



GOLD STANDARD

SB 2 NAY OTP/A
SB 20 NAY OTP
SB 193 NAY OTP/A
SB 205 NAY OTP/A
SB 271 NAY OTP
SB 310 YEA ITL



NHLIBERTY.ORG

HOUSE SESSION - WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2019

Part One

SB 193, prohibiting the sale of certain furniture and carpeting with flame retardant chemicals.

SB 193

Commerce and Consumer Affairs: OTP/A 14-6

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill bans the sale and distribution of new upholstered furniture for residential purposes that has been treated with flame-retardant chemicals while still allowing their use in public facilities, including schools.

NAY OTP/A

- This bill enacts a broad ban against treatment of furniture and carpeting with all current and future chemicals that offer flame-retardant properties. This is a legislative overreaction to incomplete science on a specific subset of chemicals by preemptively banning all future uses of treatments with flame-retardant properties.
- The public already has an increasing number of options available for purchasing flammable furniture, including options at NH retailers such as Ethan Allen (www.ethanallen.com/en_US/faqs.html).
- Flame retardants were initially added to furniture in 1975 due to government overreach in California. More than 40 years later and 6 years after California lifted the initial requirement, we are still suffering the long-term consequences of this overreach.
- The Business and Institutional Furniture Manufacturers trade organization has already issued guidance (www.bifma.org/page/advocacyareas) supporting removal of dangerous fire-retardant chemicals previously added under state mandate. Additional overly broad and confusing government regulation is not needed.

SB 2, relative to funding for job training programs in the department of business and economic affairs.

SB 2

Labor, Industrial and Rehabilitative Services: OTP/A 12-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill increases the administrative fee on unemployment compensation and spends money on government-directed job training programs.

NAY OTP/A

- While government-sponsored job training programs are effective at spending taxpayer money, there is little evidence that they have any lasting impacts. Taxpayers have been funding jobs programs since the 1960s, yet federal auditors can find little evidence that they are effective: Government Accountability Office, "Multiple Employment and Training Programs," GAO-11-92, January 2011, p. 11 (www.gao.gov/new.items/d1192.pdf).
- The state should not have a role in determining the training that businesses will require.

SB 271, relative to requiring prevailing wages on state-funded public works projects.

SB 271

Labor, Industrial and Rehabilitative Services: OTP 12-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill mandates federally-determined prevailing minimum wages on state-funded public works projects.

**NAY
OTP**

- This bill would impose significant additional recordkeeping and weekly reporting requirements for contractors supporting state projects. These increased overhead costs, which are not directly represented by the fiscal note, would ultimately be borne as additional costs to the taxpayer.
- The bill mirrors similar federal legislation (Davis Bacon Act) which was passed with the deliberate intent to prevent non-unionized, less established, minority laborers from competing with established, unionized, white workers during the depression. While times have changed and the intent of this bill may be somewhat different, the effect will still be to dramatically increase the risk and/or cost of employing workers with potential for growth but with lower demonstrated skill level.
- Small firms may not have the personnel to absorb compliance overhead costs. This bill would have the effect of biasing state contracts toward larger/established firms.

SB 310, relative to casino gambling.

SB 310

Ways and Means: ITL 17-2

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill creates government-granted monopoly privileges.

YEA ITL

- Allowing two special interests to conduct gambling operations while prohibiting all others from competing is a clear example of regulatory capture and an unjust use of government power.
- This bill would violate Article 83 of the NH Constitution, which states *"Free and fair competition in the trades and industries is an inherent and essential right of the people and should be protected against all monopolies and conspiracies which tend to hinder or destroy it."*
- This bill dramatically increases the size and scope of government. Once large bureaucracies and moneyed interests are created, they are very difficult to roll back.
- The NHLA would support a bill to more broadly legalize gambling, or allow for the creation of many independent casinos.

Part Two

SB 20, relative to notification requirements for employees, workplace inspections, and the youth employment law.

SB 20

Labor, Industrial and Rehabilitative Services: OTP 12-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill replaces the judgment of the family with that of the state in determining the hours that a teen may work.

**NAY
OTP**

- This bill limits the number of hours a teen may work in a week to 40.25 if the teen is enrolled in school and there is even a single session day in that week.
- Teens work for many reasons including, at times, the need to help support the family. The new restrictions may force a student to make the choice to drop out of school entirely in order to earn money rather than stay in school and develop time management skills.

SB 205, (New Title) relative to energy efficiency programs funded from the systems benefits charge and the duties and members of the energy efficiency and sustainable energy board.

SB 205

Science, Technology and Energy: OTP/A 12-8

ANTI-LIBERTY: This bill enables the system benefits charge to be increased without legislative approval in certain cases.

**NAY
OTP/A**

- This bill contains a hidden tax on utility ratepayers by authorizing increases in the system benefits charge.
- These new taxes are earmarked for workforce development programs that support energy auditors and weatherization contractors and to enable low-income ratepayers to go into debt by mandating that the state develop relationships with big banks and other lending institutions to provide low-income financing of energy efficiency measures.