



NEW HAMPSHIRE LIBERTY ALLIANCE

GOLD STANDARD

SB 11 YEA OTP
SB 12 YEA OTP
SB 15 YEA OTP
SB 17 YEA OTP
SB 30 NAY OTP



NHLIBERTY.ORG

SENATE SESSION - THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2017

SB 11-FN, prohibiting collective bargaining agreements that require employees to join or contribute to a labor union.

SB 11

Commerce: OTP 3-2

PRO-LIBERTY: This bill prohibits collective bargaining agreements that require employees to join or contribute to a labor union and prohibits coercion and intimidation intended to compel an employee to join, affiliate with, or financially support a labor organization or to refrain from doing so.

YEA OTP

- The federal National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) contains several coercive mechanisms that infringe upon the rights of workers and business owners. Among these are section 9a which mandates exclusive representation by a single union and mandates that the union representative is given opportunity to be present at grievance adjustment between employers and employees even if the employee does not wish that the representative is present. In addition, it forces employers to recognize and bargain collectively with unions following a majority vote of their workforces.
- Right-to-work is the only way currently permitted under federal law to restore some of the freedom of dissenting workers and their employers to withhold support from unions with whom they disagree. While this bill interferes with freedom of contract, it does so in a way intended to remedy current, more egregious limitations of freedom of contract.
- Public sector collective bargaining is often more harmful than private sector collective bargaining because taxpayers are not directly represented in negotiations. It is impossible to bargain collectively with the government, said Franklin D. Roosevelt, who opposed public sector unions. Public sector right-to-work reduces union density in government and reduces government spending and taxes (Ichniowski & Zax 1991).

SB 30, defining woodland buffers and relative to such woodland buffers for the purposes of the shoreland protection act.

SB 30

Energy and Natural Resources: OTP/A 4-0

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill places additional restrictions on private property for the stated purpose of improving shoreland protection.

NAY OTP

- This bill redefines size/shape of segments that are used to score the impact of improvements landowners make to their property for the expressed purpose of protecting shorelines. Property owners already have financial incentives to maintain property and limit damage that may impact the future value of their property. Attempts to micromanage property improvements with a one size fits all solution infringes on property owners rights and is unlikely to significantly contribute to shoreland protection.
- The bill mainly serves to raise the value of existing shoreline property (landscaped under the older, less restrictive scheme) by adding restrictions to new shoreline construction, making it less desirable.
- The bill reduces the time that an applicant has to respond to information requests from 120 days to 60 days at which time the application is denied forcing applicants to refile and potentially incur a fee as high as \$3,750 per 483-B:5-b. The reduction in time does not take into account that landowners are private individuals for whom 60 days may be an insufficient amount of time to obtain quotes, select an expert, shedule an investigation and respond to the state's demand for additional information. Some required information may be weather-dependant or other circumstances could delay the applicant. There is no reason to place any deadline on an applicant, as their delay just affects when their permit would be received.
- The bill increases the time for the state's paid professional full time staff to evaluate applications and make a determination from 20 days to 30 days.

SB 15

**YEA
OTP**

SB 17

**YEA
OTP**

SB 12

**YEA
OTP**

SB 15, relative to the law regarding therapeutic use of cannabis.

Health and Human Services: OTP 4-0

PRO-LIBERTY: This bill allows doctors to recommend cannabis for severe pain that has not responded to previously prescribed medication or surgical measures or for which other treatment options produced serious side effects.

- Numerous studies, including clinical trials, have shown medical cannabis to be a safe and effective treatment for pain.
- Doctors are already permitted to prescribe serious, habit forming drugs for pain management. By comparison, cannabis is extremely mild. It is not reasonable to allow the prescription of hard opioids to patients suffering from pain, but not allow recommendation of cannabis.
- Abuse of prescription opioids is a major contributing factor to the opioid epidemic in NH. Replacement of prescription opioids with cannabis will help prevent addiction and abuse in some patients, as well as potentially reducing the quantity of prescription opioids on the street.

SB 17, relative to treatment for hepatitis C under the law relative to use of cannabis for therapeutic purposes.

Health and Human Services: OTP 4-0

PRO-LIBERTY: This bill removes the requirement that a patient with hepatitis-C be "currently undergoing antiviral treatment" in order to qualify for the therapeutic cannabis program.

- According to a study published by the National Institutes for Health, there is substantial evidence that cannabis use may help address key challenges faced by drug users in hepatitis-C treatment (e.g., nausea, depression). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16957507>.
- The legislature should not be inserting itself in the patient/doctor relationship and pretending to understand the medical challenges faced by patients.

SB 12-FN, repealing the licensing requirement for carrying a concealed pistol or revolver.

Judiciary: OTP 3-2

PRO-LIBERTY: Makes NH pistol/revolver license optional; replaces vague term of "suitable" with "not prohibited by state or federal law"; extends license minimum period from 4 to 5 years.

- New Hampshire voters affirmed our inherent right to self-defense in 1982 with the adoption of Article 2-a. of the state Constitution: "All persons have the right to keep and bear arms in defense of themselves, their families, their property and the state."
- A requirement to have a license to carry a concealed firearm is an infringement on an individual's right to self-defense. This bill restores the right of law-abiding citizens to carry protection discreetly.
- Our neighbors Vermont and Maine, two states that allow concealed carry without a license, rank among the safest places in the country.
- This bill eliminates unnecessary and obscure definitions of "open" versus "concealed" carry, which are difficult to interpret, have led to several lawsuits, and unfairly criminalizes law-abiding citizens.
- This bill replaces the subjectivity of the phrase "suitable person", which has in the past been used by biased officials for ethnic, racial, and gender discrimination, with the objective and easily understood phrase of not prohibited by state or federal law.
- By making the license optional, this bill eliminates a vulnerability period that has prevented persons who may feel threatened (e.g. a woman with a stalker) from carrying discreet protection when needed. It also facilitates license reciprocity requirements between NH and other states.
- Other states that have enacted constitutional carry have seen either no statistically significant change in violent crime, or a slight downward trend.
- There is no evidence that the current NH pistol license provides a necessary benefit to public safety.