



**A: I think the population of the school should depend on the community that you live in. And it should be, in my mind, small schools, and they should be schools that are close enough to mom and dad that you can get them down to the school when the teacher needs them. It shouldn't be based on any forced mandate by government, and I think it will work out a lot better that way.**

**Source: 2007 GOP Presidential Forum at Morgan State University Sep 27, 2007**

#### **Supports vouchers & home schooling**

**Regarding educational choice; home schooling; and the freedom of private and home education from federal regulation: I support taking the actions necessary to strengthen our public educational system and school vouchers are a great opportunity to provide students and their families with additional educational choices. A significant percentage of high school students have difficulty reading at a proficient level, test well below the international average in math and science, and lack basic knowledge in history. Clearly, parents have a reason to be concerned. Many Americans support innovative plans that address our current education shortcomings and I believe school vouchers are an effective way of achieving this goal.**

**Taking into consideration that approximately 2 million children are taught at home, it is important that we make every effort to ensure these students have the same access and opportunities to federal benefits, such as financial aid, as those who attend public school.**

**Source: Campaign website, [www.gohunter08.com](http://www.gohunter08.com), "Core Principles" Sep 1, 2007**

**Voted NO on allowing Courts to decide on "God" in Pledge of Allegiance.**

**Amendment to preserve the authority of the US Supreme Court to decide any question pertaining to the Pledge of Allegiance. The bill underlying this amendment would disallow any federal courts from hearing cases concerning the Pledge of Allegiance. This amendment would make an exception for the Supreme Court.**

**Proponents support voting YES because:**

**I believe that our Pledge of Allegiance with its use of the phrase "under God" is entirely consistent with our Nation's cultural and historic traditions. I also believe that the Court holding that use of this phrase is unconstitutional is wrong. But this court-stripping bill is not necessary. This legislation would bar a Federal court, including the Supreme Court, from reviewing any claim that challenges the recitation of the Pledge on first amendment grounds.**

**If we are a Nation of laws, we must be committed to allowing courts to decide what the law is. This bill is unnecessary and probably unconstitutional. It would contradict the principle of Marbury v. Madison, intrude on the principles of separation of powers, and degrade our independent Federal judiciary.**

**Opponents support voting NO because:**

**David C. Osborne** OPEN LETTER - 25 October 2007-- **PAGE 3 of 9---**

I was disappointed 4 years ago when two judges of the Ninth US Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that our Pledge, our statement of shared national values, was somehow unconstitutional. I do not take legislation that removes an issue from the jurisdiction of this court system lightly. This legislation is appropriate, however, because of the egregious conduct of the courts in dealing with the Pledge of Allegiance.

By striking "under God" from the Pledge, the Court has shown contempt for the Congress which approved the language, and, more importantly, shows a complete disregard for the millions of Americans who proudly recite the Pledge as a statement of our shared national values and aspirations. No one is required to recite the Pledge if they disagree with its message.

Reference: Watt amendment to Pledge Protection Act; Bill H R 2389 ; vote number 2006-384 on Jul 19, 2006

Voted NO on \$84 million in grants for Black and Hispanic colleges.

# This vote is on a substitute bill (which means an amendment which replaces the entire text of the original bill). Voting YES means support for the key differences from the original bill: lowering student loan interest rates; \$59 million for a new Predominantly Black Serving Institution program; \$25 million for a new graduate Hispanic Serving Institution program; provide for year- round Pell grants; and repeal the Single Lender rule. The substitute's proponents say: The original bill has some critical shortcomings. First and foremost, this substitute will cut the new Pell Grant fixed interest rate in half from 6.8% to 3.4%, to reduce college costs to those students most in need.

# It would also establish a new predominantly black-serving institutions programs to boost college participation rates for low-income black students, and a new graduate Hispanic-serving institution program.

# As we saw from 1995 to 2000, the questions employers were asking was not your race, not your ethnicity, not your religion, they wanted to know if you had the skills and talents to do the job. Most often today, those skills and that talent requires a higher education. A college education is going to have to become as common as a high school education.

\* The substitute's opponents say: I feel it is not totally the Federal Government's responsibility to provide for all of higher education. The substitute has three critical flaws.

\* 1. The name itself, "Reverse the Raid on Student Aid." Don't believe the hype. Not one student in America will receive less financial aid under our bill. Not one.

\* 2. This amendment does not retain the \$6,000 maximum Pell Grant award that our legislation has. In fact, they stay with the same old \$5,800 maximum award.

\* 3. It says that we are going to have a 3.4% interest rate for 1 year that is going to cost \$2.7 billion, but it has no offsets whatsoever. How do they pay for it? They don't tell us.

Reference: Reverse the Raid on Student Aid Act; Bill HR 609 Amendment 772 ; vote number 2006-080 on Mar 30, 2006

Voted YES on allowing school prayer during the War on Terror.

**Children's Prayers Resolution: Expressing the sense of Congress that schools should allow children time to pray for, or silently reflect upon, the country during the war against terrorism.**

**Reference: Bill sponsored by Isakson, R-GA; Bill H.Con.Res.239 ; vote number 2001-445 on Nov 15, 2001**

**Voted YES on requiring states to test students.**

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: Vote to pass a bill that would authorize \$22.8 billion in education funding, a 29 percent increase from fiscal 2001. The bill would require states to test students to track progress.**

**Reference: Bill sponsored by Boehner R-OH; Bill HR 1 ; vote number 2001-145 on May 23, 2001**

**Voted YES on allowing vouchers in DC schools.**

**Vote to create a non-profit corporation to administer federally-funded vouchers for low-income children in the District of Columbia.**

**Reference: Amendment introduced by Arney, R-TX; Bill HR 4380 ; vote number 1998-411 on Aug 6, 1998**

**Voted YES on vouchers for private & parochial schools.**

**Vote to pass a bill to allow states to use certain federal funds designated for elementary and secondary education to provide scholarships, or vouchers, to low-income families to send their children to private schools, including religious schools.**

**Reference: Bill sponsored by Riggs, R-CA; Bill HR 2746 ; vote number 1997-569 on Nov 4, 1997**

**Voted YES on giving federal aid only to schools allowing voluntary prayer.**

**Motion to add language to the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" to give federal aid only to schools allowing voluntary prayer.**

**Bill HR 1804 ; vote number 1994-85 on Mar 23, 1994**

**Rated 17% by the NEA, indicating anti-public education votes.**

**Hunter scores 17% by the NEA on public education issues**

**The National Education Association has a long, proud history as the nation's leading organization committed to advancing the cause of public education. Founded in 1857 "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States," the NEA has remained constant in its commitment to its original mission as evidenced by the current mission statement:**

**To fulfill the promise of a democratic society, the National Education Association shall promote the cause of quality public education and advance the profession of education; expand the rights and further the interest of educational employees; and advocate human, civil, and economic rights for all.**



I believe that in the PRIMARY voters should vote for the BEST candidate, not the candidate that “think can win”.. however there are a lot of voters who would disagree with me, and if you are one those folks consider this point that I recently made in an e-mail I sent out to some fellow Duncan Hunter supporters...

A point I have been making in every “open letter” that I write.. Rudy is the candidate that the LEFT is fighting for to be the GOP nomination... it's a toss up between Giuliani and Ron Paul in the race for the LEFT spoiler of the GOP primary... I would like to see some in depth analysis of the “money trail” for both Giuliani and Ron Paul... I suspect that we will discover that they are BOTH largely supported by the FAR LEFT in an attempt to affect the outcome of the GOP Primary.. this is the SAME reason that Duncan Hunter is NOT getting the coverage that he deserves.. Duncan Hunter is the candidate that the LEFT does not want to see win the primary. and they are pulling out all the stops to make sure that he does not get any traction.. I have seen this very clearly for several weeks now.. and others will see it if they just take a look at what is going on.. DUNCAN HUNTER is the ONLY CANDIDATE qualified to be Commander in Chief.. and if the GOP primary voters don't see that they will effectively DESTROY our party... with the help of the DEMOCRATS !! ---- Duncan Hunter is the ONLY candidate that ALL CONSERVATIVES will rally behind in the General election... in addition to MANY of the moderate Democrats.. this will result in a Ronald Reagan type victory for the GOP... If ANY OTHER Republican candidate emerges from primary they will effectively split the base, and will not be able to rally enough support in the General Election to beat the HildaBeast...

Here are a few additional observations.....

1. FRED THOMPSON – Interestingly enough, Fred made his first debut in a presidential debate, and to put it mildly he fell flat on his face, and the numbers are starting to reflect that. Many of his grassroots supporters have left the campaign in the wake of the disaster. Many folks on a conservative web forum that was created to support Fred Thompson have shifted their support to DUNCAN HUNTER.

2. MITT ROMNEY – What can I say, the guy has the MONEY, he even has the so-called NAME RECOGNITION, and yes his grassroots supporters are few and far between. I don't know if this has anything to do with him being a Mormon or not, but that “issue” always seems to come up in conservative circles.

3. MIKE HUCKABEE – I confess that my opinion of Mike Huckabee is not as objective as it should be. Many of my fellow Christian/Conservatives insist that he the THE MAN, however the “conservative family” is much larger than the “Christian Conservative” family, and I just don't see Mike Huckabee breaking out.

4. TOM TANCREDO – I have heard a rumor that Tom Tancredo is considering dropping out of the race, if this is true, I hope to see his supporters come over the DUNCAN HUNTER CAMP. In fact if Tom decides to endorse Duncan Hunter I think it will be a very wise move for him.

5. JOHN MCCAIN – Way too much of RINO to get ANY support from the grassroots conservatives. While I respect John McCain and thank him for his service to our country his opportunity to become President of United States has come and gone. I hope to see him drop out of the race as well, but I don't see that happening any time soon.

6. RUDY GIULIANI – Former mayor of New York, has the name recognition that other candidates could only dream of, however he is NOT a conservative. I encourage the “Moderate Republicans” among us who support him to consider the consequences of supporting a candidate that can certainly make it through the PRIMARY, but will have ZERO chance in the GENERAL, simply because many conservatives have vowed to not vote for him even if he IS the nominee.

7. RON PAUL – In short – Ron Paul is the LEFT's dream candidate for the Republican party – I can't help but offer this “conspiracy theory” – Who thinks its possible that the ANTI-WAR crowd will register REPUBLICAN in the Primary, JUST to vote for RON PAUL ! --- Not to give the left any ideas, but think about it for second. If ALL THE Anti-War folks register Republican, and vote for Ron Paul in the Primary, they can marginalize the REAL conservatives and all but guarantee a GIULIANI victory. Which of course will result in a HILLARY CLINTON victory in the General Election.

8. DUNCAN HUNTER – O.K. Now that we got through all that I have saved the BEST for LAST. DUNCAN HUNTER is the only candidate in the race that can not only win the PRIMARY, but is the only candidate who can defeat Hillary Clinton in the GENERAL ELECTION. – In my humble opinion, it is imperative that REAL conservatives seriously consider who they are supporting in the PRIMARY. If you do this, I am sure you will, as many already have, come to the conclusion that DUNCAN HUNTER IS... The RIGHT man, at the RIGHT time, and is the only candidate in the race that can pull of a RONALD REAGAN type victory in 2008.

It is my sincere humble opinion, that Duncan Hunter is MOST qualified to wear the “Commander in Chief hat” in 2008 and on into the foreseeable future. No other candidate in the race on either side of aisle comes even close to his qualifications.

Having said that; It is very frustrating to me that so many folks out there who KNOW in their heart that Duncan Hunter is the right man at the right time are buying into the notion that Duncan Hunter “can’t win”. They seem to suggest that no matter how qualified Duncan Hunter is, if the MEDIA says he can’t win, then it must be true. Some have even suggested that it’s all about “NAME RECOGNITION”. If you have not heard this excuse yet, then you just are not paying close attention to the primary race.

If these well meaning conservatives would quit spouting this garbage, the “name recognition” factor would be dramatically reduced. In my research I have found that many of the folk who say that “Duncan Hunter can’t win” are the folks who have already committed to supporting another candidate. This is a clear indication to me that it simply is NOT TRUE, but rather a campaign slogan for the “other guy”.

In fact if you look at the national polls, you will see that a very significant number of folks out there are UNDECIDED when asked which REPUBLICAN candidate they will support in the PRIMARY. Truthfully, I look at the “national polls” simply for entertainment sakes, because personally I don’t believe that polls taken so early in the game are any real indication of who really can or can’t win the REPUBLICAN PRIMARY.

However, the FreeRepublic.Com polls in my humble opinion ARE a very good indication of where grassroots conservatives stand. I have been watching these polls very carefully since the beginning of the campaign season. I have made a couple of observations that I would like to share. Before I state these observations, let me say that the only numbers I consider relevant are the “members” numbers. While this of course is not scientific by any means, if supported by additional data can be a very good barometer of where grassroots conservative INDIVIDUALS are leaning.

1. Fred Thompson seems to pull a high percentage of all member votes, however this high figure is NOT supported by the fact that so few of these folks post anything PUBLIC on the forum itself. My latest estimate is that about 35% of the folks who have posted publicly in support of either Fred Thompson or Duncan Hunter are actually Fred Thompson Supporters. However, 65% of the folks who have posted publicly in support of either Fred Thompson or Duncan Hunter have indicated support for Duncan Hunter. Again, not scientific, but a very interesting observation, for which there may be a number of “explanations”.

2. As of this writing, the FR polls have made a dramatic shift toward Duncan Hunter and away from Fred Thompson. In fact Fred Thompson’s numbers have been in steady decline since the Michigan Debate. This phenomenon is not just on FreeRepublic.com, but other conservative web forums as well. Look for this trend to continue as we get deeper into the campaign season.

**David C. Osborne** OPEN LETTER - 25 October 2007-- **PAGE 9 of 9---**

In conclusion, it appears to me that as more conservatives start to take a serious look at the candidates in the race, Duncan Hunter seems to be gaining momentum, it is my sincere hope that this trend continues into the primary, and that folk stop the "Duncan Hunter can't win rhetoric.

Thanks for listening, feel free to pass this letter on.

TOWARD VICTORY

David C. Osborne