



Standing for America & Sitting for Politics

March 1, 2026

Vanessa Maurer – Contributor

Michele DeBlasio - Contributor

The State of the Union is always theater. But this year, the split screen told the real story.

On one side: applause for border security, energy independence, parental rights, public safety, and fiscal restraint. On the other: rows of folded arms, tight expressions, and selective silence. The divide wasn't subtle - and *voters noticed*.

Because here's the thing: these weren't abstract policy debates. These were human moments.

When our Olympic athletes were recognized; young men and women who wore the American flag across their chests and brought home gold - that should be universal. Pride in country shouldn't require a whip count.

When the topic turned to protecting girls' sports, preserving fair competition, and honoring the biological reality that makes women's athletics possible, it shouldn't be controversial to stand.

When the issue of medical decisions involving minors came up, including irreversible treatments undertaken without full parental involvement, Americans watching at home weren't thinking "partisan." They were thinking, "Since when do parents take a back seat?"

When families who have lost children to violent crime were acknowledged, standing should not depend on the politics of prosecution. Grief doesn't wear a party label.

When our American military was honored, the young Americans who sign their names knowing it could cost them everything, that is supposed to be sacred ground. They fight for the freedoms that allow the rest of us to argue about policy in the first place. You stand.

And when the simple idea was expressed that American citizens should come first in matters of public policy: jobs, safety, benefits, and opportunity - that is not extremism. That is the definition of national responsibility.

Yet in moment after moment, much of the Democratic caucus chose posture over unity. Sitting became a signal. And while Washington may see that as strategy, voters often see it as something else: a refusal to affirm the obvious.

The conservative base didn't just hear policy proposals that night - it saw contrast. It saw conviction. It saw a willingness to say plainly that borders matter, families matter, fairness matters, sovereignty matters.

You can disagree on implementation. You can debate cost. You can argue priorities. That's healthy.

But there are moments that transcend policy details and moments where standing isn't about endorsing a bill. It's about affirming a value. An American value.

This State of the Union revealed more than legislative divides. It revealed a philosophical one.

One side stood for America.

The other seemed more comfortable sitting for politics.

And in an election year, that image may matter more than any line in the speech.



Warrington Township Board of Supervisors – Attended the Bucks County Association for Township Officials (BCATO) February 28th, 2026

Common Sense Starts at Home

Every year we hear a State of the Union address filled with big promises - affordability, economic growth, public safety, energy independence, and stronger communities.

Those aren't partisan ideas. They're common-sense goals.

But here's the reality: Washington talks. Harrisburg mandates. Local taxpayers pay.

If we truly believe in stronger communities, then we need to start where communities actually live - at the local level. Right here in Warrington Township.

Warrington Township Supervisors attending the BCATO Breakfast to meet with local legislators to discuss very serious issues that will require common-sense solutions.

When national leaders talk about affordability, they mention housing, groceries, and utilities. At the township level, affordability means:

- Responsible budgets
- Stable property taxes
- Smart infrastructure planning
- No unfunded mandates

Every time the state strips municipal authority, it shifts cost and control away from residents and toward bureaucracies that don't know our roads, our schools, or our neighborhoods.

Common sense says the government closest to the people governs best.

The hot issue - Attainable Housing that doesn't take away local control. We all recognize that young families and seniors need attainable housing options. But proposals being pushed in Harrisburg, including elements of the BCATO framework, would override municipal zoning authority in the name of statewide housing policy.

Governor Shapiro has signaled support for measures that would weaken local land-use control and preempt municipal zoning discretion. That's not reform. That's centralization.

Warrington isn't Center City Philadelphia. We don't need a one-size-fits-all housing mandate written in Harrisburg.

Attainable housing should be addressed through local zoning flexibility, thoughtful density planning, infrastructure capacity analysis and public safety and school impact review. Not state-imposed quotas or automatic approvals.

Local officials understand traffic flow on Route 611 better than any state agency ever will.

The Commonwealth is also considering legislation to fast-track data center development.

We support economic growth. We support innovation. We support energy independence.

But data centers require: massive power consumption, water capacity, land use flexibility, emergency service capacity.

If Harrisburg preempts municipal review authority, local taxpayers bear the infrastructure burden.

That's not pro-growth. That's pro-risk. Economic development should happen with local partnership - not over local objection.

Before adding density mandates or industrial-scale power users, common sense says:

1. Are our roads equipped?
2. Are our first responders staffed?
3. Is our electrical grid stable?
4. Can our stormwater systems handle it?

Conservatism at the local level means measured growth, not growth at any cost.

The real strength of this country doesn't come from speeches in Washington.

It comes from townships like Warrington:

- Volunteers who show up
- Public works crews clearing storms
- Police protecting neighborhoods
- Residents paying property taxes expecting accountability

Local government works best when it remains local.

If we want attainable housing, let's design it responsibly here.

If we want economic growth, let's plan it intelligently here.

If we want affordability, let's protect taxpayers here.

Because the State of the Union starts on our streets - not in someone else's legislature.

Common sense. Local control. Fiscal responsibility. That's how we keep Warrington strong.

Reality Check

SAVEing Election Integrity

If you're like me, you've seen, heard, or read news about the SAVE Act — but may not fully understand what it does or whether it could actually become law.

What Is the SAVE Act?

The **SAVE Act**, or the **Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act**, is proposed federal legislation that would require documentary proof of U.S. citizenship in order to **register** to vote in federal elections.

The bill generally includes:

1. Mandatory documentary proof of U.S. citizenship for voter registration
2. Requirements for states to verify citizenship status
3. Removal of non-citizens from voter rolls
4. Criminal penalties for election officials who register applicants without proper proof

The SAVE Act was introduced by Republican lawmakers in response to concerns about non-citizens registering and voting in U.S. elections. Supporters argue the bill would strengthen election integrity and ensure that only U.S. citizens vote in federal elections. Critics argue that federal law already prohibits non-citizen voting and that additional documentation requirements could unintentionally disenfranchise eligible voters.

Federal law has long prohibited non-citizens from voting in federal elections, including under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. However, voter registration procedures are largely

governed by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA), which requires states to accept a standardized federal registration form and does not generally require documentary proof of citizenship.

Legislative History

The SAVE Act was introduced in the United States House of Representatives to amend the NVRA and add stricter verification requirements.

The bill passed the House on April 10, 2025. However, it did not advance in the United States Senate and did not become law.

In February 2026, a revised version — now referred to as the SAVE America Act — again passed the House by a narrow margin (218–213).

Current Status

As of now, the SAVE America Act has not passed the Senate and has not become law. Its future remains uncertain because advancing the bill would likely require overcoming Senate filibuster rules.

Under current Senate rules, most legislation requires **60 votes** (three-fifths of the Senate) to end debate and move to a final vote. Because there are only slightly more than 50 Republican senators, reaching 60 votes would require several Democrats or independents to support the bill — which appears unlikely at this time.

There has been public discussion about whether Senate Majority Leader John Thune might pursue alternative procedural strategies, but no such path has yet secured sufficient support.