



NEW HAMPSHIRE LIBERTY ALLIANCE

GOLD STANDARD



NHLIBERTY.ORG

HOUSE SESSION - THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2026

HB 1083 YEA ITL	HB 1557 YEA ITL	HB 1786 Oppose	HB 1803 YEA ITL	HB 1831 YEA ITL
HB 1130 YEA OTP/A	HB 1627 YEA ITL	HB 1791 YEA ITL	HB 1811 YEA OTP/A	HB 1835 YEA ITL
HB 1492 YEA OTP/A	HB 1732 YEA ITL	HB 1792 YEA OTP	HB 1814 YEA ITL	HB 1838 YEA ITL
HB 1499 YEA OTP/A	HB 1758 YEA OTP	HB 1799 YEA ITL	HB 1826 YEA ITL	

HB 1557, modifying the state average expenditure per pupil relative to students in special education.

Education Funding: ITL 10-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill lowers the threshold that triggers state payments to local school districts for special education students from 3.5 times the average student cost to 1.5 times the average student cost.

- This bill proposes to dramatically increase education funding without identifying a funding source. It is an unfunded mandate.
- New Hampshire had the *fourth-highest* growth rate in the nation in per-pupil public education spending from 2002-2023: it grew by 60.5% over that period. "Only the big, blue states of New York (75.8%), California (78.6%) and Illinois (62.5%) saw their public education expenditures rise at a faster rate":
– jbartlett.org/2025/11/nh-public-schools-post-nations-largest-enrollment-decline-and-4th-highest-per-pupil-spending-growth

HB 1557

YEA ITL

HB 1791, directing the department of education to establish a grant program at the post-secondary educational level for individuals with developmental disabilities, and making an appropriation therefor.

Education Funding: ITL 10-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill establishes a grant program for college-level programming for people with developmental disabilities.

- This program would be more appropriately-funded through the state's biennial budget process.
- The comments in the fiscal note state that a program of this type could not be accomplished with the money allocated, and would require either additional ongoing state funds, or funding from the sponsoring institution.

HB 1791

YEA ITL

HB 1799, relative to required state funding for providing an opportunity for an adequate education.

HB 1799

Education Funding: ITL 10-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This is an omnibus bill that does many things. It increases the cost of an adequate education. It moves control of locally-collected education funds to the state. It establishes a study commission to explore new taxes to fund education.

- Education is already well-funded. The cost of an adequate education does not need refining.
- New Hampshire had the *fourth-highest* growth rate in the nation in per-pupil public education spending from 2002-2023: it grew by 60.5% over that period. "Only the big, blue states of New York (75.8%), California (78.6%) and Illinois (62.5%) saw their public education expenditures rise at a faster rate":
– jbartlett.org/2025/11/nh-public-schools-post-nations-largest-enrollment-decline-and-4th-highest-per-pupil-spending-growth
- Moving control of SWEPT funds from local government to the state seeks to centralize control of education in the state government.
- The only way to pay for this increase in spending is through new taxes. New Hampshire voters want to see their taxes go down, not up.

YEA ITL

HB 1803, rendering a recipient of an education tax credit scholarship ineligible to receive education freedom account funds in the same program year.

HB 1803

Education Funding: ITL 10-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill makes Education Freedom Account recipients ineligible to also receive an education tax credit.

- This bill seeks to punish those parents and students who make use of their school choice options and leave a public school.

YEA ITL

HB 1826, relative to the cost of an opportunity for an adequate education.

HB 1826

Education Funding: ITL 11-7

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill increases the cost of an adequate education from \$4,100 to \$4,438 per student, with additional cost increases for low-income students and special education students.

- Education is already well-funded. The cost of an adequate education does not need refining.
- New Hampshire had the *fourth-highest* growth rate in the nation in per-pupil public education spending from 2002-2023: it grew by 60.5% over that period. "Only the big, blue states of New York (75.8%), California (78.6%) and Illinois (62.5%) saw their public education expenditures rise at a faster rate":
– jbartlett.org/2025/11/nh-public-schools-post-nations-largest-enrollment-decline-and-4th-highest-per-pupil-spending-growth

YEA ITL

HB 1831, repealing the education trust fund targeted aid cap.

HB 1831

Education Funding: ITL 10-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill removes the current targeted aid cap of \$3,750 per pupil and allows for unlimited targeted aid.

- This bill seeks to remove a specific provision of the 2026-2027 budget.
- Targeted aid unfairly gives more dollars to large districts with more low-income students (in practice only Manchester).

YEA ITL

HB 1835, relative to the formula for distribution of aid to school districts.

HB 1835

Education Funding: ITL 10-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill increases the cost to the state for special education to whatever a school district decides to spend and bill to the state.

- Districts need to align their expenses with the amount of money available, rather than demand unlimited money and expect the state to pay it. That is what budgets are for.

YEA ITL

<p>HB 1792, prohibiting school districts and personnel from the instruction of critical race theory and LGBTQ+ ideologies in schools as well as establishing a private right of action for violations.</p> <p>Education Policy and Administration: OTP 9-8</p> <p>PRO-LIBERTY: This bill would prevent indoctrination of public school students with ideas deemed too biased. Instead it requires neutral, fact-based teaching of all subjects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Hampshire public schools have seen their curriculum move to the political left. • This bill is a reset, which requires a neutral telling of world events and ideas, acknowledging ideas from the political left without claiming they are better than any other world views. 	<p>HB 1792</p> <p>YEA OTP</p>
<p>HB 1083, requiring the disclosure of the source of certain political donations in state elections.</p> <p>Election Law: ITL 9-8</p> <p>ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill requires that independent expenditures of more than \$50,000 in most cases require reporting the "original source" of the funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution disclosure requirements are already adequate in New Hampshire. This bill seeks to add another layer of complexity to campaign finance rules. 	<p>HB 1083</p> <p>YEA ITL</p>
<p>HB 1627, creating a single primary ballot.</p> <p>Election Law: ITL 14-2</p> <p>ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill creates a primary system where the top two candidates for each seat regardless of political party registration will make it to the general election.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In practice, policies like these in other states have protected the two main political parties to the detriment of 3rd party and independent candidates. • In places where a single party dominates, no other party's candidate will make it to the general election ballot at all. • Proponents argue that the result of this system will be more moderate candidates. Historically, it has not had that effect. 	<p>HB 1627</p> <p>YEA ITL</p>
<p>HB 1838, establishing a voter-owned elections fund and commission and raising vehicle registration fees.</p> <p>Election Law: ITL 10-7</p> <p>ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill raises the fees for car registration to create public financing for elections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a tax increase, to which we are opposed. • This bill proposes to spend these new taxes to fund political campaigns. Campaigns should be funded by private money, not with taxpayer dollars. • This bill wants to take money without a person's consent, and then use it to send them political messaging they may not agree with. In the current system, at least the political ads are purchased with someone else's money. 	<p>HB 1838</p> <p>YEA ITL</p>
<p>HB 1811, repealing statutory immunization requirements for children.</p> <p>Health, Human Services and Elderly Affairs: OTP/A 10-8</p> <p>PRO-LIBERTY: This bill makes vaccination for students attending schools or childcare centers optional instead of a mandate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents should be in charge of the medical decisions for their children, not the State of New Hampshire. • By denying families access to basic public services like schools and childcare, the State is using its position of power to force compliance with vaccination rules. • This change forces the state to use education, not intimidation, to promote vaccination. 	<p>HB 1811</p> <p>YEA OTP/A</p>

<p>HB 1499, relative to additional grounds for eviction under the landlord and tenant statute.</p> <p>Housing: OTP/A 10-8</p> <p>PRO-LIBERTY: This bill allows tenants to be evicted because they enter into a rental agreement using false identification or fail to disclose that they are an illegal alien, guilty of a serious crime, or a registered sex offender.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landlords should be able to terminate a tenancy without cause according to the terms of their rental agreement, so long as they are not discriminating against a protected class (age, race, gender, etc). This bill protects tenants who disclose their convictions in advance of signing a lease. 	<p>HB 1499</p> <p>YEA OTP/A</p>
<p>HB 1732, relative to housing accessibility and voucher allocation in new multi-unit developments.</p> <p>Housing: ITL 10-8</p> <p>ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill requires that virtually all new multifamily housing set aside 5 percent of their units for low-income housing. It also requires increased accessibility requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposal is the government telling a person what they are allowed to do with their private property. The cost to construct low-income units is not any cheaper than that of constructing market-rate units. In order to make up for the losses incurred on the low-income units, the developer must charge more for the market-rate units. This has the effect of exacerbating the housing crisis. Government should be getting out of the way of developers, not instituting more development requirements. 	<p>HB 1732</p> <p>YEA ITL</p>
<p>HB 1786, relative to creating a state assessment on non-homestead luxury second homes to fund statewide housing development programs and address housing shortages and making appropriations therefor.</p> <p>Housing: Without Recommendation</p> <p>ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill creates a new property tax on second homes of an additional 5% on their value over \$1 million. It uses the funds for various tax credits for low-income housing, tuition assistance, trade programs, and other uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This bill makes the false assumption that lack of funding is the reason houses aren't being built. Houses aren't being built because there are too many government rules that slow down or stop the process. Rather than institute a massive 5% taxes on massive homes to create trade labor programs, lawmakers should focus on allowing more projects to be approved and let developers find their own financing, which they are more than able and willing to do. 	<p>HB 1786</p> <p>Oppose</p>
<p>HB 1814, establishing a 10-year strategic housing and infrastructure plan.</p> <p>Housing: ITL 10-8</p> <p>ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill proposes a California-style centralized housing solution, where each town has a quota of homes to build.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These types of regional housing-needs assessments (aka "housing quotas") are in place in California. This is a top-down approach where the government forces growth where they want it. Property owners, not the government, should be making decisions about what type of use can be built on their property. Government should get out of the way. 	<p>HB 1814</p> <p>YEA ITL</p>
<p>HB 1130, relative to judicial performance evaluations.</p> <p>Judiciary: OTP/A 9-7</p> <p>PRO-LIBERTY: This bill expands judicial performance reviews to apply broadly to all judges and judge-like public servants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This bill adds more transparency for the judiciary. 	<p>HB 1130</p> <p>YEA OTP/A</p>

HB 1492, (new title) relative to the regulation and appeal of motor vehicle towing from public highways and prohibiting the division of motor vehicles from suspending a license on the basis of debt owed to a private entity related to the towing or storing of a motor vehicle.

HB 1492

Transportation: OTP/A 10-6

PRO-LIBERTY: This bill requires invoices for towing services prominently display the process to appeal the invoice. It also prevents a person's license from being suspended as a result of not paying the fees.

- It is improper to take someone's license away for inability to pay a debt.
- A driver's license should be taken away for excessive moving violations, as they prove one is not a safe driver. Failure to pay a debt is not a moving violation.

**YEA
OTP/A**

HB 1758, relative to school bus drivers' certificates.

HB 1758

Transportation: OTP 8-7

PRO-LIBERTY: This bill allows bus drivers who are certified in Vermont to be considered certified in New Hampshire.

- This bill is a great example of removing an unnecessary regulatory burden. Unless the requirements to drive a bus vary significantly from New Hampshire to Vermont, a single license should be adequate for both states.
- Laws like this encourage bus drivers based in Vermont to move to New Hampshire.

**YEA
OTP**