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Military Order of the Purple Heart
of the U.S.A., Inc.

BYLAWS AND RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

08 July 2019

(5:13 p.m.)

(Gavel raps)

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Can I have your attention please? The Bylaws Committee is going to start.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I want everybody to stand, we’ll face the flags. Hand salute.

Patriots: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Two. Be seated.

ROLL CALL

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I’m Jim Anderson, I’m the Chair of the Bylaws Committee. The only people that have a vote on the Bylaws Committee are the members sitting here at the table. I will do a Roll Call.

Rick Cherone?
JVC CHERONE: Here, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Char Gatlin?

DEPT COM GATLIN: Here.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Nick McIntosh?

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Here.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Gil Brown is absent.

Kathleen Shaw?

DEPT JVC SHAW: Here.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Chuck Adkins?

REG V COM ADKINS: Here, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Larry Leighton is absent. James McCormick?

DEPT COM McCORMICK: Here.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And Felix Garcia is an alternate. He’s here. We’re all present.

2019 PROPOSED BYLAW RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 6-2019

Article XI, Section 5A 1) & 2) - National Inspector

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We’re going to discuss two Resolutions that were submitted by the National Junior Vice Commander, approved to be submitted to the Bylaws Committee by the National Executive Committee.

Resolution 6-2019, this is concerning the National Inspector, authorizing the National
Inspector to do inspections on Headquarters. If we refer back to our Bylaws, within the Bylaws under the section concerning duties of the National Finance Committee, it states in there that the National Finance Committee is supposed to audit the books of the Order at least once a year. It probably hasn’t been done on a regular basis.

Under the duties of the National Finance Committee, it says that the National Finance Committee is to audit or have the books of the Order audited by a CPA. This would be an outside person not affiliated with the Order looking at the books of the Order and making sure that everything is correct.

This Resolution, basically it’s saying that the National Inspector can go in and look at the books of the Order and make sure that they’re conforming to the Bylaws. Committee, it’s open for discussion.

REG V COM ADKINS: You’ve already answered one of my questions. My understanding, this was already a duty of the Finance Committee and they had the authority to bring in outside agency, probably somebody who’s a CPA or at least has some background in finance to do the audit.
That leaves the question, is our National Inspector -- every year when we elect a new one or reelect the current one, that individual may or may not be a CPA. Therefore, I’ve got an issue of whether or not we actually need this. We’ve already had the provisions in the Bylaw that has this done.

JVC CHERONE: The reasoning behind this Resolution, a Bylaw change, is not -- it’s not to do an annual inspection like -- this would be in conjunction with the Departments and Chapters. The Departments and Chapters have their Inspector come in and do an inspection of the books every year to make sure they’re following the procedures and Bylaws. That’s what the Inspector’s responsibility is, he should know that kind of stuff. That’s why we elect him.

If that’s what he’s looking for to make sure people are following the procedures and Bylaws of our organization. He’s not to be a CPA. Are they turning in a warrant? Do they have receipts with their warrant when they send it in? He’s looking if they follow the Bylaws and procedures, that’s what his job is to do. That’s what this is all about, nothing more. It’s to be in line with the Departments and Chapters, which they do.
REG V COM ADKINS: It says right here in the third Whereas, it says an annual inspection of National headquarters finances. It doesn’t say the procedures like using warrants or following the procedures like we do for Chapters and Departments. It just simply states finances. To me, that means he’s going in and looking at the books. Right there on the third, “That an annual inspection of National Headquarters finances should be a customary practice for the protection of the Order.” I don’t disagree with that, I just think that the Finance Committee is better suited to do it.

DEPT COM GATLIN: On face value, this looks good but there’s a couple of things to it that I think bear notice. One is that if you have someone that maybe doesn’t have the professional and/or the background coming in, let’s say a CPA or a similarly qualified individual to look at the books, they could be taking marching orders from up top, very simply. That’s going to lack some transparency and it also creates the unnecessary use of a sword and shield, if you will, considering if there’s a personal disagreement within the chain of command. Number two, it does say finances, but as we heard previously, they’re at looking at procedures,
whether the Bylaws are followed or other, shall we say, discrepancies or deviation from standard protocol. While I don’t necessarily think that’s a bad thing, once again, we could have someone in there taking marching orders. It reduces transparency and it could create some issues within the chain of command if there’s a personal and/or professional disagreement.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Also referring back to National Inspector, the duties of the National Inspector, right off the top, it says this is a principle advisor to the National Commander on inspections and investigations.

When we look at the duties of the National Inspector, he’s basically -- he or she is basically under the command of the National Commander. Giving him additional authority to do things without the National Commander, the National Commander’s authorization, it’s sort of stepping over the National Commander, in my opinion. This is just my opinion. Any other comments?

JVC CHERONE: What I’m looking at is I’m looking to make sure that this -- this is in place to make sure that we have checks and balances in our system. That’s all I’m looking -- I’m not trying to
override the Commander. He has to report this to
the Commander, so he's not overriding his authority.
That’s all this is for is checks and balances of the
system. That’s why we left no. 2 in there, he has
authority to check anybody else. This has nothing
to do with that.

It’s got nothing to do with accusing
anybody or transparency. This is just the checks
and balances for the organization. Thank you.

SVC GARCIA: Thank you, Chairman. Checks
and balances, I agree. But the checks and balances
when it comes to the finances, that’s why we have
you guys as National Finance Committee and the
Finance Officer. You’re supposed to do an audit,
audit your own books, make sure that everything is
correct, warrants are being done, the same things
that the Junior Vice spoke about. I disagree with
this.

Another thing, if there’s something that’s
wrong and the National Inspector is there, depending
on who sent them up there, what’s going on -- I
mean, there’s a lot of -- a grievance is going to
have to be filed or something. It could be
something that’s wrong. I just don’t agree with it.

DEPT COM McCormick: I definitely
understand why this has been put in here. I know that everyone wants to have that added checks and balances to this. I do agree with that, I do agree we need an audit. I do agree with what Rick says. Maybe not in the way that maybe there’s some more work that needs to be done with it, I don’t know. But sitting here and kind of reviewing what we’re dealing with today and what we’re dealing with with the Order right now, I think that justifiably, he’s trying to add an extra check and balance that’s going to be good for the Order. That’s all I want to say.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: I concur that we need the checks and balances. The emphasis is to assure that all procedures are being followed according to the Bylaws. That is not directly specifically at finances, it’s talking about procedures. We have not followed the procedures in the past year. We did not have a prompt appointment of an Adjutant, we did not have the approval of the Adjutant. We have -- on the elections that we had, we did not have the tally sheets sent out on a timely basis. Those are procedural issues that were this year.

So, I think we need the ability to be able to go in and ensure that the office is following the
procedures in the Bylaws.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Katherine?

DEPT SVC SHAW: I believe it’s up to the Finance Committee and our Finance Chair to -- because it’s already in our Bylaws for them to do this annually. If it was written differently, maybe, but because it’s to inspect the finances, I’m going to say no.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Again, Katherine, I don’t want to disagree with you but I am going to because I go back to the second sentence of 1. It says procedures. It is not specifically addressing finances in there. I don’t see the word --

DEPT SVC SHAW: It’s the one right before.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: It’s in -- it’s maybe in the “Whereas,” but it is not in the way the Bylaw is written, so you have to go with the way the Bylaw is written, not the “Whereas.” The “Whereas” are giving the reason for doing it.

I use examples this year. Frankly, going back for many years, we have done procedures particularly on balance and elections that do not adhere to the Bylaws completely. So it’s not just this year, it goes back historically. Emphasizing one is in the second line that all procedures are
being followed.

DEPT COM GATLIN: But you’ve got golf (G), golf (G) is the opening statement, and then 1 and 2 are subparagraphs of golf. Golf’s stating finances of the order and then numeral 1. Annual inspection of Headquarters to assume that all procedures are being followed, one would assume that all procedures would support the opening paragraph, golf finances.

I mean, it could be rewritten otherwise for sure, no doubt about it, but as written.

DEPT COM McCORMICK: If it was rewritten, I see where everybody’s -- the hang-up is on the finances, but we do agree that we do need someone to do an audit of the procedure. I think that all of that is good when you look at (1) and (2) and you read what the actual meat of this is. My question is, is from this point what’s the best way to advance this? I think it’s a great idea. I think we need an oversight.

We definitely need to have our Inspector to be able to have the authorization, the ability -- and I think they already do that, but to be able to actually call that and make that an annual basis to look for specific things like procedure. I agree with that. I agree with the meat of this. The
finance part is the only thing I’m stuck on like everybody else. Everything else, I kind of agree with that.

DEPT COM GATLIN: One last thing to consider, though, if this is the way this is written, this would give the National Commander a tool, for lack of a better term, to investigate his number two or three or the Adjutant, whomever, at will. Just keep that in mind.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What is the recommendation to committee?

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: I move that it be accepted.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right, we have a motion to move to accept.

JVC CHERONE: Second.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right, Rick Cherone has seconded. Any more discussion?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We’ll call for a vote.

Rick Cherone?

JVC CHERONE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Char?

DEPT COM GATLIN: Nay.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Nick?
NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Yea.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Kathleen?

DEPT SVC SHAW: No.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Chuck Adkins?

REG V COM ADKINS: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: James McCormick?

DEPT COM McCORMICK: Yea.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We’ve got a tie.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: We have people that are not here. So at that juncture, shouldn’t the alternate be asked for a vote?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. Alternate, Felix?

SVC GARCIA: Nay.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So it carries (sic), we have three yeas and four nays. All right, this Resolution will not advance.

(Resolution 6-2019 not recommended.)

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: No, it will be brought up to floor with the recommendation not to accept.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

Resolution 7-2019

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Resolution 7, this one concerns the National Adjutant’s duty station.

Referring to Article XI, Section 5 A1) and 2),
basically states that the National Adjutant is supposed to be at National Headquarters every day of the week.

I’ll take comments from the committee.

**JVC CHERONE:** The reason behind this is that with the advent of the technology we’ve got now and expenses and everything else we’re trying to cover, it’s -- the Adjutant doesn’t have to always be in the office every day. We can have a person in the office be an office manager running day-to-day -- the office. The Adjutant can be getting them on Go To Meetings, could be a face-to-face conference.

That way, if they have to come to the office or come into the area for reasons, there would be some expenses but not the big salaries we need to do now. It’s a cost savings. I think it’s the right thing to do. It opens up your chance for getting an Adjutant from around the country and not just in the D.C. area. That was my logic behind it is just to -- I think it’s the right thing to do moving forward and that’s why this is there. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN ANDERSON:** Any other comments?

Char?

**DEPT COM GATLIN:** I’m in full agreement,
but there’s another side to this too. This is something we discussed in the Bylaw Committee a while back. It’s very difficult to bring an Adjutant in from somewhere, CONUS, OCONUS, take your pick, to come to the greater D.C. area without any type of job security considering that we have leadership rotate in and out every year. If I’m the Adjutant, I’d come in this year, the new Commander doesn’t like me for whatever reason, there’s probably a thousand of them, and then I’m out.

I’ve got kids, I’ve got them at school, I’ve got a spouse, I’ve got all kinds of problems and I’m in D.C. This makes perfect sense, as pointed out with the advent of technology. The communication gaps would be overcome that maybe the Adjutant, he or she, comes into the greater D.C. area or wherever needed, wherever the duty assignment is required, three or four times a year, as point out expenses paid.

There’s just no way that we can hire good people on a consistent basis and have them come to D.C. with zero job security from year in and year out. This is what I consider common sense 101.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Chuck?

REG V COM ADKINS: I agree with the
comments by Patriot Gatlin. This is kind of common sense. I couldn’t quite hear how many times a year you think the Adjutant -- because I think there ought to be at least a few times a year, maybe monthly, that they come up there, have a physical presence for one or two days. Of course, that’s understanding the current crunch but how do you define as needed. We’ve got to figure that out too.

I think there ought to be some requirement in here, otherwise I think it’s a good resolution. I don’t know if we can let you pull this back, add that in, and say as needed basis or whatever to have him up there at least once a month for a couple of days or what have you. I’ll leave that for the Chairman and the Secretary.

JVC CHERONE: That’s a good point, as needed. We have it for a year, we find out that he’s coming or she’s coming in and say, no, it wasn’t -- it’s got to be at least once a month because we found it -- and that’s why I said right now -- as Char said, it’s the right thing to do. We’re going in the right direction. We can get some qualified people for the position around the country instead of just one area, and he’s right. We change, Commanders change every year. I don’t like
you this year or you made a commitment, it’s just hard. It’s hard, that’s why. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: James?

DEPT COM McCormick: I fully agree with this. Number one, technology has advanced to where -- and honestly, I don’t think this goes far enough. I think that any position can be put on a distance for everything from your Legislative people to whatever we need to do in order to keep the Order alive. But this is a great idea. This is going to save the Order a tremendous amount of money. We cannot afford the $100,000-plus a year salaries anymore, we just can’t do it. So I think that this is the way to bring that down and to get us into an ability to be able to be sustainable.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Katherine?

DEPT SVC Shaw: I completely agree. It makes sense and you’ll be able to open it up to people who -- like you said, Char, would have difficulty relocating without job security.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Nick, any comments?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Felix? No comment?

REG V COM Adkins: Just a general question, if the Adjutant is not going to be at the National
Headquarters, do we just appoint somebody as an office manager that’s still in charge of the staff that’s there on a day-to-day basis?

Again, why aren’t we doing this for the National Service Officer, which James has kind of pointed out? His requirements to be there, then would he be the day-to-day service office manager? He’s like the next in charge. That’s a question we’ve got to ask.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Char?

DEPT COM GATLIN: You also have the chief of staff rule that’s in there. Keep that in mind. This actually falls under the Commander and the Adjutant. The Adjutant’s appointed position works at the beck and call of the Commander. If the Adjutant’s not cutting the muster, then it’s up to the Commander to relieve him or her. The Adjutant works technically for the organization, then it’s up to the Commander and Leadership Team to smooth that over.

If they want to appoint a de facto office manager that in theory works for them, then that’s on the Commander just as long as it’s getting done. I think we’re splitting hairs a little bit on this one, though.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Felix? Nick? No comment? Okay. We have discussed this several times during the videoconferences with the Bylaws Committee, so we are very much aware of it and as to how it could be implemented and I think it would be a good thing for the Order. If we do the Resolution, if it’s not working, come next year, we can turn around and change it to something else. Keep that in mind. Call for a motion?

REG V COM ADKINS: I call for a motion.

DEPT COM McCORMICK: I’ll second.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: What was the motion?

REG V COM ADKINS: To advance to --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Do a roll call. Rick?

JVC CHERONE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Char?

DEPT COM GATLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Nick?

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Katherine?

DEPT SVC SHAW: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Chuck?

REG V COM ADKINS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: James?
DEPT COM McCORMICK: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Felix?

SVC GARCIA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, unanimous. This will be advanced to the floor of the Convention.

(Resolution 7-2019 recommended unanimously.)

PSVC MIDDLETON: Chairman, Point of Order.

The motion needs to be for the committee to approve the resolution. It automatically has to go forward.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The motion to approve this Resolution is unanimous by the committee, it will advance to the floor.

Resolution 3-2019

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We have one more that was brought. It’s concerning the Resolution that was submitted prior and it concerns adding back in — it’s Resolution 3-2019. It was brought to our attention that -- in the resolve that the JROTC/ROTC Director was not listed along with several other positions that are appointed.

The Bylaws Committee approved the resolution to be submitted to the National Executive Committee prior to the meeting of the committee. This will also be brought up to the body floor in the next couple days. Any comments? Chuck?
REG V COM ADKINS: We just need to fix the third Whereas where it says, “and other elected.” It should say, “other elected and appointed officers.”

Patriot Newall, correct me if I’m wrong, but your correct title is the ROTC and Youth Awards Officer?

NROTC OFFICER NEWALL: That’s a typo. Right now, it’s the ROTC Officer.

REG V COM ADKINS: Okay.

NROTC OFFICER NEWALL: But that allows the Badge of Merit, it’s another youth award.

REG V COM ADKINS: Roger.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes, sir?

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: The way the Bylaws are set up, the Bylaws Committee has a lot of latitude in writing these Bylaws. We came out and we agreed on it. The problem lays with adding those words in now. We have to go by what was sent to the NEC. If we were to add those words, then we would have to go back and resubmit it from the floor and go through that procedure.

We can’t go in — we can correct verbiage or a little bit of grammar, but we can’t correct something major like that.

REG V COM ADKINS: But we did that last
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: There were some that were corrected last year that were not submitted to the NEC. They were submitted to the body.

REG V COM ADKINS: I submitted some to the NEC. They went out --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No, but they were kicked back to you and you turn around and rewrote and represented.

REG V COM ADKINS: And represented on the floor, which we can do, correct, Patriot McIntosh?

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Yes, it can be represented to the floor and then a vote has to be to send it back to the committee. If it’s sent back to the committee, then it goes back to the floor and requires a three-quarter vote.

PSVC MIDDLETON: We’ll run out of time at this Convention.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah.

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: I think -- actually, hang on just a second. It requires a three-quarter vote. “The Bylaws may be amended at the National Convention…” and in (4), After the Bylaws Committee finding(s) and/or recommendation(s) are reported, a
three-fourths (3/4) vote of the votes cast by the
delegates and officers shall be required for
approval.” So it requires a three-quarter vote.

Just for a point of information, I’ve heard
over the years people say a majority of two-thirds and
a majority of three-quarters. A majority is 50% plus
one; a vote of two-thirds is a two-thirds vote; a
three-quarters is a three-quarter vote. It’s not a
super majority.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I’m going to make a
recommendation that we not do any changes to this
Resolution because it has already been presented and
because of time, we would not have enough time to
submit it and then have it voted on. I recommend
that we go and submit it as presented. Any
comments?

NPC CHAIR McINTOSH: I would like to make a
motion that all of the Bylaw amendments that the
Bylaws Committee submitted -- that were approved by
the Bylaws Committee and submitted to the NEC, I
recommend that this Bylaws Committee recommend
approval to the Convention body.

JVC CHERONE: Second.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All in favor?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any opposed?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So, all of the
Resolutions that have been submitted to the Bylaws
Committee will be presented to the body. I will see
if I can get copies made up to be handed out to
everybody.

(Motion carried.)

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I’m open for questions
or suggestions from the floor. Arthur?

NSD COLEMAN: Committee Chair, basically, I
wanted to -- I believe your logic makes a lot of
sense about the National Adjutant being anywhere.
But a lot of the meetings that we have in D.C. with
the Secretary as well as the Undersecretaries
require someone to be on ground. So basically --
although prior to my tenure, Jack, Frank, Wilder,
all those guys, they had to go to a lot of these
meetings.

Three times a year for the veteran events,
that’s a different ballgame, but we have meetings
every month. NSO, VSO meetings, some of the
meetings are videoconference. We also have MOUs
that we have to develop at meetings in D.C. I’m
looking at the travel for an Adjutant to come in.

It makes a lot of sense because someone moving there because they’re chosen as the Adjutant, they have no job security when another Commander comes in. Since I’ve been Service Director, I didn’t know when I first came on how many meetings that I had to go to, like every week, three or four meetings. Why? Because we have a lot of regulatory changes.

Aleks deals with the legislative, so the Legislative Director definitely has to be in D.C. because he has to go to Congress. There’s no videoconference in Congress. As far as regulatory, there’s no videoconference regulatory because you have to be at the executive offices in order to get those things done.

Now, between the Legislative Director and the National Service Director, we do share a lot of duties according to the Bylaws and also according to -- pursuant to federal law being that I certify the NSOs and he actually, under our 501(c)(19), he can advocate for us on Capitol Hill.

The Adjutant is our backup. He is actually our backup when we have a lot of these meetings.

One of the meetings I want to express is the NSO
meeting. The NSO meeting takes place in Falls Church with the Pentagon. Simultaneously, I would have a meeting with the undersecretary of benefits, which we have every week. I also have meetings with the board of veteran appeals with the law judges and the chief judge.

With this AMA, this new regulatory system, we’re having a lot of meetings because they’re putting together regulatory answers. Congress made a law, so now the VA must interpret those laws and so they boosted up the meetings.

I just want to know how would you guys address a lot of these meetings where -- I understand about the videoconferencing. Some of the other meetings, they do videoconference but a lot of the meetings they don’t. Based on being that you have to be a PIP cardholder, being able to go into these government facilities, I don’t know if they can set it up where they can go to the local VA to get certain things done.

This is why this is a very complex organization. I believe the founding fathers and the individuals who set up it, they set it up for a reason. The reason -- I understand what we’re going through now in technology, but I really do think it
would benefit us a lot more to have someone to go to these meetings. An office manager doesn’t have the title to go to these meetings.

The National Adjutant is like an executive director. If you look at the other counterparts, they have executive directors. When they go to meetings and we get -- they want to talk to the VSOs to get certain things done. They will either request the Legislative Director, the Service Director, or the Executive Director, in our case, the Adjutant. That happens quite a bit.

So I just want to know, are you guys thinking about how you would address that?

DEPT COM GATLIN: I don’t know if it necessarily falls to us. That would be more on the Commander hiring the appropriate person that’s going to have the time to do it. That would be the Commander doing a more in depth vetting process of proper employees as opposed to maybe a friend or colleague.

Two, it would fall, my best guess, is to budgetary apparatus between MOPH and the Foundation to set aside and to budget for that money in order to travel.

Bottom line, I get your point, it makes
perfect sense. This is sort of a double-edged sword --

NSD COLEMAN: Right.

DEPT COM GATLIN: -- but you cannot have someone there that does not have job security over a year when you’re thinking about their family, everything else.

Two, you’re -- the Commander is going to have to hire or find someone with the flexibility that’s going to be able to come in once a week, once a month, depending on the pace as dictated by -- like you said, the rules, regulations, and inside the beltway federal apparatus. I think it’s difficult to wargame it on the outside sitting in.

To not be able to go -- pay a competitive wage and not have two years’ job security is just asinine.

NA HERNANDEZ: If I could just make a comment? I know this body’s not to make the recommendation, but I agree with Arthur. I think what you’re trying to say and I’ll just elaborate, just -- whoever’s elected National Commander and your next board of governors here, you need to come up with a strategic plan. There is a lot of bees in D.C. Just recognize that you’re going to fall from
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1  the totem pole. You will no longer be with the top.
2  I’ll reach out to our colleague from DVA.
3  He’s the executive director, he knows the amount of
4  meetings that we’re invited to, the amount of
5  meetings that we see each other, the National
6  Adjutant, executive director, the Service Director,
7  the Legislative Director. That is fine. We’re
8  broke, it is what it is, but you need to come up
9  with a forecast or strategic plan because you’re
10  going to fall out of sight and that’s what a lot of
11  the other VSOs want and other organizations want
12  Purple Heart gone.
13  Regardless of the problems we’re having in
14  here, we’ve got the biggest name on the block.
15  Nobody else has Purple Heart. Joe, you’ve got both
16  of them. You’re executive director for (inaudible),
17  executive director for DVA. So I would ask when you
18  go to dinner tonight, the next couple of days, why
19  don’t you sit down with somebody from the outside
20  looking in?
21  
22  **NSD COLEMAN:** Going back to the economic
23  footprint, depending on where this highly qualified
24  Adjutant will live would dictate exactly what the
25  expenditures are. That’s the apparatus that you was
26  talking about that needs to come up.
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If you get someone in -- let’s say the most qualified person is in California, okay, well, a plane ticket from anywhere in California to D.C. costs X-amount of dollars. Then that individual will have to have a hotel there. On top of that, per diem based on the federal rate. On top of that, being at those meetings, they’re not going to be back to back. He cannot plan the meetings, the Secretary, the directors for these organizations, the Executive Branch.

So, it is, like you said, a double-edged sword. I see what you’re trying to do, but at the same time, we need to really look at that economically and being able to keep our advocacy footprint in D.C. because we are the biggest brand.

What a lot of our members do not -- I believe they do know. The Secretary of the VA has put the Purple Heart claims at the forefront to be adjudicated. That was only because we have people on the ground. We have Aleks, we have myself, we even have Ernesto. I know some people don’t agree, but when it comes to getting certain things done, I have to give it to him, he would get it done.

I have worked with many people whether they like me or not. When we’re advocating for veterans,
it is a very delicate situation. We are the torch
bearers of the benevolence. We are also the
watchdogs of the VA. I’m watching them now on the
federal registry because they’re trying to interpret
laws that the intent of Congress is -- they’re not
even looking at.

So, just take that in consideration when
you communicate with some of the supreme body.

JVC CHERONE: You’re right. This may be
something that looks good on paper and we think
we’re doing it for the right reason. Once we do it,
we may find out it didn’t work. But we’ve got to
try something right now. You’re right, it may not
be the right thing to do but we have to do something
at this point. If after a year we find out, hey, if
you want to be the Adjutant or you want to be the --
it’s going to have to be three to four times a
month.

It may not be the cost, but Char’s got a
good point. We’re limited to the people we can get
for what we do. This is something we’re trying to
do as a committee and the body, and if it doesn’t
work, let’s redo it and say we tried but it wasn’t
really a smart idea. What is it going to cost us?

DEPT COM McCormick: Just speaking from --
and I’ve been in D.C. with these guys, so I’m in and out of there all the time. I run an advocacy program that went nationwide. You guys have seen me all around. I did not live in Washington, D.C. but we still recruited 78,000 people. We got all of our legislative agendas passed because we worked through the individual states and we set up state legislative folks as well.

Whether it be legislator, whether it be National Adjutant, whether it be the meetings or whatever, I get it. Somebody’s got to be there in the D.C. area, but as what everybody else is saying here, we don’t have the money. We just can’t afford to pay the salaries anymore. The reality is that I don’t think that we can afford anything right now. Most of these folks are going to have to volunteer some time. I don’t know any other way else to do it. That’s it.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. Arthur, your comments are very well taken. During the presentation of the Resolution for vote on the floor, you are more than welcome to voice your opinion at that time. It will be up to the body as to how they want to handle this particular Resolution.
Something that the new Officers coming in or Leadership Team, which will include all the way down to the Region Commanders that they’re going to have to take all this information in and try and figure out a good road to travel for the upcoming year. We’re going to be facing a lot of problems.

Any other comments?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Motion to adjourn?

REG V COM ADKINS: Motion to adjourn.

JVC CHERONE: Second.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Bylaws Committee adjourned.

(5:58 p.m.)
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