

2017 Annual Convention Business Session

| MINUTES

3/18/2017 2:00 PM | Holiday Inn Concord, NH

Meeting called by Darryl W. Perry - Chair [Name] [Dees]
Type of meeting Annual Convention – Business [Purpose]
Session
Note taker Jillette Jarvis [Name]

AGENDA TOPICS

Call to Order & Welcome

Darryl W. Perry

Welcome to Event, Silent Auction Reminder and time of closing 5:30 and announcement of winners will be 5:45pm as well as a request of Delegate Count from Membership Director

Motion to Amend Agenda due to time needed for New Business (amendment requests) Rodger Paxton to move elections to beginning of agenda

Discussion – some people who may want to run for office are not yet here, would like to extend that time to allow for them to arrive Daniel Fishman

Amendment to Motion: Amend Agenda to move Elections to after reports Rodger Paxton

Motion Seconded and Passed

Agenda Amended

Report from Regional Director

Patrick McKnight

Please see YouTube video for this wonderful speech

<http://freekeene.com/2017/03/21/new-jersey-libertarian-cant-explain-why-he-still-lives-there/>

“Reasons I Switched to the Libertarian Party”

Caleb Dyer

Please see YouTube video for this wonderful speech

<http://freekeene.com/2017/03/22/state-representative-caleb-dyer-reasons-i-switched-to-the-libertarian-party/>

Report From Chair

Darryl W. Perry

Chair Report over last 6 months (Since September Business Convention)

Great strides – largest convention since 2008

Have a Libertarian State Rep serving most of his term as a Libertarian for first time in 20 years

Brian McQuade has done a great job getting new members and renewals and gotten our membership database up to date

Jilletta Jarvis and Darryl Perry met with some Russian Delegates thanks to the World Affairs Council at Southern NH University – Russians interested in plight of minor parties in the US

Already recruited Candidate for Governor, 3 Candidates for US Congress, 3 Candidates for State Senate, and 14 or 15 Candidates for State Representatives and most likely several more to come as well as county level candidates as well

LPNH was represented at the Liberty Forum this year and Darryl was invited to speak at that event as Chair of Party. We signed up 4 new members, & sold 5 convention tickets

For the first time in a while, the Executive Committee is holding regular meeting and posting the minutes of those meetings on the newly designed LPNH website (by Brian Chabot)

We have pushed forward putting party principle before individual interests and as a team we accomplished this in just 6 months

Plans for the future include:

- Setting up tables at county faires including Concord Market Days
- More representation at state & local events

Hopefully have a bigger and better convention next year with workshops and more activities

Treasury Report

Tom Kershaw

We are in a stronger financial position now then we have been in quite some time.

Expanding into the use of PayPal and Bitcoin have helped this.

We have merchandise, lapel pins, bumper stickers, and t-shirts

Bank Balance stands at \$6,879

Some expenses will be coming out of that due to the convention

With Membership Drives, Renewals and such we are holding strong

More updates with the post mortem on expenses from the convention will be provided at the next Executive Council Meeting (Secretary's addition to notes: next EC meeting will be held in April and minutes will be posted to LPNH website)

QUESTION: Have you seen any surge in donations or interest since the 2016 campaign? Heather Mullins

ANSWER: Yes, definitely. Other than just memberships, we have seen more come in with notes in PayPal as straight up donations

LP National report shows 186 bylaw sustaining members of LP National that are from NH. Trying to get more of those people to be members with LPNH as well

Currently have 101 LPNH Members

At last convention in September we had 62 LPNH Member

That’s a gain of 39 members, or a 63% increase

Want to recognize & thanks our Lifetime Members:

- Darryl W. Perry
- Victoria Saucier
- John Babiarz
- Rosalie Babiarz

If re-elected, goals for going forward:

- Getting members from some of our northern counties
- Current Membership by County:
 - Belknap = 1
 - Carroll = 3
 - Cheshire = 6
 - Coos = 0 Plans to change this!
 - Grafton = 4
 - Hillsborough = 38
 - Merrimack = 9
 - Rockingham = 17
 - Stratford = 14
 - Sullivan = 1
 - Out of State = 8
- Credentialing:
 - Delegates = 34 in attendance
 - 30 votes for a 7/8 majority
 - 28 votes for a 3/4 majority
 - 23 for a 2/3 majority

Officer Elections

Darryl W. Perry

Position of Chair – nomination of Darryl W. Perry

Jilletta Jarvis

Seconded & Accepted

Position of Chair – nomination of Max Abramson

Moe Egan

Seconded & Accepted

Motion to allow Candidate Statements at 2 minutes each

Max gave Candidate speech in support of his nomination and focusing energy campaign Max Abramson focus strategies

Darryl gave brief speech to request that the whole team be re-elected to work as a team Darryl W. Perry

Rodger Paxton Presided over Chair Election

LP National Delegate Patrick McKnight handled ballot counting with assistance of Heather Mullins

QUESTION: In reading the Bylaws, it is written that there should actually be 2 Vice-Chairs Dan Fisher

ANSWER: That is correct. There has actually not been 2 Vice-Chairs in quite some time. We could motion to elect a 2nd but we do have a proposal to vote on later to change the Bylaws to show only one and if that passes then the person would go away. It's currently a conflict between the Constitution (which states just 1 Vice-Chair) and the Bylaws which were supposed to have been updated previously but we do not have a version of those updated bylaws so we do have a motion to fix this conflict up for vote tonight. Previously there were 2 based on Congressional Districts but that hasn't been in effect for at least 10 years.

VOTE RESULTS:

22 votes for Darryl W. Perry

13 votes for Max Abramson

Winner of Chair Election is Darryl W. Perry

POINT OF INFORMATION: 35 votes in last election – only should have been 34. Please Rodger Paxton only vote if you have a yellow name tag. 1 vote less in either tally would not change results for this election but please be careful to only vote if you are a delegate

Position of Vice-Chair – nomination of Rodger Paxton Caleb Dyer

Seconded & Accepted

No additional nominations

Voice Vote 1 opposed, passed on voice vote, winner of Vice-Chair is Rodger Paxton

Winner of Vice C

Position of Secretary – nomination of Jillette Jarvis Brian McQuade

Seconded & Accepted

Voice Vote 0 opposed, passed on voice vote, winner of Secretary is Jillette Jarvis

Position of Treasurer – nomination of Tom Kershaw Rodger Paxton

Seconded & Accepted

Voice Vote 0 opposed, passed on voice vote, winner of Treasurer is Tom Kershaw

Position of Chair of Membership Committee – nomination of Brian McQuade Rodger Paxton

Seconded & Accepted

Voice Vote 0 opposed, passed on voice vote, winner of Chair of Membership Committee is Brian McQuade

Position of Chair of Judicial Committee – nomination of John Babiarz Brian McQuade

Officer Elections

Darryl W. Perry

POINT OF INFORMATION: What is the job description of the Judiciary Committee? Caleb Dyer

ANSWER: If there are disputes, if someone feels there has been a violation of the Constitution or Bylaws or Platform they could appeal that decision to the Judicial Committee, or if there is a dispute about something that happens at this convention it could be appealed to the Judicial Committee for review.

Nomination of Chair of Judicial Committee Seconded & Accepted

Voice Vote 0 opposed, passed on voice vote, winner of Chair of Judicial Committee is John Babiarz

Committee Member Elections

Darryl W. Perry

Position of Membership Committee Members – Nominations of: Brian McQuade

- Brian Shields - accepted
- Robert Lombardo – not in room, accepted later during the event
- Linda Keane – ~~Event Coordinator~~ – Accepted

POINT OF CLARIFICATION: Event Coordinator does this fall under the purview of the Membership Coordinator Caleb Dyer

ANSWER – Event Coordinator is not a position

QUESTION: Is there a limit on the number of committee members and should we be voting on them individually? Sean Michalski

ANSWER: No Limit specified, regarding how to elect, that is up to the body.

MOTION: motion to nominate as a slate Rodger Paxton

Motion Seconded

Voice Vote:

Motion to elect Sean Michalski to membership committee Neal Connor

Seconded & Accepted

Voice Vote: on all 4 committee Members. 0 opposed

Winners of Membership Committee Members: Brian Shields, Robert Lombardo, Linda Keane, & Sean Michalski

Position of Judicial Committee Members – nomination of Caleb Dyer Jessica Paxton

Seconded & Accepted

Position of Judicial Committee Members – nomination of: Rich Tomasso

- Rosalie Babiarz = Seconded & Accepted
- Max Abramson = Seconded & Not Accepted

POINT OF HISTORICAL INFORMATION: The Judicial Committee serves as our appellate body that serves for our body or executive body when they are in conflict of Rich Tomasso

our principles and Constitution & Bylaws and has long been held by members of long standing that have shown their commitment to the party and their principles. If you're thinking of people to nominate, keep that in mind. For the record - this body has met maybe 2 or 3 times in the last 40 years.

Position of Judicial Committee Members – nomination of Chip Spangler

Caleb Dyer

Seconded & Accepted

Position of Judicial Committee Members – nomination of Brian Chabot

Sean Michalski

Seconded & Accepted

Ballot Vote: select 2 names

LP National Regional Director Counting Ballots with help from Heather Mullins

POINT OF INFORMATION: When the person picking up the ballots could verify that they are picking up ballots from delegates so they are not picking them up from people who can't vote.

Dan Fishman

POINT OF ORDER: Is there actually a limit to the number of people on the Judicial Committee?

Sean Michalski

ANSWER: There is not a limit, again the figure is based on historically used. It is not in the Constitution or Bylaws

QUESTION: So could we by simple majority vote have more people serve on the Judicial Committee?

ANSWER; Yes, the votes are currently being cast and counted.

QUESTION: So there is no way we could have more?

ANSWER: I would entertain such a motion if it were to be made, it would have to have a 2/3 majority vote

MOTION: I would move that we accept the full slate of 4 nominees in addition to the chair to serve on the committee

Seconded

Speaking against motion: We already voted and while I sympathize with the other members, but we have ~45 years history with a 3 member committee and we have already voted and changing the rules in the middle of a vote sets a bad precedence even if we like all the people it goes against parliamentary procedures

Rich Tomasso

The Status Quo as it is based on what's written in the Constitution with no hard limit means that the people being nominated will win, they cannot lose. Therefore, people don't have to vote for it, they vote against it and the amendment can be withdrawn and we will get a judicial committee of 5 members

Dan Fishman

Since we were voting for 2 out of 4 there is a possibility that there will be members that do not get a majority of support to win. I believe the Chair of the Committee can populate the committee so if there comes a time when the committee needs to meet and the chair of the committee feels he needs additional people, he can ask additional members to sit on the committee. This convention does not have to populate the committee at all. The chair of the committee can submit nominations to the committee to

Rich Tomasso

the board. For a committee that 99% will never meet I believe we're fine as we are and in the future, we can update the party documents.

It just appears that the convention may elect standing committees and members I thought that was fully consistent with the group as a whole electing the full committee and leaving less discretion to the chair.

Sean Michalski

ANSWER: The question before us now is how many members should be on the committee not whether or not we should elect the members. The ruling of the chair had been that since historically we have had 3 members on that committee, that is what we would adopt. There was a motion to have a 5 member committee and spoken to and spoken against.

QUESTION CALLED

2/3 to pass Hand Vote 23 hands in favor, vote passed

4 members Judiciary Committee Members (other than chair):

- Caleb Dyer
- Rosalie Babiarz
- Chip Spangler
- Sean Michalski

POINT OF ORDER: You did not actually vote on the members, just to increase the number of member.

Victoria Saucier

ANSWER: That is correct...Voice Vote on the slate of the members of the

CHALLENGE TO THE CHAIR: You cannot change the rules of a vote in the middle of a vote. What we just did was a violation of Roberts Rules of Order.

Rich Tomasso

ANSWER: Majority vote to support to the challenge

VOTE TO SUSTAIN THE RULE OF THE CHAIR: Hand Vote 19 to sustain, 9 (including chair) to overturn

Voice Vote to elect the 4 aforementioned individuals to the Judiciary Committee.

1 opposed, vote passes

4 members Judiciary Committee Members (other than chair):

- Caleb Dyer
- Rosalie Babiarz
- Chip Spangler
- Sean Michalski

MOTION for 5 minute recess – seconded, no opposition. Motion passed

DELEGATE COUNT CHANGE

35 Delegates now in attendance

3/4 majority requires 27 votes

2/3 majority requires 24 votes

Simple majority requires 17 votes

Constitution & Bylaw Amendments

Darryl W. Perry

Proposal 1 – Constitutional Amendment to correct spelling of By-laws to Bylaws throughout Constitution and in Bylaws

Move to Accept Proposal

Seconded

Voice Vote – 1 Opposed. Motion Passed

POINT OF CLARIFICATION: A packet was just handed out, is this in addition to what is in the program?

ANSWER: Anything that was just handed out would be an addition to be considered after the motions in the program

Proposal 2 – Constitutional Amendment to Add Article IX Section 3 d: Consider modification to the party platform

MOTION – I'd like to divide and vote on each proposals separately

Seconded. No opposition. Passed

MOTION to vote, seconded, no opposition

Voice Vote – 1 Opposed. Motion Passed

Proposal 2 – Constitutional Amendment to Add Article VI: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND PLATFORM (renumber accordingly)

1. The Statement of Principles affirms that philosophy upon which the Libertarian Party is founded, by which it shall be sustained, and through which liberty shall prevail. The enduring importance of the Statement of Principles requires that it may be amended only by a vote of 7/8 of all registered delegates at a Regular Convention.

2. The Party Platform shall include, but not be limited to, the Statement of Principles and the implementation of those principles in the form of planks.

3. The current Platform shall serve as the basis of all future platforms. The existing Platform may be amended only at Regular Conventions. Additional planks, or additions to planks, must be approved by 2/3 vote. A platform plank may be deleted by majority vote.

MOTION TO VOTE & Seconded, No Opposition

Voice Vote – 0 Opposed. Motion Passed

Proposal 2 – Constitutional Amendment to Add ARTICLE XIII Section 2. Article VI, Section 1, shall not be amended by a vote of less than 7/8 of all registered delegates at a Regular Convention.

MOTION to vote, seconded, no opposition

Voice Vote – 0 Opposed. Motion Passed

Proposal 3 – Bylaw Amendment Change Bylaw 1 Section 3 to read as follows:

Bylaw 1 Section 3 - The Vice-Chair shall act as an assistant to the Chair, performing such duties as the Chair shall prescribe, and holding such executive powers as the Chair shall delegate, and shall perform the duties of the Chair as the Executive Committee may direct should the Chair be unable, for any reason, to perform those duties.

POINT OF INFORMATION: Proposed Amendment has different wording than final wording

ANSWER This was a typo, Secretary fixing so that they read the same (written correctly in notes)

POINT OF INFORMATION: Assuming that the section on Vice-Chair being elected by Chip Spangler ballot is being stricken is for...

ANSWER: The election of Vice Chair will be the same as is written for all other elections, it was written that way in reference to voting by district

Proposal 3 – Constitutional Amendment to change Article 4 Section 7 to read as follows:

ARTICLE 4 Section 7 - The Vice-Chair shall act as an assistant to the Chair, performing such duties as the Chair shall prescribe, and holding such executive powers as the Chair shall delegate, and shall perform the duties of the Chair as the Executive Committee may direct should the Chair be unable, for any reason, to perform those duties.

MOTION to vote for all of Proposal 3, seconded, no opposition

Voice Vote – 1 Opposed. Motion Passed

Proposal 4 – Bylaw Amendment to change Bylaw III to read as follows:

Bylaw III – CONVENTIONS

Section 1 - The Chairs of the convention committees specified in Article VIII Section 2 of the Constitution shall be the presiding officer of his/her respective Committee.

Section 2 - A majority of the committee is necessary for a "do-pass" recommendation, and in the case of the Platform Committee, a majority must approve each specific plank.

Section 3 - The committees shall report their recommendations to the floor of the convention.

Section 4 - A member must be present in Committee to vote.

Section 5 - More than one-half (1/2) of the membership of each Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Proposal 4 – Constitutional Amendment to change Article VIII Section 2 to read as follows:

ARTICLE VIII Section 2. - For each Regular Convention, the Executive Committee shall appoint Chairs for the:

a) Platform Committee,

b) Constitution, Bylaws and Rules Committee,

c) Credentials Committee, and

d) such other committees as the Chair and Executive Committee may, deem appropriate.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION: Changes to section 3 on removing minority reports could you clarify why you removed that Rich Tomasso

ANSWER: Darryl made this change and answered. I was trying to stream line the wording and I could not find any wording that this would be in accordance with.

QUESTION: So the intent is not to remove minority reports, you're just not saying one way or another.

ANSWER: Correct

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Perhaps put a 2 week or 1 month deadline so that the Platform Committee doesn't get bogged down with suggestions prior to the convention. Dan Fisher

Such as 2 weeks prior to the convention or it won't be considered

Friendly amendment not seconded

POINT OF INFORMATION: The rules in the Bylaws say that the committee makes their report before the convention. So has the Executive Committee set any rules for when reports are due? Rich Tomasso

ANSWER: We did set a rule that we needed the report a minimum of 2 weeks prior so that we could get it in the program, unfortunately the program went to the printer before we got the proposals. I would like to in the future have a 30 day prior to the convention which would mean we would need to start planning the convention a lot sooner than 8 weeks prior to the convention.

QUESTION: So is the Chair saying that the Executive Committee will set deadlines for the committee reports?

ANSWER: Yes

MOTION to vote for all of Proposal 4, seconded, no opposition

Voice Vote – 0 Opposed. Motion Passed

Proposal 5 – Constitutional Amendment to change Article VII Section 1 b to read as follows:

ARTICLE VII Section 1 b. - The Chair of the Membership Committee and Judicial Committee

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Having the Chair of the Judicial Committee sitting in on the Committee that it may have to rule for or against is a conflict of interest, I would suggest removing "and Judicial Committee" from this section Rodger Paxton

Seconded. Friendly Amendment accepted.

NEW AMENDMENT

ARTICLE VII Section 1 b. - The Chair of the Membership Committee

Proposal 5 – STRIKE from Bylaws Amendment to remove Bylaw VII Standing Committees Sections 1 & 2

Due to Friendly Amendment, this would stay

POINT OF ORDER: Is this published you have to have a vote on as it stands then you'd have to have a vote on as it's amended so that one or the other is your two choices so you'd do the vote for "As Written" or you vote for "As suggested" that's your parliamentary option. George Carpenter

So we would need to reject the proposal as written to hear the amendment

All in favor of passing proposal as written? None in favor – proposal not passed

Motion to re-prop

MOTION; to re-propose Proposal 5 with just removing the words “and Judicial Committee”

Rodger Paxton

Seconded

POINT OF CLARIFICATION: Is that all of proposal 5?

ANSWER just Article VII Section 1 b

Voice Vote – 0 Opposed. Motion Passed

Proposal 6 – Constitutional Amendment to Add the following Article:

ARTICLE X: PRIMARY ELECTIONS – In the event the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire is entitled to a primary election, no voter who is not registered as Libertarian shall be allowed to vote in the Libertarian Party primary.

This would prevent undeclared voters from voting in our primary

QUESTION: In the state of NH can you not change your registration the day of the primary and then change it back?

Brian Chabot

ANSWER: Currently you can and a party can opt out allowing undeclared voters from voting in their primary by doing such. Meaning that a voter wishing to register as Libertarian, if this passes, would have to do so 90 days prior to the primary

QUESTION: So that would be different from the way the Democrats and Republicans currently do it.

ANSWER: Correct the Republicans and Democrats have currently not opted out of the semi-open primary that currently exist

Would it be in our best interest to close our primary to undeclared voters? I see our goal as being to increase membership in the party, I don't know if I would support this at this time. I think it is probably best if we are to have our primary remain open as the major parties do out of reference to the primary that we have in NH but also because we are desiring to grow -this is one of the best ways to grow the party. Just wondering if the Chair could speak to the motivation to opting out?

Caleb Dyer

ANSWER: The motivation came from hearing discussion from people that do not have our best interests in mind who have said they will get a Libertarian Ballot and then try to have Chris Sununu as our Gubernatorial Nominee and I don't believe that the Libertarian Party should be nominating Republicans and Democrats, we should be nominating Libertarians.

SPEAKING AGAINST: for 2 reasons: 1 is that obviously, we need to grow the party in terms of size and what we've found with other minor parties everywhere else in the country that are really successful, people find out about them – sometimes for the first time – when they walk in, in September. If you exclude them, they see that ballot there and it's not an option and they have a tendency to walk away. The other issue is having open primaries that are open to undeclareds and moderates, what-have-you, as long as they're not activists, the other advantage is it brings more people, more candidates, into the primary. Those of us who believe in the Big Tent Strategy, and I don't mean a difference in policy. When I first joined the Libertarian Party of Washington 15 or 16 years ago, as a dues paying member one of the first things that I heard was that the reason the Libertarian Party of Washington was one of the largest and most successful

Max Abramson

3rd parties in the country is because they bring people in first and once they are in the Libertarian Party then they become more Libertarian on the issues. It has never made sense to me that we should be a small tent party where you have to learn everything about Libertarian Policy and ideas from the outside from the outside from the standpoint of being an Independent or Republican or Democrat. That seems counterproductive to me. I've always believed that we should be a Big Tent Party and bring people in first and then they learn the ideas and the single best way to do that is to have an open primary that attracts more candidates, that attracts better candidates and it also allows us, I think, to grow much more quickly.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: There is probably no one in this room that is more Big Tent than me when it comes to growing the Libertarian Party. Jess and I grew the Libertarian Party of Arkansas doing that exact same thing. The issue that I have with this, with not changing this, is that you will have non-libertarians nominating non-libertarians for office. Then how are people going to learn the principles and the ideals of the libertarian party if you have non-libertarians representing the party at the ballot. That's a big concern for me. Now yes, the party absolutely should be Big Tent. Invite the whore to church, but don't have her preach at the pulpit next Sunday.

Rodger Paxton

SPEAKING AGAINST: The predominant voter in this state is an Undeclared or unaffiliated Voter. If we're going to wall them off, then we're going to be working against one of our greatest proponents which is the NH Independent Voters. Unfortunately Tiani Coleman in is NY for their convention or she could speak on this, but they've been consistently supportive of having open balloting Libertarian access and for us to slam the door on their face, and voters like them, is going to be counterproductive. I'm with Max. We need to go and bring people to us and give them the opportunity to do so. If we're concerned that someone can upstage our libertarian candidates, then we have to elect better people within this organization to represent us at the ballot. We can't be sitting here walling it off saying we're going to put an unsavory candidate up for the average voter but we're going to insist that that's the only option that they have. We, as an organization, have to put forth the best possible people and then sell that person to the electorate.

George Carpenter

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: We're a small party right now. We are very vulnerable if there is an activist movement to affect our primary. I would suggest that we protect ourselves at this time and when we grow consider opening up the primary at a future date.

Brian Shields

SPEAKING AGAINST: I've given this a lot of thought. I remember back in 2000 where the party almost had their Gubernatorial Candidate hijacked. We had Gordon Humphrey actually walk in and that's why we had a 30 day rule, actually it was 6 months or a year prior to for a candidate to run for that high office. The state has a mechanism right now that even if we go through the primary process and at that is in June at the declaration of Candidacy. As a Republican, they cannot register to be on that primary ballot. They have to be a Libertarian. So that's our first check point in June at the Declaration of Candidacy. Somebody fearing Sununu running on our ballot, not gonna happen because he would have to change his registration to Libertarian in order to be on our primary ballot. Now does that prevent them from doing a write-in? No it does not. But if our candidate can't override them then our candidate in our party has not done enough good ground work because for them to override on a write-in ballot would be quote "putting their candidate in jeopardy" on a write-in on their side from

John Babiarz

Democrats doing it. So from a tactical standpoint, I think there's enough of a protection mechanism. I think I would personally view that we should not even be having a primary until we get near 10% and have a good solid base, but being that the law is what it is at this point, we're going to have to go working within the confines and that is why I'm against this amendment. I don't want to go tying our party up.

QUESTION: This amendment does a raise a bunch of good questions that people have already brought up. My question is: Is there some way that we can prevent non-libertarians from being written in? Is there any way for instance that we can say write-ins must be a current member of the Libertarian Party? Brian Chabot

ANSWER: Currently there is not. Currently there is no law that allows us to reject a primary winner that wins via write-in. There is a proposal that did pass the Senate, SB114, that would specify that a candidate would only be the nominee of one political party so if that passes that would give us some protection for making sure that someone is not on the ballot twice but it still would not give us full protection to reject a write-in candidate.

SPEAKING AGAINST: I'm against this proposal for the simple fact that there are so many undeclared people that do not even know that you can register as Libertarian now. When I went to go vote in my own town elections, I'm registered as a Libertarian obviously, but they didn't even tell people that that was an option at the voting booth. So I think we should leave it open for undeclared people because that's how they will learn about us because unless people are looking at the libertarian website and see that they can register, they're not going to know. Most voters who are undeclared aren't really that politically savvy really. So that would give them an option to pick a libertarian ballot and vote in the primary and possibly add to our base and that would be very important. Especially now that we're still so small. Carmel Fogarty

Hand Vote:

9 In Favor

"Overwhelming" Against

Proposal 6 rejected.

The platform was not looked at as an amendment to various sections of the platform, but a complete re-write of the existing platform

POINT OF INFORMATION: Colorado did a similar re-write of their platform last year and the motion that was made before they began the review of the re-write was a motion to strike the entire platform except for the preamble and statement of principle so that might be the motion that you would like to make. Darryl Perry

Motion to strike the existing platform except the preamble & statement of Principles Rodger Paxton
Seconded

Voice Vote: 0 Opposed, motion passes.

New Platform Submitted for approval. Votes will be plank by plank

PLATFORM OF THE LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

(As proposed by the Platform Committee, March 2017)

PREAMBLE

As Libertarians, we seek a world of liberty; a world in which all individuals are sovereign over their own lives and no one is forced to sacrifice his or her values for the benefit of others. We believe that respect for individual rights is the essential precondition for a free and prosperous world, that force and fraud must be banished from human relationships, and that only through freedom can peace and prosperity be realized.

Consequently, we defend each person's right to engage in any activity that is peaceful and honest, and welcome the diversity that freedom brings. The world we seek to build is one where individuals are free to follow their own dreams in their own ways, without interference from government or any authoritarian power.

In the following pages we have set forth our basic principles and enumerated various policy positions derived from those principles. These specific policies are not our goal, however. Our goal is nothing more nor less than a world set free in our lifetime, and it is to this end that we take these stands.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We, the members of the Libertarian Party, challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual. We hold that all individuals have the right to exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose.

Governments throughout history have regularly operated on the opposite principle, that the State has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor. Even within the United States, all political parties other than our own grant to government the right to regulate the lives of individuals and seize the fruits of their labor without their consent.

We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life --accordingly we support the prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action -- accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property --accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation.

Since governments, when instituted, must not violate individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals. People should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders; and the resultant economic system, the only one compatible with the protection of individual rights, is the free market.

I. The Individual

1.1 Civil Rights

We believe that every human is born with certain inalienable rights to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, and that no governmental entity, individual, or corporation may violate or void these rights. We believe that individual rights are civil rights, regardless of age, sex, gender, orientation, race, nationality, creed, or religion. We will consistently fight to protect your civil rights in New Hampshire.

Motion to adopt platform as a whole

Rodger Paxton

QUESTION: I thought the constitution called for the adoption of the platform Plank by plank? I could be wrong

Rich Tomasso

ANSWER: Is the new constitution now in effect? Seeing as neither the Constitution nor the Bylaws specify when the new proposals go in effect, It is the ruling of the Chair that they go into effect immediately which does allow us to consider amendments to the Platform.

DISCUSSION regarding the fact that the current constitution does not allow for amending the Platform

QUESTION: By the logic you're talking about we could never have approved a platform to begin with so there is a very clear precedence that this body can adopt a platform

ANSWER: Adopt but not Amend

QUESTION: What's the difference?

ANSWER: One is adopting that we have something, the other is changing what you have.

QUESTION: The Platform Committee submits a report. It is accepted or rejected by the body. If it's different text or the same text, it's still the same process. I also think that amendments to the Constitution take effect, our precedent has been that they take effect, at the close of the convention unless that is specified otherwise. That has been long policy of the party. Of the Chair's ruling is that this page 19 is taking effect now then I would challenge the ruling of the Chair on that.

Challenge to the Ruling of the Chair. Seconded.

Caleb Dyer

The reason I seconded this motion was so that a subsequent motion could be made to suspend the rules so that we may resolve this and then move on to actually move on and adopt the ability to discuss the platform and adopt it.

SPEAKING AGAINST: We need to change the platform and to do so we have to have to go with the ruling of the Chair.

Rodger Paxton

Hand Vote to uphold the ruling of the chair

20 In Favor

8 Opposed

Ruling of the Chair Stands

Motion to Adopt Platform as written:

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: I was part of the platform committee and I spent a lot of time writing the language and tweaking the language with my fellow members and I feel like this is a good departure from the more minimal platform that we had before but it's also a cogent positive statement of advances that we can make in the Libertarian Party and something that can serve as basis to recruit more people and I'm very eager to push for positive identification of the Libertarian Party rather than just as an alternative to the 2 party duopoly and I think that this platform very clearly states a lot of our principles in terms of things that we can take action on at a local level and reflects our principles as a group. Sean Michalski

POINT OF INFORMATION: If this motion passes would that prevent us afterwards from passing minor amendments to the individual planks? Robert Lombardo

ANSWER: I don't think it would

While as a whole, this is wonderful, there is one issue I have with it in one plank that I would be opposed to simply, not because of Libertarian Principles, but because it could open us up to a lot of scrutiny from the public which could reduce the possibility of our people getting elected because of it. That would be 2.3 Professional Licensing. Again while it is fully in compliance with our principles, and I'm not against it in principle, I do think it would open us up to some really bad PR when they say Unlicensed Doctors, etc There will be people that are going to come down on us for that. Brian Chabot

ANSWER: Would you like to make a motion to amend the plank?

Yes

Would you be okay with putting forth that motion after adoption?

Yes I would

VOICE VOTE: 0 Opposed, Platform Passes (see below for specific amendment requests)

1.2 Privacy

Just as it is true that the only economic situation consistent with individual rights is the free market, so is it also true that life, liberty and happiness cannot prosper under continuous state surveillance. We oppose the use by the state of people or technology to monitor, account for, and keep Granite Staters under surveillance, especially where there is no evidence of criminal behavior, and thereby restrict the normal interaction of peoples. We oppose passive, yet compulsory, surveillance legislation, such as laws that require individuals and businesses to report legal activities without evidence of criminal acts.

1.3 Self-Defense

We support every individual's inalienable right to self-defense, and thus to keep and bear arms. We support the existence of 'Stand Your Ground' and 'Castle Doctrine' laws and believe that every person may exercise their right to self-defense wherever they have a right to be. We reject all laws at

any level of government restricting, registering, or monitoring the ownership, manufacture, transport or transfer of any item or tool that could be used for self-defense.

1.4 Vice

Government should confine itself to protecting individuals from aggression, coercion and deceit. We oppose all laws and regulations that attempt to protect individuals from the consequences of their own behavior. While not necessarily condoning such activities, we advocate the repeal of all laws criminalizing gambling, possession and sale of drugs, and sexual relations between consenting adults. All those presently incarcerated or ever convicted solely for the commission of these victimless crimes should be pardoned and their records expunged.

1.5 Healthcare

The most fundamental property right is an individual's right to own and control his or her own body. All individuals have the right to determine their own health care needs and treatment. We support a truly free market health care system and oppose government mandates in insurance and healthcare. Government has no constitutional authority to interfere with the practitioner/patient relationship.

1.6 Labor

The contract between an employer and employee is a voluntary relationship, where both sides choose to enter into it and can only fairly negotiate on the terms of the contract without interference by government. We support the right of employers and employees to freely choose whether or not to bargain with each other through a third party, such as a labor union. There is no inherent "right to work" nor a "right to unionize," merely the freedom for all to negotiate conditions of employment.

II. The Market

2.1 Taxation

We oppose any and all new tax burdens, including income and sales taxes in every form.

We support all efforts to minimize the tax burden of every citizen and business in New Hampshire, and advocate voluntary means of supporting state services, such as lotteries and user fees.

Taxation of privately owned real property should be eliminated. In effect, it makes the state the owner of all lands by forcing individuals to pay rent to the state or forfeit their title.

Tax favoritism should be illegal. Abatements, subsidies, credits, or other incentives to businesses based on geographical area, job creation, or any other criteria deny equal protection under the law.

2.2 Money

Individuals engaged in voluntary exchange should be free to use as money any mutually agreeable commodity or item. We oppose inflationary monetary policies and unconstitutional legal tender laws. We oppose government use of debt to conceal or cover the cost of their expenditures.

2.3 Professional Licensing

Each person has the inalienable right to earn a living by the fruits of their labor. State licensing subverts these rights, and acts as a protectionist guard against competition without achieving their stated goal of protecting the safety of our citizens. Requiring professionals to carry licenses restricts worker mobility and competition which leads to higher consumer prices.

We support the elimination of all state run boards and license requirements for all professions. Professionals are best regulated when they are forced to compete for consumers without interference from the state.

MOTION: I would like to propose we strike 2.3 Professional Licensing Brian Chabot

POINT OF ORDER: Shouldn't this fall under New Business? Dan Fishman

ANSWER: Yes, this should be part of New Business.

We are now onto New Business.

MOTION: As new business, I would like to propose we strike 2.3 from our Brian Chabot
platform.

Seconded

SPEAKING AGAINST THE MOTION: I was very passionate about including Sean Michalskie this proposal in the plank. I think this is actually an area where a lot of disenfranchised Republicans and Democrats can come an agreement and sort of see Liberty as a sensible way forward. When you ask people what good does the government do and they say "Oh well it protects us. It protects us through this licensing and making sure that these things go through." Those sort of ring true until you say "Oh what about hair dressers? Do they need 2000 hours and this artificial barrier to entry?" "What about lawyers?" "Well that's keeping the price of lawyers artificially high. That's damaging society, that's damaging liberty." The same thing with Doctors, the same thing with Teachers, the same thing with any professionally licensed person. The best mechanism to ensure this is the free market and this is not just "Oh this is something that we sort of think." This is both an end in itself and a means to an end in addressing what the Libertarian Party can do for individual people and this will help tell a story that for so long the Democrats and Republicans

haven't been able to tell. I met somebody who was impacted by this. I was met by a hairdresser who couldn't ply her trade because this licensing meant that she had to spend \$10,000 to get licensing by the state. This is an inappropriate use of state resources and it goes to a tangible thing that people can feel and that can resonate with voters and direct them to the libertarian party and for that reason I oppose the motion to strike it from the platform

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: I propose instead of dropping 2.3, I propose to just get rid of a few sentences of it. Keep the first, 3rd and last sentences so it would read: Rich Tomasso

Each person has the inalienable right to earn a living by the fruits of their labor. Requiring professionals to carry licenses restricts worker mobility and competition which leads to higher consumer prices.

Professionals are best regulated when they are forced to compete for consumers without interference from the state.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: So I understand there are lots of concerns on both sides. Oh you say "You shouldn't regulate any profession" "But what about the guy doing eye surgery on me, I want to make sure he's legit." I'm of two minds on this but I think we do need to make a statement because professional licensing in NH is actually...we're in the bottom 1/2 of the States. We do need to address this and this is a very big issue. So I do think we need to say something about it but as you pointed out, bad marketing and bad communication has been a problem for us so if we can get the public fully on our side on this, I think maybe not leading with our chin so much on this would be a better goal by still stating our principles and still giving the public the direction we want them to go.

SPEAKING AGAINST MOTION: We're Libertarians. That means we're the party of principle. That means we should stick to that principle and we don't need to water things down. We're not going to get everybody from the public to be on board with these ideas ever. That's Okay. We don't need everyone to be on board with that. There're going to be a lot of people who will use our positions to fear monger about what will happen when we get the state out of our lives, "Oh my god, the sky is falling." Let's stick to Principles Ian Freeman

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: I absolutely support 2.3, in fact as we found in our research in urban areas Occupational Licensing is a big big issue and it's something that we can use to reach into large sections of the community that are not normally accessible. People who lose their opportunity to work and Max Abramson

earn a living due to favoritism and protectionism and cronyism. And frankly it is cronyism. I think everyone now recognizes this. We used to have only 8% of Americans who had to get an Occupational License in order to work and I think that was 8% too many or 7% too many, whatever you want to call it. But now it's almost 30% so you have people being kept out of almost every high paying occupation and you can't get your foot in the door. It's almost impossible to get a license, and what do they do? As soon as people start getting their foot in the door, they raise the bar. An anesthesiologist now has to go through 14 years of college in some states to learn to turn a knob. What I would like to do is just strike the last sentence. I don't think that we need to go the full monty but I would like to keep the first paragraph of 2.3.

QUESTION: Are you proposing to amend the amendment? This is the current wording (showed above motion)

ANSWER: This is the motion I just spoke in favor of, I'm in favor of this wording.

Speaking AGAINST MOTION: I'm in IT, Brian (Chabot) is in IT too and we don't have to have state licensing to do our job. There are bodies out there that will give you certifications, licensing that do not have to be done through the state. The state should not be picking winners and losers in the market place, ever. Also currently we have this issue in the state of to do African Hair Braiding for example, you need 1500 hours to get a license from the state. To do African Hair Braiding. This is insanity. We need to get the state out of this. We need to be handling this in the free market. And so I oppose this motion. Rodger Paxton

SPEAKING AGAINST MOTION: I myself have several Occupational Licenses I'm forced to carry. Not only by the state of NH, but I do work digitally in the Insurance Sector and I need to be licensed in all 50 states plus the territories of DC and Porto Rico for my job. NH alone is not an issue, I pay \$75 a year for that license however across the board nationally that ranges. Some states will give it to you for free as a Veteran. But there are other people who are barred from entering into the field because they can't afford the \$1000 a year fee for a DC Insurance Producers License. Or they can't afford the \$500 a year for the Montana Insurance Producers License or they can't afford the \$10,000 every 5 years to register as an Insurance Producer in the state of Hawaii. I think this is a huge issue and I'm fortunate enough that I'm successful enough in my business that I can afford those fees and I can afford to maintain my business but my competition is limited by the fact that other people who can get the same education in insurance knowledge as me from reading a book can't compete. Justin O'Donnell

Motion to end discussion + Seconded. 1 Opposed.

Hand Vote on Friendly Amendment

9 In Favor

Motion Failed

2.4 The Liquor Market

We believe that free markets drive economic growth and competition is essential to free markets. Government owned businesses are anti-competitive and unnecessary. We advocate abolishing the state liquor board, eliminating liquor store quotas, and eliminating the regulation of liquor sales.

III. The Community

3.1 Criminal Justice

Where criminal statutes are necessary for the protection of life, liberty and property, the punishments applied should be proportionate to the crime. Rehabilitation, counseling, and restitution should be sought over incarceration. Offenders should have the opportunity to make the aggrieved party whole, rather than continue to place a drain on society. Ineffective and detrimental incarceration is costly in terms of wasted human potential, as well as tax dollars which are diverted from productive private use.

Motion to Amend 3.1 to strike the word “necessary” and replace with the word “purposed” Robert Lombardo

To not conflate any agreement with the existence of certain statutes

Seconded

SPEAKING AGAINST: Just because a lot of times the legislative bodies will say the “purpose” for this is...and then it’s for the children it’s for the old people then they tent their things as the purpose for this is to protect someone so I think using the word purposed instead of necessary, it actually sort of opens it up a little bit more to basically saying that as long as they can say it’s for the purpose of this...but it’s not actually necessary for that Darryl Perry

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: For similar reasons to what Darryl just said I would actually support the motion. I think that purposed is actually better than necessary as I think that many in this room would not think that certain Caleb Dyer

personal statutes might be necessary I think there are many criminal statutes on the books, mainly a lot of drug laws that are certainly not necessary and they do not protect, they actually violate life liberty and property. I think purposed is probably a better word in that sentence

“Where criminal statutes are **purposed** for the protection of life, liberty and property, the punishments applied should be proportionate to the crime.”

I think that is slightly more clear than necessary and I think that is slightly more in line with our principles.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: instead of “are purposed” how about replacing “are necessary” with just the word “exist”? Brian Chabot

Friendly Amendment accepted

POINT OF CLARIFICATION: The reason for using the word “necessary” is because that was the minimum. Where criminal punishments ARE Necessary...This presumes the Libertarian position that the only valid exercise of a criminal statute would be for the protection of life, liberty and property. So Where a criminal statute IS necessary ...is required we decided to be consistent with liberty we have to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of property, that this is the minimum threshold that if a criminal statute is necessary that we’ve all agreed this criminal thing is bad not that some criminal statutes are or are not valid exercises of this non-aggression which I believe we all are in agreement about. That we should have fewer criminal statutes. This is just related to what we should do in response to what we have in congress decided would be criminal statutes. That goes to the reason behind the selection of the word necessary instead of “where they exist” or “how they are” because we don’t want to condone the existence of them , just to say “If you gotta have them, then we want to have this be our party response to those criminal statutes.” Sean Michalski

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: I believe we still have an issue with the wording. As I read it now (“Where criminal statutes **exists** for the protection of life, liberty and property, the punishments applied should be proportionate to the crime.”) “exists” is essentially a given. I would propose something slightly less excepting of existence. Blue sky exists, water is wet, it exists as a wet substance – except when it’s ice. Criminal statutes are promoted as being necessary for the protection of life, liberty and property. These statutes are often promoted with a specific end goal. The gun control act of 68 was promoted to “end” a spree of violence but it was penned with an intention of giving the southern states back Jim Crow authority over African Americans receiving firearms under the Civil Rights Act of 68. The necessary exists and the actual promotion of is something that always runs George Carpenter

through my head. So I would ask if the authors of the amendment would accept the word promoted instead as a replacement of the word exists or other.

“Where criminal statutes **are promoted** for the protection of life, liberty and property, the punishments applied should be proportionate to the crime.”

Friendly amendment accepted

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: For Clarity I’m going to move that we strike the Brian Chabot word “Where” and simply say “Criminal statutes must only be for the protection....”

Not Accepted

Voice Vote: Not passed

3.2 Civil Asset Forfeiture

We support the elimination of civil asset forfeiture, which permits the government to take private property without having to prove any criminal wrongdoing. State law should prohibit receiving funds from federal civil asset forfeiture to remove incentives to seize assets wrongly. State law should require a criminal conviction before the state may seize illegitimately obtained property.

3.3 Death Penalty

We recognize that the justice system is imperfect and subject to human error. The possibility of taking an innocent life means there are insufficient moral grounds to justify the use of the death penalty and we oppose its use by the state.

3.4 Foreign Policy

"If goods don't cross borders, armies will."

We believe that American foreign policy should seek an America at peace with the world. Peace will never be achieved through force. Libertarians seek the withdrawal of troops from the 900+ military bases in over 130 nations around the world.

We support an end to taxpayer funded foreign aid and we support real free trade (not the bureaucratic version of "free trade" that exists under NAFTA, CAFTA, GATT, etc). We agree with President Thomas Jefferson who stated in his March 4, 1801 inaugural address that we should seek "peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none."

3.5 Environment

The environment is a shared resource, a treasure, and an important part of New Hampshire's economy. Pollution of air, water, and land violates rights to health and life, and rights to property. Polluters, including government, should be strictly liable for harms caused by pollution. Competitive free markets and individual property rights stimulate the moral choices and behavioral changes required to protect our environment and ecosystems. Private landowners have a vested interest in maintaining natural resources. Protecting the environment requires individual rights and responsibilities regarding resources like land, water, air, and wildlife to be protected by individuals. Where damage is inflicted to the environment restitution to the injured parties must be required.

Motion: I think that we all stand in agreement that when people harm us, we should be able to pursue and get restitution for the harm done. I would include the environment in that. However, we're all always polluting. Everyone of us polluted to get here and it's important to me that the platform speak to what we do in our daily lives and we try to live by our principles, but we're not living by our principles when it comes to it comes to certain environmental concerns like driving a car. Every one of us is violating this agreement when we drove here today. I would move to strike the 3rd line and the last line (so it would read as follows:) Victoria Saucier

The environment is a shared resource, a treasure, and an important part of New Hampshire's economy. Pollution of air, water, and land violates rights to health and life, and rights to property. Competitive free markets and individual property rights stimulate the moral choices and behavioral changes required to protect our environment and ecosystems. Private landowners have a vested interest in maintaining natural resources. Protecting the environment requires individual rights and responsibilities regarding resources like land, water, air, and wildlife to be protected by individuals.

Motion Seconded

SPEAKING AGAINST AMENDMENT: I understand where she's coming from and I tend to agree with her, but there's likely lots of planks in here that many of us do violate. The question is, who can you be held responsible for that? And I think this speaks to being held responsible for that. If I pollute somebody's air on the way here, they could sue me for restitution and if somebody finds in their favor than I should pay restitution. So I think that's already covered in here. Rodger Paxton

SPEAKING IN FAVOR: I also agree with the speaker that we violate this, we do cause harms that go uncompensated but the legal meaning of strictly liable for harms – harms in this context of the platform means legally cognizable harm, so something that you could go to a judge for that you would have standing to sue for already, just recognizes the fact that we want the default not to be government regulated legislation that we Sean Michalski

want it to be judicial action between private individuals who are actually suffering a legally cognizable harm.

Motion to close discussion – seconded, passed

Hand Vote 3 in favor of amendment

Motion Failed.

3.6 Independence

Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security, of the whole community, and not for the private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore, whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power, and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind.

We recognize the right to political independence. Exercise of this right, like the exercise of all other rights, does not remove legal and moral obligations not to violate the rights of others.

IV. OMISSIONS

Our silence about any other particular **government law, regulation, ordinance, directive, edict, control, restriction, regulatory agency, activity, or objections should not be construed to imply approval.**

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION: Article IV Section 4 Involving Officers of the Brian McQuade Libertarian Party to add a Section C that says "If registered to vote, shall not be registered with any other party."

The only thing I can say on this is that if you're a Libertarian you're gonna be a Libertarian all the way, you can't be registered with the Democratic Party to run for office of the Libertarian Party

CLARIFICATION: so if you're currently registered Undeclared, in compliance with this Rich Tomasso and then vote in a party's primary, which requires changing your registration, would that kick you off the board?

ANSWER: Technically the registration would only be changed if you do not stop at the table before exiting

QUESTION: but for the 5 minutes that you are voting, you are a member of another party, so I'm just curious if the intent is that this shall not apply on election day, essentially.

ANSWER: Essentially the intent here is to make clear that if you are going to hold an Officer Position that you should only be registered as a Libertarian. So I would say to that that you should not be voting in another primary with the exception of the Libertarian Party's Primary.

QUESTION: And if we do not have one? I'm not trying to be a jerk here...

ANSWER: I would accept a friendly amendment to add in a section regarding if a primary is held

QUESTION: If we have party status

DISCUSSION regarding how to word such an amendment and have it still clear.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: You could add one more sentence to say "This shall not apply to the temporary change voter registration on Election Day."

Friendly Amendment accepted and Clarified

New Motion for Amendment: Article IV Section 4 Involving Officers of the Libertarian Party to add a Section C that says "If registered to vote, shall not be registered with any other party. This shall not apply to Undeclared Voters temporarily changing their registration to vote in a partisan primary on election day, provided they switch back to Undeclared."

SPEAKING AGAINST PROPOSAL: I have 2 reasons. Number 1 is any such wording where you're exempt because of how you're registered puts you at the mercy to changes in the voting laws. When I was in the state house, every single year we had changes to the election laws. NH Municipal Association puts out a list and it's "this" long. Every single year they change it and change it and change it. Each party changes it to their advantage. The second concern that I have is that it's very very difficult to enforce and just because the rolls right now are you can vote in another party's primary – what's happened in the past is most Libertarians that I knew voted in the Republican Party's Primary because we didn't have a primary and they're used to voting used to voting in the Republican Party Primary because it's an active party primary and you have some liberty republicans out there to support. So now, all of a sudden, they're gonna register as that and I've walked out of the voting place and forgotten that I was registered as who knows what and who knows how many people are going to continue to be registered as a Democrat or Republican having voted in that party's primary. Now admittedly the Democrat Party Primary is not very active because the party bosses basically pick the point, their party's nominees but the Republican Party, every single position on my ballot has 4, 5, 6, sometimes as much as 10 people running for Congress, for Senate, for Governor – we have a very active Republican Primary. We're gonna have people coming out who are still registered as Republican just because they voted in that primary.

Max Abramson

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION: Is the intent to have Officers be registered Libertarians, because that seems to be what the...

Robert Lombardo

ANSWER: Only if registered to vote

QUESTION: To be registered Libertarians, so if the intent is to have them registered as Libertarians then the wording should perhaps read "should be registered Libertarians"

ANSWER from Chair: My interpretation of this does not speak to people who are registered Undeclared, as Undeclared is not a party. Republican and Democrat are parties. It says "if one is registered to vote..." and there is currently no requirement to be registered to vote to be an officer or member of the party. "if you're registered to vote, you shall not be registered with any other party" so it would allow for Undeclared and those who are registered Libertarian.

VOICE VOTE: 3 opposed. Motion Passes

Motion to extend the Business Session portion of the agenda by 20 minutes & seconded

Voice Vote: Motion Passes

I submitted a packet of proposals in the interest of time, I'd like to focus on Proposals 3 & 4 Amendments to the Constitution Justin O'Donnell

Proposal 3 Amendment Article XI Sec 2 to read:

The bylaws of the Party may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates at any convention of the Party provided the proposed changes were published in a newsletter prior to the convention. By a vote of three fourths (3/4) of the Executive Committee the bylaws may also be altered at any other time, subject to ratification by the next convention.

Proposal 4 Amendment Article XIII Sec 1 to read:

This Constitution may be amended by a three-quarters (3/4) vote of the delegates at any Convention provided that such amendment be made available in writing to convention delegates with enough time to consider the amendment. Publication in the newsletter at least a week before the convention shall always constitute sufficient notice

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT : I'd like to extend that to 30 days. In Arkansas we had 90 days, but I think 30 days is plenty of time. I definitely think the body should be aware of what they're going to be voting for before they get to the convention Rodger Paxton

Proposal 3 is the amendment on the floor for consideration

POINT OF CLARIFICATION: How do you define newsletter? Is it something sent via mail or email? Darryl Perry

ANSWER: I would define newsletter as something sent via email or mail. As I'm not the Executive Committee it would be something confirmed delivered. As some delegates do not have email, they would have to be mailed a copy.

SPEAKING AGAINST: I would speak against I think that the party at Convention should be able to accept proposals at the meeting regardless of what's been proposed ahead of time. This says only amendments would be considered if they've been notified 30 days ahead of time. Sean Michalski

POINT OF INFORMATION TO THE PREVIOUS POINT: It can be any convention, I believe the bylaws provide for calling a convention at any point and time. So if you Dan Fishman

wanted to make proposals you could just call a convention, notify people 30 days before hand...so you're right, it does stop the body from being able to consider something at that moment and time. However, that's actually the intent of it. The idea is that the body shouldn't be voting on something they've been presented with 2 hours beforehand. I mean if you think how complicated the platform was – how well informed do you think the body really was about it?

POINT: I just want to point out that this would also allow the Executive Committee to prevent something from going to the body if you are leaving it up to the Executive Committee to publish something, the body, and I'm not saying that this particular body would do that but a body could – and I've seen it happen in other states – could lose the email and it never gets published 30 days before hand. Darryl Perry

SPEAKING AGAINST: As Secretary knowing that we have many people that are on a "Do not email, do not mail, do not phone" list, this would disenfranchise those people from having the same opportunity as other members of the membership. Jilletta Jarvis

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: I believe the intent of this is to stop the Executive Committee from making amendments right before the convention. I don't think the intent of this was to stop the membership. So I'd like to make the amendment to make this apply to only the Executive Committee Rodger Paxton

Friendly Amendment Accepted

QUESTION: How would this be worded?

I may be able to answer that Caleb Dyer

Amendment Article XI Sec 2 to read:

The bylaws of the Party may be amended by the Executive Committee by a majority vote of the delegates at any convention of the Party provided the Members are notified proposed changes were published in a newsletter prior to the convention. By a vote of three fourths (3/4) of the Executive Committee the bylaws may also be altered at any other time, subject to ratification by the next convention.

Friendly Amendment: Have the newsletter published on the LPNH website a month beforehand Dan Fisher

MOTION: I vote to table the amendment until we come to an agreement on language Sean Michalski
Seconded

Voice Vote: 1 opposed. Proposal is tabled

RESOLUTION: I did want to make at least a recognition. I found out recently that one of the founding members of the LPNH, Mr. Howard Wilson, has passed away around Christmas time. For some of you newer members, Howard has been active for some time and moved out west (Texas) and so Howard and I didn't always see eye to eye. Howard came to the political scene as a Political Anarchist and slightly moderated his views over time but say what you want about Howard, he worked like a dog. He did probably more outreach booths than all of us combined. He would go anywhere and work a table all day usually the World's Smallest Political Quiz, Membership, whatever we were doing, that was his thing. He collected thousands of petition signatures. He ran for office as a Libertarian. He was actually a Libertarian office holder. He was on Rich Tomasso

his town Budget Committee and maybe another committee. Howard was a hard core Libertarian and people were voting for him. I talked to Howard about this once and he said "Well, they knew I wouldn't lie to them. So I earned their vote, even if they didn't agree with me" So people do respect your integrity and your principles. Howard did serve on the board several times. He was at the State House, I saw him there even just shortly before he moved away. Like I said, you may not approve of Howard's methods or everything he was doing or how he dressed or anything like that, but believe me if all of us worked as hard as he did we'd run this state in 10 years. I'd like the entire convention to recognize Howard Wilson and to wish his family well in this trying time and just recognize he was Libertarian of the Year at least once, maybe twice and we may have even given him a lifetime achievement award for decades of activism. So I'd like a brief moment of silence to recognize Howard and for those of us who can remember him – to remember him.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR HOWARD WILSON.

Proposal 3 and 4 (of tabled motions). This sentence would be added at the end of the first paragraph for both: Rodger Paxton

Proposal by Executive Committee for (Bylaws Prop 3 or Constitution Prop 4) Amendments must be emailed or mailed or printed to party's website to all party members no later than 30 days prior to the convention.

VOICE VOTE for Proposal 3: 1 Opposed – Motion Passed

VOICE VOTE for Proposal 4: 1 Opposed – Motion Passed

Dan Fishman bought everyone a beer!

Amendment to the Platform: Change the word "over" to "more than" in new Platform 3.4 Rich Tomasso

3.4 Foreign Policy

We believe that American foreign policy should seek an America at peace with the world. Peace will never be achieved through force. Libertarians seek the withdrawal of troops from the 900+ military bases **in more than** 130 nations around the world.

VOICE VOTE: 0 opposed – Motion Passed

I Motion that all further business be tabled pending the Executive Committee scheduling a second convention for business purposes only to occur within 180 days to discuss: Justin O'Donnell

- Membership Report (These are posted monthly in the Minutes page of the LPNH.org)
- Platform Amendments
- Constitution & Bylaws Amendments

- Party Election Activities

Seconded

Speaking Against: Trying to do 2 of these a year are expensive and difficult. The treasury and membership reports are posted online every month. Not opposed to do so, the issue is the expense time and effort

Rodger Paxton

Speaking in favor: When we lost party status we allowed our convention to float which is fine, but now that we have party status we are required by law to have a convention in the September timeframe so we must have one

John Babiarz

ANSWER: That is incorrect, there is an opt out option

Speaking Against: Once a year is enough for bylaws

Ian Freeman

Speaking Against: As to the intent to the motion to meet and continue to grow the party I feel that's appropriate, but I don't think the way to do that is through another convention addressing Bylaws and Constitutional things, I think that addressing strategy and election and policy is fine and having adopted a platform I think we should stick with that until the next convention and we should address any concerns to our strategy outside of that process

Sean Michalski

VOICE VOTE 0 in favor, motion fails.

POINT OF INFORMATION: Mr. Chair Is Taxation Theft?

Justin O'Donnell

Answer: Taxation is theft.

Meeting Adjourned.

DRAFT