

NH Redress Petitions - The Other Side of The Issues

Regarding the Petitions Process, specifically Article 31 Redress Petitions and not the Article 32 Instruction Petitions in New Hampshire, I would sure appreciate it if someone would correct me where I'm wrong.

Here is Article 31's clear mandates to the General Court. "***The legislature shall assemble for the redress of public grievances and for making such laws as the public good may require.***"

Someone is either engaged in a very serious misinformation campaign about Redress Petitions in New Hampshire or I've completely misinterpreted the evidence found at the Secretary of State Archives at 78 Fruit Street in Concord.

Someone is telling people that 1) there is a filing period for Redress Petitions 2) that Redress Petitions have to be sponsored by a State Rep and 3) no action can be taken on them until the Redress Committee is resurrected.

Having spent countless hours at the Secretary of State Archives researching and reading both Article 31 & 32 Petitions as well as the original handwritten House and Senate journals, I can tell you one thing; there is absolutely no ambiguity about the process and have I found no evidence to the contrary of the following facts pertaining to Article 31 Petitions for Redress specifically.

I have held in my hands the original parchments and traced many of those petitions from the time of their original filings, sometimes through their ad-hoc committee recommendations to the Legislature and ultimately all of them to their approval or denial through a final hearing of the General Court in convention.

First of all THERE IS NO FILING PERIOD: a Petition for Redress is a Constituency Bill and it takes priority over All non-emergency Legislative Bills because it is a claim against the State for damages caused to the People and thus Petitions for Redress take priority over all other activity in the General Court because the public safety is in jeopardy.

Secondly, there is no evidence that any Redress Petitions were ever subject to House Rule 4, Petition Sponsorship by a State Rep. Furthermore, the U.S.

Supreme Court clearly stated in Miranda v. Arizona that "***Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be NO RULE MAKING or LEGISLATION which would abrogate them.***" All that aside, we do have Sponsors ... so at this point, that's irrelevant.

Third is "The Redress Committee": I have found no evidence to support the claim that such a committee ever existed. The redress process in every instance that I read up on followed the exact same process for over 140 years including both before and after 1784 Constitution.

The process was 1) a Redress Petition was filed with the General Court Clerk 2) the Petition was read to the General Court in convention 3) Simple petitions were granted (or denied) on the spot by the House first and by the Senate next 4) complex petitions were submitted to an ad-hoc committee for review, study and recommendations to the General Court which reconvened at a later date to then vote yea or nay.

Petitions that were granted were often endorsed on the back by the Speaker of the House followed in concurrence by the President of the Senate.

I would really like to accompany anyone wishing to examine the volumes of evidence at the SOS archives, and especially someone that can prove me wrong, so these and other Redress issues can be laid to rest.

Gus Breton

603-396-1092

www.NHredress.org