



Citizen's Guide to Delaware Public Policy

Do Lawmakers Share Your Values?

Senator Bryant L. Richardson

Delaware's 21st District

Introduction

My dad and mom rarely talked politics, but I knew they voted for the person, not the party.

Back then, the differences between candidates were not that extreme. That has changed.

In the past, I have voted for Democrats who represented my views on the issues.

What concerns me most about the Democrat Party today is when I see good people on that side of the aisle voting in lockstep on some utterly outrageous bills.

What concerns me most about the Republican Party is its longtime lack of party platform. Voters have a right to know its stand on all of the issues.

My purpose in preparing this booklet is to inform voters about what is going on in government. By doing so, I hope to encourage more people to get involved.

Special interest groups should not be controlling the statewide agenda. We the People should.

Senator Bryant L. Richardson

Delaware's 21st District

302-245-0109

To the Delaware Taxpayers

On these pages I highlight some of the bills that went through the Delaware General Assembly the past few years.

Do these bills reflect your values? Are you pleased with the performance of your Representative or Senator?

You can check the voting record of your elected officials at legis.delaware.gov on any of these bills.

The authority in our constitutional republic comes from "We the People."

As citizens, our obligation is to know more about the integrity of those representing us and their stand on the issues.



Justice will not be served until those who are unaffected are as outraged as those who are.

Benjamin Franklin



Table of Contents

02	Introduction	22	Jamie Reed: This is wrong
03	Note to Delaware taxpayers	23	SAFE Act to protect children
05	To compel a man...	24	Who are we electing?
06	Tell lawmakers "Your time is up!"	25	Laken Riley Act opposed
07	What happens in Dover	26	Failure of government
08	Billions vs Millions	27	Convention of States
09	Investment of tax dollars	28	Parents who complain
10	Personal attacks	29	Library controversy
11	Boys in girls' sports	30	We cannot allow hatred
12	On being "Gender Silent"	31	Written opinions matter
13	"Technical" corrections amendment	32	With socialism, incentives die
14	Anti-transgender bills?	33	Socialism vs Free Enterprise
15	Do these bill reflect your values?	34	Women's safety?
16	Rebuilding the family	35	Stop pretending you care
17	Our heritage reflects our Faith	36	The Pope on tolerance
18	Family Resolution opponents	37	Our Sacred Honor today
19	Importance of family values	38	Delaware Government Basics
20	Daughter transitions at four	39	Let your voice be heard
21	Decision triggers governor's "Order"	40	Final Word

To compel a man to
furnish funds for the
propagation of ideas
he disbelieves and
abhors is sinful and
tyrannical.

Thomas Jefferson

Members of the public may want to tell lawmakers who don't respect their First Amendment rights, "Your time is up" on Election Day.

What happens in Dover should not stay in Dover, but be known by taxpayers

Taxpayers have a right to know what their elected officials are doing and how those decisions impact their daily lives.

From electric vehicle mandates to government-ordered shutdowns, the public deserves the chance to push back when policies go too far.

Public involvement is critical to preserving individual rights. Yet anyone who has tried to testify during committee hearings—whether in person or online—knows the process is flawed.

Yes, citizens are allowed to sign up and speak. For most hearings, comments are limited to two minutes.

But in some cases, the time has been cut to a single minute, with speakers



abruptly silenced mid-sentence by the sharp warning: “Your time is up.”

This lack of respect illustrates the deeper problem: when one side holds the votes to pass anything it wants, it no longer has to listen to the voices of those who disagree.

The First Amendment protects free speech precisely to safeguard and promote

open political debate. Shutting down public testimony undermines that principle.

Citizens need to understand how extreme some legislative actions have become.

Regardless of party affiliation, everyone should recognize that this lack of serious dialogue is disrespectful, dangerous, and unacceptable.

President Dennis Assanis said the University received \$1 million for that development, but should have received \$1 billion.

Million vs billion dollar shortfall is eye-opener

When then University of Delaware President Dennis Assanis appeared before the Joint Finance Committee (JFC) a few years ago, I asked him how researchers at UD were protecting the intellectual property that was being developed.

During the UD hearing, Dr. Assanis mentioned that the money given to the university is an investment in the future, and I agree.

However, I expressed my concern that, in the past, Delaware did not fully benefit from the investment in the research for which the state provides funding.

My example focused on the fact that the university helped develop the touchscreen technology that is used on computers and cell phones worldwide.

I asked how the UD benefitted from this research. Dr. Assanis' answer did not please me.

The university does not receive any residuals from this discovery.



President Assanis told the JFC that the university received \$1 million as a result of this research, but should have received \$1 billion.

Dr. Assanis was not the university's president at that time of that development.

He said one of his priorities is to make sure the university is aware of the importance of obtaining patents on their research.

Did Delaware get short-changed \$999 million by not protecting its intellectual property?

Taxpayers are asked to invest in our institutions of higher learning, and I agree this is money well spent, as long as our state benefits from breakthroughs.

Let's not allow any more billion-dollar opportunities to go unprotected.

**To be attacked
because you express
an opinion is un-
American. Personal
attacks are distrac-
tions from the issues
under discussion.**

Fairness in Women's Sports bills never make it out of committee

Twice I have introduced a Fairness in Women's Sports Act, and twice the bill has been frozen in committee by the Democrat majority.

This Act generally requires a student athlete to compete for athletic teams, or in sports associated with their biological sex, as determined at or near birth and based on the student's birth certificate or other government record if a birth certificate is unobtainable.

The issue of fairness should be obvious to anyone interested in protecting the rights gained by women more than a half a century ago through Title IX.

The Fairness in Women's Sports Act was written after a careful evaluation of the facts.

What facts?

The facts that opportunities for girls and women are eroded when male-bodied athletes are allowed to compete in women's sports.

The inclusion of male-bodied athletes in women's

Decorum lacking during discussion

Those who have been in the General Assembly for more than a few years understand that certain courtesies and decorum are to be extended to others whether or not you agree with or even want to hear their opinions.

To say decorum was lacking from the committee chair would be an understatement.

sports harms female athletes by:

- Decreasing the chances of athletic success.
- Taking away roster spots, playing time, and scholarships opportunities.
- In some sports increasing the chances of injury.

At the first committee hearing in the 151st General Assembly, I did not expect

anything but a serious and mutually respectful discussion about the bill.

Instead, I received lectures and scoldings from then Senator Sarah McBride, who chaired the committee hearing.

Anyone can express an opinion on any topic. To be attacked because you express an opinion is un-American.

Personal attacks are distractions from the issues under discussion.

During the hearing, I had two expert witnesses, Dr. Michelle Parsons and attorney Thomas Neuberger.

While I took time to properly introduce Dr. Parsons, I cut short my introduction for Neuberger when I sensed Senator McBride wanted me to "speed it up".

When a question came up about the Supreme Court's 2020 *Bostock v. Clayton County* ruling, I asked permission for Neuberger to respond, but that request was denied.

Delaware's Constitution may contain some glaring violations of federal law, but at least we're on the way to becoming "gender silent."

Taxes pay for “gender silent” cleanup in the Constitution

House Bill 10 passed in the Senate in late March 2025. This is the second leg of an amendment to make technical corrections to the Delaware Constitution.

In part HB 10 makes the language of the Delaware Constitution “gender silent.” How was that done?

Code revisors went through our state Constitution to ensure that masculine or feminine pronouns are not used unless otherwise needed.

The bill has a total count of 36,836 words. Imagine how many attorney hours went into going through the Constitution to make it “gender silent.”

Seven Senators

Article II, Section 2 of the Delaware Constitution contains these instructions:

This State is also hereby divided into twenty-one (21) Senatorial Districts, from each of which shall be chosen, by the qualified electors thereof, one Senator.

Political jargon

The highway to political correctness is replete with road signs that are designed to “correct” language that may offend someone’s feelings.

House Bill 343 in the 151st General Assembly uses the term “birthing person” to replace woman or mother.

As a taxpayer, are you pleased that money is being spent on such projects?

In New Castle County there shall be seven Senatorial Districts, numbered from one to seven inclusive; in Kent County, seven Senatorial Districts, numbered from one to seven inclusive; and in Sussex County, seven Senatorial Districts from one to seven inclusive.

Since the Constitution transcends the Delaware Code, shouldn’t we comply with that seven-per-county provision?

Mark Cutrona, director, Division of Legislative Services, offered this explanation:

The U.S. Supreme Court held that Delaware’s system of having one upper house apportioned on a geographical basis and one lower house apportioned on population basis was unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause since population is the only permissible guide to apportionment.

Senator Stephanie Hansen asked why so much time would be taken to make “technical corrections” to the Constitution, but when something so obviously wrong was found, it wasn’t addressed.

The answer was that the purpose of HB 10 was to focus on technical corrections, including making the constitution “gender silent.”

Delaware’s Constitution may contain some glaring violations of the federal law, but at least we are on the way to making our Constitution “gender silent.”

What are referred to as “anti-trans-gender bills” protect minors from being influenced into life-altering medical decisions, and protect girls’ sports.

Do these bills reflect your values?

This is a sampling of bills that went through the Delaware General Assembly in recent years. Do they do anything to improve your life?

Are you pleased your elected reps are spending time on this type of legislation?

You can check the voting records of your elected officials at legis.delaware.gov on any of these bills.

House Bill 140

Assisted Suicide

Despite bipartisan opposition to this bill, the bill passed with the minimum number of required votes in the House and Senate. HB 140 says you can take your life when it is “no longer worth living.” There was a bi-partisan effort to defeat this bill. Disability groups opposed HB 140.

House Bill 275

Sexual Orientation

HB 275 adds “asexuality” (little to no sexual attraction) and pansexuality (attracted to anyone regardless of their sex or gender identity) to the list of possible sexual orientations in Delaware Code.

Senate Bill 106

SB 106 erases Women from the Delaware Code. It says

House Bill 205

HB 205 ensures that no healthcare provider in Delaware can be sued for performing lawful health services in-state that have been deemed unlawful in other states.

This means practitioners in the First State cannot face legal action for abortion and reproductive services, fertility and IVF treatments, as well as gender-affirming care.

“The maternal health-care policy of this State shall serve to increase the likelihood that a person who has given birth and demonstrates symptoms of perinatal mood and anxiety disorder will receive the necessary mental health treatment.” That’s good, but In the context of pregnancy, SB 106 replaces “woman” with “person” explicitly erasing womanhood.

House Bill 110

Taxpayer Funded Abortion HB 110 forces Delaware taxpayers to fund abortion on demand through insurance. This includes Medicaid insurance, which means

the dollars of those opposed to the taking of human life will fund the deaths of the unborn.

House Concurrent Resolution 31

Transgender Day of Visibility HCR 31 refers to the “record number of anti-transgender bills introduced across the country targeting areas including education, bans on books and curricula relating to gender identity.”

(What are referred to as “anti-transgender bills” are bills that protect children from being sexualized in schools, protect minors from being influenced into making life-altering medical decisions, and protect girls’ sports.)

Senate Bill 301

Abortion Pills on Campus Senate Bill 301 requires public universities with a health center on campus to provide access to medication for the termination of pregnancy and emergency contraception.

Senate Bill 300

SB 300 would require Pregnancy Care Centers to post signs warning women the facility is not licensed as a medical facility. The enforcement has been delayed pending a court decision.

If we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken, and so cause Him to withdraw His present help from us, we shall be made a story and a by-word through the world.

John Winthrop

Our heritage reflects our Faith as that 'Shining City on a Hill'

The following is from President Ronald Reagan's farewell address in January 1989:

The past few days when I've been at [my favorite window in the White House] upstairs, I've thought a bit of the "shining city upon a hill."

The phrase comes from John Winthrop, who wrote it to describe the America he imagined.

What he imagined was important because he was an early Pilgrim, an early freedom man.

He journeyed here on what today we'd call a little wooden boat; and like the other Pilgrims, he was looking for a home that would be free.

I've spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it.

But in my mind it was a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, wind-swept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and

Reagan's warning

In his 1989 address Reagan concluded:

Are we doing a good enough job teaching our children what America is and what she represents in the long history of the world?

We've got to do a better job of getting across that America is freedom – of speech, of religion, of enterprise.

I'm warning of an eradication of the American memory that could result, ultimately, in an erosion of the American spirit.

peace; a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity.

John Winthrop, an English Puritan lawyer, led a group of colonists from England in 1630. He was a key figure in the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Winthrop, who served as

governor for 12 years, said this in a letter:

For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken, and so cause Him to withdraw His present help from us, we shall be made a story and a by-word through the world.

If our hearts shall turn away, so that we will not obey, but shall be seduced, and worship and serve other gods, our pleasure and profits, and serve them; it is propounded unto us this day, we shall surely perish out of the good land whither we pass over this vast sea to possess it.

Therefore let us choose life that we, and our seed may live, by obeying His voice and cleaving to Him, for He is our life and our prosperity.

Winthrop no doubt was inspired by Matthew 5:14 which says:

"You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden."

The resolution simply pointed out the benefits of families. Are we no longer allowed to examine the impact of family structure on the stability of society?

The Dissolution of the Family and the Woeful Consequences

In June 2024, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 206 that would establish the Delaware Restoring the Family Unit Task Force.

The purpose of the Task Force was to examine changes in laws and practices that could act to benefit family unity and thusly our state.

Joining me in advocating for the task force were Representatives Danny Short, Tim Dukes, Jeff Hilovsky, Ron Gray, Charles Postles, Michael Smith and Lyndon Yearick, and Senators Dave Lawson, Eric Buckson, Dave Wilson, Gerald Hocker and Brian Pettyjohn.

The six Republican senators voted for the resolution. Twelve of the 15 Democrat senators voted no, one went not voting and two were absent for the vote.

Those in opposition brought up information stating that gay couples were fully capable of raising children in a supportive environment.

To me this seemed odd, since the resolution was not

Tragic loss of life

The discussion about the task force is of particular interest in Laurel.

The tragic deaths of four young people in Laurel in just over a year was the impetus for this action.

Laurel residents are looking for answers.

They want a safe community where they don't have to worry about losing another youth to violence.

critical of non-traditional families, but simply pointed out the benefits of traditional families to children and society.

The Restoring the Family Unit Task Force would have examined the impact the following policies have on families:

- * Delaware tax policies
- * Delaware welfare policies
- * Delaware education policies
- * Delaware recidivism policies

Why the recidivism policies? What I feel is important is helping young men and women avoid serving time in prison.

Young men in particular are needed in their families, providing discipline and guidance.

Providing instructions and incentives for young men to take on the responsibilities of a family will give them purpose.

Instead of occupying a jail cell, they will be fulfilling the important role as provider.

Their children will benefit, and society will benefit.

I want to see children have every opportunity to succeed, and to have the opportunity to grow up in a society that is safe.

I know we can do better.

Having a dialog is tantamount to understanding and taking steps to improving conditions in Delaware.

I will try again to form a task force to address this issue.

On the news by
WBOC-TV, state
Representative
DeShanna Neal was
shown with one of
her children that
she said transi-
tioned at age four.

Decision from the SCOTUS triggers governor's "Order"

The Supreme Court decision in *U.S. v. Skrmetti*, upholding Tennessee's law banning gender-affirming care for minors, is a victory for the protection of children's health and for the role of states in safeguarding young people.

Great news, right?

Not in Delaware, where our governor, Matt Meyer, took upon himself to sign an executive order that "...adds further protections for gender-affirming care providers and patients."

My question is: If gender affirming care is such an acceptable practice, why would the providers need protections?

On the news coverage by WBOC-TV, state Representative DeShanna Neal was shown with one of her four children that she said transitioned at age four.

Yes, age four.

On her official House profile page, Representative DeShanna Neal includes the following information:

Legal liability

Governor Meyer's executive order in part emphasizes the following:

- Delaware law does not currently provide explicit legal protections to healthcare providers offering gender-affirming care.
- It is imperative to reinforce and expand these protections to ensure that individuals providing or seeking gender-affirming care in Delaware are not subjected to legal liability or professional sanctions.

DeShanna Neal is a mother of four, an activist for social justice reform, and an author. They have recently become the first non-binary elected official in Delaware. DeShanna and their oldest child, Trinity, became public figures back in 2016 after news about their battle with Medicaid to cover Trinity's gender affirming care, got around.

By affirming that Tennessee and other states with similar laws have the authority to regulate irreversible puberty blockers and hormone treatments for minors, the Court recognizes that these deeply personal and life-altering medical decisions should be made with the utmost care and only when an individual is an adult capable of making such choices.

The SCOTUS ruling sides with parents to ensure that minors receive appropriate care that supports their long-term well-being.

More than 20 U.S. states have banned or severely limited treatment to align a young person's body with their gender identity, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Others report that number may be as high as 27.

In March, Senate Bill 55, known as the SAFE Act (Save Adolescents From Experimentation) was introduced. See more on page 23 about the current status of this proposed bill.

Almost everyone in my life advised me to keep my head down. But I cannot in good conscience do so. What is happening to scores of children is morally and medically appalling.

Jamie Reed, whistleblower

SAFE Act would protect children from experimental procedures

A hearing for Senate Bill 55, known as the SAFE Act (Save Adolescents from Experimentation) was held on March 19, before the Senate Health & Social Services Committee.

The bill has not been released from committee and likely never will.

Senate Bill 55 would prohibit gender transition procedures for children due to the potential for irrevocable harm occurring when there is a significant probability that children will come to identify with their biological gender without such treatments.

As the bill's sponsor, I had three witnesses provide testimony remotely.

They were Jamie Reed of the Courage Coalition, a Pediatric Clinic whistleblower, Camille Kiefel, a detransitioner, and Dr. Christopher Casscells.

I found out later that another detransitioner was prepared to offer testimony.

Prisha Mosley had registered, was in the queue and had put her hand up to speak, but was not acknowledged. What's interesting about the

Care suspended

Fortunately, for our youth, Nemours and Planned Parenthood by mid-2025 stopped certain so-called gender-affirming care practices.

President Trump's order to cut off funding for such care was given as the reason.

Apparently it took the threat of the loss of funding to persuade institutions to stop those practices.

So that makes one wonder, was it ever about helping children, or was it about the money?

testimony of Jamie Reed is that she is a Democrat, is a self-proclaimed liberal and is married to a transman.

In 2018 Jamie worked as a case manager at The Washington University Transgender Center at the St. Louis Children's Hospital.

"By the time I departed, I was certain that the way the American medical system is treating these patients is the opposite of the promise we make to 'do no harm.'

"Instead, we [were] permanently harming the patients in our care.

"I left the clinic in November of last year (2024) because I could no longer participate in what was happening there," Jamie wrote."

In an article Jamie authored, she said the center's working assumption was that the earlier you treat kids with gender dysphoria, the more anguish you can prevent later on.

Studies show an overwhelming majority of children who are gender nonconforming or experience difficulty identifying with their birth sex comes to identify with their biological sex in adolescence or adulthood, rendering most physiological interventions unnecessary.

In her writings about being a whistleblower, Jamie Reed ends with this warning:

"The doctors I worked alongside at the Transgender Center said frequently about the treatment of our patients, 'We are building the plane while we are flying it.'

"No one should be a passenger on that kind of aircraft."

It is our responsibility
in Delaware to know
more about who is being
elected as lawmakers
at the federal level, and
how they are voting on
the issues.

Laken Riley Act opposed by our representatives in the federal government

With bipartisan support, the U.S. House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed House Resolution 29 (H.R. 29), dubbed the Laken Riley Act, on Tuesday, January 7, 2025.

The bi-partisan effort did not come with any of support from Delaware Senators Chris Coons and Lisa Blunt Rochester or U.S. representative Sara McBride.

The Laken Riley Act is a United States law that requires the detention, without bond, of non-citizens admitting to, charged with, or convicted of theft-related crimes, assaulting a police officer, or a crime that results in death or serious bodily injury like drunk driving.

The vote of our senators and representative suggests a disregard for public safety, as the bill directly addresses the need to protect our communities from individuals who are already in our country illegally, who have shown



The United States Capital in Washington, DC. Photo by JamesDeMers

they are willing to break our laws.

On February 22, 2024, Laken Riley, a 22-year-old Augusta University nursing student, was murdered while she was jogging at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia.

Her assailant, José Antonio

Ibarra, a 26-year-old Venezuelan, had entered the United States illegally.

When Riley fought back against her attacker, he repeatedly bashed her skull in with a rock.

Ibarra was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.

**Increasing the debt
limit is NOT a solution.
It's an admission by
members of Congress
they are incapable of
managing the federal
government in a
responsible manner.**

Article V was the safeguard against unstable government

The national debt at the time of this writing in early August 2025 was nearly \$37.2 trillion.

The average share of the debt per taxpayer was \$323,053.

The national debt increased by \$2.98 trillion in just over one year from 2023 to 2024.

The average cost per taxpayer increased by \$18,911 during that time.

Does anyone think this rate of increase is not a problem?

Ask members of Congress this question.

A few years ago U.S. Senator Chris Coons of Delaware introduced legislation to repeal the debt ceiling. A press release he issued at the time said in part:

The time has come for Congress to eliminate the debt ceiling. Debt limit showdowns have become far too routine, and it's now considered almost normal to threaten default. That must change.

Resolution

A Convention of States (COS) resolution (SCR 100) was introduced in the 152nd General Assembly. Senator Dave Lawson was the prime sponsor .

SCR 100 failed along party lines with all six Republican senators voting 'Yes'.

Seven Democrats went 'Not Voting,' five voted 'No' and three were absent for the vote.

'Not Voting' is used due to a conflict of interest, not to avoid going on record in opposition of a bill or resolution.

If this is the logic allowed to advance, what hope is there for our future?

The debt is not seen by Congress or the Administration as being a threat to our way of life. It is.

Want proof? Consider the fact that the Debt Ceiling has been raised 90 times in the past few decades.

Do we take a risk with a COS under Article V? Per-

haps, but how much more unbearable and overpowering does our federal government become before we take action?

Congress members have shown us repeatedly that they do not have the will to correct the problem of spending more money than is supported by revenues.

I agree wholeheartedly with the COS opponents that we already have an excellent Constitution. Sadly, we do not have enough members of Congress willing to put the interests of protecting and preserving our Republic above their own self interests.

The founders knew this and include the Article V provision in the Constitution.

Washington will not fix itself. Here are some questions to think about:

What happens to middle class America when a crisis is declared?

What freedoms will we be asked to sacrifice to insure our security?

**Parents who complain
will be reminded
that HB 119 specifies
that “library material
should not be removed
because of partisan,
ideological, or religious
disapproval.”**

Library controversy centers on who decides “allowable materials”

House Bill 119, a bill dictating to libraries, passed in the House and the Senate mostly along party lines.

HB119 states that library material should not be “excluded, removed, or prohibited from a catalogue because of the origin, background, or views of those who created the material.”

It further states that “material should not be excluded, removed, or prohibited from a library because of partisan, ideological, or religious disapproval.”

HB119 includes similar requirements for school libraries.

An appeal of a decision determining whether school library material may remain in the school library may be made to the board of the local education agency.

So if a parent objects to material in a school library, they may seek its removal.

If they don't like the decision of the local school board, they may appeal to the School Library Review

School Library Review members

- The President of the School Chiefs' Association
- The State Librarian
- The Secretary of the Department of Education
- The President of the Delaware State Education Association
- The President of the Association of School Administrators
- The President of the Delaware Association of School Librarians
- The President of the Delaware Library Association

Committee, created under HB 119.

There are organized efforts to place material in school libraries that could very well be found to be objectional by parents.

One such effort is from GLSEN (formerly the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network).

GLSEN works to promote “cultural inclusion and

awareness in K-12 schools.” It boasts to be in schools in the majority of states.

The American Library Association announced on July 25 that Sam Helmick, (they, them) is the 2024–2025 president-elect.

Helmick seems the perfect choice to promote the K-12 activities of GLSEN.

Parents who complain about books they find objectionable will be reminded that HB 119 specifies that “material should not be excluded, removed, or prohibited from a library because of partisan, ideological, or religious disapproval.”

My hope is local school boards are not allowing what parents may find objectional into the K-12 libraries to begin with.

Regrettably, school board members may find they are standing in the way of organized efforts to force them to accept materials they may find to be in poor taste. Being inclusionary does not mean you have to abandon all community standards.

We cannot let hatred for our God and our nation go unchallenged. We have a responsibility to use whatever means we have to contribute to the discussion.

Let your opinions be heard to influence your decisionmakers

There are those who want to take away our freedoms, ban any mention of God and His Word in the public square, silence pastors and rewrite our Constitution.

Where these people are in power, crime and poverty increase, along with dependence on government handouts.

They know that others must be held down in order for them to rise in power.

We cannot let their hatred for our God and our nation go unchallenged.

We all have a responsibility to use whatever means we have to add to the discussion.

A well-written Letter to the Editor in a hometown paper is one of the best ways to influence the election process and introduce issues to the public.

Even while your are sitting at home, there are ways you can help change the dangerous direction in which our state and our nation are headed.

Points for writing compelling Letters

1 Focus on one topic. If you have two issues, write a second letter.

2 Obey the newspaper word count limits. If your letter gets long, divide your thoughts into a second letter.

3 Be clear and concise. You don't need to write like an academic or a policy expert.



4 Use well documented information in your letters.

Too many people today are careless with the "facts" and simply repeat what others, even so-called experts, are saying.

You will gain the respect of editors and readers if, when they research what you are saying, they discover you are not bending the truth.

Go to the internet to find out the names of the editors of the print media. Addressing them by name helps to show your sincerity.

Continue to spread the word

In addition to sending the letter to the news media, post the content of your letter on social media and mention it also appeared in the local newspapers.

With socialism, incentives for free enterprise suffer, as do the benefits to consumers. Do you want to choose the type of car you will drive, or have the government decide for you?

Socialism vs capitalism in education, a crucial lesson

While many in our society refer to our system as capitalism, I prefer the phrase “free enterprise.”

Of course capital is used in this system, but that capital is not good or evil, rather simply the way to pay for the exchange of goods and for services.

In a free enterprise system, ideas are tested in the marketplace.

Good ideas succeed. Bad ideas fail.

Also, in a free enterprise system, commodities or products improve over time.

Those who bring ideas to the marketplace are aware that if they do not build that “better mousetrap,” so to speak, they will lose out to other entrepreneurs who realize the value of continuous improvement.

There is a strong incentive to produce the best television, the best automobile, the best video game, the best computer, the best cell phone, the best delivery system and so on.

How to succeed

Our young people need to know the principles that lead to gaining independence.

- 1 Earn a diploma**
- 2 Start working**
- 3 Wait until marriage to have children**

Almost anyone can enjoy at least a middle class quality of life by following these three steps.

That is how people of ordinary means gain access to materials to improve their lives.

Consumers benefit greatly from this competition.

We want our system of government to work for everyone.

We want everyone to have the opportunity to succeed.

When power is concentrated in the government, incentives for individual enterprise suffer, as do the benefits to consumers.

Those who work hard, pursue advanced education or pursue learning in the trades, employ their ingenuity and risk their capital have an expectation to do significantly better than those who don't.

Socialism takes away this incentive to improve your life and to benefit from the rewards of hard work. In government ideas that are not working receive additional funding.

Socialists think socialism will work if the “right people” are in charge.

Those “right people” do not exist.

That's why the failed ideas of Marx and Lenin will never work.

They have been tried with disastrous results. Look at history.

Socialism says things should be given to you because you exist.

The free enterprise system says you work hard and you benefit from your labor.

HB 31 did not originate because women were concerned that the abortionist might be charged if someone dies as the result of a poorly performed abortion.

Let's stop pretending this is about the rights of women

Let's stop pretending that the changes in abortion law are about protecting women's health.

In the 151st General Assembly, House Bill 31 was passed. That bill increased the risks to women seeking abortions.

Before HB 31, Delaware law said this: "If a person commits upon a female an abortion which causes her death, unless such abortion is a therapeutic abortion and the death is not the result of reckless conduct, shall be guilty of manslaughter."

That line was stricken from Title 11. Erased.

Why would the state make that change?

There would be minimal risk of death from an abortion if proper precautions were taken to care for the patient in the event of an unforeseen problem, such as perforation of the uterine wall.

Should not the state be more concerned about the safety of women than the consequences facing an

Informed choice

If women's rights were truly at the heart of this, then women would have the right to see an ultrasound of their unborn child before making their decision.

They would have the right to all the information needed for an informed choice.

Real reproductive health care would protect women from risky procedures.

abortionist whose actions result in death?

Was this bill demanded by women who feared their abortionist might be charged if they died from a botched procedure? Or was it designed to shield abortion providers from accountability?

Would not the risk of facing charges help influence the abortionist to provide the safest of services?

On the other hand, is it not possible that the removal of this risk makes it less likely that adequate precautions will be provided to protect the life of the woman?

This is not a bill that is concerned about women's health, but in relaxing standards and the risk to abortion providers, while putting women at greater risk.

When will the rights of women include an opportunity to make an informed choice?

Can you really call it reproductive health care when the emphasis is on abortion?

Real reproductive health care would encourage women to deliver healthy babies and would protect women from risky procedures.

Too often women are being told that children are an encumbrance to their chances for leading a productive life. That's a lie.

When abortion is promoted at the expense of women's safety, the rights of women are not defended. They are denied.

When tolerance
becomes the supreme
virtue, truth is
banished and the
Gospel itself is
recast as hate.

Pope Leo XIV

Is anything worth committing our 'Sacred Honor' for today?

The phrase "sacred honor" appears in the concluding sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

Our founders' "sacred honor" was pledged for the cause of making the Colonies free and independent States, "absolved from allegiance to the British Crown."

The signers knew that their actions would be seen as treasonous, but living as subjects under King George III had become intolerable.

They made it clear that rights come from God and not from man and especially not from a king. The signers declared:

"When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers

The fate of the signers

Five of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were captured by the British as traitors, and tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes burned.

Two lost sons serving in the Revolutionary Army; another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or hardships of the war.

of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are

Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

Today our nation is divided over a number of issues.

We have entered into an era in which what would have been seen as intolerable in previous times is now being accepted and promoted and protected by law.

In Delaware now we are "tolerating" men in women's sports.

We are "tolerating" boys in girls' locker rooms in our schools.

We are 'tolerating' the deaths of healthy unborn children.

We are "tolerating" unproven gender transition procedures for minors.

It seems as though our dependence on God has been cast aside in the interest of being "tolerant."

Pope Leo XIV said: "When tolerance becomes the supreme virtue, truth is banished and the Gospel itself is recast as hate."

Delaware Government Basics

A responsible government should provide conditions in which people can pursue their dreams. People need to be respected, to have an equal opportunity to succeed and to live in a safe environment.

A responsible government stands on these platform principles:

God

The Declaration of Independence says: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of happiness.” Our rights are from God, not government.

Life

Life begins at conception. Respectful public policy helps women through their pregnancies and then provides support for women giving birth to include encouraging fathers to share in the commitment for the mother and child.

Suicide is not “Death with Dignity.” The Hippocratic Oath requires adherents to swear to do no harm. Some harms are irreversible. Protections for the mentally ill and other vulnerable people cannot be guaranteed under so-called “Death with Dignity” laws.

Constitution

Our Delaware Constitution begins: “Through Divine goodness, all people have by nature the rights of worshiping and serving their Creator according to the dictates of their consciences, of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring and protecting reputation and property...”

Our oath of office includes these words: “to always to place the public interests above

any special or personal interests, and to respect the right of future generations to share the rich historic and natural heritage of Delaware”.

No other oath, declaration or test shall be required as a qualification for any office of public trust.

Justice (Law & Order)

A safe streets initiative ensures adequate police presence in neighborhoods in partnership with community leaders to stop the flow of illegal drugs and prioritize the prosecution of sex trafficking crimes.

Showing our support for law enforcement is extremely important at all times. We cannot allow any lack of respect for our officers to become part of our culture in Delaware.

Education

Our youth benefit from educators and curricula that are focused on preparing them for a well-adjusted life.

Teachers who display proficiency in helping children learn and overcome problems should be paid well for this exceptional talent.

Classroom discipline must be a priority. There should be zero tolerance for behavior that puts teachers at risk and prevents students from achieving academic success.

Judicial restraint

Our justices should not be making decisions for businesses incorporated in Delaware that are contrary to the decisions that come out of board rooms when no law is being violated. The cost to Delaware when corporations flee forces lawmakers to look elsewhere for additional revenues.

Take time to let your voice be heard

Public participation helps to bring back a measure of balance when it comes to discussing the merits of prospective laws.

When Testifying at Committee hearings:

*Register at legis.delaware.gov
Identify yourself and reason for testifying.*

Have strong/memorable closing statement.

Keep comments to under two minutes to avoid being cut off in mid sentence.

Rehearse and time your testimony.

Make sure any facts/statistics you use are easily verifiable.

Personal stories that evoke emotions are powerful.

When telling stories, make sure you stay within the time limit.



*Let it not be
said that I was
silent when
they needed me.*

William Wilberforce

Legislation does not solve problems created by a culture that is in decline. We have to work on rebuilding the culture, starting with families and individuals, then our laws will have more meaning and be less necessary at the same time.

Senator Bryant Richardson