

Wednesday February 1, 2023

Bill Number SB50 A proponent for the Bill

Vicki Kline

Liberty Lions League co-founder and

Committee Woman of Overland Park

Chairman Thompson and Members of the Committee,

I appreciate SB50 Bill.

I want to submit some observations and knowledge I have. I have questions if this Bill will help protect or could be used for these following things.

First, I attended at least three school board meetings and one time it was overflowing over a school board member's status to head the board was voted on. I stood outside with some of the press and at least 30 more people. I realized that the press wished to speak to people who may appear to be making statements about their belief system through their clothes or appearance, such as wearing statements about pro-LGBTQ or holding signs up. I waited for my conservative friend who had gone into the meeting and when she came out I told the reporter, "I am sure you want to talk to my friend. She's a conservative and get her take on the meeting." She said simply about the meeting that, "He is entitled to his opinion, and he deserves to be heard as well." When I read or watched the other channels coverage of the event. She was the only voice interviewed that one could say was conservative. However, standing outside, few people realized that most of those people outside waiting due to the overcrowded meeting, were more conservative. I knew many of them. Could this bill in anyway address choice bias reporting? Meaning, if it was being shown in the media, they could not be taken down because she is speaking opposite of the other people? And the other people were chosen for a reason that aligns with removing the man from his position.

Second, I asked Sheriff Hayden about the books, we saw at the other school board meetings that showed drawings of pictures that were graphic between encouraging a sexual encounter between an older man and an underage young man. He said, "They are drawings and not photographs. That is why we are limited to doing anything." A cartoon or drawing cannot be the "victim". Therefore, I am bringing to the attention of this Bill, how are we to address the issue of drawings versus photography or video?"

Third, since I have worked for three years on election integrity. I have found disinformation in numerous forms. It is first assumed the news media does some sort of Bob Woodward investigation into each story that may censor our rights or show a violation of the law. I feel nothing is further from the truth. For example: Recently this same statement is addressed by the Russian Ambassador to a Sky News Reporter as he spends 14 minutes educating the news media on the UN Charter, and the violation of said Charter constantly by the United States and others. If anyone had censored the Ambassador or if any social media had not allowed for it to go forward. We would have one less voice that could clear up

a position of a nation being made to sound like thugs and villains by a media agenda, that is not addressing the actual abuse of the UN Charter rules, nor would we be able to see an exchange where clearly the media is being told they are being used as pawns.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CyUfGLFEJK8>).

My question goes to outline of information brought before the public, which has never been removed from the public's ability to read the information. However, the mainstream media has also avoided the issue. Meaning, it's not been tested. This same view that media companies are being complicit or advancing misinformation and not being held accountable can be seen in the issues presently with Twitter, which executives are now being brought in for a hearing over.

I want to draw attention to line item (21) of SB50, "Each instance in which an interactive computer service enters into a contract with a person containing terms of service that violate this section shall constitute a separate violation."

I supply a Substack that has all the information from June, 2021. One only needs to spend a small amount of time realizing what the author is pointing out. (<https://patelpatriot.substack.com/p/election-infrastructure-corruption> or even better this one <https://patelpatriot.substack.com/p/devolution-part-5>)

- Homeland Security Act signed into law 2002 under George Bush, Jr. Directive 7 (HSPD-7) replacing PDD-63. Priority is critical infrastructure. Out of this the NIPP National Infrastructure Protection Plan was meant to create partnerships between Government Coordinating Councils (GCC) from the public sector and Sector Coordinating Councils (SCC) from the Private Sector. SCC is PRIVATE SECTOR. (a portion is brought to the readers attention in the link).
- Advisory Councils give advice, recommendations and expertise to the government.
- DHS -Department of Homeland Security published a Federal Register March 24, 2006, announcing the establishment of CIPAC as a Federal ADVISORY COMMITTEE of CIPAC (Critical Infrastructure Partnership Advisory Council. FACA – the Federal Advisory Committee ACT exempt body pursuant to section 871 of Homeland Security Act.
- On January 6, 2017 Secretary of DHS Jeh Johnson and he defines "Government Facilities" This put Election Infrastructure under DHS.
- November 16, 2018 President Trump signed into law the Cybersecurity and infrastructure Security Agency Act of 2018. CISA. They are the Nations risk advisor, working with partners to defend against threats and collaborating to build more secure and resilient infrastructure for the future. It lists the 16 critical infrastructure Security Agency...the focus is Government Facilities Sector where Election Infrastructure Subsector.
- The key is to be a liaison between election subsector and federal, STATE, and LOCAL agencies.
- Please note those later reference allows them to be the sole entity and bars others from competition in the contract. They handle the physical security along with cybersecurity through their own VOLUNTARY ACTIONS.
- They operate under section 871 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 USC 451)
- The advisory committee's are exempt from public laws 92-463. A great deal of laws.

- They are now SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
- They are eligible for certifications under subsection (b x3) 208 of title 18.
- Under special government employee ACT of 1978, certifies in writing that the need for the individual outweighs the potential conflict of interest created by the financial interest involved.
- Please then see all the Organizing EISCC who get Special attention and if they do something untoward, it appears we protect them. They are our partners. How would we protect them? By saying we do not have a problem, how would we do that probably through media. However, my question is does our Elections, as they claim they do not and we know they do. Process over the internet, such as the poll pads. Almost every name on the list have been used by our enemies and are literally doing the opposite for which they are set up to do.

Does this bill address the issues in this Substack? If we prove they have done the opposite of a contract, does this law allow for punishment? And if it involves safety of our Nation or State, does that go to a crime or stay in forever world going from court to court? If the media in any way shuts down the information, are they held accountable?

It is now common knowledge that Eugene Curtis in 2000 was hired by a Republican Tom Feeney to create an algorithm to make the machines cheat. In fact, recently Fred Sherman of Johnson County had people come to see the machines working properly with a series of tests to the Election Office for November 2022 election. I asked the person who attended the display of the voting machines "how do you know the test shows you what he claims? Eugene Curtis said he set up the algorithm to run tests accurately." Jovan Hutton Pulitzer who has been running the tests on the Arizona Audits and has 67 patents with regards to paper. Can and has told anyone that machines can switch votes simply by giving it a different type of paper. Literally, the ink type can be picked up and know to vote the way the machine is telling it too. <https://investortimes.com/freedomoutpost/flashback-computer-programmer-testifies-that-he-rigged-voting-machines/>

Will this Bill protect a journalist or citizen who wishes to write about this issue? If the only way to find out about the program of the machines is to open them and none of the machines have been allowed to be opened, how than can journalist's say "There is no evidence" when in fact they do not know if the machine is compromised by the very person who wrote the algorithm and said he created it to not find the problem? Is a Tech Company possibly violating this future law if they do not allow a full audit of these issues with elections?

Recently whistleblowers and journalist came January 20,2023 to the Belmarsh Tribunal. To request the release of Julian Assange.

We need people like Edward Snowden and others who have told us what the government has done with mass surveillance over their own people. These people have had to flee from their own government that has been exposed by hiding secretive information that could hurt our country, by weakening its own citizens. The attack by the United States against these whistleblowers who expose our own government plotting against its own citizens and against its own laws, should be punished. The Belmarsh Tribunal

gathered to speak about the process through Judges and Attorneys that show that "Truth" is not even being allowed to be used. A whistleblower during their trial has no access to the material to which one is being accused of handling or mishandling. And the government's response is, you are found guilty, "Because we say so" you are violating the Espionage Act.

Does this law protect whistleblowers and journalists that use social media to expose corruption and unlawful acts against the citizens of the Country and State.

How can you make an argument for your actions from the law that they are violating? Here is my question about SB50? "If I print the truth about a crime against the government or the very company that holds the ability to shut me down. Can I still be censored by a service, whom I contract with to be able to shut me down if I expose them or the government that they do business with? Do I not have a certain right or honor to expose criminal behavior of my government? And is this bill saying that "contracts" between the Government and Private Sector cannot happen, if they may hinder the rights of the people they claim to protect. For example, can the government partner with a corporation such as Verizon and have my cell phone turned off if I do not receive a vaccine?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MRUyBv3LyYk>

I do not want any Tech Company silencing my voice. I also want to know if the Tech Companies use their power and position to silence me will they be fined and is this a criminal or civil suit that I have to go through. Is money and time coming out of my pocket when they try to starve my personal life out of existence with their own agenda?