

FREE ENTERPRISE SOCIETY NEWS

6083 N. Figarden Drive #208, Fresno, California 93722 - (209)-966-7040
www.Welcome.FreeEnterpriseSociety.com



Volume 14, Number 8

Organized under the First
Amendment, U.S. Constitution

Sep-Oct 2016 Edition

16th Amendment Still Not Ratified

By Attorney Larry Becraft

The interest in the issue of the non-ratification of the 16th Amendment has drawn some comments that the amendment legally did nothing: in the words of the Supreme Court, the amendment did not confer any new taxing powers. Based on this statement of the Supreme Court, some contend that this issue is meaningless. Those who believe this are mistaken and do not understand what the Supreme Court has decided in the series of cases regarding the income tax.

Under the United States Constitution, Congress can impose two types of taxes: direct taxes, which must be apportioned via the census, and indirect taxes which must be uniform. Before the Supreme Court's decision in the Pollock case, the Court had determined that income taxes imposed upon the income

of public officials were excises taxes which need not be apportioned, but only uniform. But things changed with the decision of the Court in Pollock.

At issue in the 1894 Pollock case was the question of whether income from real property (land) and personal property (stocks and bonds) could be subjected to a federal income tax via a law which was not apportioned. In Pollock, the Court held that a tax upon the income from land was a direct tax. Clearly, Congress could tax the income from land and has always had that power, provided the tax was apportioned, which is extremely difficult. However, since the 1894 federal income tax was uniform and not apportioned, it was held unconstitutional. Even today, it would be virtually impossible to apportion an income tax on land. If you wish to read

the first Pollock decision, it is posted on <http://caselaw.findlaw.com>.

After the first Pollock decision and in response to a petition for rehearing, the Court had to determine the remaining question of whether taxes on the income from personal property were also direct taxes which must be apportioned. Again, the Court concluded that an income tax on the income from personal property could only be taxed via an apportioned tax. If you wish to read the opinion of the Pollock Court on rehearing, it is also posted at FindLaw.com.

In summary, the Pollock Court held that, while Congress has always had the power to tax incomes from real and personal property, such taxes had to be apportioned; an uniform income tax

See **16th** page 4

Governor LePage Leads The Charge To Eliminate Income Tax

Maine Governor Paul LePage is unwilling to accept the status quo when it comes to his state's economic future. While in the past he's proven willing to play the long game by accepting gradual cuts, a simple reduction is not the Governor's goal. He's taken a firm stand, announcing a bill to eliminate the state income tax by 2020.

Of course, LePage's bold trajectory is not surprising. During his State of the State address in February of this year, the Governor said unequivocally

See **LePage** 7

"Tens of thousands" of fraudulent Clinton votes found in Ohio warehouse

<http://christiantimesnewspaper.com>
Election officials in Franklin County, Ohio are reportedly stumped over what one maintenance worker found in a dilapidated downtown Columbus warehouse earlier this week.

According to sources, Randall Prince, a Columbus-area electrical worker, was doing a routine check of his company's wiring and electrical systems when he stumbled across ap-

proximately one dozen black, sealed ballot boxes filled with thousands of Franklin County votes for Hillary Clinton and other Democrat candidates.

"No one really goes in this building. It's mainly used for short-term storage by a commercial plumber," Prince said.

So when Prince, who is a Trump

See **FRAUD** page 5

Three Questions to Change the Election

By Tom DeWeese

The number of candidates for President seems to grow on a daily basis.

In fact, about the only reason we are given to vote for these candidates is that perhaps a charge that their opponent is involved in some kind of scandal or hired an illegal gardener.

Consequently, as has been the case for the last many elections, rarely does a candidate risk taking on the really vital issues that get to the core of our nation's pending demise. Have you heard a single candidate address any of these issues:

The massive destruction of American industry by the EPA.

The near complete usurpation of private property rights in communities

and rural areas.

The complete federal takeover of state and local school systems, enforcing a national curriculum that warps history, destroys mathematics and provides little in the way of real academics.

It's time to change all of that. Here's how. Put the candidates on the spot during their public meetings.

Starting now, as the presidential campaign heats up, let me offer three questions designed to shake up any public candidate meeting. A word of caution - do not take this action alone. Organize with at least three friends. Have each choose

one of these questions to ask the candidates. If you have more people to join you, have others prepared to do a follow up question if they fail to answer. As you get your moment in front of the microphone, read the statement as I've provided below and then finish with the question shown in bold:

Property Rights Question

Private property rights are under assault in communities and rural areas across the nation as local, state and federal governments move to enforce new planning development programs, particularly under the labels of Sustainable Developments or "Local Visioning." **If elected, what actions will you take to protect the unrestricted right of use, enjoyment and disposal of private property by its owners?**

Regional Government Question

It's a growing situation that local elected representative government is being overshadowed by the establish-

ment of non-elected boards, councils, planning commissions and regional governments. These non-elected organizations are, in effect, taking government further away from the people as they deal in backrooms,

unseen and unapproachable. Yet, while not elected by the people, they are creating policy that affects private property, tax rates and much more, especially through the taking of federal grant money, which results in federal control over the use and outcome of that money. **If elected, what actions will you take to eliminate these massive grant programs and to stop federal efforts to enforce creation of non-elected boards, councils and regional government boards?**



Tom DeWeese

Social Justice Question

The term social justice is used more and more in today's official society. The actual meaning of social justice is redistribution of wealth, much of which is imposed through the tool of political correctness. Social Justice is used to create class warfare and divisions in our society. It is now widely used in our public school curricula to replace actual academics with behavior modification methods designed to change the attitudes, values and beliefs of the children. The openly stated purpose of such programs as Outcome based education and Common Core is to create new global citizens who reject traditional American values of individual freedom, free enterprise and limited government. Such curriculum is enforced through a centralized Federal Department of Education, which has usurped local input. **If elected, will you take action to shut down**

See **QUESTION** page 7

Free Enterprise Society News

✓ This is a private publication for the members of this society. The articles contain discussions or opinions of certain controversial topics. These are not given or intended as legal advice but only as the opinion of the author for information only. For legal advice contact a competent attorney.

✓ Members are welcome to send in short articles for possible publication. Bylines will be used at your option and we reserve the right to edit any material that is published for space availability and clarity.

✓ Permission is hereby granted to use articles contained in this publication provided proper credit is given and a copy of its use sent to the Editor of Free Enterprise Society News.

✓ This newsletter is an exclusive benefit of members of this private society. Free information will be sent on request for those who wish to find out how to receive this publication.

Vaccine Controversy Shows Why We Need Markets, Not Mandates

By Congressman Ron Paul

If I were still a practicing ob-gyn and one of my patients said she was not going to vaccinate her child, I might try to persuade her to change her mind. But, if I were unsuccessful, I would respect her decision. I certainly would not lobby the government to pass a law mandating that children be vaccinated even if the children's parents object. Sadly, the recent panic over the outbreak of measles has led many Americans, including some self-styled libertarians, to call for giving government new powers to force all children to be vaccinated.

Those who are willing to make an "exception" to the principle that parents should make health care decisions for their children should ask themselves when in history has a "limited" infringement on individual liberty stayed limited. By ceding the principle that individuals have the right to make their own health care decisions, supporters of mandatory vaccines are opening the door for future infringements on health freedom.

If government can mandate that children receive vaccines, then why shouldn't the government mandate that adults receive certain types of vaccines? And if it is the law that individuals must be vaccinated, then why shouldn't police officers be empowered to physically force resisters to receive a vaccine? If the fear of infections from the unvaccinated justifies mandatory vaccine laws, then why shouldn't police offices fine or arrest people who don't wash their hands or cover their noses or mouths when they cough or sneeze in public? Why not force people to eat right and take vitamins in order to lower their risk of contracting an infectious disease? These proposals may seem outlandish, but they are no different in principle from the proposal that government force children to be vaccinated.

By giving vaccine companies a captive market, mandates encourage

these companies to use their political influence to expand the amount of vaccine mandates. An example of how vaccine mandates may have led politics to override sound science is from my home state of Texas. In 2007, the then-Texas governor signed an executive order forcing eleven and twelve year old girls to receive the human papilloma virus (HPV) vaccine, even though most young girls are not at risk of HPV. The Texas legislature passed legislation undoing the order following a massive public outcry, fueled by revelations that the governor's former chief of staff was a top lobbyist for the company that manufactured the HPV vaccine.

The same principles that protect the right to refuse vaccines also protect the right of individuals to refuse to associate with the unvaccinated. Private property owners have the right to forbid those who reject vaccines from entering their property. This right extends to private businesses concerned that unvaccinated individuals could pose a risk to their employees and customers. Consistent application of the principles of private property, freedom of association, and individual responsibility is the best way to address concerns that those who refuse vaccines could infect others with disease.

Giving the government the power to override parental decisions regarding vaccines will inevitably lead to further restrictions on liberties. After all, if government can override parental or personal health care decisions, then what area of our lives is off-limits to government interference? Concerns about infection from the unvaccinated can be addressed by consistent application of the principles of private property and freedom of association. Instead of justifying new government intrusion into our lives, the vaccine debate provides more evidence of the need to restore respect for private property and individual liberty. □




Dem Rep Says Congress Needs Pay Raise: \$174,000 a Year Leads to Poor Reps in 'Sackcloth and Ashes'

by Larry O'Connor
www.ijreview.com

Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-IL) says he and his colleagues in Congress are vastly underpaid and the American people need to pony up some more money, if they want to keep these stellar politicians around.

That's basically the argument he made at Roll Call a while back:

"We are entering our seventh year without a pay raise. Now I think we've proven to the American people that we are responsible. And I know that it has impacted me personally.



We have more than 50 members, probably as many as 75 or more living in their offices. They're not there because of any other reason than they can't afford it. Now if people want us in sackcloth and ashes then they will get what they rightly deserve as representation."

[ED NOTE: Who in their right mind would believe \$174,000 per year will leave you in rags. Alcee Hastings is not stellar, but dishonest!] □

16th from page 1

could not tax such income. Once this is understood, the meaning of the above statements about “no new taxing power” becomes clear.

However, the Supreme Court in *Pollock* held the whole 1894 federal income tax void. A decision simply invalidating the 1894 income tax insofar as it concerned the income from real and personal property would have left the tax to be borne entirely by “professions and occupations” and the Court determined that Congress would not have adopted the 1894 tax if the tax was invalid as to incomes from real and personal property. For this reason, the whole act was voided. You will find that part of the decision in the *Pollock* case.

Based upon the decision in *Pollock*, the 16th Amendment is absolutely essential to enable Congress to impose an uniform tax upon incomes from real and personal property, contrary to the popular beliefs of some. Without the amendment, Congress could not impose uniform taxes upon the income of real and personal property. But further, if the 16th Amendment were declared today to be void because of the defects discovered by Bill Benson, income taxes on the income of real and personal property would fall. But it does not stop there. Clearly just like the *Pollock* Court observed, Congress would not have imposed this tax to be borne entirely by the professions and occupations if the taxes on income from real and personal property were constitutionally invalid. Thus everyone should have an interest in the question of the ratification of the 16th Amendment.

Here is the Court’s rationale for holding the entire 1894 income tax void:

“It is elementary that the same statute may be in part constitutional and in part unconstitutional, and, if the parts are wholly independent of each other, that which is constitutional may stand, while that which is unconstitutional will be rejected. And in the case before us there is no question as to the validity of this act, except sections 27 to 37, inclusive, which relate to the subject which has been under

discussion; and, as to them, we think the rule laid down by Chief Justice Shaw in *Warren v. Charlestown*, 2 Gray, 84, is [158 U.S. 601, 636] applicable, that if the different parts ‘are so mutually connected with and dependent on each other, as conditions, considerations, or compensations for each other, as to warrant a belief that the legislature intended them as a whole, and that if all could not be carried into effect the legislature would not pass the residue independently, and some parts are unconstitutional, all the provisions which are thus dependent, conditional, or connected must fall with them.’ Or, as the point is put by Mr. Justice Matthews in *Poindexter v. Greenhow*, 114 U.S. 270, 304, 5 S. Sup. Ct. 903, 962: ‘It is undoubtedly true that there may be cases where one part of a statute may be enforced, as constitutional, and another be declared inoperative and void, because unconstitutional; but these are cases where the parts are so distinctly separable that each can stand alone, and where the court is able to see, and to declare, that the intention of the legislature was that the part pronounced valid should be enforceable, even though the other part should fail. To hold otherwise would be to substitute for the law intended by the legislature one they may never have been willing, by itself, to enact.’ And again, as stated by the same eminent judge in *Sprague v. Thompson*, 118 U.S. 90, 95, 6 S. Sup. Ct. 988, where it was urged that certain illegal exceptions in a section of a statute might be disregarded, but that the rest could stand: ‘The insuperable difficulty with the application of that principle of construction to the present instance is that by rejecting the exceptions intended by the legislature of Georgia the statute is made to enact what, confessedly, the legislature never meant. It confers upon the statute a positive operation beyond the legislative intent, and beyond what any one can say it would have enacted, in view of the illegality of the exceptions.’

According to the census, the true valuation of real and personal property in the United States in 1890 was \$65,037,091,197, of which real estate with improvements thereon made up \$39,544,544,333. Of course, from the latter must be deducted, in applying these

sections, all unproductive property and all property whose net yield does not exceed \$4,000; but, even with such deductions, it is evident that the income from realty formed a vital part of the scheme for taxation em- [158 U.S. 601, 637] bodied therein. If that be stricken out, and also the income from all invested personal property, bonds, stocks, investments of all kinds, it is obvious that the largest part of the anticipated revenue would be eliminated, and this would leave the burden of the tax to be borne by professions, trades, employments, or vocations; and in that way what was intended as a tax on capital would remain, in substance, a tax on occupations and labor. We cannot believe that such was the intention of congress. We do not mean to say that an act laying by apportionment a direct tax on all real estate and personal property, or the income thereof, might not also lay excise taxes on business, privileges, employments, and vocations. But this is not such an act, and the scheme must be considered as a whole. Being invalid as to the greater part, and falling, as the tax would, if any part were held valid, in a direction which could not have been contemplated, except in connection with the taxation considered as an entirety, we are constrained to conclude that sections 27 to 37, inclusive, of the act, which became a law, without the signature of the president, on August 28, 1894, are wholly inoperative and void.

Our conclusions may therefore be summed up as follows:

First. We adhere to the opinion already announced, that, taxes on real estate being indisputably direct taxes, taxes on the rents or income of real estate are equally direct taxes.

Second. We are of opinion that taxes on personal property, or on the income of personal property, are likewise direct taxes.

Third. The tax imposed by sections 27 to 37, inclusive, of the act of 1894, so far as it falls on the income of real estate, and of personal property, being a direct tax, within the meaning of the constitution, and therefore unconstitutional and void, because not apportioned according to representation, all those sections, constituting one entire scheme of taxation, are necessarily invalid." □

FRAUD from page 1

supporter, saw several black boxes in an otherwise empty room, he went to investigate. What he found could allegedly be evidence of a massive operation designed to deliver Clinton the crucial swing state.

Prince, shown here, poses with



his find, as election officials investigate.

Early voting does not begin in Ohio until October 12, so no votes have officially been cast in the Buckeye state. However, inside these boxes were, what one source described as, “potentially tens of thousands of votes” for Hillary Clinton.

Christian Times Newspaper has not yet been able to obtain a photocopy of one of the ballots found inside the box, but an affiliate in Ohio passed along a replica of what was found.

It is important to note that the above replica coincides with a ballot that a Franklin County voter would cast at the polling place on Election Day, meaning the Clinton campaign’s likely goal was to slip the fake ballot boxes in with the real ballot boxes when they went to official election judges on November 8th.

Ohio, a perennial swing state in the presidential election, has been a challenge for Clinton and her Democrat counterparts in 2016. Many national Democrat groups have pulled funding from the state entirely, in order to redirect it to places in which they are

+

OFFICIAL GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT

CDLS 14-E-01

Franklin County, Ohio		General Election		November 8, 2016	
Instructions to Voter					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To vote: completely darken the oval (●) to the left of your choice. Note the permitted number of choices directly below the title of each candidate office. Do not mark the ballot for more choices than allowed. Vote either "Yes" or "No," or "For" or "Against," on any issue. If you mark the ballot for more choices than permitted, that contest or question will not be counted. To vote for a write-in candidate: completely darken the oval (●) to the left of the blank line and write in the candidate's name. Only votes cast for candidates who filed as write-in candidates can be counted. Do not write in a candidate's name if that person's name is already printed on the ballot for that same contest. If you make a mistake or want to change your vote: return your ballot to an election official and get a new ballot. You may ask for a new ballot up to two times. 					
For President and Vice President (Vote for not more than 1 pair) A vote for any candidates for President and Vice President shall be a vote for the electors of those candidates whose names have been certified to the Secretary of State.		For U.S. Senator (Vote for not more than 1)		For Prosecuting Attorney (Vote for not more than 1)	
<input type="radio"/> For President Jill Stein For Vice President Ajamu Baraka Green		<input type="radio"/> Scott Rupert Nonparty Candidate <input checked="" type="radio"/> Ted Strickland Democratic <input type="radio"/> Tom Connors Nonparty Candidate <input type="radio"/> Joseph R. DeMare Green <input type="radio"/> Rob Portman Republican <input type="radio"/> Write-In		<input type="radio"/> Bob Fittrakis Green <input checked="" type="radio"/> Zach Klein Democratic <input type="radio"/> Ron O'Brien Republican	
<input type="radio"/> For President Donald J. Trump For Vice President Michael R. Pence Republican		<input type="radio"/> Write-In		For Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas (Vote for not more than 1)	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> For President Hillary Clinton For Vice President Tim Kaine Democratic		For Representative to Congress (15th District) (Vote for not more than 1)		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Maryellen O'Shaughnessy Democratic <input type="radio"/> Besa Sharrah Republican	
<input type="radio"/> For President Richard Duncan For Vice President Ricky Johnson Nonparty Candidates		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Scott Wharton Democratic <input type="radio"/> Steve Stivers Republican		For Sheriff (Vote for not more than 1)	
		<input type="radio"/> For State Representative (18th District) (Vote for not more than 1)		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Dallas L. Baldwin Democratic	
		<input type="radio"/> Kristin Boggs		<input type="radio"/> Daphne Hawk Republican <input checked="" type="radio"/> Danny O'Connor Democratic	
				For County Treasurer (Vote for not more than 1)	
				<input type="radio"/> Ted A. Berry Republican	

Official FES Addresses

Free Enterprise Society has two main addresses. They are the following:

**6083 N. Figarden Drive, #208
Fresno, California 93722**

and

**PO Box 5008-334, Mariposa,
California 95338.**

If you receive billing or membership information from another address or are asked to send money to an address other than those above it is probably not from us.

I bring this to your attention because there is another organization with a similar name which has caused some confusion. It is a separate organization not connected with *Free Enterprise Society*.

If you have any questions about this or are not sure about something in this regard, feel free to contact Steve at 209-966-7040. □

doing better.

Clinton herself has spent less time in Ohio, and spent less money, in recent weeks as it has appeared that Trump will carry the crucial state.

With this find, however, it now appears that Clinton and the Democrat Party planned on stealing the state on Election Day, making any campaigning there now a waste of time.

[ED NOTE: Every time we find major election fraud it is the democrats that are behind it. This is very serious. They may already have these cases hidden in every Ohio voting district.

I would also believe that every state where Clinton is in jeopardy they have already done the same thing. These are a major felonies.] □

I freed thousands of slaves. I could have freed thousands more, if they had known they were slaves.

Harriet Tubman

1822-1913

State Of Georgia Sues Man For Copyright Infringement For Publishing The State's Own Laws

by: Mike Masnick

Years ago, we wrote about the state of Georgia ridiculously threatening to sue Carl Malamud and his site Public.Resource.org for copyright infringement... for publishing an official annotated copy of the state's laws. This followed on a similar threat from the state of Oregon, which wisely backed down. Malamud has spent the last few years of his life doing wonderful and important work trying to make sure that the laws that we live by are actually available to the public. The specific issue here is that while the basic Georgia legal code is available to the public, the state charges a lot of money for the "Official Code of Georgia Annotated." The distinction here is fairly important — but it's worth noting that the state points directly to the annotated version as the official laws of the state. Furthermore, the annotations are very important in understanding and applying the relevant interpretations and case law (case law is a part of the law, after all). And then, the question is whether or not the law itself should be subject to copyright restrictions. Malamud has long argued no, while the state has obviously argued yes, probably blinded by the revenue from selling its official copy of the annotated code.

It took two years, but the state has now done the absolutely ridiculous thing of suing Malamud. It is about as ridiculous as you would expect again focusing on the highly questionable claim that the Official Code of Georgia Annotated is covered by federal copyright law — and that not only was Malamud (*gasp*) distributing it, but also... creating derivative works! Oh no! And, he's such an evil person that he was encouraging others to do so as well!

This action for injunctive relief arises from Defendant's systematic, widespread and unauthorized copying and distribution of the copyrighted annotations in the Official Code of Georgia Annotated ("O.C.G.A.") through

the distribution of thumb drives containing copies of the O.C.G.A. and the posting of the O.C.G.A. on various web sites. Defendant has facilitated, enabled, encouraged and induced others to view, download, print, copy, and distribute the O.C.G.A copyrighted an-



notations without limitation, authorization, or appropriate compensation. On information and belief, Defendant has also created unauthorized derivative works containing the O.C.G.A. annotations by re-keying the O.C.G.A. in order to make it possible for members of the public to copy and manipulate the O.C.G.A., thereby also encouraging the creation of further unauthorized derivative works.

Believe it or not, the State of Georgia is actually claiming that it needs the copyright protections here to incentivize it to create these annotated copies of the law. Apparently, without copyright, Georgia's law would remain sadly unannotated.

Each of these annotations is an original and creative work of authorship that is protected by copyrights owned by the State of Georgia. Without providing the publisher with the ability to recoup its costs for the development of these copyrighted annotations, the State of Georgia will be required to either stop publishing the annotations altogether or pay for development of the annotations using state tax dollars. Unless Defendant's infringing activities are enjoined, Plaintiff and citizens of the State of Georgia, will face losing valuable analysis and guidance regard-

ing their state laws.

This is ridiculous. In what world does making the law require copyright protection?

Later, the lawsuit makes Malamud out to be some sort of horrible person on a "crusade" to make the laws free, and to "control the accessibility of U.S. government documents."

On information and belief, Carl Malamud has engaged in an 18 year-long crusade to control the accessibility of U.S. government documents by becoming the United States' Public Printer — an individual nominated by the U.S. President and who is in control of the U.S. Government Printing Office. Carl Malamud has not been so nominated.

It takes a special kind of ridiculousness to argue that someone seeking to make the laws of the land more accessible to the public is somehow looking to "control the accessibility" of those laws. But, welcome to the State of Georgia, apparently home to just that kind of special ridiculousness.

Either way, this seems like a ridiculous move for Georgia. Going after Carl Malamud for copyright infringement for helping to make the public more aware of the law in the state of Georgia just seems ridiculous. And for all of the state's repeated claims in the lawsuit that it's doing this to protect taxpayers, one has to ask why it's spending taxpayer revenue on filing such a ridiculous lawsuit.

Back when the state of Georgia first threatened Malamud two years ago, he responded as such:

It is a long-held tenet of American law that there is no copyright in the law. This is because the law belongs to the people and in our system of democracy we have the right to read, know, and speak the laws by which we choose to govern ourselves.

This still applies, and it seems that the State of Georgia might want to re-evaluate its choice of targets here. □

LePage from Page 1

cally: “My vision for Maine is a Maine without an income tax.” He further demonstrated his commitment to meaningful reform, explaining that the income-tax elimination must become permanent via a Constitutional amendment. Taking this ironclad step would, LePage reasoned, “remove the burden



that the personal income tax places on Maine families – from retirees on fixed incomes to job creators.”

At present, Maine isn't a top destination for those job creators. According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation's 2015 State Business Tax Climate Index, the quality of Maine's tax climate is far from impressive, coming in at 33rd in the nation. Even worse, the state's property tax burden is the tenth worst in the nation; the corporate tax burden is the fifth worst.

With realities such as these, it's crucial that a leader such as LePage takes action to level the playing field and make Maine attractive to workers and the job-creating businesses that employ them. By eliminating the income tax in favor of other, more benign forms of taxation, such as broad-based consumption taxes, Maine could keep more of the net adjusted gross income that currently flees to states like Florida (which levies no state income tax and siphoned off nearly \$826 million of Maine's net AGI between 1992 and 2011).

In the book I co-authored, *An*

Inquiry into The Nature and Causes of the Wealth of States, we looked at moving companies' record over the last five years. Neighboring New Hampshire, a no-income tax state, has been classified as an inbound state, determined by having more than 55 percent of all shipments going into a given state. In fact, New Hampshire holds the distinction of being the only inbound state in New England with the population growing by 6.5 percent between 2000 and 2010. Despite being a small state in a slow-growing region, New Hampshire consistently attracts new residents and businesses with its low tax burdens, ranking 8th in the Tax Foundation's 2015 State Business Tax Climate. LePage must continue his strong stance with

legislators on passing tax reform in order to reverse Maine's current stagnant economic growth.

Predictably, this week LePage's antagonists on the Democratic side of the aisle belittled the plan as lawmakers on the Legislature's Taxation Committee voted the party-line and recommended against the bill. These opponents seem to miss the intrinsically harmful nature of the income tax, which effectively penalizes work and encourages people (and businesses) to head to states that do not punish productivity and innovation.

Even though Republicans are in the minority on the committee, they remain optimistic that the bill will pass as it moves on to the full Legislature making the plan a priority. When asked about the likelihood of the bill's passage, House Republican Leader Ken Fredette (R-Newport) responded: “I think the right question is how committed are the Democrats to reducing the size of the government and keeping more money in the pockets of businesses and individuals?”

The Maine State Chamber of Commerce also voiced its support of

Governor LePage's tax-reform proposals. Last week the Chamber called the plan a “historic opportunity” and emphasized its agreement with reductions in not just the income tax, but also the corporate tax and the estate tax. The Chamber stated that the plan will “improve Maine's economic competitiveness, provide exportability and revenue stability, and that also assist lower-income taxpayers and attract/retain retirees to our state.”

The State of Maine would reap historic benefits from the elimination of the income tax, similar to the consistent, above-average growth that the nine states currently without an income tax enjoy. With political will and business support behind him, LePage stands a real chance of seeing his plan become a reality. □

QUESTION from page 2

the federal Department of Education and return education policy to the states, making sure to end these orchestrated attacks on the attitudes, values and beliefs of the children?

Ask these questions in a public forum and watch those clueless candidates squirm. Most won't have an answer. In fact most won't even know what you are talking about. They will try to evade or put some positive spin on it. But you will know. You will understand that such candidates will never work to fix these problems. And so will the rest of the audience.

It is time for our movement to take aggressive action against these slithering candidates. We need to descend on public forums. Organize. Place our people strategically around the room. And one by one begin to ask these questions. When they can't answer, have someone else ask it again, and again. Let them know they had better give these issues some thought. Let them know that we are going to be there every time they appear in public. And let them know we are going to make them look like fools in front of audiences until they decide to actually talk about issues that mean something to real Americans. □

Virginia College Student Caught Registering Dead Voters

By: Bill Still

A Virginia college student has been caught red-handed registering names of dead people to vote in the upcoming presidential election.

Andrew Spieles, a James Madison University student working for Harrisonburg Votes, confessed to submitting 19 applications to register previously deceased people to vote.

Spieles was caught when he tried to register under the name of Richard Allen Claybrook Sr., who died in 2014 at the age of 87.

Claybrook was a former Fairfax County elementary school principal, and was known by a clerk in the Voter Registrar's office.

The student was working for Joe Fitzgerald, the chairman of the Democratic Committee for his Congressional District and veteran Virginia political operative. Fitzgerald said he had no knowledge of Spieles's actions and fired him immediately.

William Howell, the Republican speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates told the Washington Post that this shows the lengths that Democrats will go to in winning the crucial swing state of Virginia.

"Often times we hear our Democrat colleagues suggest that voter fraud doesn't exist in Virginia or is a myth. This is proof that voter fraud not only exists but is ongoing and is a threat to the integrity of our elections."

Election experts wonder how long this form of voter fraud has been going on because Democrats must have some way of exploiting these fraudulent registrations or they wouldn't be doing it. There must be a previously unknown way to cast fraudulent votes on election day because Virginia is one of 7 states that has the most stringent identification requirements in the nation – known as "Strict photo ID

required."

Harrisonburg Registrar Debbie Logan said on Thursday that using a deceased person's real name and address but a false social security number would not automatically raise the alarm under existing Virginia law.

The only way election officials would have recognized the deception is when the voter had to display a valid ID, which is required in Virginia, but not required in 18 states – 15 of which normally vote Democrat.



It would be interesting to ask young Andrew Spieles what the plan was to use these fraudulent voter registrations.

Certainly no college student could have been motivated to do it as

a prank unless they knew it could be used effectively in some way without the guidance of veteran politicians steeped in a culture of the fine art of political corruption.

Imagine how much of this is going on in the 18 states with zero identification requirements to vote?

These states are:

Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, North Carolina, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, and California

Voter fraud is considered a serious crime at both the federal and state level that includes stiff penalties.

Under federal law perpetrators face up to 5 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine for each act of fraud. State laws add additional years of imprisonment and fines.

I'm still reporting from Washington. Good Day.

Bill Still is a former newspaper editor and publisher. He has written for USA Today, The Saturday Evening Post, the Los Angeles Times Syndicate, OMNI magazine, and has also produced the syndicated radio

program, Health News. He has written 22 books and two documentary videos and is the host of his wildly popular daily YouTube Channel the "Still Report", the quintessential report on the economy and Washington. □

"A bureaucrat is the most despicable of men, though he is needed as vultures are needed, but one hardly admires vultures whom bureaucrats so strangely resemble. I have yet to meet a bureaucrat who is not petty, dull, almost witless, crafty or stupid, an oppressor or a thief, a holder of little authority in which he delights, as a boy delights in possessing a vicious dog. Who can trust such a creature?" M. Tullius Cicero, circa. 50 B.C.