Wednesday, January 11th, 2023
10:44am

To be included in written testimony for SF 1
State and Local Government and Veterans Affairs

Thank you Chair and Members of this committee
For the record, I am not appearing as a partisan of Democratic or Republican
but rather a proponent of the United States Constitution.

for the purposes of the First Amendment Establishment Clause
I would urge you to vote NO on SF1-

The First Amendment Establishment Clause
of
The United States Constitution
is predicated off of
three primary criteria
for whether or not GOVERNMENT
action has the primary effect of advancing a religion.

1) government indoctrination,
2) defining the recipients of government benefits based on religion, and
3) excessive entanglement between government and religion.

In the US Supreme Court Case
Torcaso V Watkins,
prior to Roe and Casey,
the Supreme Court of the
United States found that secular humanism is a religion for
purposes of the First Amendment's religious clauses in

a.) Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488 (1961)
b.) School District of A Bington Township Pa. v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963),
(c) United States v. Seeger, 380 US 163 (1965),
(d) Welsh v. United States, 398 U.S. 333 (1970),
and the federal courts of appeals found the same thing in:
(a) Malnak v. Yogi, 592 F.2d 197 (3d Cir.1979);
(b) Theriault v. Silber,547 F.2d 1279 (5th Cir.1977),
(c) Thomas v. Review Bd., 450 U.S. 707 (1981),
(d) Lindell v. McCallum, 352 F. 3d 1107 (7th Cir. 2003),
(e) Real Alternatives, Inc. v. Sec'y Dep't of Health & Human Servs.,150 F. Supp. 3d 419, 2017 WL3324690 (3dCir.Aug.4,2017),
(6) Wells v. City and County of Denver, 257 F.3d1132 (10th Cir. 2001),

When someone says that life does not begin at conception,
that abortion is not murder,
that abortion is not immoral,
these are a series of unproven, faith based assumptions and naked assertions
that are explicitly linked to the
Religion
of
Secular Humanism.

while convenience abortion practices are sacred in
the religion of secular humanism, those practices are considered
to be evil by other religions, whose members do not want to pay
taxes to support a secular humanist theocracy in the place of a
Constitutional Republic,
and
unlike the establishment clause, the right of
convenience abortion, privacy, and autonomy are not found in the
text of the United States Constitution,
and the States,
therefore,
have the authority to regulate convenience abortion
practices through the powers conferred to them by the Tenth
Amendment of the United States Constitution .

The State of Minnesota has been permitted under the power
conferred to it through the Tenth Amendment to regulate
licentious religious practices, which includes convenience
abortion practices,
convenience abortion practices and promote
licentiousness and attempt to justify practices that are
inconsistent with the peace and safety of this State,
If only one person in your district does not agree with abortion and favors
this one person who is a tax payer has tax payer standing and government actors such
as those in favor of HF 1 are in violation.
and
this State favors life and has an interest in
protecting the life of an unborn child and in upholding
community standards of decency, which convenience abortion
practices erode;

when government actors such yourselves create, introduce, or enact laws and vote legislation through to convenience abortions, and to fund convenience abortions facilities, you are:

1. in direct violation of the oath of office pursuant to article 6

2. You are essentially saying that the favorable religion in the State Of Minnesota is the religion of Secular Humanism, and this is absolutely not the case,

Is Minnesota appropriating tax payer $ to provide convenience abortions? YES
even if one person in your district believes abortion funding violates their conscious
even if it is $1 going towards convenience abortions, we are in direct violation of the law.

This Tax payer standing gives each of us who have testified before every committee and you today and in every piece of legislation that promotes or gives money to convience abortion facilities such as Planned Parenthood, to say that the state of Minnesota is in direct violation of the United States constitution and you are in direct violation of the oath pursuant to article 6
Article VI clause 2 of the United States
Constitution sets forth that the text of the United States
Constitution is the supreme law of the land and reads, “This
Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be
made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall
be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the
supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be
bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any
State to the Contrary notwithstanding,” which means that
although federal law made by the three federal branches of
government preempts state law when they conflict, the text of
the United States Constitution preempts federal laws made by the
three federal branches when they conflict, and

We are calling upon you government actors who took such oath to uphold the oath of office pursuant to article 6
In HF1 it is clear that the government is in violation of the First Amendment Establishment Clause.

We are in a hearing determining whether or not we are going to promote or enact legislation that violates the oaths taken and the United States Constitution.

On behalf of those in opposition of the bill and those that have not had a chance to speak or write a written testimony we are asking the state legislature to obey the constitution and lastly to set the record straight abortion is not a fundamental right.

This was stated in the United States Supreme Court Case
Dobbs v Jackson Whole Women's Health Organization

Precedence
Justice Alito (along with Justices Barrett, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Thomas) portrayed the decision as simply ending 50 years of judicial interference that had found rights where none existed and erected barriers to state regulation.

Alito wrote, "the Constitution makes no reference to abortion and no such right is implicitly protected by any constitutional provision. This Court cannot bring about the permanent resolution of a rancorous national controversy simply by dictating a settlement and telling the people to move on."

The majority concluded that the right to abortion was nothing more than a manufactured constitutional right — an abuse of the Fourteenth Amendment's "liberty" protection — and that the parameters of the Fourteenth Amendment's protection are set by the scope of rights that existed in 1868 when the amendment was adopted.

The majority held that in finding a right to abortion, the *Roe* and *Casey* Courts had legislated from the bench, elevating a medical procedure to constitutionally protected status. In so doing, it said, the previous Courts — in a misguided effort — had concocted a regulatory regime that exempted abortion from states' historical power to regulate medical care and had mistakenly treated access to abortion as an extension of other constitutional liberty and privacy interests.

The majority contended that abortion protections lacked any basis in historical fact since abortion bans were widespread up to the time of *Roe.* Excising the constitutional protection of abortion, Alito wrote, was a "neutral" action by the Court that would return abortion regulation to the states, where the democratic process could set acceptable bounds.

Stare decisis — that is, respect for precedent — was not a problem, the Court held, since it has long recognized the need to overturn erroneous precedents, such as *Plessy v. Ferguson,* which for a half century enshrined "separate but equal" as lawful until it was overturned by *Brown v. Board of Education.*

upon the adoption of the United States Supreme Court decision June 24th
our team was involved in federal litigation in the District of Columbia against the Biden administration and Democrat senior leadership in Congress over the "Women's Health Protection Act" and the "Equality Act."

We knew that the Supreme Court in Dobbs was going to overturn Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey, sending the issue of when to restrict the licentious religious practice of convenience abortion back to the States and here we are.

our motion for preliminary injunction was filed at 3am on June 24th, https://www.dropbox.com/s/0cwwfvr1i94cj5u/Official%20Motion%20for%20Preliminary%20Injunction%20Equality%20Act%20and%20Women%27s%20Health%20Protection%20Act.pdf?dl=0

Our response in every manner is to draw upon the correct and controlling text of the Federal Constitution under the establishment clause of the First Amendment and the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution in a water-tight manner.

The tenth amendment reads,
“The
powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution,
nor prohibited by it to the States,
are reserved to the
States
respectively, or to the people”, and
while the belief or disbelief in the morality of
convenience abortion practices is protected under the free exercise clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and under Section 16, Article I of the Minnesota Constitution, the free exercise clause is not absolute, and
as part of American tradition and heritage since
the founding.
Also a direct quote from McCreary v ACLU on this . ….
“We repeat and again reaffirm that neither a State nor the Federal Government can constitutionally force a person ‘to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion.’ Neither can constitutionally pass laws or impose requirements which aid all religions as against nonbelievers, and neither can aid those religions based on a belief in the existence of God as against those religions founded on different beliefs.” Thus, it makes no difference whether a law discriminating in favor of theists against atheists or secular humanists qualifies as favoring religion over non-religion or favoring one religion over others.
The judge in these cases did indeed note in his ruling that “[t]he court finds that Secular Humanism is a religion for Establishment Clause purposes.” However, at another point in the decision, he also wrote that “the touchstone of the Establishment Clause was ‘the principle that the First Amendment mandates government NEUTRALITY between

religion and religion, and *between religion and nonreligion*.'[*McCreary County v. ACLU*], 545 U.S. 844, 860 (2005) (emphasis added). Thus, whether Humanism is a religion or a nonreligion, the Establishment Clause applies." Just as the Establishment Clause protects Christian or Muslim who wish to hold a discussion group where they promote belief in God, so it also protects Secular Humanists or atheists who want to promote the opposite view. ‘

these matters are confusing and complex
trying to give a constitution legal basis why they should engage or not engage in certain actions is complex but here it is.

I would respectfully submit to this committee to
take into consideration all of these matters,
and push this bill out so that you can truly grasp the weight of your decision.

I urge you to ask yourselves if SF1 comports with your duty pursuant to article 6 and the first amendment establishment clause, and every other legal standing?

Attached is our proposed bill language,
Title could be changed to suit all
Either way the words in the code are what legally satisfies the issue of abortion on constitutional and contextual standings.
Here is the dropbox:https://www.dropbox.com/s/xdyopj5qwkk9ys3/Minnesota%20Keep%20Roe%20Reversed%20Forever%20Act%20.pdf?dl=0

Because I have had issues with PDF formatting of the language above I received a copy from my colleague and will forward that. I will also be submitting my personal testimony to be recorded and a few testimonies of the families that I have worked with and video for those.

Thank you,

Christine Wiehle