



# New Jersey Libertarian

Volume LI, Issue 2

## Summer 2026

### Summer General Meeting Announcement

Announcing our Summer General Meeting and Picnic.

**Date:** Saturday, July 11, 2:00 PM – 8:00 PM. Meeting is expected to start promptly at 2:00 PM

**Location:** Come join fellow lovers of freedom at Jay Edgar’s house at 8 Arneytown Hornerstown Road in Cream Ridge NJ. Bring drinks and food to share. Bring bathing suit for small pool! Call 848-525-0578 for directions.

Meeting agenda is posted at [njlp.org/summer26meeting](http://njlp.org/summer26meeting). RSVP (optional) at [njlp.org/summer-picnic](http://njlp.org/summer-picnic)

### Bylaws Committee Recommendation

By: NJLP Bylaws Committee

The 2026 Bylaws Committee is proud to submit the following proposal for consideration during our next General Meeting.

**Proposal 1:** Modify Bylaws Paragraph 10a.1. as follows. Underlined text indicates an insertion, stricken text a deletion.

### 10. Affiliations

#### a. Local Organizations

1. NJLP members may create organizations which represent Counties, Boroughs, Townships, Cities, Towns, Villages, and any other appropriate local organization as adjudicated by the containing Regional Organizations provided the following:

a. Voting members of a local organization shall consist of NJLP members.

b. They cannot publicly take a stance contrary to the NJLP’s Statement of Principles.

c. They only endorse or fund candidates in partisan races that are nominated by the NJLP or national party.

d. They do not function as, or hold themselves out as, or register with any entity or election board as, a political party.

Add new 10.a.4. as follows, renumbering existing 4 to 5.

4. The State Secretary and the containing Regional Representation shall be notified upon the formation of any local organization and shall maintain a record of each local organization’s status.

Add new paragraph 6, renumbering subsequent paragraphs as needed to 7 and 8.

6. A local organization shall be considered dissolved if meetings are not called at least two (2) times a year.

Add new paragraph 10.a.9.

9. The NJLP may revoke its affiliation with local organizations and their access permissions and use of any trademarks for failure to follow any of the above guidelines or conducting themselves in a manner harmful to the image of the Party.

### *In This Issue*

<a href="#">Summer Meeting Announcement</a> .....	1
<a href="#">Bylaws Committee Report</a> .....	1
<a href="#">Federal Toilet Use Standards</a> .....	2
<a href="#">Libertarian View of MAHA</a> .....	3
<a href="#">NJLP Opposes Increase in Minimum Wage</a> .....	4
<a href="#">Southern Region Bylaws Suggestion</a> .....	5
<a href="#">Republicans Oppose Our Ballot Placement</a> .....	5
<a href="#">Piscataway BOE Endorses RCV</a> .....	7

### **Rational:**

We currently have county and town organizations that should be void due to inactivity. There is currently no protocol to keep track of the local affiliations at a state level or accountability process if one were to work contrary to the goals of the New Jersey Libertarian Party or National Libertarian Party. These additional points are necessary to protect the image and brand of the NJLP and affiliates. The language has been borrowed and edited for relevance from the LNC by laws "Permissible Use of Trademarks."

This passed the bylaws committee 5-0.

**Proposal 2.** Add new number 5 to Bylaws 6.a. renumbering existing 5 to 6.

5. At least 2 General Meetings shall be held each year.

### **Rationale:**

Our current bylaws does not specify any General Meetings other than our annual Convention. This provides a minimum number of meetings that we should hold each year.

This passed the Bylaws committee 5-0.

## **Policy Paper: Reconsidering Federal Toilet Water-Use Standards**

By: Loren Jay Chassels, DO, MST, FAAIM, FAWM

The federal toilet standard is grounded in the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which required new toilets sold in the United States to use no more than 1.6 gallons per flush beginning in 1994, while EPA's WaterSense label pushes performance toward 1.28 gallons per flush or less. This paper recommends repealing or substantially revising those federal limits and replacing them with flexible, performance-based state or local standards. [\[1\]\[2\]](#)

### **Executive Position**

The current federal approach is too rigid for a product that depends heavily on plumbing design, waste load, and building conditions. A better policy would preserve conservation goals while allowing higher-flush toilets where needed for sanitation, reliability, and public health. [\[2\]\[3\]\[1\]](#)

### **Regulatory Background**

The national baseline of 1.6 gallons per flush stems from the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and took effect in 1994. EPA's WaterSense program later promoted toilets that use 1.28 gallons per flush or less, framing them as at least 20 percent more water-efficient than the federal standard. EPA has also continued to

revise its WaterSense criteria, showing that the market and performance assumptions around these rules are not fixed. [\[3\]\[4\]\[5\]\[6\]\[1\]\[2\]](#)

### **Policy Problems**

The central flaw in the regulation is that it treats water savings as the primary metric, even when toilets require repeated flushing to function properly. Multiple flushes can erase projected conservation gains, and consumers may end up using more water overall than a better-performing toilet with a higher single flush volume. In practical terms, a standard that increases the odds of clogging is not efficient; it is merely restrictive. [\[7\]\[1\]](#)

### **Sanitation and Reliability**

Toilet performance is not a luxury issue; it is a sanitation issue. When a toilet clogs, waste may remain in the bowl longer, odors intensify, and users face an unsanitary and embarrassing situation. That matters in homes, schools, workplaces, and public facilities where cleanliness and dignity depend on prompt waste removal. [\[1\]\[7\]](#)

Frequent clogs also increase demand for emergency plumbing services. That creates avoidable costs for households and businesses and diverts plumbing labor toward preventable failures instead of maintenance and improvement. A regulation that shifts cost from water bills to repair calls is not a sound public policy. [\[2\]\[7\]](#)

### **Social Effects**

Basic household systems influence how people feel about their living environment, and repeated toilet failures can undermine comfort and self-esteem. A bathroom that is unreliable or embarrassing affects daily confidence in a way that public policy should not dismiss. Sanitation problems can also increase stress in homes and crowded buildings, where disorder tends to spread. While toilet standards do not directly determine violent crime rates, policies that worsen the quality of basic living conditions can contribute to broader neighborhood instability and social strain.

### **Recommended Reform**

Congress or the responsible agencies should repeal the federal gallons-per-flush mandate and replace it with a performance standard that allows flexibility by region, building type, and plumbing system. States and localities should be free to adopt stricter rules where water scarcity justifies them, but the federal government should stop imposing a one-size-fits-all

limit. Performance testing should focus on actual waste removal, clog resistance, and total water use over time, not just the nominal water per flush figure. [\[6\]\[3\]\[7\]\[2\]](#)

### Conclusion

The existing EPA-linked toilet water limits were created to conserve water, but their real-world costs can include excessive flushing, unsanitary clogs, more emergency plumbing, and reduced user confidence. A repeal or major revision would not abandon conservation; it would modernize it by prioritizing effective performance and local flexibility over an inflexible federal cap. [\[3\]\[6\]\[7\]\[1\]\[2\]](#)

### Sources

- [1] Residential Toilets | WaterSense <https://19january2021snapshot.epa.gov/watersense/residential-toilets.html>
- [2] Toilets | ASAP Appliance Standard Awareness Project <https://appliance-standards.org/product/toilets>
- [3] U.S. EPA to Revisit Requirements for Water-Efficient Toilets <https://aspe.org/pipeline/u-s-epa-to-revisit-requirements-for-water-efficient-toilets/>
- [4] WaterSense Revises Tank-Type Toilet Specification <https://aspe.org/pipeline/watersense-revises-tank-type-toilet-specification/>
- [5] Congress Set Toilet Standards in 1992. <https://www.ase.org/blog/congress-set-toilet-standards-1992-heres-data-showing-theyre-saving-water-and-energy>
- [6] WaterSense products, info - SafePlumbing <https://www.safeplumbing.org/advocacy/saving-water/watersense>
- [7] Modern Toilets Can Be Flush With Water Savings - IANR News <https://ianrnews.unl.edu/modern-toilets-can-be-flush-water-savings>
- [8] Trump's War on Water Conservation <https://www.sustainablewaters.org/trumps-war-on-water-conservation/>
- [9] Did you see the new WaterSense toilet standard? <https://greenhomeinstitute.org/did-you-see-the-new-watersense-toilet-standard/>
- [10] Water conservation ... by the flush <https://greenmainehomes.com/blog/water-conservation>



**KenKap**  
Realty Corp. Broker

Commercial / Industrial / Investment



**Kenneth Kaplan, Broker**

President

322 Route 46, Suite 200  
Parsippany, NJ 07054  
[www.kenkap.com](http://www.kenkap.com)

Office: 973-287-7400  
Cell: 973-978-9722  
[kkaplan@kenkap.com](mailto:kkaplan@kenkap.com)

## MAHA Through a Libertarian Lens - The Positives and the Negatives

By: Michael Guadagnino III

The “Make America Healthy Again” (MAHA) movement, often associated with Robert F. Kennedy Jr., has sparked a national conversation about chronic disease, food quality, government regulation, pharmaceutical influence, and personal health responsibility. While supporters and critics often view MAHA through partisan lenses, libertarians tend to evaluate it based on a different set of principles: individual liberty, limited government, free markets, transparency, and personal responsibility.

From a libertarian perspective, MAHA has both appealing strengths and significant concerns.

One of the biggest positives is its focus on individual health and informed decision-making. Libertarians generally believe that people should have the freedom to make their own choices about nutrition, medical care, exercise, and lifestyle. MAHA's emphasis on educating the public about food ingredients, environmental toxins, and chronic disease aligns with the libertarian belief that individuals should have access to information so they can make decisions without excessive interference from government agencies or corporate interests.

Many libertarians also appreciate MAHA's skepticism toward the close relationship between government regulators and large industries. Whether discussing pharmaceutical companies, food manufacturers, or agricultural interests, libertarians often worry about “regulatory capture,” where government agencies become overly influenced by the industries they are supposed to regulate. Calls for greater transparency, independent research, and accountability resonate strongly with those who value free and fair markets.

Another positive is MAHA's focus on prevention rather than simply treating disease after it occurs.

Encouraging healthier diets, physical activity, better sleep, and reduced exposure to harmful substances can potentially reduce healthcare costs and improve quality of life. Libertarians generally favor solutions that empower individuals to take responsibility for their own health rather than relying solely on government programs or medical interventions.

However, libertarians also see potential drawbacks.

The largest concern is that efforts to improve public health can sometimes lead to increased government control. If MAHA evolves into policies that heavily regulate food choices, restrict consumer options, ban products, or impose broad federal mandates, many libertarians would object. They generally believe that even well-intentioned government interventions can reduce personal freedom and create unintended consequences.

Another concern involves the risk of government deciding what constitutes “healthy” behavior. Libertarians often argue that adults should be free to make choices—even unhealthy ones—as long as they do not harm others. While education and transparency are encouraged, coercion is not. Policies that dictate dietary choices, farming practices, or healthcare decisions could be viewed as government overreach.

Some libertarians are also cautious about picking winners and losers in the marketplace. If MAHA policies favor certain industries, products, or health approaches through subsidies, regulations, or government endorsements, it could distort market competition. Libertarians generally prefer consumers—not politicians or bureaucrats—to determine which products succeed.

Ultimately, a libertarian assessment of MAHA depends on how its goals are pursued. Increasing transparency, encouraging personal responsibility, and reducing the influence of special interests are generally viewed as positive developments. Expanding government authority, restricting consumer choice, or substituting one form of centralized control for another would be viewed far less favorably.

In the end, most libertarians would support the objective of a healthier America, while insisting that health improvements come primarily through freedom, education, informed consent, and individual responsibility rather than government mandates.

---

*Dr. Michael Guadagnino holds a Bachelor's Degree in Biology from the New York Institute of Technology and earned his Doctor of Chiropractic degree from New York*

*Chiropractic College. He served as Vice President of Public Relations for the New Jersey Libertarian Party from 2017 to 2022. Dr. Guadagnino is the author of the best-selling book *Fitness Over 50, 60, 70 and Beyond*, available on Amazon and other major platforms. He also shares health and wellness insights on Instagram at @Dr.\_Guadagnino. As a regular guest contributor, Dr. Guadagnino will be writing on health care topics through the lens of personal freedom and individual liberty.*

## **The NJ Libertarian Party Rejects an Increase to the Federal Minimum Wage**

By: Bruno Periera, Chair, NJLP

On April 28th, 11th District Rep. Analilia Mejia introduced the Living Wage for All Act. This piece of legislation, if approved, would increase the federal minimum wage from the current \$7.25 up to \$25.00 hourly in stages over the next 5 years. This would mean that NJ's hourly minimum would increase more than 9 dollars. As the name suggests, this legislation is designed to offer assistance to struggling Americans who are suffering due to the increased cost of living.

While we can appreciate the intention here as no one wants to see their loved ones suffer from privation, this act, like all acts of today's Congress, is woefully blind to the economics behind affordability. Large increases to minimum wage, whether implemented immediately or gradually, increases inflation, worsens unemployment, encourages automation, and makes it all the more difficult for small businesses to operate. As the cost of hiring employees grows, companies will downsize their staff and pass additional costs onto the consumer. California lost between 10-18 thousand food service jobs when they raised theirs to \$20. Workers might applaud this bill's passage now, but when their jobs are phased out and the costs of their needed goods and services grow even more unaffordable, they will realize that once again, the government has made their situation worse.

If Rep. Mejia and her colleagues want to actually improve the lives of struggling Americans, then there are many other things that can be done. Firstly, Congress needs to exercise its Constitutional powers of the purse to reign in the run-away spending bleeding Americans dry. To date the U.S. government is over 39 trillion dollars in debt with over a trillion in annual deficit. The greater that number grows the weaker our dollar gets and the more taxpayer money has to be allocated to bloated interest payments. Additionally, consider enacting pay-as-you-go style legislation to prevent the government from needing another debt increase.

End President Trump's disastrous tariffs and his many unjustifiable acts of aggression (be they in Iran, Venezuela, or carried out by ICE agents). Estimates put the daily operation costs in Iran at approx. 1 billion, Venezuela costs us over 20 million a day and ICE costs us around 10 million a day. Not only are these actions costly, unpopular and constitutionally dubious, but they create artificial barriers for employment and trade and further diminish the wealth of each American. They also make each trip to the pump a nightmare.

Make starting and running a small business simpler and cheaper. Audit the FED and Pentagon to identify economic waste. The best and most effective way to help laborers is to increase employment opportunities. One possibility is to deregulate small businesses, which account for around 45 percent of all employment. Additionally, the more competition in the market, the cheaper goods and services become.

Finally, and most importantly, allow Americans to enjoy the money they make by limiting or eliminating harmful taxes. Every dollar seized by Uncle Sam, regardless of the reason, is a dollar that cannot be spent on needs, wants, and luxuries. No manner of redistribution, regulation or restrictions will ever do more to help citizens than leaving them and their property alone.

### **Notification to Amend SJLP Bylaws**

By: Loren Chassels, Director of Programs for both the NJLP and SJLP

Whereas, the Southern New Jersey Libertarians (SJLP) is committed to maximizing member participation, volunteer leadership, and organizational effectiveness within the Libertarian Party structure; and

Whereas, Section F (OFFICERS), Subsection v. of the current SJLP Bylaws states:

"Apart from the Regional Representative, no member of the Southern Regional Board shall be permitted to serve on the State Board or any County Committee."

Whereas, this restriction limits the ability of qualified SJLP members to serve in leadership roles at the regional, county, and state levels simultaneously; and, the New Jersey Libertarian Party (NJLP) Bylaws do not require or mandate such a prohibition on dual service; and removing this restriction would promote greater volunteer engagement, foster improved coordination and unity across all levels of the Party, and eliminate an unnecessary barrier to

participation while preserving the Regional Representative as the designated liaison to the State Board. I propose that:

Section F (Officers), Subsection v. of the SJLP Bylaws be stricken in its entirety.

This serves as advance written notice of this proposed amendment to be considered at our next Regional General Meeting (per SJLP Bylaws, Section K. Amendments).

### **Republicans Seek to Limit Voter Choice**

By: Lana Leguia

On June 8 of this year the New Jersey Republican State Committee, represented by Jason Seno esq, submitted a challenge to my nominating petition for New Jersey House of Representative District 7 on the basis that 670 endorsements in my petition were circulated by out of state residents. 303 endorsements were also challenged for various reasons, including the signatory not being a registered voter, the signatory residing outside the district, and incomplete signature. I submitted 775 signatures to the Division of Elections on the 1st of June. In New Jersey the signature threshold for direct nomination for House of Representative is 250 endorsements.

In Mr. Sena's petition objection, he references NJ statute 19:13-7 which outlines the requirements for petition circulators which include eligibility to vote in New Jersey and Empower Our Neighborhoods vs Guadagno which eliminated district residency requirements but upheld the state residency requirement for petition circulators.

The hearing held on June 9 I along with my attorney, Joseph Fortunato esq, argued in *Arsenault vs Way* the court ordered that New Jersey residency requirement be declared unconstitutional and ordered the Division of Elections provide a more narrowly tailored procedure to comport with this ruling. Fortunato further argued "*Arsenault* analyzed the political speech of the petition circulators themselves and has ruled that is political speech, the most protected kind of speech. The speech which deserves the strictest of scrutiny, because it involves a core constitutional right." Mr. Sena responded that *Arsenault vs Wade* was addressing residency requirements of circulators for primary elections not direct nominations and that the distinction was critical. Administrative Law Judge William Courtney asked both sides to submit briefs by noon on June 10, after which he would send his determination.

In his brief, Mr. Sena, denied that *Arsenault vs Wade* addressed the constitutionality of the statute. He argues that it was analyzing the language, "The person who circulates the petition shall be a registered voter in this State whose party affiliation is of the same political party named in the petition" which has key differences to the language found in N.J.S.A 19:13-7, "shall not be required to be a registered voter, but shall be voter eligible, which means at least 18 years of age, a resident of this State, a citizen of the United States, and not otherwise disqualified under the New Jersey Constitution." Additionally, he wrote that the Respondent failed to notify the proper court of challenging the constitutionality of NJ statute 19:13-7, referencing *Staubus v. Whitman*, "No administrative agency has jurisdiction to declare a statute unconstitutional." Claiming that Respondent cannot raise a facial constitutional challenge in an administrative proceeding such as this in the first place nor does the Secretary of State who will ultimately review the Administrative Court's decision and recommendation.

In contrast, Mr. Fortunato cited multiple U.S Supreme court rulings regarding the petition process such as *Meyer v. Grant*, (1988), "Although the petition circulation process does not involve the formal expression of a political view, it does involve both the expression of a desire for political change and a discussion of the merits of the proposed change," *Buckley v. American Constitutional Law Foundation* (1999), "Petition circulation, we agree, is 'core political speech,' for which First Amendment protection is 'at its zenith," *Williams v. Rhodes* (1968), "The right to form a party for the advancement of political goals means little if a party can be kept off the election ballot and thus denied an equal opportunity to win votes." He further argued Objectors seek the extraordinary remedy of removing a congressional candidate from the ballot despite the absence of any allegation that petition signers were unqualified, fraudulent, misleading or that the circulators engaged in improper conduct.

ALJ Courtney ordered on June 10 that my petition be declared invalid and be excluded from the 2026 ballot. His rationale being, "While Leguía raises significant and compelling constitutional arguments in defense of her nominating petition, her challenge to the constitutionality of N.J.S.A. 19:13-7 is purely a question of law which should be addressed by the Appellate Division. Without clear guidance from the Appellate Division or the Supreme Court of New Jersey, I must conclude that the OAL is not the

proper forum for the consideration of this issue." His ruling being an interpretation of the law as it's written and not the validity of the law itself. Upon receiving this ruling my team began preparing to appeal the decision and contact the Attorney General.

Earlier this year, Secretary of State of New Jersey Dale Caldwell edited ALJ Michael Stanzione's ruling of invalidating 83 signatures collected by Princeton University students registered to vote outside of New Jersey for Democratic CD12 candidate Sue Altman's petition stating, "The Constitutional invalidity of N.J.S.A. 19:13-7 with respect to the residency requirement of petition circulators is equally applicable to presidential primary candidates and congressional primary candidates," Caldwell wrote. "Thus, pursuant to *Arsenault elections case*, out-of-state individuals must be permitted to act as petition circulators so as to not unconstitutionally violate associational rights of political parties."

If you have ever run for office or been involved in the petitioning process in New Jersey you know the employees at the Division of Elections don't bat an eye when they receive a petition where the circulator is an out of state resident. They will ask for their driver's license and submit it along with the rest of the nominating paperwork. The question then becomes why has this law been allowed to remain? Why is there a statute on the books that judges are compelled to enforce despite it being ruled unconstitutional over and over again? A statute that results in frequent modification, reversals and rejection by the Secretary of State? Having out of state circulators, paid or volunteer, is common practice in New Jersey and throughout the country by Republicans, Democrats, Libertarians, Greens and Independents alike. There is an entire industry built around this one task of achieving ballot access.

The Republican State Committee has not challenged candidates in previous years who have had out of state circulators, including the New Jersey Libertarian Party candidates as recently as 2025 and 2024, why now? They see me as a threat. Tom Kean Jr. has been missing from congress since March 5, 2026. District 7 has not had a representative in congress for over 100 days. Not only has he not shown up to roll call but he has not even directly spoken for himself answering to his constituents. His team has collected his signatures, manned his booths, posted on social media and they have even tried to submit statements into the congressional record on his behalf. The only way the Republicans can secure their seat is by exploiting technicalities in the law to eliminate competition.

On June 11, SoS Dale Caldwell ordered ALJ William Courtney's initial decision regarding my nominating petition be modified to accept the petition booklets circulated by non-residents as valid. In his determination he writes, "The court in Arsenault definitively held that a residency requirement for Primary Election petition circulators is unnecessarily restrictive and does not survive strict scrutiny. For General Election petitions, when political party affiliation is irrelevant, petition requirements are even less restrictive. As such, candidates seeking petition signatures to appear on the General Election ballot should not be burdened with greater restrictions than Primary Election candidates. Consistent with the Arsenault decision, out-of-state individuals must be permitted to act as petition circulators so as to not unconstitutionally violate their free speech by prohibiting the right of voters to choose from eligible candidates being placed on the General Election ballot."

Victory, or so it appeared. That Monday, on June 15, Mr. Fortunato received a letter informing us the State Republican Committee will be appealing the decision of the Secretary of State. Libertarians across the US are being challenged for insignificant objections such as forenames being shortened, missing information on paperwork or in my case, the person holding the clipboard not being a resident. The NJ Republican State committee cares not of how this disenfranchises the hundreds of registered District 7 voters who endorsed my petition.

The purpose behind nominating petitions was to give voters the opportunity to have a say in who was going to be on their ballot instead of community leaders or party officials deciding for them. It was meant to be an expression of the democratic process. It is now a mere procedural barrier abused by the two parties to maintain power and preserve the illusion of choice in elections.

I need your help! Donate to cover legal fees and follow my campaign on social media.

Donate at [lanaleguia.com](https://lanaleguia.com)



## **Piscataway Board of Education Supports Alternative Voting Options**

By: Matt Amitrano

On May 14th, 2026 at the Piscataway Board of Education meeting a resolution to support the Municipal and School Board Voting Options Act was unanimously approved by board members. This act once passed into law will allow school boards, towns, and cities in New Jersey to implement Ranked Choice Voting for elections.

Before making it to the school board for the vote the resolution was debated and finally recommended by the Piscataway Board of Education Policy Committee which I am a member of. The people at Voter Choice NJ did a great job of educating the Board and Committee members who were unfamiliar with what exactly Ranked Choice Voting is and how it works.

Voter Choice NJ is a nonpartisan organization run by volunteers who are dedicated to working with local municipalities to grow support for Ranked Choice Voting within New Jersey. They host fun, hands-on educational events throughout the state open to everyone.

These events have played a critical role in getting support in Hoboken, Jersey City, Montclair, Collingswood, South Brunswick, Princeton, Red Bank, South Orange and Maplewood.

The Piscataway Board Of Education joined in support of the South Orange-Maplewood Board of Education's resolution at the most recent New Jersey School Board Association Delegate Assembly to allow school boards to use Ranked Choice Voting. The resolution did not pass this time but there is optimism it will in the near future.

"We in Piscataway are committed to strengthening democratic participation and promoting electoral processes that reflect the full range of community preferences. Giving voters a full range of choices strengthens the democratic process for all" said Piscataway School Board President Nancy L. Salgado-Cowen in a press release.

One reason why there is so much optimism and growing support for Ranked Choice Voting is the increased frustration voters are having with the "two party system" and lack of any kind of true representation.

Ranked Choice Voting essentially eliminates the "spoiler effect" or feeling of throwing away a vote by voters who are worried about choosing a candidate who they prefer but "can't win." No longer having to worry about "wasted" votes, voters can choose from a larger pool of qualified candidates including those who are independent or from third parties.



Our state level candidates need your contributions, both money and time. Donations to the Federal Fund shall be used to support state and local candidates for political office. Your generous contributions are greatly appreciated.

All donations to the NJLP Federal Fund must meet the requirements for an Ongoing Political Committee. You must be a US citizen or a permanent resident alien. All donations to the general fund must come from your personal funds. To donate online visit [njlp.org/federalfund](http://njlp.org/federalfund)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ St: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Employer: \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

I wish to support the NJ Libertarian Party by donating to the NJLP Federal Fund. Enclosed is my contribution of:

\$250  \$100  \$50  \$10  Other: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Make checks payable to "NJLP Federal Fund."

Send checks to: NJLP Treasurer

PO Box 56

Tennent, NJ 07063

NOTE: We respect your privacy and will keep the identity and amount of our supporters' donations confidential to the extent permitted by our insane laws. Individual annual contributions to Political Committees like the NJLP Federal Fund are limited to \$75,000 per calendar year, and contributor information for donations over \$200 must be reported. We do not report contribution information for any donation unless required by law



New Jersey Libertarian Party

P.O. Box 56

Tennent, New Jersey 07763

[njlp.org](http://njlp.org)