Let me tell you what I believe and what principles will guide me:

First, last, and always, The Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Next to The Sermon on The Mount, The Bill of Rights is the most important and effective guarantor of human rights ever; because people do not live by one we need the other. Problems occur not because of The Bill of Rights but because governments ignore or compromise it.

It is simple and clear:

*"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. "*

Even a politician should be able to understand that.

Probable cause has been an inviolate principle since colonial America: there is no good reason to abandon it; and many good reasons to keep it. Among them being the presumption of innocence; the right to privacy; freedoms of assembly, speech and religion, freedom to engage in trade and contracts and virtually every human relationship without government interference. We endure an excess of political pollution and government interference. They take our money, and that alone makes us less free.

Therefore, sir, I am a fierce advocate of The Bill of Rights including The Fourth Amendment. No probable cause: no warrant; no warrant, no surveillance of ANY personal communication in any form or manner whatsoever. America is not a police state. America is supposed to be free.

1. I support lawful surveillance conducted only after issue of a warrant

2. Fusion centers should be closed, and relabeling of American interest groups prohibited as it represents a violation of The First Amendment; there are no second class citizens in America and everybody is entitled to freedom from persecution.

3. [Regarding the wiretapping bill], I see no violation of the Fourth Amendment here. I do see an expansion of the list of crimes subject to legal surveillance, and if that is what it is, then prudence dictates that we let law enforcement do their job. This item does raise the question why some alleged crimes are ... were ... subject to a wiretap and why some were not, but, the history of this law is not available to me at this time.

This is a little too close to a " minority report " type of law enforcement, in which surveillance can be warranted upon suspicion or alleged conspiracy to commit. Persons initiating nefarious activities are taking their chances against super-computers and hidden cameras. I see no problem there either: no crime, no harm.

I see no difference between crime and organized crime: they are equally criminal and differ only in magnitude, and no crime deserves special treatment.

I would like to see decriminalization of " moral " offenses.

There are two glaring problems: [The bill] makes the carrying of a firearm a crime, which makes it impossible to use without committing a crime. It is easy to imagine a person defending his family, and in doing so grabs a gun to save his child, and in so saving his family he is committing a crime. That goes too far. Secondly, is a 'covert weapon' one carried under a shirt or jacket? That goes too far.

In this respect, Mr. Marthews, my objection has less to do with surveillance than with The Second Amendment. Interesting that in contesting The Fourth Amendment we see a potential violation of The Second Amendment.

Let's see if this is effective in reducing crime, or at least some kinds of crime.

If it becomes abusive; if we see people being convicted for " minor " crimes, then we can redress that in the legislature.

Frankly I'd like to bust politicians for lies, try them and remove them from office.

Nobody wants an innocent person to be prosecuted, nor a criminal to go free.

Therefore: Oppose

4. [On the Amash Amendment]: Support

5. Support 2818[, The Surveillance State Repeal Act]

But...do we believe them? If it is true the NSA can monitor all our electronic communications without our knowledge or permission, then, how can we be assured they are not? If they already admitted to spying on our allies, and we have credible evidence ( Snowden ) that the NSA has been spying on us.

If they can monitor our communications they also can redirect them, such as bank and financial information. The public sleeps.

NSA surveillance does nothing to increase liberty, almost nothing to protect freedom, and little to protect life and property.

Fusion centers are a massive waste of money, and considering the government gets money for nothing but passes the cost of all this to us and our children, and then controls the media and electorate, our government - has become antagonistic to We The People. That is why I am running and by winning I will start the landslide that will return Congress to the great center of the nation. If the center breaks, its all over, and we are near the breaking point.

Otherwise live and let live, as there is no probable cause for concern.

Who would not prevent Tsarnaev from his heinous plot?

Each of us has a moral and legal duty to our fellow citizens to protect life, health, and property as best we can. If our government was doing its job and attended to Russian intelligence this tragedy would have been avoided. It was not due to lack of law; it was due to lack of prowess that he slipped through. If the Russian intelligence was communicated with local law enforcement, it is more possible they would have probable cause and probably gotten it, and after the marathon the press conference would have been about an arrest, not a tragedy.

Our innocence needs no defense. Yet we have direct evidence the IRS is harassing private groups, direct evidence of NSA confiscating a reporters work product, direct evidence of a militarizing of municipal police, direct evidence of gun running by our own government; and direct evidence of government " spying " on Americans. Presently we have another President with zero credibility, and even more, he seems to not understand that falsehoods lead to breach of faith, as if lies are OK just because he is the one lying. What about this gives us hope for change we can believe in? I never believed any of it.

As for the NSA spying on Americans: Its creepy to think the feds are monitoring my every electronic communication, and how can I trust that one low rent SOB won't report to another if he sees something not ' politically correct ' ? My sentiments lie somewhere between shutting it down and blowing it up. Of course that is political satire, I believe in law and order, so judgment dictates I'll take the high road: As a Representative I will vote to defund it and let the spies go back to video games, or porn, or studying worms or whatever it is ex-government employees do while we're working for a living.

The parties have lost the faith of the people and lost control of the government, so, it is time to change Representatives to one who is not beholden to any party or failed political or economic theory. And certainly not to one who believes in expanding government power, which is exactly the opposite of what our Constitution provides for:

Our Constitution gives Power to the People.

To hinder investigation given probable cause is not a good idea.

Let the professionals do their job, best they can, with what they have.

I trust them a lot more than I trust the politicians. If it's an illegal bust, then we have to defend ourselves ~ and thank goodness we have the best lawyers in the world ~ and let the jury decide. We can trust our fellow citizens a great deal more than we can trust the politicians.

Nobody wants to send an innocent man to go to jail, and nobody wants a guilty man to go free: but a jury of our peers is all we got.