“If the person charged is innocent, they will have little ability to defend themselves, as the only testimony is that of a child who may not be able to provide a reliable story,”

IS THE CHILD MOLESTED? PROVE IT!!
As Obama wins the presidency in 2008 and enters the White House in Jan 2009, the House of once people becomes the House of Black Cards. The Tsunami of UnAmerican bills and proposals hit the Congress and the House confirms the unconstitutional bills one after the other. Why all this rush? Because the people who have spent millions and influenced the election of a Community organizer Senator, Barack Obama have not paid to be kept in a waiting line. It was time to return the favor.

During the past two years, pedophile sympathizers and MAP AKA minor-attracted people have been popping up like toxic mushrooms from every corner and it seemed they have been activated by a code or a secret authorization which protects them.
But what was the authorization?

When we learned about the former U.S. House Majority Leader Tom DeLay who claimed the Obama DOJ had drafted a memo to legalize 12 “perversions,” including bestiality, pedophilia, and polygamy, we were convinced that this might have been the turning point for these pedophiles to find the courage to come out and announce their glorious identity of being a pedophile child molester-raper but Nah… it was not it. It was way older. Obama didn’t make them wait.

It was 2009 when the bill to protect pedophiles was introduced and passed by the Congress. Were we aware of the nations first pedophile protection Act?

According to the disgraceful Act, it is necessary to enable doctors, teachers and others who work with children to perform their work without fear of wrongful accusations.

Umm… Did we hear right? Without fear of wrongful “accusations” not wrongful actions.

The bill was not “to protect children against doctors-teachers’ wrongdoings but protects molester doctors and teachers from being “accused.”

So the bill which became law shuts up the children who may have been molested and protects the pedophile doctor-teacher who have molested them. Isn’t that a beautiful justice system? Was this the reason for the abuse when Project Veritas caught Teachers Union President and the school system enabling child abuse, cover it up and let it pass because “nobody was there to witness the abuse”? And as they said nobody will believe the child?

NEW VIDEO: Teachers Union President Will Cover Up Child Abuse, Protects Drug-Using, Shoplifting Teachers

The despicable bill offered by Rep William Marsh was defended by him with this statement: “If the person charged is innocent, they will have little ability to defend themselves, as the only testimony is that of a young child who may not be able to provide a reliable story,”

Pay attention to this phrase: “as the only testimony is that of a young child who may not be able to provide a reliable story,”

This is literally saying “Don’t listen to the molested child as he-she is just a child and shouldn’t be considered as reliable.”

This was the first Pedophile Protection Act in the history of America. But not the only one. Take a look at the first one before we go through the rest of them.
See the related article here.

“A piece of proposed legislation in New Hampshire was reportedly introduced with the intention of protecting against wrongful convictions, but opponents are saying it will protect pedophiles and sexual predators.

According to local news reports, lawmakers held a hearing on Tuesday on a proposed bill that was designed to protect against wrongful convictions in sexual assault cases. The bill requires victims of sexual assault to corroborate their allegations if the accused has no prior convictions. However, the bill does provide a definition of corroboration.

The bill was introduced in the aftermath of the conviction of Foad Afshar, a New Hampshire psychotherapist who a jury found guilty of molesting an underage client during an appointment. Afshar claims he was wrongfully convicted.
Opponents of the bill appeared at the hearing and denounced the proposal. The harshest criticism appears to have come from a police sergeant from a department in Concord, NH.


The bill’s sponsor, Rep. William Marsh, and other supporters of the proposal believe it is necessary to enable doctors, teachers and others who work with children to perform their work without fear of wrongful accusations.

“If the person charged is innocent, they will have little ability to defend themselves, as the only testimony is that of a young child who may not be able to provide a reliable story,” Marsh said.

Opponents, including prosecutors and police, generally oppose the change because they believe it will make it more difficult to obtain convictions and cause already reluctant victims to come forward.”
Why didn’t we hear about this bill which should have been on every news agencies’ first page? Why did CNN, MSNBC, CBS, BBC and none of the major news outlets not publish the report? Just some local news agencies? Because they are protected and run by these people. Why should they shed a light on it and give a platform to opponents? Wasn’t this the reason for us to know about it just now in 2018 after almost 10 years?

With all my dislike for the daily beast, it was the only newspaper to report it in 2017.

Status: Dies on Table but presented later by another sponsor later and passes amended.

InSANE

Lawmaker to Rape Victims: ‘Prove It’

A new bill by a New Hampshire Republican would force rape victims—including children—to give extra proof of assault before a case goes to trial.

Read the article by The Daily Beast here.
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“Though sexual assault is rarely reported—and even then, only occasionally prosecuted—it’s victims have had it way too easy for far too long, according to a New Hampshire Republican representative. He’s made it his first legislative order of business to pass a bill that would require more proof than just a victim’s testimony before a rape case could be brought to trial.

Sponsored by Rep. William Marsh, the vaguely-worded HB 106 requires a victim’s testimony in a sexual assault case to have “corroboration,” at least in cases where the defendant has no prior sexual assault convictions.
Afshar’s conviction, in Marsh’s opinion, is a miscarriage of justice—one that should be rectified not in the court of appeals, but with a change in state law.

“My daughter Emily’s friend from NHIA [The New Hampshire Institute of Art], Dr. Foad Afshar was convicted in June without corroborating evidence—the case is under appeal,” Marsh explained on his website. “Consequently, NH Psychologists are afraid to treat victims of sexual abuse fearing a similar fate. Left untreated, these victims are likely to become the next generation of predators. This bill would ensure due process.”

“Yes, children who are sexually abused are innocent victims, but they are not the only innocent victims,” Marsh said in his official testimony. “I think we would all agree that if a person who has not committed a crime is found guilty and sent to jail, then that person also is an innocent victim.”

Whatever side one rests on concerning Afshar’s conviction, Marsh’s claim that state psychologists “are afraid to treat victims of sexual abuse fearing a similar fate,” seems to be a stretch. Criminal cases against mental health providers in New Hampshire are incredibly rare; Afshar’s is is the only complaint that has led to criminal prosecution since the New Hampshire’s Board of Psychologists began regulating the profession in 2013.

The bill’s co-sponsor, Republican Jess Edwards, testified that without a change in law, retirees like himself could be dissuaded from working with troubled youth in programs like Big Brothers, Big Sisters of America because of the chance of being falsely accused of sexual abuse.

“The social cost of discouraging adults from engaging youth populations is extremely high,” Edwards wrote in his official testimony.

A third sponsor, Democrat Mary Heath, withdrew her support in response to fierce opposition. Objections came from varied organizations including the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, the County Attorney’s Association, The New Hampshire Chiefs of Police, and the New Hampshire Psychologist Association, which wrote in a statement that “Sexual assault victims already face significant challenges when seeking justice, and corroborating evidence is not always available. This proposed change places a higher onus on victims and may especially disadvantage children.”

Sexual assault—especially of a minor—is a clandestine crime, as the bill’s opponents have all noted. Bruises ripped clothing, or eye witnesses are hard to come by. Child molesters aren’t known to commit their crimes in the presence of others, and often exert power over their victims by telling them that no one will believe them.

This bill, its opponents argue, seeks to formally codify that threat by resurrecting so-called corroboration rules, laws that legal experts and advocates have fought against since the 1970s and that most states had entirely banished by the early aughts, according to a 2004 paper by Michele J, Anderson, now president of Brooklyn College and one of the country’s foremost experts of legal issues surrounding rape.

With HB 106, Marsh wants New Hampshire to go further than any state has sought to in years. “What New Hampshire is considering, requiring corroboration in all cases where the defendant has not been convicted previously, goes far beyond the requirements of any state I can think
of,” Roger Canaff, a legal expert on sexual abuse cases, told the Concord Monitor.

Whether his bill will ever escape committee remains to be seen. Considering it faces vocal opposition, goes further than any other corroboration standard in the country, and its Democratic co-sponsor has removed her support, its chance for passage looks bleak.

Not that it bothers Marsh.

“I never had any illusions about the chances for my bill,” Marsh told me. “After all, they advise us not to submit bills in our first year and I’m in my first few weeks. But that won’t make the issues go away.”

………………………………

There was a bill presented by California lesbian Senator Sheila Keuhl (D) promoting Senate Bill 1313 which was the equivalent of the bill above in 2004 in the State of California. The bill has gotten past both houses of the Democratically controlled California State Legislature and was on its way to Arnold Schwarzenegger’s desk for signature.
In 2013, California Congresswoman Jackie Speier, Democrat, proposed another bill to federalize a state law that protects pedophiles. The bill is known as SB1172 in California. Speier’s bill was designed to prohibit counseling to change a person’s sexual orientation. But “Sexual orientation change efforts’ means any practices by mental health providers that seek to change an individual’s sexual orientation.” According to this bill, a mental health provider should not do any attempt to change the client’s “sexual orientation” and if he does, according to this bill, the counselor could be sanctioned if there was AN ATTEMPT to get a pedophile or gay individual to change his behavior or speak negatively about their behavior as it relates to sexuality.

Status: AMENDED

This bill was passed in California. Again here, Republicans tried to add an amendment specifying that pedophilia is not covered as an orientation, but the Democrats again defeated the amendment. The Democrats knew that by labeling pedophilia a sexual orientation, discrimination laws apply and pedophiles cannot be barred from jobs such as teaching preschool based solely on their pedophilia.

How many bills like this have been passed in different states?

This is why we see what we see today.

This is why they have become so arrogant to have pages and websites and attack us claiming we are subjected to hate speech as we offend their sexuality. This is THE LAW and we didn’t know it.

Although the law does not specifically mention pedophilia, in its explanation, pedophilia is named as one of the protected sexual orientations.

The next Pedophile Protection Act not only protects pedophilia as a “sexual orientation” but also considers the objection of opponents as “hate crime.”

It was months that I was searching the library of the Congress to find an Act which legalizes pedophilia as a sexual orientation. I have many articles covering pedophiles and I could clearly
see a pattern of normalization not only by pedophiles but by a gang of supporters amongst the media, legislators, celebrities and Democratic lawmakers and it was obvious that I am missing something somewhere. There should be a law protecting them but the problem is you don’t know the date and the name of the act. None of these non-human acts which has become the law, had a name matching what they really stand for. These Acts have strange titles and most of the time the Soros trick of calling something completely the opposite of what it stands for is in action. Besides, there are many bills presented each day and this went on until my friend @GodSentUs777 saved me by sending these Acts.

Wake up people, we have several pedophile protection Acts and we have the proof.

The degradation of morality in the Obama era, under this sinister bill that accompanies H.R. 1913 (Hate Crimes Bill), S. 909 Criminalized Christianity and gave a special protection to pedophiles. A combination of the Pedophile Protection Act along with the Hate Crimes Bill presented below was the turning point towards criminalizing Christianity, and protecting sexually deviant activities as sexual preferences.

It was Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), to add the “Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act,” (which is better known to conservatives as the “Pedophile Protection Act,”) to his short-term legislative list.

A bill which makes 547 deviances as legal sexual orientations and opposing them will be convicted as “hate crime.”

The list can include all of the following:

Incest – sex with one’s offspring
Necrophilia – sexual relations with a corpse
Pedophilia – sex with an underage child
Zoophilia – bestiality, a crime in many states

Voyeurism – a criminal offense in most states
Fronteurism – a man rubbing against an unknown woman’s buttocks
Coprophilia – sexual arousal from feces
Urophilia – sexual arousal from urine

Here again, attempts by House Republicans to add amendments stating “pedophilia is not protected as a sexual orientation” were blocked. Hey, folks what’s going on? Why all Republican attempts to remove pedophilia from the list were blocked? This time it was Lesbian Congresswoman Tammy Baldwin (D-WI). She claimed that pedophiles would not be defined within “sexual orientation,” but wouldn’t put that in writing, and refused to define that phrase “sexual orientation.” Do you see the hypocrisy? Why other Republicans didn’t offer a clear definition of pedophilia? Where does it stand? Why twisting?

How should they announce they NEED to legalize pedophilia people? What do we need more than this??

According to this bill PASTORS NOT PROTECTED BY FIRST AMENDMENT and PRAYER IN JESUS’ NAME Is A “HATE CRIME.”
See the WND article here.

Please read this article very carefully, especially the segment related to Rush Limbaugh and Eric Holder.

**CONGRESS PASSES ‘PEDOPHILE PROTECTION ACT’**

Opponents worry over special ‘hate crimes’ treatment for homosexuals

Published: 10/22/2009 at 8:05 PM

A “hate crimes” bill opponents claim will be used to crack down on Christian speech, even the reading of the Bible, is poised to be signed by President Obama, a longtime proponent of the plan to give homosexuals and others with alternative lifestyles special protections not provided other classes of citizens.
“must-pass” $680 billion defense appropriations plan.

Most Republicans, although normally strong supporters of the U.S. military, opposed the bill.

“The inclusion of the controversial language of the hate-crimes legislation, which is unrelated to our national defense, is deeply troubling,” Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., told Fox News after the vote.

The plan also hands out federal money to states and local governments in pursuit of “preventing” hate crimes.

Sen. Jim DeMint, R-S.C., said the move is a step toward criminalizing thought and suggested the bill will be a threat to those to speak out about their religious faith.

Obama was strongly supported during his 2008 presidential campaign by homosexual advocates and has expressed a willingness to act on the proposal, calling it an “important civil-rights issue.”

WND reported days ago when several organizations urged their members to contact Congress to oppose the plan.

The bill – which creates federal protections and privileges for homosexuals and other alternative lifestyles but denies those protections to other groups of citizens – earlier was approved in the U.S. House.

When the Senate earlier approved a key move, Mathew Staver, founder of Liberty Counsel, said, “In ... months President Obama and the Democratic-led Congress have forced on the American people the most radical and immoral agenda.

“The administration and the Democratic-led Congress are out of touch with the mainstream. They represent the most fringe extreme elements of America. They will not be able to continue their efforts to undermine moral values, socialize the economy and trash American pride and heritage.

“The people will not remain silent forever,” he said.

The House vote prompted the American Family Association to alert its constituents and create a procedure for them to send e-mails to Washington about the plan.

“In its never-ending quest to shred America’s Judeo-Christian value system, the left is planning to hurriedly push through a ‘thought crimes’ bill,” the alert said. “So-called ‘hate crimes’ laws are really laws that criminalize thought because they punish an individual not for what he did but for what he thought. Politically incorrect thoughts about homosexual behavior will result in enhanced criminal sanctions under this law.”

The AFA said, “Everywhere hate-crimes laws have gone into effect, they have been quickly used to intimidate, silence and punish people of faith who express deeply held religious objections to the normalization of homosexuality.
“Such laws not only punish officially disapproved speech and thought, they create two tiers of victims. Under hate-crimes laws, some victims get more protections than others, which violates the fundamental American principle of equality under the law,” the alert said. “In fact, such laws actively discriminate against heterosexual Christians who are victims of crime, since they will get less legal protection than homosexual victims.”

The American Family Association said since “sexual orientation” nowhere is defined in the law, “this law will give pedophiles, voyeurs, and exhibitionists special protections, which is why the bill has correctly been called ‘The Pedophile Protection Act.’”

Also offering an online “contact Washington” process is the organization Pray in Jesus Name, founded by former U.S. Navy Chaplain Gordon Klingenschmitt, who was involuntarily removed from the U.S. military after he prayed “in Jesus’ name.”

His organization submitted via fax almost 400,000 petitions to Washington opposing the “hate crimes” law.

Also, a separate larger FedEx campaign to warn U.S. Senate members of the dangers of the “hate crimes” plan dispatched more than 705,000 letters to senators.

The letter-writing effort was organized by WND columnist Janet Porter, who also heads the Faith2Action Christian ministry. It allowed citizens to send individually addressed letters to all 100 senators over their own “signature” for only $10.95.

Klingenschmitt said there is a remote chance Obama may not like the proposal, since it is linked to funding for an engine for the F-35 fighter jet, which he has opposed.

“If President Obama vetoes the F-35 second engine, as he promised when speaking in Phoenix last spring, he will ironically kill the homosexual agenda and their evil ‘Pedophile Protection Act,’” he wrote.

Attempts by Republicans to add amendments stating “pedophilia is not protected as a sexual orientation” were blocked by House Democrats.

In fact, Rep. Alcee Hastings, D-Fla., said all alternative sexual lifestyles should be protected.

“This bill addresses our resolve to end violence based on prejudice and to guarantee that all Americans regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability or all of these ‘philias’ and fetishes and ‘isms’ that were put forward need not live in fear because of who they are. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule,” he said.

Further, the proposal has a broad definition of “intimidation,” so a Christian pastor’s sermon could be considered “hate speech” if heard by an individual who then acts aggressively against someone based on “sexual orientation.”

The pastor, Klingenschmitt said, could be prosecuted for “conspiracy to commit a hate crime” or “inciting violence against gays” for quoting the Bible.
As it went through the House, the version was H.R. 1913, or the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009. The Senate then worked on its own version, and it ultimately was added as an amendment to a defense spending plan.

As WND reported, U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder admitted a homosexual activist who is attacked following a Christian minister’s sermon about homosexuality would be protected by the proposed federal law, but a minister attacked by a homosexual wouldn’t be.

The revelations came from Holder’s June testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, which was taking comments on the proposal. The measure also was the subject of discussion on talk-radio host Rush Limbaugh’s July 3 show.

the question,” Limbaugh said. “(Sen.) Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) presents a hypothetical where a minister gives a sermon, quotes the Bible about homosexuality and is thereafter attacked … by a gay activist because of what the minister said about his religious beliefs and what Scripture says about homosexuality. Is the minister protected?”

No, said Holder.

“Well, the statute would not – would not necessarily cover that,” Holder stated. “We’re talking about crimes that have a historical basis. Groups who have been targeted for violence as a result of the color of their skin, their sexual orientation, that is what this statute tends – is designed to cover. We don’t have the indication that the attack was motivated by a person’s desire to strike at somebody who was in one of these protected groups. That would not be covered by the statute.”

Continued Limbaugh, “In other words: ministers and whites are not covered by the hate-crime statute because we’re talking about crimes that have a historic basis, groups who have been targeted for violence as a result of their skin color, sexual orientation. So hate crimes are reserved exclusively for blacks and homosexuals. Everybody else can get to the back of the bus on this one.”

The bill was nicknamed “The Pedophile Protection Act” when Rep. Steve King proposed an amendment during its trek through the U.S. House that would specify pedophiles could not use the law to protect their activities.

Majority Democrats flatly refused.
Erik Stanley, senior legal counsel with the Alliance Defense Fund, told WND the move is alarming because “this would be the very first governmental and societal disapproval of a sincerely held religious belief, held by a majority of Americans, namely that homosexual behavior is immoral.

“It’s the first time the federal government is writing into law a disapproval of that belief,” he said.

While he said he doesn’t believe there will be “immediate” prosecutions of pastors and churches for teaching the biblical injunction that homosexual behavior is a sin, “I think the effect on speech and religious speech is nonetheless real.”

He said he does expect that pastors soon will begin being called to testify in “hate crime” cases in court “as to what that pastor preaches, what the church teaches, what the Bible teaches.”

“When this happens, there will be a shock wave through pastorates in America,” he said.

Ultimately, he warned that the homosexual advocates who have pushed the “hate crimes” plan consider this law just the first step “toward silencing Christians.”

That development already has been observed not only with the enactment of “hate crimes” laws in other nations but in the “hate crime” related speech codes existing on many university campuses in the U.S., Stanley said.


See the article here.
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