter: AGENDA 21. Agenda 21 is a United Nation's game plan for a radical transformation of the global society. President George H. W. Bush signed onto it at the Rio Earth Summit. At the same time Al Gore stated that "Americans are going to have to face a wrenching transformation of Society." Now President Obama's stated goal is a "transformation of America" as we know it. The innocuous term used by the United Nations to accomplish this transformation is "Sustainable Development." Broken down, that means the dismantling of America as a sovereign nation and the globalization of our economy and our laws. Our rate of development, according to globalists, is "un-sustainable" based on underdeveloped countries. In effect, it restricts population and economic growth in America through government-controlled health care and through decreased and redistributed resources such as energy and wealth. Americans

should no longer "sustain life" of the very young or elderly or remain sovereign and prosperous. The globalists' creed (on the outside) is - the planet cannot endure it.

Politicians on both sides of the aisle have signed on to Agenda 21's "Sustainable Development." Obama's health care will have a vice-like grip on who gets medical care - who lives or dies, whereas Cap and Trade, that Obama still desperately wants, will allow the government to have a vice-like grip on how Americans live. With Cap and Trade, the Environmental Protection Agency will have power to force many homeowners to virtually rebuild their homes to meet stringent environmental requirements before they can sell them. Living in a house that does not meet the EPA's "green" regulations for roofing, windows, doors, insulation or heating and cooling systems will be slapped with fines. Electrical companies are rapidly installing "smart monitoring systems" to track usage of energy by residents. Hence, President Obama's warning that your energy bills will "skyrocket." This represents only one area of control, but a critical one, as the Obama administration attempts to restrict individual rights.

America's health, wealth, and way of life are to be sacrificed to global need based on **junk** science by those who believe you can be duped into believing it is all in your best interest and the interest of the planet. Cap and Trade is a global agenda with pockets to be lined at America's expense. President Obama says there is a "deficit of trust" in America. What he does not say is that it is directed at the White House.

With Cap and Trade, the Environmental Protection Agency will have power to force many homeowners to virtually rebuild their homes to meet stringent environmental requirements before they can sell them. Living in a house that does not meet the EPA's "green" regulations for roofing, windows, doors, insulation or heating and cooling systems will be slapped with fines. Electrical companies are rapidly installing "smart monitoring systems" to track usage of energy by residents. Smart Meters do so much more than just show how much electricity you use. The new Smart Meters are watching you.

Predicated on junk science they have mandated that all nations report to them any violation of environmental protocols. You need to pay very close attention to the wording, (although I would normally not dedicate any time to this document, and vote against it in its very nature, it being from the UN) it refers to all countries and continents as states reducing their importance and their sovereignty. They then state most of their rules ambiguously; they leave the standards and measurements to unrealistic to or unproven standards.

Once again the UN is trying to assert itself as one world government, snatching our freedoms and developing a document that gives them the right in this case arbitrarily to establish regulations under their own guidelines that will produce a revenue stream for them.

All patriots should understand that we are a government "of the people, by the people" and that the UN is a body of elitist and academia's and think they know best. They will use junk science

to substantiate their regulations and protocols to destroy The United States sovereignty while The UN forms a One World Government under the UN control.

Judiciary:

9. What are your requirements for judicial appointments? Please discuss the recent appointment of Sotomayor and Kagan.

Kagan had a cakewalk through confirmation hearings. Some of her early rulings/dissertations where she stated that the U.N. should be a controlling factor over governments or the fact that she believed in European justice and laws should be applied to American courts.

This is as absurd as it gets.

Several high profile "conservatives" repeat this moronic mantra: "President Obama has won the election and judge Sotomayor is qualified, so the President has the right to see her seated as a Supreme Court justice."

The Republicans (congress) that served to vet both Kagan and Sotomayor either did not understand the constitution and their roles as advise and consent or they themselves were derelict in their duties. For the first standard should be that all elected officials and judicial officials should not only have a basic understanding of...is our constitution... the nominee should be able to profess and affirm that the United States Constitution is the document that governs this country and that no other government or document supersedes it, replaces it, or can be consulted. Below is an article I have carried around for a long time that will show to the degree liberals will go to make sure defenders of the Constitution in our country will never sit on the bench.

Yeah, right.

Roll back to 1987 when President Reagan nominated judge Bork to the Supreme Court. Judge Bork was undisputedly qualified and no one questioned validity of Reagan's election. Yet the Democratic senators launched a series of vicious and relentless attacks on judge Bork during his confirmation hearing (see [1]) that could be fairly characterized as slander and character assassination, and, eventually, derailed his nomination. The argument that President Reagan then had the same right as, ostensibly, President Obama has now, somehow slipped attention of the vicious hyenas that brought Bork's nomination down.

Judge Sotomayor is a product of engineered diversity that has been in works in the U.S. since mid-1960-ties. Although she graduated from Princeton and Yale, one wouldn't have guessed that she did based on her answers (if one can call a bunch or repetitive evasive statements "answers") during the confirmation hearings and her brief (if not cryptic) and often flawed

opinions (later overturned) that she wrote as an appellate judge. One can imagine a group of "concerned" faculty at these finest universities doing whatever they could to assure that she did graduate in flying colors despite some of her unimpressive academic capabilities, meager communication skills and difficulty with carrying on complex logical argument being two of which. (Thanks a lot, professors!)

And her loyalty (something that the "she is qualified"-mantra morons always forget to mention) to the Constitution and the law as they have been written, as opposed to using the Supreme Court bench as a launch pad for imposition of progressive "Liberalism" and ethno-centric agenda - as it was indicated by her "wise Latina" (apparently, "wise" enough to doctor the truth during her confirmation hearing) comments and her membership in the National Council of The Race ("La Raza") - on the white majority, leaves a lot to be desired.

Contrast this with judge Bork's impressive knowledge of the law, his outstanding record of mainstream constitutional scholarship, his brilliance while specifically answering tricky questions that were asked of him during his confirmation hearings, and his unquestionable commitment to the Constitution and the core values that have been the cornerstones of the American Republic.

Well, he wasn't "Hispanic", nor was he a woman, and even if he were, his contempt of "Liberalism" (a result of his attachment to the letter of the Constitution) would be enough for his Democratic assailants to tarnish him as they did in 1986.

So, it is really funny that the "conservative" morons of today invoke the "right" of President Obama to see his nominee of dubious qualifications and questionable loyalty seated on the Supreme Court bench, as if there were a shortage of outstanding judges committed to this country and its legal cornerstones, even among those whose political orientation might be described as Liberal. She may be "qualified" (which I personally doubt), but it doesn't mean that she is good enough. It would be a shame if the same U.S. Senate that rejected mainstream judge Bork confirmed controversial judge Sotomayor.

There is a disturbing pattern here.

Just like it usually is the case with "affirmative action" appointments, a lackluster candidate with marginal accomplishments and serious weaknesses is given a pass (morons applauding) while an outstanding one with stellar record of achievements and job strengths had been eliminated based on the "minority" status of the former and/or a lack of clear "Liberal" inclinations of the latter. The artificially implanted dilemma of "*qualified*" vs. "*not qualified*" (with respect to whatever flimsy or bureaucratic standards) is the sworn enemy of "*the best*" vs. "*acceptable*". It has been imported into traditionally competitive America in order to give mediocre "minorities" a chance to advance to the positions of influence and power once reserved for the brightest, the

most accomplished, and the most loyal.

As a result, we end up with a substandard quality appointees (not that they will not find, later on, enough arrogance and combativeness in themselves to impose their half-baked or outright wrong ideas on us) whose bad judgment, a lack of clear thinking, and strong attachment to trans-national "Liberal" ideology, push the country step-by-step in wrong direction, while the ones who got eliminated could have used their wisdom, knowledge, experience, and commitment to the American Republic for the betterment of this nation, making it more free and prosperous.

This damaging trend is the reason why this once greatest nation that the planet has ever seen is slowly deteriorating, inching closer and closer to the point of social and economic decay. And all our "conservative" "elites" seem to be worrying about is to not appear argumentative or rude while scoring defeat after defeat and losing office after office to packs of ruthless "Liberal" hyenas that do not have scruples of any sort.

10. What determines a breach of oath? An impeachable offence? Is a breach of the oath of office an impeachable offence?

An **oath of office** is an oath or affirmation a person takes before undertaking the duties of an office, usually a position in government or within a religious body, although such oaths are sometimes required of officers of other organizations. Such oaths are often required by the laws of the state, religious body, or other organization before the person may actually exercise the powers of the office or any religious body. It may be administered at an inauguration, coronation, enthronement, or other ceremony connected with the taking up of office itself, or it may be administered privately. In some cases it may be administered privately and then repeated during a public ceremony.

Some oaths of office are a statement of loyalty to a constitution or other legal text or to a person or other office-holder (e.g., an oath to support the constitution of the state, or of loyalty to the king). Under the laws of a state it may be considered treason or a high crime to betray a sworn oath of office.

According to the on-line encyclopedia "Oaths of office are usually a statement of loyalty to a constitution or other legal text, as well as an oath to the state or religion the office holder will be serving. It is often considered treason or a high crime to betray a sworn oath of office."

I'm in complete agreement with this definition, especially the part about it being "considered treason or a high crime to betray a sworn oath of office". While, I'm sure, there are lawyers and pundits out there who would argue that "treason" or "a high crime" are something else and that these terms shouldn't be applied to our government officials if/when they break their oath of office - their solemn promise to us who in trust them with vast (but limited) power to do our will

while in our employ, but being a simple Italian lad I have no problem with calling betrayal of our trust, in the political context, treason or a crime.

The Federal Oaths of Office (for us simple folk) is that these people - our employees -swear to uphold the Constitution - the highest law of the land. So, what might constitute a breach or betrayal of our employee's Oath of Office? For simple folks (those of us who aren't lawyers or political apologists for the folks we send to represent our interests but who do anything their lobbyist friends ask them to do rather than represent us) the most obvious and blatant example of a violation, breach or betrayal of their Oath would be that they initiate laws or vote for laws which violate our Federal Constitutions. If they vote for laws which remove, regulate, limit or tax a Right protected by our Constitution then clearly (to us simple folks) they have not "support(ed)" or "defend(ed)" or bore "true faith" to their responsibility to our Constitution thus, they are in breach of their Oath requires they "shall be forthwith dismissed from the office or position involved."

President Obama's luck got so bad during the debate over raising the debt ceiling that even his chief of staff said he could be impeached. On July 27, the Cato Institute's director of health policy studies Michael F. Cannon heard Bill Daley admit, in not so many words, that it's okay to impeach Obama: I don't think the American people would find it appropriate for the president of the United States to defy the laws of the nation and its Constitution, without their belief that that president should be impeached. And this president isn't going to do anything against the Constitution, against the laws of the United States of America.

11. Will you use the Legislative branch to rein in Judiciary legislative initiatives? Executive branch initiatives?

Our government is set up with checks and balances exert one branch over another branch for the sake of one's own ideals does not meet the standard of our Framers desire when structuring our government. Over the past three years this administration and Debbie Stabenow have both been derelict and have overstepped their bounds. This has happened many times in history where a president has gone beyond the Executive authority. During Vietnam war 50,000 good men and women were killed and Congress was just as complicit by short funding the war causing troops to fighting what was referred to as a "9-5 war" continually putting them in harm's way. Lynden Johnson further abused his office by inserting social security monies into the budget to offset the deficits with NO objection from Congress. We need to start electing people with the courage to tell the truth, and but be a "whistle blower" on these kinds of indiscretions. All those that read my words should understand that they cannot sit at home, they cannot stand and complain, they need to be vigilant, out spoken, and elect politicians with the same kind of behavior. They also have to make sure that their own organizations and their own party is not corrupt. For we find over-reaching not only at the local level, but all the way up to the Federal government.

III Accountability:

1 How will you communicate with the people who send you to office?

I am a great believer in modern technologies. Presently I use e-mail, facebook, twitter, and newsletters as forms of communication. We make sure that we verify when sending out responses with time stamp and other devices. We record all transactions and in the future we will continue to use like methods including website for all to go to, to see exactly what is happening every day.

2 Will you pledge to daily post and identify the source of any offerings of gifts, trips, donations to your election / reelection campaign that you are offered from lobbyists, PACS or organizations and whether or not you have accepted them? What have you received to date and from whom?

First of all let me make it perfectly clear, I worked in the business world and was an executive in sales and purchasing and none those people were ever allowed to take any gifts, trips, or anything of this nature. I come from a culture of understanding the inappropriateness of such transactions.

To date I have taken no PAC money, nor have I accepted any money or gifts from any organization such as listed above. As far as PAC money itself is concerned, it seems to me that those that complain about taking PAC money or those that want to write in newspapers that took PAC money continually favor one group or person over another. If donations from a union considered PAC money, yet we have many candidates in the race today that receive funds from unions, high ranking GM official who built the Volt and was on WJR stating he would like to see gas prices go to 5 or 6 dollars even if the government gets involved, is that PAC money? We have a group of Tea Party leaders that met in Dewitt and they decided to put their support behind one candidate that has received or will be receiving money; is the Tea Party PAC money?

What I want to make real clear is that I am tired of groups of people or individuals that bully a candidate or person into a position so they have an unfair advantage.

I will never take PAC money from any organization or group that I do not believe in their cause or do not represent the United States best interest which includes strict adherence to the Constitution and capitalism.

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turn over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

3 Would you immediately start to reform entitlement programs that have driven the United States to insolvency? How would you do this?

With the way the government is depleting social security by reducing the payroll tax we may not have an opportunity to fix it; it may be pushed into insolvency/bankruptcy.

With just recently learning that the Tea Party had a meeting in Dewitt with the sole purpose to define new rules for this election, and deciding to endorse a candidate February 25, has put me a disadvantage and restricted the opportunity for new ideas.

I was developing a new kind of social security recovery program to be rolled out the 18th of February; I find it near impossible with now trying to get to the Tea Party to make the necessary introductions around the state. Once again a few select people have caused an unlevel playing field, or moreover to serve their own interest they have deprived all of us from being able to work through the process, develop new ideas and to elect the best candidate that can help our country return back to democracy, the constitution and capitalism.

I will provide three points for Social Security; First I would find those with a desire to restore social security and put in a sustaining new direction for taking care of our retirees. Secondly; I would make sure social security comes out of the general fund immediately. Third; I would start educating the American public how social security works and provide them with solutions that they could debate.

IV Electability:

1 Currently how many signatures do you have on all nominating petitions?

We are approximately half way to our goal.

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turn over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this

document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

2 How much money do you have in your campaign?

This is an inappropriate question given the fact that not all of the candidate will be receiving this document, this information if filed with-in the federal guidelines

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turn over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

3 How significant is money in this race?

Of course we can always use more money but fortunately money doesn't vote, people do and the person with all the money does not guarantee a win.

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turn over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

4 What do you believe is the role of the Tea Party/Patriotic Citizens Groups in America today?

I was at the very first tea party express that came through Brighton and I was on the phone encouraging the people to bring it through Brighton. I attended meetings in Brighton but only recently joined. My understanding of the tea party stood for and their values is much different that my experiences this year. Even the questions within this document do not serve our country. The debates I have attended and the straw polls I seen have not served our best interest. We had a year with approx. between 6 and 8 candidates with strong beliefs in the constitution/conservatism, and we should have been encouraging every tea party, every home, every group, or forum to have all of these candidates in and preach the "gospel". We should have encouraged them to seek out independents and even democrats to meet with and discuss our values and let them know that our vision could return this country back to greatness.

The emails that I have received from tea party officials and the recent email from another candidate clearly shows that some tea party management have their own private agenda which is not in the best interest of our country nor will it do anything to return our country back to greatness.

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turned over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

5 If elected as the junior Republican Senator from Michigan, will you break from the party if the party breaks from the Constitution? (i.e: the FED raising the debt ceiling, bailing-out private institutions, bailing out foreign institutions, increasing entitlements vs. phase them out?)

My answer would be redundant in nature, and this question should not even have to be asked if you understood the candidate which is part of the vetting process. The very reason I am in this race is that candidates that are running against me continue to vote the status quo. I am polar opposite of Debbie Stabenow and at least two of the candidates running. The majority of candidates all feed at the government trough and the only way they know how to fix problems is through our pockets. The only way to ensure not to vote for things like raising the debt ceiling, tarp, new taxes etc. is to be able to come up with new ideas, new arguments to put this country back in the right direction (which separates me from the other candidates).

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turned over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

6 As Nominee, what are the key issues about you, past and present, that the opposition will use against you. Remember that we will also have to defend you so be very thorough.

None that I know of, unfortunately I am pretty vanilla, however I do stand up for my rights and the rights of others and some of those confrontations may come out, but I guarantee you I am not embarrassed nor do I see it as a liability. I am my own man and have no problem standing toe to toe, for our rights, liberties and the pursuit of happiness.

This is an inappropriate question being asked and then being turn over to a group of people that may use it in an unfavorable manner either by taking it out of context or positioning it in a way that it was not intended to be. So let it be known to all parties that all words contained in this document is the property of Chuck Marino for Senate and to use it without written permission is prohibited.

Closing;

Unfortunately this document does not provide the patriots of this country a clear understanding of my ability (in the business world regarding budgets, taxes, and jobs) to move this country in a new direction from the senate. Since it is well over 20pages long and in the upcoming debate if questions are asked regarding candidate abilities, skill sets, or aptitude only short snapshots will be allowed. The best and shortest answer I can give regarding my concerns and my understanding of how to fix the problems and my loyalty to the constitution, free markets and the United States of America is summed up in these three letters... IMU.....if you understand this acronym and fully comprehend it then you must agree that together we can move this country back to the vision of our forefathers.

Chuck Marino is running for the U.S. Senate for the state of Michigan to "Take your voice to Washington." Chuck will be a voice of constitutional conservatism, limited government, and make sure the people of Michigan get their voices heard.

Chuck Marino is a leading advocate for tax reform, a staunch opponent of wasteful government spending and a strong proponent of adherence to the Constitution--as it was intended by the Founding Fathers. He believes Government has grown exponentially. Marino wants the Government to make the same kind of serious spending decisions that many families and small businesses have been forced to make. Marino is a champion of "free market" and believes in the vitality of family as the first unit of Government. He is also a defender of the "Right to Life" and devotedly stands for religious liberties.

As one who served in the U.S. Marine Corps, Marino is passionate about his country's military, and believes that when you send our forces into harm's way, the country should be committed to two things: fully funding the troops and leaving politics out of strategies by relying on the top officers responsible for executing the war.

Chuck and Carolyn have been married for 40 years; have five children and 10 grandchildren who have inspired him to be passionate about stopping the overspending of this administration, which is now projected to cost each of his grandchildren \$51,000.00.

Chuck Marino is the CEO of National Building Inspections, a Howell-based business that conducts commercial property assessments.

Marino has spent his life outside politics, dealing with real problems in the real economy and understands the economy from the inside out.

Both career politicians and our President have decided it is more important to keep levying debt on future generations so that Washington's undisciplined spending can fund waste, fraud and failing departments.

Chuck Marino has spent his past years in the real world; creating jobs, meeting payrolls, balancing budgets, negotiating contracts, and mentoring future managers. Marino wants to bring those skill sets to the U.S. Senate from the state of Michigan.

With the make-up of Congress to be heavier weighted with attorneys – 43 in the Senate, and 145 in the House – it is not surprising why Congress is turning out new regulations at an alarming rate. Marino will utilize his negotiation skills to develop arguments for reducing business taxes and create new strategies to save struggling small businesses, eliminate all regulation that are not “win/win” situation on jobs-profits-workers, introduce “sunset rules” for all departments, and “0” out all departments budgets each year.

The Senate seems broken, and seeing what Debbie Stabenow has done, or not done, it's clear Debbie's lack of understanding of business acumen is the cause of Michigan's manufacturing falling from 21st in the nation to 43rd. (Debbie Stabenow co-chairs manufacturing) Every year since she has been in office she has allowed Michigan to be a donor state for revenues we send to the federal government. Even during those times that Michigan was struggling (more than any other state 2006-2010) she has allowed manufacturing jobs to go overseas and decided to pick winners and losers when opening businesses here in Michigan. Allowing companies to take government funds and flee to China. Her lack of knowledge in capitalism, free markets, and our constitution has been the corner stone of Michigan's and the United States downward spiral of the economy.

Debbie Stabenow, calls herself a liberal, but institutes socialist programs. She believes that 12 year old girls do not need parental consent when obtaining HPV vaccinations. She has been in the forefront of destroying our freedoms by instituting Obama-care, which is unconstitutional in its very form. She went on to further erode our freedoms by instituting in the Obama-care mandate that tax payers pay for abortions and all Christian hospitals have to hand out contraceptives and perform abortions.

Marino's candidacy is polar opposite of Debbie Stabenow in every regard. Chuck Marino believes in free markets, the constitution, and will find consensus within the senate to repeal Obama care, repeal the collection of taxes for abortion, and institute solid programs that would reassert Michigan's manufacturing dominance as a world leader.

CHUCK MARINO

FOR UNITED STATES SENATE

www.chuckmarino.com

Chuck Marino would push for legislation that did away with regulations that stifle job creation. Marino believes the government needs to get out of the way of job creation, reduce taxes, and balance the budget. The United States needs to reassert itself as the leader of the "Free World" showing leadership in manufacturing, space exploration, and sound fiscal responsibility. Additionally, Marino believes we need to find free market solutions to providing adequate affordable insurance for all citizens, we need to restructure and devise 21st century techniques to reforming social security, while at the same time guaranteeing our seniors the benefits they have already been promised.

Career politicians got us into this mess and they simply do not know how to get us out. Once again, Chuck Marino would like to serve our Country, this time as your U.S. Senator.

For more information on Chuck Marino, visit his Web page at www.chuckmarino.com

www.facebook.com/chuckmarinoforsenate