
MISSOURI CATHOLIC CONFERENCE MESSENGER



October 2008

The bishops of Missouri, speaking together on matters of public policy, form the Missouri Catholic Conference.

MCC CANDIDATE SURVEY: BE INFORMED BEFORE THE NOVEMBER 4 ELECTION



Pope Benedict XVI stated during his visit to the U.S. in April 2008 that Catholics have a duty to participate in the political process and vote. In the 2008 election Missouri voters face a myriad of issues and candidates. Issues are being decided and candidates are being elected on smaller margins proving that every vote is critical.

Due to the effects of state term limits, many veteran senators and representatives will be replaced. Leadership in both chambers of the Missouri General Assembly will change. This turnover of members and change in the character and dynamics of the legislature will undoubtedly alter how public policies are made. The change will certainly affect the lives and well being of people in Missouri.

Congress faces issues of both national and international importance. All nine Missouri congressmen face election this year.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As Catholics, we have rights and responsibilities to participate in the political order. The significance of this year's election only magnifies the need for us to educate ourselves about Catholic social teaching and participate in the debate over matters affecting the common good. The MCC is here to help in this regard.

MCC CANDIDATE SURVEY

The MCC has conducted a survey of all candidates from all parties in Missouri seeking election to statewide office, the Missouri General Assembly and to Congress. The general election is **November 4, 2008**.

On the following pages you will find the candidates' responses to the MCC Candidate Survey.

The MCC does not endorse or rate candidates. The survey seeks to educate voters and is a legal activity for churches and tax exempt organizations.

The MCC encourages readers to gather information from a variety of resources, to be informed and active, and to be sure to vote in the general election.

PLEASE NOTE

The Missouri Catholic Conference does not endorse or rate candidates. Candidate replies are provided without comment as a service to voters. The MCC urges citizens to gather information from a variety of sources, make responsible decisions and participate in the election of our government officials.

The MCC has made every effort to ensure the accuracy and fair representation of candidates and their positions based upon the Secretary of State's certified list and based upon survey responses as they were provided to the MCC by certified candidates. The information contained on these pages is accurate to the best of our knowledge at the time of printing.

The MCC encourages citizens to contact candidates directly with questions, requests for clarification or further information about a candidate's position on issues.

2008 ELECTION ISSUES: ENGLISH ONLY & GAMBLING

On November 4th voters will consider a constitutional amendment to make English the language of all governmental meetings and a proposition to amend Missouri's gambling laws.

Constitutional Amendment 1 Government Communications in English Only

Amendment 1 is a proposed amendment to the Missouri Constitution to make English the language of all governmental meetings. The official ballot title for Constitutional Amendment 1 reads as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to add a statement that English shall be the language of all governmental meetings at which any public business is discussed, decided, or public policy is formulated whether conducted in person or by communication equipment including conference calls, video

conferences, or Internet chat or message board?

English is already the de facto language of meetings of governmental bodies throughout Missouri and there is no need to make this practice a constitutional requirement. By doing so, Amendment 1 prevents local officials from making common sense exceptions when emergencies or other special occasions arise. Even English grammar has exceptions to the general rules, but Amendment 1 is not nearly as flexible as the language it supposedly seeks to protect.

Amendment 1 applies to all public meetings so, for example, public officials could not meet with non-English speakers to discuss planned responses to emergencies such as floods, tornadoes, epidemics or terrorist attacks. The proposal could be interpreted to prohibit emergency public bulletins in languages other than English. In short, Amendment 1 places more value on the English

language than it does the preservation of human life.

The unspoken fear behind Amendment 1 is that newly arrived immigrants will not learn English and that America will become a country in which people no longer understand each other. That is the same suspicion that greeted our Catholic ancestors - the Germans, Poles, Italians and others who came to America's shores in the 19th and early 20th century. A vicious anti-Catholic nativism arose which sought to bar Catholic immigrants from participation in American life.

Catholics who know their heritage know that the present fears are unfounded. Just as our ancestors learned English so are today's immigrants. Just as in the past, the parents struggled to learn English, but their children and grandchildren rapidly adopt it. They know that learning English is the path to successful integration into American culture. Newly arrived immigrants are starting new businesses, joining civic

organizations and becoming active members of our parishes.

Amendment 1, however, expects instant assimilation by newly arrived immigrants, even the elderly, but this is neither realistic nor compassionate. We don't need to slam a door in the face of newcomers but build a bridge of welcoming hospitality. Rather than passing laws that unrealistically demand immediate mastery of English, we should offer opportunities for newcomers to learn English.

Our laws should reflect the best of our American ideals. We are known as a warm and generous people who confidently extend a welcoming hand to newcomers. Amendment 1, however, is a selfish, fearful and suspicious response that rejects Christ's command to welcome the stranger as Himself. (Mt. 25: 35). We, as a people, are better than Amendment 1. The Missouri Catholic Conference opposed the joint resolution

see ISSUES on back page

HOW TO INTERPRET THE SURVEY

1. Candidates are listed by the office they seek, by district number and by party.
2. If you do not know the district in which you vote, contact your local election officials.
3. The statements, exactly as they appeared in the candidate survey, are listed below. Each candidate's responses appear in the row to the right of his or her name.
4. The MCC advised candidates that, due to limited space, only the responses "support," "oppose," or "no position." would be reported. If a candidate wrote comments but did not mark one of the responses, the designation "DNR" for "Did Not Respond" appears in that space.

FEDERAL CANDIDATE SURVEY

Each candidate for Congress was asked whether he or she supports or opposes the following MCC legislative priorities:

1. No Tax Dollars for Abortion – Federal law should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to provide or promote abortion or to subsidize organizations that provide abortions.
2. Cloning Ban – Federal law should prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to subsidize human cloning – including so-called "therapeutic cloning" and somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT) – and any other research practices that destroy human embryos for their tissue or stem cells.
3. School Parent/Educational Expenses – Tax policies should promote the ability for families to deduct a portion of K-12 educational expenses for public and private school parents.
4. Access to Health Care – A person who cannot afford private health insurance or does not have access to other health coverage should be entitled to government provided health coverage.
5. Due Process/Non-Citizens – Federal policies should afford basic due process rights for non-citizens, including timely access to an attorney, adequate time to prepare a defense and a prompt hearing.
6. Immigrants – Federal law should provide a process to allow undocumented persons to attain legal status.
7. Family Farm Assistance – Federal farm programs should give preference to family owned and operated farms instead of large scale corporate-owned agricultural enterprises.
8. Federal Budget Priorities – Cuts to federal assistance programs for the needy like Medicaid and TANF are inappropriate in light of current economic circumstances.
9. Interrogation Practices – Federal law and policy should prohibit use of waterboarding and other inhumane interrogation practices.
10. Environmental Protection – Government should act to reduce greenhouse gases in order to protect the environment.

L E G E N D	<u>Political Party</u>	<u>Position</u>
	D = Democrat	S = Support
	R = Republican	O = Oppose
	L = Libertarian	NP = No Position
	I = Independent	DNR = Did Not Respond
	C = Constitution	

					No Tax Dollars for Abortion	Cloning Ban	School Parent/Educational Expenses	Access to Health Care	Due Process/Non-Citizens	Immigrants	Family Farm Assistance	Federal Budget Priorities	Interrogation Practices	Environmental Protection
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
U.S. House of Representatives	District	P	Name	City										
	District 4	D	Ike Skelton	Harrisonville	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
	District 4	R	Jeff Parnell	Rogersville	S	S	S	S	O	O	S	NP	O	O
	District 7	C	Travis Maddox	Fair Grove	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
	District 7	D	Richard Monroe	Springfield	O	O	O	S	S	O	S	S	S	S
	District 7	L	Kevin Craig	Powersite	S	S	S	O	S	S	S	O	S	O
	District 7	R	Roy Blunt	Springfield	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
	District 8	C	Richard L. Smith	Mansfield	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
	District 8	D	Joe Allen	Forsyth	S	S	O	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
	District 8	L	Branden C. McCullough	Cape Girardeau	S	S	S	O	S	S	S	O	S	O
District 8	R	Jo Ann Emerson	Cape Girardeau	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	

STATE CANDIDATE SURVEY

Each candidate for state office was asked whether he or she supports or opposes the following MCC legislative priorities:

1. Regulation of Abortion – State law should regulate or limit abortions to the greatest extent possible.
2. No Tax Dollars for Cloning – State law should prohibit taxpayer funding of human cloning – including so-called "therapeutic cloning" and somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT) – and any other research practices that destroy human embryos for their tissue or stem cells.
3. Access to Health Care – A person who cannot afford private health insurance or does not have access to other health coverage should be entitled to government provided health coverage.
4. Provide Tax Relief for School Parents – Public and private school parents should be eligible for tax deductions or credits for expenses incurred in educating their children.
5. Federal Immigration – Immigration laws and policies should be determined by the federal government and not the state of Missouri.
6. Death Penalty Moratorium – A moratorium on executions should be enacted to address questions of fairness and effectiveness of Missouri's death penalty.
7. Alternatives to Incarceration – Missouri should provide alternative sentencing options for offenders who do not pose a threat to public safety, rather than expanding prison capacity.
8. Health Care Rights of Conscience – State law should allow pharmacists and other health care providers to refuse to provide prescriptions or other health care that conflicts with their religious or moral beliefs.
9. Family Farm Assistance – State agricultural programs should provide incentives and protections to smaller-scale family farm operations.
10. Confined Animal Feeding Organizations – State law should not supersede local regulation of CAFOs.

L E G E N D	<u>Political Party</u>	<u>Position</u>
	D = Democrat	S = Support
	R = Republican	O = Oppose
	L = Libertarian	NP = No Position
	I = Independent	DNR = Did Not Respond
	C = Constitution	

Office	P	Name	City	1 Regulation of Abortion	2 No Tax Dollars For Cloning	3 Access to Health Care	4 Tax Relief for School Parents	5 Federal Immigration	6 Death Penalty Moratorium	7 Alternatives to Incarceration	8 Health Care Rights of Conscience	9 Family Farm Assistance	10 Confined Animal Feeding Organizations
District 146	R	Darrell Pollock	Lebanon	S	S	O	S	NP	O	S	S	S	O
District 147	R	Don Wells	Cabool	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 148	R	David Day	Dixon	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 150	D	James D. Ellis	Salem	S	S	S	NP	O	S	S	S	S	S
District 150	R	Jason T. Smith	Salem	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 151	C	Roberrt Lee Mills	West Plains	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 151	I	Kathleen Hensley	Mountain View	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 151	R	Ward Franz	West Plains	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 152	C	Thad Wheeler	Summersville	S	S	O	S	O	O	S	S	NP	S
District 152	D	J. C. Kuessner	Eminence	S	S	S	NP	NP	NP	S	S	S	S
District 152	R	Eric (Rick) Mansfield	Ellington	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 153	R	Mike Dethrow	Alton	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 154	L	Larry S. Busby	Poplar Bluff	DNR	S	S	S	DNR	O	S	S	O	O
District 154	R	Gayle Kingery	Poplar Bluff	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 156	D	Michael R. Winder	Marquand	S	S	S	O	O	O	S	S	S	S
District 156	R	Shelley White Keeney	Marble Hill	S	S	O	S	S	O	S	S	S	NP
District 157	C	Jennifer Friedrich	St. Mary	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 157	R	Scott A. Lipke	Jackson	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 158	L	Robert Roland	Cape Girardeau	O	S	S	O	S	O	S	S	S	S
District 158	R	Clint Tracy	Cape Girardeau	S	S	O	S	O	O	S	S	S	NP
District 159	D	Bill Burlison	Advance	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 159	R	Billy Pat Wright	Dexter	S	S	S	O	S	S	S	S	S	S
District 160	R	Ellen Brandom	Sikeston	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 161	D	Steve Hodges	East Prairie	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	O
District 162	D	Terry Swinger	Caruthersville	S	S	S	O	O	O	S	S	S	O
District 163	D	Tom Todd	Campbell	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR
District 163	I	Pat (Wilson) Allen	Kennett	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR	DNR

ISSUES *continued*

in the General Assembly submitting this issue to voters and urges voters to vote "NO" on November 4th.

Proposition A Amending Missouri's Gambling Laws

Proposition A would amend Missouri's gambling laws. The most significant proposed changes would:

- Repeal the existing \$500 loss limit;
- Prohibit enactment of any future loss limit;
- Restrict the number of casinos to those already built or being built;
- Increase the gambling tax from 20% to 21%; and,
- Create a fund to provide revenue to elementary and secondary public schools.

Some churches teach that gambling is essentially wrong in terms of morality. This has never been the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Catechism of the Catholic Church states:

"Games of chances...or wagers are not in themselves contrary to justice. They become morally unacceptable when they deprive someone of what is necessary to provide for his needs and those of others. The passion for gambling risks becoming an enslavement." (Catechism par. 2413)

Although gambling is not intrinsically evil, serious questions affecting the common good are raised when gambling becomes a big business. For example, extensive advertising by casinos attracts customers who can ill-afford to gamble away their family's limited income. The existing loss limit of \$500 is intended to address this concern by limiting the losses a person can sustain every two hours. Proposition A, however, removes the loss limit, which can only lead to more excessive gambling, harming not only the gambler but his family and the local community.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission created by Congress noted that the "Commission knows that no dollar amount can represent what a lost or impaired parent, spouse or child means to the rest of the family." But compulsive gambling is not just a problem for the gambler's family. It can increase work absences both for the gambler and other family members. As compulsive gambling spreads, it places greater strains on social service agencies. These so-called

"hidden costs" are often overlooked when studies tout how the casino industry can spur economic development.

By removing the loss limits Proposition A will expand the rate of gambling in the state of Missouri. Money spent on gambling will be money not available for other local businesses or for contributions to local charities and churches. And the additional profits casinos make will likely go far too often to out-of-state interests that provide no benefit to the hosting community.

Proposition A earmarks the tax revenue generated by increasing the casino tax to elementary and secondary public schools, the one area of the state budget that has been spared the severe budget cuts of recent years. While public school funding has been protected, essential human services for the poor have been slashed. Many of the working poor and disabled, for example, have lost their health coverage. Catholic teaching calls for a preferential love for the poor, but

Proposition A ignores the weak in favor of the strong.

While proposition A earmarks its tax revenue to public elementary and secondary public schools, there is no guarantee that this will actually result in any increase in funding for these schools. The casino tax revenue could simply replace existing general revenue, resulting in no increase in public school funding. In fact, enactment of Proposition A will not prevent the Missouri General Assembly from reducing funds to public schools, if it so chooses..

Expanded gambling will harm Missouri families and local communities. The Missouri Catholic Conference urges voters to reject Proposition A.



HOW TO CONTACT THE MISSOURI CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

By Mail:
PO Box 1022
Jefferson City, MO 65102

By Phone:
(573) 635-7239
(800) 456-1679

By E-Mail:
mocatholic@mocatholic.org
www.mocatholic.org