

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
May 9, 2013**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2013, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013](http://nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013). In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: [publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us); telephone: 775-684-6835).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair  
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson  
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan  
Assemblyman Pat Hickey  
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick  
Assemblyman Andrew Martin  
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford  
Assemblyman James Oscarson  
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None



**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Justin C. Jones, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9  
Senator Tick Segerblom, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3  
Senator David R. Parks, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7  
Senator Pat Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1  
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore, Clark County Assembly District No. 4  
Assemblyman James Healey, Clark County Assembly District No. 35

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst  
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel  
Karen Pugh, Committee Secretary  
Macy Young, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Robert Fulkerson, State Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Elisa Cafferata, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates  
Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Families for Freedom, and Nevada Eagle Forum  
Scott F. Gilles, Esq., Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
John Wagner, representing Independent American Party  
Lynn Chapman, representing Nevada Families for Freedom  
David R. Mathews, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Ed Gobel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Linda West Myers, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Eric Farnsworth, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Don Alt, Private Citizen, Silver Springs, Nevada  
Dr. Reverend William Paul Tarbell, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Patricia Saake, Private Citizen, Fallon, Nevada  
James P. Parrish, Private Citizen, Fallon, Nevada  
Reverend David A. Hoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
David Knell, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Danielle Arceo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Cleto B. Arceo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
J.C.T. Wang, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Virginia Douglas, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Juanita Clark, representing Charleston Neighborhood Preservation,  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Karlos LaSane II, Regional Vice President, Government Relations, Caesars  
Entertainment

Josh Griffin, representing MGM Resorts International

Yvanna Cancela, representing Culinary Workers Union Local 226

Tod Story, Interim Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union  
of Nevada

Mya Reyes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Reverend Wilfred Moore, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Ashley Manke, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Dalia Zaki, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Khalil Zaki, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Salwa Zaki, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Riley Roberts, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada

Pamela Roberts, representing Nevada Women's Lobby

Barbara Silva, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Astrid Silva, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Rafael Lopez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Cindy Davis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Angela Golik, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada

Kenzie Tillitt, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada

Gary Peck, Executive Director, Nevada State Education Association

Helen Caddes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Christopher Preciado, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Carla Castedo, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Leo Murrieta, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Sandra Eddy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

[Roll was taken. Committee policy and procedures were reviewed.] We will start today's meeting with the work session.

**Assembly Bill 301: Requires the Legislative Committee on Public Lands to conduct a study concerning water conservation and alternative sources of water for Nevada communities. (BDR S-807)**

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 301 was sponsored by Assembly Members Oscarson, Ellison, et al, and Senator Goicoechea and was heard before this Committee on May 2, 2013. This bill requires the Public Lands Committee to conduct a study of alternative sources of water and to submit a report no later than February 1, 2015. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Mr. Oscarson, are there any comments you would like to make in regard to A.B. 301? [He had no comment.]

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 301.

ASSEMBLYMAN HICKEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN FLORES AND KIRKPATRICK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Mr. Oscarson.

**Assembly Bill 444: Provides for an audit of the fiscal costs of the death penalty. (BDR S-817)**

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The next bill in your work session binder is Assembly Bill 444, which was sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and heard on May 2, 2013. This bill directs the Legislative Auditor to conduct an audit of the fiscal costs of the death penalty. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN MARTIN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 444.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Hickey:**

I will be supporting this measure as I like that the bill asks for an audit and not a committee study, which is costly. I believe it is worthwhile to study the impact the death penalty is having upon the state.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

The bill is crafted to be dispassionate. It is neither for nor against the death penalty. The Legislature should know the costs involved, its effectiveness, and whether or not it should be retained. Is there any further discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN FLORES AND KIRKPATRICK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement on this bill myself.

[Senate Bill 325 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to elections.  
(BDR 24-953)

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 325 (1st Reprint) was sponsored by Senator Pat Spearman and heard by this Committee on May 7, 2013. This bill requires an explanation of a ballot question to include a digest with a summary of existing laws related to the question and a statement of impact of the proposal on those laws. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I see that Senator Spearman is here should the members have any questions on the measure. [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 325 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Oscarson:**

After the hearing I was able to speak to several of my constituents, all of whom are in favor of clearer, more concise language for ballot questions.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I talked to many constituents who told me they always vote no on all ballot measures because they do not understand them. The language is too confusing and they do not trust what their vote may bring. Is there any further discussion on the measure? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN FLORES AND KIRKPATRICK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement on this measure.

**Senate Bill 393**: Revises provisions governing the procedure for filling certain vacancies in a nomination. (BDR 24-535)

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 393 is sponsored by Senator Smith and was heard in this Committee on April 25, 2013. The bill revises provisions governing the procedure for filling a vacancy in a major political party nomination. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

As I recall, there was no opposition to this measure when it was heard by this Committee. I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HICKEY MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 393.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN FLORES AND KIRKPATRICK WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement for the measure to Assemblyman Thompson.

**Senate Bill 405**: Revises provisions relating to the submission of reports to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and certain other persons. (BDR 17-541)

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Bill 405 is sponsored by Senators Smith, Denis, Roberson, et al, and Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick and Assemblyman Sprinkle. It was heard by this Committee on April 25, 2013. The bill eliminates the requirement for various entities to submit reports that have become obsolete or are redundant as identified in the bill. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO  
PASS SENATE BILL 405.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KIRKPATRICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will give the floor statement to Assemblyman Duncan.

**Senate Joint Resolution 12: Urges the President of the United States to grant a  
posthumous pardon to John Arthur "Jack" Johnson. (BDR R-440)**

**Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The last bill in work session today is Senate Joint Resolution 12, which is sponsored by Senator Brower and Assemblyman Munford, and was heard in this Committee on April 25, 2013. This resolution urges the President of the United States to grant a posthumous pardon to John A. "Jack" Johnson, who in 1913 was convicted of violating the Mann Act, a conviction thought to be racially motivated. Mr. Johnson was the first African American to hold the title of Heavyweight Champion of the World ([Exhibit H](#)).

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN MUNFORD MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12.

ASSEMBLYMAN DUNCAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:**

I wanted to say that I am very proud to vote yes on this bill. It is never too late to right a wrong.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

I agree. Senator Harry Reid is going to propose a similar bill in Washington, D.C.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Is there any further discussion on the measure? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement on the measure to Assemblyman Munford. That concludes our work session. I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 203.

**Senate Bill 203: Requires legislative lobbyists to file quarterly reports concerning lobbying activities under certain circumstances. (BDR 17-26)**

**Senator Justin C. Jones, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9:**

I have introduced Senate Bill 203 for one simple reason. I think it provides another tool to foster good government which requires transparency and lobbying and legislative activity. Senate Bill 203 adds a new section to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 218H to define a legislator as a person elected or appointed to the Senate or Assembly from the effective date until the person is no longer serving. It would also add a former member who serves on a legislative committee to which he or she has been appointed until the committee completes its work or a successor has been appointed. Senate Bill 203 amends NRS Chapter 218H to require that a registered lobbyist file a quarterly report of lobbying activities during the months that the Legislature is not in session. [Read from prepared presentation ([Exhibit I](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you, Senator Jones. I believe both of us were inspired by former Senator Leslie's work on this issue. Great minds think alike. Our Committee sponsored Assembly Bill 190 which is very similar to S.B. 203. Are there any questions for Senator Jones? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in support of the measure who would like to speak?

**Robert Fulkerson, State Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

Our Legislature is in session for only a few months every other year. When not in session, lobbyists can shower our Assembly and Senate members with gifts, meals, and drinks, without ever having to report a single dime. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I do not know about the other members of this Committee but the only showers I take involve a bar of soap. Are there any questions for Mr. Fulkerson? [There were none.]

**Elisa Cafferata, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates:**

We have supported the gamut of these bills for the increased reporting in the interim and want to be on the record continuing to support the transparency.



**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Ms. Cafferata? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in support of S.B. 203 who would like to speak? [There was no response.] Is there anyone in opposition who wishes to speak? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral to the measure who would like to speak?

**Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Families for Freedom, and Nevada Eagle Forum:**

We are very appreciative of Senator Jones for making sure that unpaid lobbyists are not covered under these reporting requirements.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I know you were concerned about that with Assembly Bill 190. We had planned on making an amendment to address those concerns; however, with Senator Jones' bill already containing language to that effect, we decided to defer to his bill. Are there any questions for Ms. Hansen? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in the neutral position who would like to be heard? [There was no response.] Senator Jones, do you have any closing remarks you would like to make?

**Senator Jones:**

I sincerely appreciate the Committee's consideration of this bill. I know you also had the same idea, and I am hopeful that we can move S.B. 203 forward.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 203 and will open the hearing on Senate Bill 246 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 246 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to committees for political action. (BDR 24-674)**

**Senator Justin C. Jones, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9:**

Under existing provisions of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 294A.0055, subsection 1, a committee for political action (PAC) is defined as "any group of natural persons or entities that solicits or receives contributions from any other person, group or entity and: (a) Makes or intends to make contributions to candidates or other persons; or (b) Makes or intends to make expenditures, designed to affect the outcome of any primary election, primary city election, general election, general city election, special election or question on the ballot." Those groups must register with the Office of the Secretary of State before engaging in any activity to affect the outcome of an election.

We all know that when it comes to campaign finance laws with each effort to close a loophole, someone will always find a new one and exploit it. That is exactly what happened in 2012. Last fall, negative billboard signs popped up around Las Vegas. The signs stated that they were "Paid for by Just Another Politician PAC." When PAC disclosure reports came out, there were no contributions listed except large in-kind contributions from a corporation, Just Another Politician, Inc., formed by the same gentleman as Just Another Politician PAC. In other words, by forming a corporation first, which is excluded from PAC disclosure requirements to receive contributions, those who funded more than \$80,000 in negative campaign ads were able to shield their identity, directly contravening the spirit of our campaign disclosure laws. I am bringing Senate Bill 246 (1st Reprint) in hopes of closing that loophole in PAC disclosure reporting. [Read from prepared presentation ([Exhibit K](#)).]

As you are all very aware, there is a great deal of money in our election process and, thanks to the U.S. Supreme Court rulings, there is no sign that it will be regulated or limited in the immediate future. All too often these expenditures are for messages that are negative, sometimes vicious, and frequently misleading. The voters, candidates, and parties have a right to know who is behind these efforts. Senate Bill 246 (1st Reprint) is one attempt to bring more transparency to the process.

In 2012, I was the primary target of the group that exploited this loophole in Nevada law. If we do not close the loophole now, any of you, or other colleagues in the Legislature, could be the target of these shadowy groups who conceal their identity in the next election cycle.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Let me give you a hypothetical situation where a group, we will call the Organization for a Better Washoe County, does positive things, such as cleaning up local parks, later becomes involved with trying to affect the outcome of an election. They put up a billboard and run ads for or against a particular candidate. Would everyone who contributed to that entity have to be listed, or only those who contributed in support of the organization's political agenda?

**Scott F. Gilles, Esq., Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:**

The individuals would not have to file; however, the organization would have to report any contribution or expenditure over \$100. Under the current definition of a PAC, many of these entities that Senator Jones is trying to reach with S.B. 246 (R1) are not required to report. If you are exempted under the current definition of a PAC, and you are going to engage in the activity that is going to reach the threshold that is in the bill, then your registration requirement and contribution and expense (C&E) reporting requirement will trigger.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Then my worry that this hypothetical group, Organization for a Better Washoe County, would need to list all of its contributors is unfounded.

**Scott Gilles:**

Under current law, once the reporting requirement is triggered, they will have to disclose all of their contributors of \$100 or more.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Even if those contributors had previously given for the organizations charitable or community efforts, not for the political actions?

**Scott Gilles:**

Correct. Once that requirement to file a C&E report is triggered, then you have to report all the contributors who have given over \$100 with one caveat: Assembly Bill 48, which passed out of this Committee and was heard before the Senate today, will increase that threshold from \$100 to \$1,000.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Understood. Are there any questions from the Committee for Senator Jones or Mr. Gilles? [There were none.] Is there anyone in support of S.B. 246 (R1), who would like to speak?

**Elisa Cafferata, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates:**

Chair Ohrenschall, I wanted to respond to your question. For organizations like ours, which does have an education mission as well as a branch that does electoral activity, we have separate Internal Revenue Service (IRS) entities. The 501(c)(3) nonprofit entity can do fundraising to further its education mission and those contributions are not reported except on our IRS 990 tax returns. We created a separate PAC that does the PAC activities and the election activities are reported there. So, an organization can set up different legal entities if they wanted to keep their reporting separate.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you, Ms. Cafferata. Are there any questions for Ms. Cafferata? [There were none.] I will now turn to opposition. If there is anyone who is opposed to S.B. 246 (R1) and would like to speak, please come forward. [There was no response.] Is there anyone in the neutral position who would like to be heard? [There was no response.] Senator Jones, do you have any closing remarks that you would like to make?

**Senator Jones:**

I think we have an obligation as legislators to increase transparency to meet the needs of our constituents, and I hope you will consider both S.B. 203 and S.B. 246 (R1).

[Senator Jones submitted a letter written in support of S.B. 246 (R1) by Matt Nese, of the Center for Competitive Politics ([Exhibit L](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I will now close the hearing on Senate Bill 246 (1st Reprint) and will open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 13 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Joint Resolution 13 (1st Reprint): Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to require the recognition of all marriages, regardless of gender. (BDR C-88)**

As you know, the hearing in the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was quite long, and I do see that we have a number of people here tonight. The subject of S.J.R. 13 (R1) is a controversial issue in this country and around the world. It is an emotional issue for many people. I want to remind everyone that we are here to take testimony on a proposed constitutional amendment and this Committee will not make the decision on whether the *Nevada Constitution* is amended. Nevada voters will make that decision.

In order to complete the hearing at a reasonable time, we are going to start with the bill's presenters and then move to hear from the opposition. After that, we will hear from those in support of the measure. Although this does deviate from the usual order, it has been used for other controversial bills this session and it is intended to facilitate balanced testimony. After the presenters of the bill complete their testimony, persons testifying will be limited to two minutes each. If you have submitted a written exhibit, please do not read from it or repeat it; limit your remarks to new material. If others have made the same arguments or points previously, please do not repeat them. A simple "me too" would be appreciated. If we run out of time or if anyone feels they have more to say, I will accept additional written testimony until 5 p.m. tomorrow, May 10, 2013.

Finally, this Committee will not tolerate any inappropriate or mean-spirited remarks. That kind of testimony will not be permitted under any circumstances. Please respect everyone who speaks on this issue, no matter your personal feelings.

**Senator Tick Segerblom, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3:**

I will keep my remarks brief. Last summer, Vice President Joe Biden announced that he was in favor of gay marriage, which prompted President Barack Obama to say that he too was in favor of gay marriage. At that time, I was contemplating proposing that we repeal the Supreme Court ban on gay marriage, so I announced that I was sponsoring this resolution, which proposes to remove from the *Nevada Constitution* the amendment stipulating that "Only a marriage between a male and female person shall be recognized and given effect in this state." Additionally, the resolution states that in Nevada there shall be marriage equality, a critical component of the bill in my view.

I consider this bill important, not just in terms of civil rights, but in terms of Nevada's economic future. Marriage is a big business in Nevada and this bill could have a very positive impact.

[Senator Segerblom submitted a copy of his PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit M](#)).]

**Senator David R. Parks, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7:**

Today, I come before you in support of the passage of S.J.R. 13 (R1) which will amend the *Nevada Constitution* to provide that the State of Nevada and its political subdivisions shall recognize marriages and issue licenses to couples, regardless of gender. [Read from prepared presentation ([Exhibit N](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Senator Pat Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1:**

I will pick up where Senator Parks left off by placing this all into historical context and by calling upon our spirit of independence as Nevadans. Some principles we hold dear to, such as strength, determination, and independence. David Boaz, in *Libertarianism: A Primer*, defined libertarianism as "the view that each person has the right to live his life in any way he chooses so long as he respects the equal rights of others. Libertarians defend each person's right to life, liberty, and property—rights that people have naturally, before governments are created. In the libertarian view, all human relationships should be voluntary; the only actions that should be forbidden by law are those that involve the initiation of force against those who have not themselves used force—actions like murder, rape, robbery, kidnapping, and fraud."

Senator Parks stated that most of the arguments against marriage equality stem from religious views that were formed in post-modernity. I would like to give you a brief history of marriage so that we can put that into its proper historical perspective. [Read from prepared presentation ([Exhibit O](#)).]

Let me address marriage as it is noted in the Hebrew text, in what Christians call the Old Testament of the Bible. Many will say this is something that was founded by God's law in terms of the definition of marriage being between one man and one woman. I would beg to disagree. I am a seminary-trained, ordained minister and have studied scripture extensively. One of the things that I have found in scripture is that Abraham, to whom the covenant was given, was married to his half-sister, Sarah. Another thing that I discovered while studying the scriptures is the fact that Jacob's mother told him to go to the other town to find his uncle and marry his uncle's daughter, which would be his first cousin. And so these types of rituals were considered marriage in the Hebrew text, also for the Christian belief as in the Old Testament. As we go through scripture, even in the New Testament, there were several things that Jesus continued to stress. He stressed love they neighbor, equality, the rights of women, forgiveness, and grace. The one thing that you will not find that Jesus talked about was marriage equality.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Senator Spearman? [There were none.]

**Assemblywoman Michele Fiore, Clark County Assembly District No. 4:**

In 2000 and 2002, the voters of Nevada overwhelmingly supported Question 2. Today, 11 countries allow their citizens to marry the person of their choice. As of yesterday, 12 states now fully recognize same-sex marriage. I am here to encourage the Assembly to join with the Senate and allow the citizens of Nevada to decide this issue. Marriage equality is not a partisan issue. It is standing up for the people that we love. Family to me is everything, and every Sunday I have dinner with my mother, daughters, and grandson. My mother is gay. My two daughters and I are not. My mother is a Democrat. My two daughters and I are strong Republicans. I know that I am the person I am today because of the upbringing and guidance of my mother who is gay. Because my mother is gay, she cannot marry the person she loves. I want to allow the citizens of Nevada the opportunity to change that. I also want to remind my peers that we are a republic and we are not a democracy and that means as a republic that we stand up for the minorities against the majority rule. I owe it to my mother to support her just as she has supported me my entire life. I urge my colleagues to support their loved ones as I am supporting mine.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Assemblywoman Fiore? [There were none.]

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson, Clark County Assembly District No. 15:**

The issue before the Committee today is not an easy one for many good people that I know. I did want to explain how and why it has become an easy issue for me, to the point of becoming a primary sponsor of this legislation.

I grew up in a small farm town, never having met anyone that I knew of as gay. From there I served in the Marine Corps, leaving active duty in 2005. After leaving the Corps, I moved to Las Vegas where I met the first person I knew of as gay. He and I worked together to advocate for our fellow veterans. At first, I was very uneasy around him, but after spending more time with him and his partner of 20 years, I lost all of that uneasiness. In many ways, I consider both of these men family now. Like everyone else, I care about my family. I want them to be happy, I want them to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Marriage for most people is the ultimate expression of the pursuit of happiness. The freedom to spend your life with the person you love, the freedom to marry is critical. I feel that we all want that freedom and that we should treat everyone else as we would want to be treated. I would not want anyone stopping me from marrying the woman that I love. I also feel that it is important to me, someone who has put off marriage until I finish law school, to support a 20-year committed couple's desire to marry. It is not just them. We all know incredibly committed gay couples who have been denied this freedom, and for them it has never been about rights. That term is thrown around a lot and it is important, but even more important is love. They want their love recognized as we all do when we get married.

Attitudes on this topic have shifted dramatically since Question 2 passed in 2000 with 69 percent of the vote. In 2002, support for the measure declined two points to 67 percent. The latest RAND Poll shows support at 54 percent, and that is from a Republican pollster. In August 2012, Public Policy Polling (PPP), a Democratic pollster, and the most active of the 2012 election, found it at 47 percent support, a two-point rise from 2011 when they had also polled the topic. Like a good portion of our state, I have changed my mind. I also noticed with interest a *Washington Post/ABC News* poll that 81 percent of voters aged 18-29, my generation, are pro-freedom to marry. I served in the Armed Forces because I believe in this country; I believe in freedom. I do not think that our state should stand in the way of a freedom as basic as the freedom to marry. If an adult can pay taxes, vote, start a business, and serve in the military, then we should grant them the freedom to marry the person that they love. I hope that like me, and an overwhelming majority of my generation, you support giving the people a chance to change their minds.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Anderson? [There were none.]

**Assemblyman James Healey, Clark County Assembly District No. 35:**

Today is an historic day for Nevada. We have seen tremendous change and evolution on this topic, as recently as May 7 with Delaware and Minnesota now allowing marriage equality and same-gender marriage. Eleven states plus the District of Columbia prove change is taking place on this topic.

I would like to echo Assemblywoman Fiore's statement that this is not a partisan issue, and it should not be an issue based on your next election. This should be based on the people who we are elected to represent and those are Nevadans.

As Senator Spearman eloquently stated, marriage has undergone many phases. Assemblyman Anderson noted that in 2000 and 2002, Nevadans voted overwhelmingly for marriage to be only between one man and one woman. Now, as we fast-forward a decade, we have to take into account that Nevada is a very transient state. The people and industries within Nevada have grown and adapted to the changes occurring within our state and nation. Many of the issues that Nevadans have faced, whether it be health care, education, tourism, or marriage, have evolved. Many of the people who voted in 2000 and 2002 are no longer residents in our state and we have had an influx of new residents who call Nevada home.

Over the last six months, we have even seen large conservative GOP groups in the media come out in support of marriage equality, contributing thousands of dollars towards campaigns in states that are engaged in marriage equality battles. This is an issue about people. It is time for Nevada to step up and not be last at something again. It is time that we stand up as legislators and let the people of Nevada have another opportunity to voice their opinion because they have a right to change their mind.

If you look at the opinion page on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) where our constituents can talk directly to us as legislators and share their opinions, you will see that S.J.R. 13 (R1) is the number one bill being discussed by our residents and our constituents, with 55 percent of those responding in support of marriage equality here in Nevada. You can take a look at any of these other studies that are out there, but I would rather look directly at what the people that I answer to are saying, and this is a direct link to that.



Let me ask you some questions. Do you support marriage equality? Do you support domestic partner relationships? Do you understand what the difference is? Of course, on the surface the difference is marriage equality represents a marriage between two people regardless of gender. Marriage means a man and a woman only. This is not a fad, this is not just because we want to be able to say that we have a marriage certificate. We, as American citizens, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community, deserve equal rights. This is not about every single marriage being recognized equally in the State of Nevada. There are 1,138 federal laws related to marriage, that as an individual of the LGBT community, I do not have. I am not recognized by those federal laws.

My family is very similar to Assemblywoman Fiore's. I am a Democrat, my parents are very conservative Republicans. Thanksgiving and Christmas are always interesting at my house. At the Thanksgiving table a few years ago, my parents, brothers, grandmother, and I were talking about marriage and why it was important. My mom is a very prominent business woman in Los Angeles. She is educated and believes she knows everything. But at this particular dinner, I brought up the 1,138 federal laws that do not pertain to her son. And she looked at me and she said, No, James, you are wrong. I said, Mom, unfortunately, in this situation, you are wrong. I began to explain to her how my relationship would not be treated or looked upon equally as my two brothers' relationships are. And she cried, and I said why are you crying, and she said because, number one, I am embarrassed that I did not know that and number two, because you are my son and I want the best for you and I want only for you to be happy in this life and I know what it is like to be married to your father and I know what your brothers have with their wives. You deserve to have that. And that is how minds have evolved because people are talking about why this is important.

Our job this session was to find sustainable sources of funding to improve things such as education, access to health care, and return to our state employees things that have been taken away from them. This is a potential source of increasing revenue in an industry that we already have the infrastructure for. In Nevada there were 98,000 marriages performed in 2012. Imagine if we opened the doors to marriage equality and same-gender marriage. We are already the marriage capital of the world, so a conservative estimate of a 10 percent increase in marriages would add an additional 10,000 weddings to our state. What does that mean? Limo companies, dress companies, flower shops, hotels, food and beverage, catering, airplanes, buses, all of that. And those are all things that relate to jobs. Put everything aside about how you personally feel about marriage equality. As legislators and as leaders, it is our job to put people back to work and find new sources of revenue.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Assemblyman Healey?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

I know the resolution states religious organizations and clergy have the right to refuse to solemnize marriages and no person can make a claim against them. If a business, or person who holds religious views and owns a business, decides that they do not want to host a same-sex reception, has there been an analysis done by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to determine whether or not a lawsuit could be brought against that business or individual? There has been some concern expressed about that.

**Senator Spearman:**

While conducting research as a doctoral student in business administration, I uncovered a very telling fact for people who are in business or who aspire to be in business. By the year 2014, the purchasing power in the LGBT community will be in excess of \$834 billion. Those who choose to exclude people on the basis of their affectional orientation do so at their own financial peril. This legislation does not compel people to do anything that they do not want to do. As prudent business people, they might want to think twice about shutting out members of the LGBT community.

**Assemblyman Healey:**

To answer your question regarding LCB conducting an analysis, the answer is no. The reason the amended language was added in the Senate side was for clarification. It does not do anything new or different. Currently there are federal laws that protect religious organizations. This resolution will not require any religious organization or clergy to solemnize any marriage. This just codifies what is already there and makes it clear, because we had a lot of questions about that. Business owners have the right to refuse business. As Senator Spearman mentioned, there are a lot of places that will not hold weddings at all, because of the nature of the business. That is a business decision that they get to make.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

You mentioned over 1,100 laws that benefit straight couples that you and your partner cannot benefit from. Can you talk about some of the obstacles that devoted couples face because of these laws that a straight couple would not?

**Assemblyman Healey:**

There are 1,138 federal protections that do not include same-sex couples. Some have to do with taxes and domestic partner relationships. So anything dealing with the filing of a joint tax return has become a real nightmare ever

since domestic partner relationships have been legalized here in Nevada. Other things have to do with social security benefits, death benefits, pension plan benefits, all of which we, as same-sex couples, are not entitled to. We still have issues with adoption and hospital visitation, but fortunately President Obama issued an executive order to hospitals that receive Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement that they cannot discriminate. However, we still have seen situations where couples have been denied access to each other at their most vulnerable time of need.

**Assemblyman Martin:**

Assemblyman Healey, you hit it right on the head. There are so many disadvantages for same-sex couples in committed relationships from a financial and legal point of view. I have made an entire career out of trying to work round the system as best as I can. Inheritance rights, visitation rights, taxation. My partner of 27 years and I cannot file a joint tax return. We are married, depending on what state you are talking about, but if we were to be domestic partners in Nevada, we would have to file, for federal purposes since this is a community property state, to split and allocate every item on the returns fifty-fifty. The system is designed for pairs. People pair up, one way or the other. The system is designed for pairs and that is where the fundamental problem is. It is a legal and financial issue. I have lived it, including the humiliation of not being able to get on my partner's health insurance. The inheritance laws are constantly changing and a same-sex couple has to buy life insurance just to get around the inheritance rules. There is the unlimited inheritance exemption in the tax code for married couples but it does not exist for same-sex couples. Again, this is a very emotional issue for me, and I apologize if I am getting emotional, but this is about equality under the law.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Mr. Healey, Ms. Spearman, do you have any comments as to what Assemblyman Martin has said?

**Assemblyman Healey:**

Thank you, Assemblyman Martin, for sharing that with us. After the Senate hearing I had a couple of emails come in saying how dare you represent 1,138 federal protections that do not extend to same-sex couples; I only find 940. That is absolutely absurd. Why is even one protection that discriminates against any individual or group in this country acceptable?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

This question might best be directed to our legal counsel. If this were approved by the voters, would the interplay of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) and federal law, coupled with the U.S. Supreme Court's pending decision, affect

same-sex couples who marry? Would they automatically get the benefits or does that still need to be settled because of DOMA and the federal laws?

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

We have our legal counsel here. That may not be something that can be answered today. Mr. Powers?

**Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel:**

I think Mr. Duncan's question is directed to the nature of the rights created by the proposed constitutional amendment. It would create rights under state law and same-sex couples would enjoy all the benefits, rights, and privileges under state law that are enjoyed by opposite-gender couples. As far as their rights under federal law, that would still be determined by the federal provisions. This state constitutional amendment would not change those particular rights under federal law.

**Assemblyman Hickey:**

I, for one, appreciate the amendment that was placed in this resolution recognizing the sensitivity towards religious organizations, whether it be Catholic or Mormon or any particular faith that views marriage in a certain way, and I appreciate that. But there are other implications for religious organizations. For instance, adoptions and foster care. You probably already know this but the Catholic Charities in Illinois decided that once same-sex marriages were deemed legal, they closed down their adoption facilities and some of their foster care services. Is that an unintended effect or, in your view, should religious organizations have the right to have certain prohibitions, given the dictates of their faith?

**Senator Spearman:**

Prior to the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, there were churches in this country that split over the question of slavery. If you look at some of the historic Methodist churches, on their cornerstone you will see Methodist Church North, or Methodist Church South. The reason that the African Methodist Episcopal Church exists today, for no other reason, is because three African Americans, at that time they were known as colored, newly freed slaves, were praying at an altar at St. George's Church. A church that they raised money for and helped to build. They were asked by their white counterparts not to pray at the altar because in their minds colored people did not have the right to pray to God at the altar. Richard Allan, who was the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, turned to the gentlemen and said, if you will allow us to finish our prayer, we will leave and we will not bother you anymore. I gave you that example to say this: I cannot decide whether it is legal or not to force a person or an organization to do something

that they do not want to do. That certainly has to be between them, the law, and more importantly, their God. But I will say this, it appears to me that every time, to use this religious language, when one door closes, another one opens.

**Assemblyman Hickey:**

Another issue related to the bill and the amendment, it says all legally valid marriages shall be treated equally under the law. I ask this question not for its shock value but I wonder, when we say legally valid marriages, in 46 countries around the world polygamy is legal. With that sort of language saying that they would be treated equally under the law, would we in Nevada be required to acknowledge marriages of individuals who came from, say, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Malaysia, or Uganda?

**Senator Spearman:**

I will not speak with specificity to the legality of that, but I will say this, the language that is in this resolution is not designed to undo any legal aspects of marriage as they currently exist. So if we currently acknowledge marriages in Malaysia, Uganda, and the other countries that you have mentioned, this legislation does not prohibit it.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Senator Spearman, if I may interject. Assemblyman Anderson cited *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 122.020 defining persons capable of marriage, and it does not allow for polygamy. I do not believe those types of marriages would be recognized under this provision, should it be adopted to the *Nevada Constitution*.

**Assemblyman Healey:**

To echo the Senator's comments, this is about marriage equality. It is just asking that a marriage between a man and a woman, a man and a man, or a woman and a woman, be treated equally here in the state. Regarding your comment on adoption, I am adopted. I was adopted when I was one year old. I can tell you that I came from a very tough situation and I thank my lucky stars every single day that I was brought into a family that would love me and would take me in under any condition.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I have had some people tell me that the LGBT community should wait for the courts to decide this issue, that they should not try to take affirmative action and go to the electorate. I would like to hear your opinion on that.

**Assemblyman Healey:**

The U.S. Supreme Court has the ability to rule in many different ways. One way would allow all marriages, same-sex or straight, throughout the country to be recognized equally. They could also come back with a provision giving the rights back to the states. We have seen a lot of emails from our constituents that say this should be the business of the states. We do not know when or what the ruling will be from the Supreme Court, but what we do know is, in this state, because the discriminatory ban is in our constitution, we felt it was important to begin the process this session.

**Senator Spearman:**

People are saying that it should be state's rights, and you asked the question, why not wait? Those are the same arguments that people put forth for civil rights; those are the same arguments that people put forth to end slavery. To paraphrase one of Dr. King's quotes, change does not roll in on the inevitability wheels of time. So for those who believe in justice, it is important to work for justice now.

**Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:**

If you look at our constitution now, you will find many things that are now considered unconstitutional. The Congressional Term Limits Act is still in our constitution. The Supreme Court can enjoin unconstitutional law, but they cannot remove anything from a state's constitution; only the state can do that.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

The *Nevada Constitution* is a living and growing document. When it was adopted in 1864, only white men could vote. In my opinion, there is no reason not to let the voters have a vote on this issue.

That concludes the presentations from the main presenters on S.J.R. 13 (R1). I will now turn to hear from the opposition and will then ask the proponents of the bill to speak. I want to remind all speakers there are many things going on in this building this evening and that we are in a time crunch. I will have to limit the speaker's time, both against and in favor, and I will do it equally, so I am not playing favorites here with either side. Everyone will have two minutes to speak. If something has been said, a "me too" is fine. I appreciate your being here and your conciseness and brevity.

**Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Families for Freedom, and Nevada Eagle Forum:**

I have a family member and a friend who are homosexuals. I love them both and we are all children of God. I think I want that to be basis of my conversation today. There was no hearing in the Senate on the language that

was added to this bill, so this is the first opportunity we have had to address it. I served as the petition chairman for 16 counties and gathered signatures in every county in the state, over twice the required number of signatures to get Question 2 on the ballot. I wanted to mention that two days ago in this Committee, Senator Spearman stated that four generations back, her family were slaves. I would say four generations back my family suffered from severe religious persecution. That is one of the reasons I am very concerned about this bill. My great-grandmother stood on her front porch with two missionaries inside as the mob came to murder them.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

It is terrible what happened to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, but I do want to ask you to speak to the bill.

**Janine Hansen:**

I wanted to make the point that is why we have significant feelings about this resolution. In the *Nevada Constitution*, the Ordinance, which is irrevocable without the consent of the United States or the people of the State of Nevada, states, "That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of said state shall ever be molested, in person or property, on account of his or her mode of religious worship." Article 1, Section 4 of the *Nevada Constitution* deals with liberty of conscience, which is what we are talking about. As we look at the new language contained in S.J.R. 13 (R1), we read that "religious organizations and clergy have the right to refuse to solemnize a marriage and no person has the right to make any claim against a religious organization or clergy for such a refusal." This does far more than just repeal the marriage amendment, and that is why it is so important to discuss this. That is very narrowly drawn. It only applies to the clergy specifically if they are going to solemnize a marriage in that particular church. It does not include other religious issues. Mr. Hickey brought up the issue in Illinois. Catholic Bishop Thomas Paprocki of Springfield noted that because of the same-sex marriage issue in Illinois, Catholic Charities has already been forced out of the foster care and adoption services. Knights of Columbus could be obligated to make their halls available for same-sex weddings.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Ms. Hansen, a reminder of the time limitations.

**Janine Hansen:**

I am trying to hurry. Catholic grade schools could be forced to hire teachers who are legally married to someone of the same sex. Even the bishop himself would not be protected if someone of same sex applied to work in his ministry. I am significantly concerned about the religious persecution and implications of

those of us who hold deeply held conscious beliefs about this issue and how our religious rights will be in jeopardy. In 2009, when we passed the domestic partnership law, we made it equal to marriage. So these 1,138 federal laws that have been mentioned have nothing to do with this law because it will not affect them. This is a radical constitutional amendment, which no other state has attempted to put into their constitution. It does far more than repeal the existing language added by Question 2.

History shows that the best incubator for happy and successful children is the traditional family, and I have 11 grandchildren and this is important to me that we want to uphold marriage between a man and a woman as the constitutional standard, as the ideal. We know we do not all reach the ideal. I have been divorced, I have been a single mother, but we want to uphold that constitutional standard. I think that this particular language goes far beyond just repealing marriage, which would have allowed the state to determine what it wanted to do. This language will put our religious liberties in jeopardy and we will once again become subject to religious persecution. [Ms. Hansen submitted additional written testimony after the close of the hearing ([Exhibit P](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I appreciate your comments and conciseness. However, I believe you are wrong. If this were to pass, there are First Amendment provisions that would protect any faith. Are there any questions for Ms. Hansen?

**Assemblyman Duncan:**

This is one of the concerns that I have because it is the intersection between the First Amendment, religious liberty, and the provision of equal protection in the *Nevada Constitution*. Have you done any legal analysis that deals with public accommodations, whether or not people cannot refuse accommodations based on race, for example?

**Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:**

Mr. Chair, we have legal counsel here. Perhaps he can speak to the First Amendment piece or get us an opinion that we may look at. The Legislative Counsel Bureau represents us so I have to believe what they say is gospel because that is the way we have always done it in this building and I think we need to stay in that realm if we are going to have a fair hearing.

**Kevin Powers:**

Mr. Duncan has raised two separate issues. The first one deals with public accommodations and discrimination within public accommodations. That is already addressed in NRS Chapter 651. In 2009 and 2011 the statute was amended, and it does prohibit racial discrimination and it also was amended to



prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity or expression. So in current Nevada law, in NRS Chapter 651, places of public accommodation cannot discriminate on those grounds right now and this constitutional amendment will have no effect on those existing statutory provisions.

The second issue, obviously this is a state constitutional amendment, and is subordinate to the First Amendment. So this constitutional amendment cannot take away any rights under the First Amendment with regard to religious freedom.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you for that analysis, Mr. Powers. Are there any other questions for Ms. Hansen? [There were none.]

**John Wagner, representing Independent American Party:**

I heard a word I did not like to hear mentioned: threat. I resent anyone who makes a threat to any one of you or to any one of the people behind me. If I ever hear of one, I will be going to the Legislative Police and filing charges. There is no need for anybody to ever have to go through that.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I do need to remind you that we are short on time. Please stick to the bill. If there is anything that you need to report to the Legislative Police you certainly may, but I did not hear anything like that.

**John Wagner:**

We oppose the bill. I have studied the Bible myself and had enough credits to become a licensed minister. My theology goes back 2,000 years; however, I do not pay attention to what Martin Luther or any of the ecumenical councils have said because these are men speaking. I believe the Bible was written by God through divine intervention. I have gay family members and friends, but I do not support gay marriages.

**Lynn Chapman, representing Nevada Families for Freedom:**

The New Mexico Supreme Court in March started to hear arguments about photographer Elaine Huguenin of Elane Photography, who decided she would rather not take photographs at a same-sex couple's commitment ceremony because of her Christian beliefs. A complaint was filed with the New Mexico Human Rights Commission. They ordered Ms. Huguenin to pay \$6,637.94 in court costs. The senior counsel for the Alliance Defending Freedom said Americans in the marketplace should not be targets for legal attacks simply because they abide by their values and beliefs. The government should not be

allowed to force a photographer to promote a message that violates her conscience. People in business may not be protected. The Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association, which is a Methodist organization, lost their tax-exempt status in New Jersey when they refused to allow a same-sex couple to use the Pavilion, property they own, for a reception. The state commissioner on environmental protection, Lisa Jackson, declined to recertify the Pavilion as eligible for real estate tax exemptions.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

You have just hit two minutes. Please tie things up.

**Lynn Chapman:**

The association had owned the land since 1870. What was really important was that the Pavilion was used largely for Sunday church services and youth ministry programs, but the general public was never granted unfettered right to use the Pavilion in any way it chose. So there are problems and there are times when there are going to be suits and countersuits over religious liberty.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I am sorry but you are out of time. I will now go to Las Vegas to hear from those in opposition. Please remember that we have a tight time crunch.

**David R. Mathews, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I believe that the term marriage as contained in the current definition of marriage in Section 21 of Article 1 of the *Nevada Constitution* correctly defines the relationship between a man and a woman. For many millennium this has been the interpretation of marriage among most societies throughout the world. Now this bill is seeking to blur the traditional meaning of marriage by including persons involved in other types of interpersonal relationships. Let us not confuse apples and oranges. These other types of interpersonal relationships need to be defined by another name. Therefore, I personally am opposed to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 (1st Reprint).

**Ed Gobel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are here today on the eve of Mother's Day, which is a celebration of the nuclear family and what it means to civilization. We have heard invalid comparisons about interracial marriages, which I resent, as those marriages are between one man and one woman, albeit of different races, and I fought for that. Where do we go from here with the definition of marriage? Everyone on the podium has supported government going in and defining marriage in the past. It was always about not only love but procreation. We have all supported many things, such as not allowing incest. Do we now start to allow interspecies marriage?

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Mr. Gobel, you are getting way off topic. If you would please speak to the bill.

**Ed Gobel:**

I do not think it is any different.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

It is very different. Mr. Gobel, we are done. We can go on to the next speaker.

**Ed Gobel:**

I did not get a chance to speak. I have been waiting all this time.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I appreciate that but you did not speak to the bill and that has nothing to do with this bill.

**Ed Gobel:**

I appreciate my right as an American. Will you give me a chance to speak?

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I will give you one more minute to speak to the bill.

**Ed Gobel:**

Historic health concerns about procreation have always been in relation to the definition of marriage. We talked about polygamy. There is a tremendous cost to taxpayers in funding health care problems that might be created by this, which many articles have been written about. All of this at a time when Nevada is enduring a jobless recovery. Gains to tourism among the LGBT community I believe are more than offset by the different medical coverage that will be needed. Also the loss of jobs as businesses struggle to cope with drastic increases due to various illnesses that might be related to same-sex marriages. [Mr. Gobel submitted additional written testimony after the close of the hearing ([Exhibit Q](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Mr. Gobel, I am sorry but we have hit two minutes. Thank you.

**Linda West Myers, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

With your permission I would like to yield my two minutes to my brother as I would simply say I agree with him.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

We will go on to the next speaker and you are welcome to speak if you would like, Ms. Myers.

**Eric Farnsworth, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

The great debate in this country for a system of independence occurred in the 1770s and it is still alive today. If either party here today were silenced, we would be in a worse condition, a condition of tyranny. Our country has evolved a system of protection from barbaric acts of violence against race, religion, and even the LGBT community, equally. I would like to state two points. You cannot legislate public safety absolutely. I bring this up as a premise for my next statement. You cannot guarantee equality absolutely. Alexis de Tocqueville warned America that equality is the root of democratic despotism; in times when conditions are unequal, no inequality, however great, offends the eye. However, in the midst of general uniformity, the slightest dissimilarity appears shocking. I was going to bring up how we define this but I think it has already been addressed. Mr. Healey, I am still in my state. I voted in 2000 and 2002. I have not evolved on the definition of marriage. If marriage is equal to all, and I am fundamentally against this, Mr. Healey, Ms. Fiore, members of the Senate and Assembly, where can I turn for redress? Take the title of marriage and give me another name for it, because to me there is an absolute difference. Take away my tax advantages, my financial advantages, my government insurances, my inheritance advantages, making fundamental changes to society based on economy is wrong. This resolution has changed and evolved. Originally it was for the repeal of this amendment; now it has evolved into this definition and change. I encourage each of you to vote against this resolution.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you. I will now come back to Carson City to hear from those in opposition.

**Don Alt, Private Citizen, Silver Springs, Nevada:**

In the livestock industry there are animals born that are called freemartins. They are the same as you might call a homosexual.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Sir, please speak to the bill.

**Don Alt:**

I want to speak to equality. The equality of the animals. They go off by themselves, they are shunned by the others, and if they were humans they would feel bad. And to pass this bill to make other people feel equal, I think is

wrong. In Genesis, Eve was called wife. If this were to pass, you would have the cart before the horse because you would have to change other laws before you could pass this.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you for your testimony, sir.

**Dr. Reverend William Paul Tarbell, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I did not realize that I needed to submit this document ([Exhibit R](#)) before the hearing, but the committee secretary tells me that I can leave it here with you for possible inclusion later.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Absolutely. As I said at the beginning of the hearing, we will keep it open until 5 p.m. tomorrow for anyone who would like to submit anything in writing.

**Dr. Tarbell:**

I want to point out one concern which has already been touched upon, but I did want to expand it. I am speaking of the conflict between church and state, religion and government, and, to some extent, conflict within religious bodies. Senator Spearman spoke to her points of view, but the people I know across this country do not share her views on scripture and religious beliefs. There is inherent in all of this what one might describe as collateral damage. If this is enacted, and I understand the vote of the people would be considered sovereign, but if it is enacted, the fear of collateral damages to religious freedom of conscience would be very great. Illinois is not the only state to curtail adoption services by Christian bodies. Massachusetts and California have also seen a reduction in services. I want to point out that in 1996, I sat on a committee of social concerns at the National Presbyterian General Assembly in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The committee was asked to consider how should we approach our same-sex friends? What kinds of needs and concerns should we support? The committee came out with a very general description of reaching out and helping people, regardless of sexual orientation.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Reverend, we are out of time. I do appreciate your testimony. And we will add what you have submitted in writing to the record.

**Patricia Saake, Private Citizen, Fallon, Nevada:**

I am against this bill. I believe that marriage is between a man and a woman. I was reading it today and, I know you are very busy, but it looks to me like it was hastily put together. There are just a lot of questions.

I have a question about section 2, on the religious organizations. Religious organizations are not the only people that perform marriages. I think you have forgotten about the judges. There may be some other provision that I do not see but I think our honorable judges around the state that are performing marriages would also need to be included in some way.

**James P. Parrish, Private Citizen, Fallon, Nevada:**

I do not know much about public speaking. I have never been in front of a group like you. I thank you for hearing me. I do not have a whole lot to say. Obviously, I am against this whole situation. I am an American and a patriot, just like I am sure all of you are, because that is why you are here. A study showed that over 80 different civilizations have become extinct over the last centuries, because every one of them had given up on strict heterosexual marriage so that within three generations there was almost no one left. That is a fact, you can look it up. We have been told that we are evolving, but you see, what we are in the middle of with this homosexual issue is not a new thing at all. We are just dropping back to things that have happened long before us. Not the marriage issue, but the homosexual issue. It looks to me like we are devolving, not evolving.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you. We will go back to Las Vegas to hear from others in opposition to S.J.R. 13 (R1).

**Linda West Myers:**

What surprises us is there has been no mention at all of what we believe should be a huge fiscal note. I believe it was Assemblyman Healey who brought up the state of Minnesota. Minnesota discovered a new wrinkle that their budget officials have determined that the state would have to spend \$688,000 each and every year to provide health insurance benefits to same-sex spouses of state employees. I think we are opening the floodgates to many unintended consequences. It is not about love, it is about the financial cost. One person's freedom ends when it impinges upon another person's freedom and, when you are causing additional costs to other taxpayers, that is not right.

**Reverend David A. Hoff, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:**

I believe that this S.J.R. 13 (R1) jeopardizes religious liberty. The language of S.J.R. 13 (R1) was amended in the Senate to add these words, "The State of Nevada and its political subdivisions shall recognize marriages and issue marriage licenses to couples, regardless of gender. All legally valid marriages shall be treated equally under the law." This is a very radical step. No state in the nation has gone this far. This makes same-sex marriage a constitutional standard. It makes same-sex marriage a constitutional right on a par with other

constitutional rights. This goes much further than originally introduced to simply repeal the marriage amendment. It means that Nevada officials will be forced to perform same-sex marriages and that same-sex marriages from other states must be recognized. In addition, because this language negates constitutional religious liberty protection, it adds language supposedly to protect religious liberty which states that religious organizations and clergy have the right to refuse to solemnize a marriage, and no person has the right to make any claim against the religious organization or clergy for such refusal. This language only protects the clergy of the church from having to perform marriages. It does not protect the religious liberties of churches, religious organizations, or individuals beyond performing the same-gender marriage. For instance, it does not protect a church or a religious organization which operates an adoption or foster care service from being forced to place children with same-sex married couples. You already heard what happened in Illinois. It does not protect a religious school from being forced to hire a person in a same-sex marriage from teaching at the school, a religious organization like the Knights of Columbus from being forced to offer their hall for a same-sex wedding reception.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you, Reverend. I am sorry but you are out of time. I do want to point out that on page 2 of S.J.R. 13 (R1), line 10, it does specifically mention religious organizations and clergy have the right to refuse to solemnize if they choose to, if it is contrary to their doctrine.

**David Knell, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

My first comment, I would like to address Senator Spearman's comment regarding no mention of marriage in the New Testament. I would have the Senator read Mathew 19:4-5.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Mr. Knell, I must urge you to speak to the bill.

**David Knell:**

I do not think this bill should be passed because of business or revenue purposes. No one has addressed what is right or wrong with this bill. Metaphorically, when a door is opened, just a crack, laws are passed to push the door wide open. Meaning that there are ramifications for this that would impact many other areas of life in a negative way and otherwise. I am very concerned about this because there have been other bills passed, and they have had vague language which has been left to the interpretation of the attorney whenever it goes to court. That is my concern with this bill also. [Submitted written testimony in opposition ([Exhibit S](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

As I see no others in Carson City in opposition to the bill, I will stay with Las Vegas. Is there anyone else who is in opposition that would like to speak?

**Danielle Arceo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am 17 years old. If you will humor me, I will represent the younger generation of Nevada. I have personal friends who are gay or lesbian and I love them very much but I am opposed to this bill. Earlier when the sponsors gave their presentation, they mentioned that traditional marriage was mainly a religious viewpoint. I would like to suggest that religion is a fundamental set of beliefs so our starting points, per se, mine on the Bible that there is a God, and potentially others who say there is not, that different starting points constitute a religion. Who is the author of marriage?

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

If you could please stick to the bill. I think we are all thrilled to see someone of your young age interested in the process and testifying, but if you could just stick to the measure.

**Danielle Arceo:**

Marriage was instituted by God, it states that in the Bible, as between one man and one woman.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you for sharing your views.

**Cleto B. Arceo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I also oppose this bill. For fundamental reasons that our dear farmer up north suggested, societies cannot be built on other than marriage of a man and a woman. A homosexual community may thrive off of a homosexual community but they cannot themselves build their own community.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Please speak to the bill, sir.

**Cleto Arceo:**

We have heard in other testimony that society cannot be built on other than heterosexual community.

**J.C.T. Wang, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have been having a dialogue with Senator Segerblom. Obviously I oppose this bill. I am a little concerned about the way this whole thing is happening



because we spend an hour for the proponents, five people speaking, four of whom are gay.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Sir, I appreciate what you are saying. Yes, the presenters are given additional time to present the bill to this Committee. However, we will be keeping the proponents of the bill to the same two minutes in time as we have those in opposition.

**J.C.T. Wang:**

I was concerned in my dialogue with Senator Segerblom about why this is happening. I heard a little about it earlier when Assemblyman Healey said that we are doing this for economic reasons. I think Senator Spearman said there is about \$834 billion, I do not know where that number came from but I would be very interested to find out. I have to ask you, have you thought about cutting spending instead of increasing spending? Next, there is a morality issue here. My brother was a homosexual and he spent almost 30 years in a relationship with another man. He died ten years ago. When my wife and I attended his 25th anniversary, my wife said she thought it was wonderful that he and his partner had spent all this time together. We assumed there was a fidelity in that relationship. He laughed at her.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Sir, time is up. I am very sorry for the loss of your brother.

**Virginia Douglas, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I wanted to say that Dr. King has been mentioned so much and in many ways that have been used beyond the good and now there are some dubious ways of quoting him. The state does have an overriding interest in this issue which is not for you or me, but the future generations. We are compelled as people who were brought up by parents who were more concerned about what would happen to their children than their personal predilections and happiness. I hope that we will not cast that aside. In your deliberations I am sure that many of you, as parents or grandparents, have a stake in a future generation and we owe a great debt that was paid by the blood of our founding fathers to maintain this. I sympathize with you as a former family therapist. It is extremely difficult to supervise a discussion among people who love each other greatly and have real conflicts of interest. It is tense. I pray that the outcome will work together for the good of the next generation.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who wishes to speak in opposition to S.J.R. 13 (R1)?

**Juanita Clark, representing Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Marriage is only between a male and female. Renaming something does not change it. Placing such a phrase in the *Nevada Constitution* will not change marriage but cause unique and major harm. [Excerpt from letter in opposition to S.J.R. 13 (R1) submitted by Ms. Clark, written by June Ingram, President, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada ([Exhibit T](#)).] We concur with the statements made by the others who testified in opposition to this measure.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who would like to speak in opposition? [There was no response.] I will come back to Carson City to hear from those in support of the measure. Please remember the same rules apply to the proponents as to the opponents of the measure; you are limited to two minutes. I also want to remind everyone that they may submit written testimony in opposition, support, or neutral to the measure. It can be emailed to my email address or the Committee's email address. We will accept all submissions until 5 p.m. tomorrow, May 10, 2013.

**Karlos LaSane II, Regional Vice President, Government Relations, Caesars Entertainment:**

I am honored to be here this evening and to be the voice of Caesars Entertainment in this forum in regard to S.J.R. 13 (R1). Caesars Entertainment has a rich history in supporting the LGBT community in Nevada, and throughout the country. We are very proud of our record. Not only do we support this bill because of its human rights platform, we also support this bill because it makes good business sense. I have no doubt that Las Vegas and other jurisdictions throughout the state will benefit from the economic impact of marriage equality. It is very important, from Caesars Entertainment's perspective, that Nevada, where we have our corporate headquarters, is the state that recognizes the rights of all people and welcomes them with open arms into the tourist-based economy. I am here to convey to this esteemed body of legislators that Caesars Entertainment fully and wholeheartedly supports S.J.R. 13 (R1).

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Mr. LaSane? [There were none.]

**Josh Griffin, representing MGM Resorts International:**

I believe the way that Mr. LaSane phrased it was excellent and we agree. MGM Resorts is the largest employer in the state of Nevada and we are proud to support S.J.R. 13 (R1). We are also the largest provider of health insurance

benefits in the state. Much has been made of the economic benefit, which may be true, and to that extent we appreciate and support and look forward to that. However, we are here as a company because it is the right thing to do. It is good for our state and our communities.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Griffin? [There were none.]

**Yvanna Cancela, representing Culinary Workers Union Local 226:**

It is an honor to be able to support S.J.R. 13 (R1). In 1997 the union established the first collective bargaining agreement that provided for same-sex benefits. It is because we believe that all people deserve the same rights and we believe this is an important measure to be on the right side of history.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Ms. Cancela, congratulations on your award as a Champion of Change from President Obama. Well deserved.

**Assemblywoman Flores:**

I think it is phenomenal that global corporations support this measure. I was not expecting all of you to be testifying here today. I am curious, given your national and global presence, have you also testified in support in other states or countries that have already moved forward with a measure of this type?

**Josh Griffin:**

I do not know. I can find out. I know that this issue is one that MGM Resorts is very proud to be a part of and we were honored to be asked to testify.

**Karlos LaSane II:**

Yes, we have. We have been in other jurisdictions where we have articulated our vision. However, I am particularly honored as this is my first time testifying and I bring not only the support of my company but my own personal support of the measure.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

I believe earlier someone made a comment that they thought this was being pushed just to promote business activity, and I see this as being a bill to promote human rights and equality. If it helps our Nevada economy then so be it. Would you care to comment on that?

**Josh Griffin:**

Trying to be very respectful of the Committee's time, I will briefly agree with you. I believe that we are here to support human rights, and any economic benefit that may materialize is ancillary to that cause.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any other questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I will now go down to Las Vegas for those who are in support of S.J.R. 13 (R1).

**Tod Story, Interim Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

In 2009 the Nevada Legislature passed Senate Bill No. 283 of the 75th Session, the Nevada Domestic Partnership Act, which sought to provide legal recognition of same-gender couple relationships. This act went a long way in providing civil recognition for same-gender couples in Nevada, but it is inherently unequal to marriage. First, it only covers relationships contracted in Nevada. This is discriminatory to those couples legally married in other states. Second, it is inadequate because it creates a separate, unequal, second-class system for those couples in Nevada that desire marriage. Third, the federal government does not currently recognize domestic partnerships or civil unions when granting benefits, rights, or privileges to married couples. We have come a long way since 2002 when the *Nevada Constitution* was amended to prohibit the recognition of marriages of same-sex couples. Yes, marriage is defined in the *Nevada Constitution*. But things have changed dramatically in Nevada and across the nation. Throughout the U.S., 58 percent now support marriage equality. Eleven states, plus the District of Columbia, recognize full marriage, and just today in Minnesota, their House of Representatives voted 75 to 59 in favor of marriage equality.

Nevada sits at the intersection between recognizing same-gender relationships, while denying them equal consideration. The only way to rectify this conflict is to repeal the constitutional restriction on the definition of marriage and extend the rights and responsibilities of marriage to all couples regardless of gender. There are those who have expressed concerns that religious recognition of marriage outside the scope of their doctrine will be required. The First Amendment to the *U.S. Constitution* protects their right to define, recognize, and solemnize only those marriages that they sanction. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has been at the forefront of defending the rights of all religious believers to practice their faith and will continue to vigorously defend that right. The doctrines about what kinds of unions are given religious sanction are and should be separate and independent from the question of which unions are sanctioned by the state. [Mr. Story submitted additional written testimony after the close of the hearing ([Exhibit U](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you, Mr. Story. Unfortunately, we do have a two-minute time limit. If there is anything you wish to submit in writing we are accepting all submissions until 5 p.m. tomorrow.

**Mya Reyes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 13 (1st Reprint), and today I will speak specifically on the economic value same-gender marriage made to our state and how it will enhance the lives of all Nevadans. In fiscal year 2011 as Director of Diversity Marketing at the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority, I assisted in booking over 83,000 room nights from LGBT meetings and conventions to Las Vegas. These meetings generated a conservative figure of \$25 million in room revenue and ancillary expenses. I share this with you as I know firsthand the economic value LGBT travelers represent to our city and to our state. Senate Joint Resolution 13 (1st Reprint) represents a financial opportunity to Nevada because of our reputation as a wedding destination. When you strip away all the religious and personal objections to same-gender marriage and focus solely on the fiscal and economic impact, you get an interesting picture. If same-gender marriage were legalized in Nevada the nearly 100,000 weddings performed here annually could see an increase of up to 10 percent, according to population reports from the U.S. Census and others. Not only will we feel the financial influx of hundreds of thousands of visitors to our state, we would also benefit from the marriage of same-gender Nevadans. Overall the state's wedding industry has been faltering. Washoe County issued 3,000 marriage licenses a month in the 1970s, but fewer than 800 per month were issued last year, even as the population tripled over that time period. The owner of the Chapel of the Bells in downtown Reno has conducted weddings in Nevada for close to 50 years. He told me that last year was the lowest number of marriage licenses issued since 1937 and that there is no question that same-gender marriages would increase business, as there are thousands of gay and lesbian couples in the West whose only option now is Iowa. As a matter of fact, Nevada could potentially be the only state in the West with same-gender marriage for some time and as a result, become a wedding magnet for many neighboring states. Who would benefit from these weddings? The wedding chapels? Yes. The state? Yes. The hotels? Yes. But there are a few others that would benefit.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Ms. Reyes, I am sorry but I must call time. Please submit any written testimony you may have.

**Reverend Wilfred Moore, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have come before you this evening to tell you that my church is made up of families; gay families and straight families. I do not see the difference between either. Love is love. Every child in those families deserves to have their family recognized by the state of Nevada. The right and freedom to marry in no way challenges or changes anyone's theological perspective. The issue is not about theology, but public policy, which allows for equal protection under the law, guaranteed to all citizens by the *United States Constitution*. According to the recent *Washington Post/ABC News* poll, 58 percent of all Americans now say it should be legal for gay and lesbian couples to wed. We stand unified and in solidarity that the gay marriage ban in the state of Nevada should be repealed. Furthermore, we believe that the values that ought to inform our public engagement are the very principles that unite us rather than the beliefs that distinguish us.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

We are going to come back to Carson City to hear testimony from those in support of S.J.R. 13 (R1).

**Ashley Manke, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am fortunate to be able to experience this issue from many vantage points. First, and foremost, as a parent with all the love I have for my gay son and three straight daughters. I want the same opportunities and basic rights for my son and his spouse, as my daughter and her husband have from what the institution of marriage provides. Not just from the legal standpoint, but the social aspects as well. I have lived and loved the Mormon faith, and when my son came out in high school, I had a church point of view that marriage should only be between a man and a woman, no exceptions. It was a sacred union. Since then, due to the journey of meeting other gay individuals, working and getting to know the gay community, and experiencing firsthand individuals who have been discriminated against, I have come to believe differently. We as heterosexuals did not have to come out or fight for the right to be with our spouses and enjoy all of the benefits which marriage offers.

As I work for an attorney, the second vantage point I have is from the professional side. We have many clients in nontraditional relationships and domestic partnerships, so we do estate planning and asset protection. I frequently see these individuals fight for the basic rights I have enjoyed with my spouse. The domestic partnership process begins when I go to the Nevada Secretary of State website, print off a form for them to fill out and send in for a certificate. To make it feel a little bit more special, they can include \$5 for a color certificate. It is a faceless process; informal, with no pomp and circumstance. There is no celebration of a new life journey together surrounded

by friends and family and with social acceptance. So I provide a little celebration. I pop the cork of some champagne, throw some confetti and give lots of hugs, congratulating them on their marriage and union, completely accepting and celebrated without prejudice.

The most heart-wrenching experiences I have witnessed are the partners who are not able to be with their loved ones, some of whom have been together for years and are their partner's only support system, during a medical crisis or even on their deathbeds, because they are not each other's spouse or family. It is a travesty to me.

We have placed the LGBT community in the back of the bus. Most of the opposed expressed that domestic partnership is the same as marriage.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Pardon me for interrupting you; however, you have reached the time limit. If there is any other testimony that you have, please submit it in writing.

**Dalia Zaki, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am 11 and a half years old and I am in the sixth grade. I was born in Las Vegas. My family, that is two moms and my brother, moved to Reno last summer.

**Khalil Zaki, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am nine years old and in the third grade in the gifted and talented program.

**Dalia Zaki:**

We are so glad we moved here because northern Nevada is perfect. We love to hike, snowshoe, kayak, camp, backpack, and especially to go to Wild Island. We also love it here because we are a lot closer to my dad and his partner who live just outside of San Francisco. We are here today to testify about what marriage equality means to us. As I said, we have two moms and two dads. Our biological mom and dad grew up as close neighbors and each realized that they were gay in their 20s. Even though they each moved away to college, they stayed in touch. My mom knew that she wanted to have kids so she asked my dad to be the donor. Soon my mom's wish came true and I was born.

**Khalil Zaki:**

I came two years later.

**Dalia Zaki:**

We see daddy often and love spending time with him and his partner and their two dogs. By the way, they cannot get married in California either.

**Khalil Zaki:**

My mom and her partner Patricia, got "married" a few years ago, as soon as domestic partnership became legal in Nevada. It was a beautiful ceremony. As you can imagine, I was the ring bearer and my sister was the flower girl. All of our family and friends helped us celebrate and we had a lot of fun at the reception, dancing, eating cake, and playing with our cousins.

**Dalia Zaki:**

Some people think that our moms should be happy being domestic partners and do not think they should have the right to get married. We do not agree because it is discrimination pure and simple. Our parents are all highly educated, work hard, pay taxes, vote, take us to piano lessons, make us do chores, go grocery shopping, and tuck us in every night. The list that makes them like any other parents is longer than we have time to share.

**Khalil Zaki:**

But we should not have to. They should not have to prove that they are worthy of the same rights and responsibilities that heterosexual people have. They deserve the basic freedom of marriage because they are human. Period.

**Dalia Zaki:**

And we deserve the basic right just to say, my parents' wedding anniversary is in March and leave it at that and not always have to explain all the details to people.

**Khalil Zaki:**

We also deserve the peace of mind of knowing that if one of them was in the hospital, that the other one would have the same rights as any other spouse to take care of things.

**Dalia Zaki:**

My brother and I deserve to feel safe and secure that Patricia can pick us up from school, take us to the doctor, or make decisions about our well-being, without facing unnecessary obstacles. Just like all my friend's parents. I think that the sexual orientation of my parents has a lot to do with the quality of my character. For as long as I can remember, I have known that discrimination against anyone is wrong.



Marriage equality will have positive implications for our state and society. Do you have any idea how many times I hear, that's so gay, and other kids calling each other fags and lesbos in middle school? I even know of a two-year-old who wore a kilt to a piano recital and the parents around him were telling the mom that he was going to be gay. It is always used as an insult, even if people do not know what it means. And I have to make the choice several times a day to either speak up or remain silent knowing that if I say something I risk insult or even physical violence, but by keeping quiet I have to hear it over and over. I wonder how other people would feel if their parents were constantly being insulted for who they chose to love. I am faced with this discrimination every day at school, in the halls, at lunch, and on the bus. Maybe if marriage equality passed giving gay and lesbian couples' relationships the recognition and respect that they deserve, using gay as an insult may become more of the exception than the rule.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you very much. You did a great job. Are there any questions for our young witnesses? I think that some of our lobbyists and legislators could learn from you both.

**Assemblywoman Flores:**

You are both very brave and I am sure that your parents are wonderful. And I am very sorry that you have to hear those things, but I know that in the near future it is going to become less frequent and it will be that way because of you.

**Salwa Zaki, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I have served in public education for the past 17 years as a teacher, principal, and central office administrator. I have also taught at both the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the University of Nevada, Reno. Patricia, my partner, is an English professor. Just like most of you, our careers keep us very busy but our family is our number one priority. As the kids shared, Patricia and I got married in 2010, soon after domestic partnership became legal. Wedding plans were very typical until the paperwork. In Las Vegas, the Marriage License Bureau is open 8 a.m. to midnight, 365 days a year, and has a continuous string of couples, young and old, of all ethnicities from all over the world, standing in line to obtain their marriage licenses. We figured we would head over there one day after work to get ours too. But we were wrong. We were shocked to learn that domestic partnership was handled in the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, open 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. So we both had to take a day off from work. When we arrived, we were the only couple seeking domestic partnership. The atmosphere was chaotic, stressful, and combative because everyone else was there to obtain

their business license. Our clerk acknowledged the general unpleasantness of the situation and did her best to compensate by expediting our paperwork and treating us with genuine kindness and respect. We prevailed in our pursuit of paperwork and obtained a business license, which we proudly display next to our marriage photo. The point of course is that domestic partnership is not marriage equality. I share our experience of living as second-class citizens in our state and how it contrasts with the rights heterosexual Nevadans take for granted. In 2001, the Protection of Marriage provision was passed in Nevada and I ask, what benefit has our state experienced as a result? Our story illustrates that the losses have outweighed the gains. Hundreds of us are spending valuable time, energy, and resources by taking days off of work, taking our kids out of school early, and continuing to fight discrimination head-on. We represent the majority of Nevadans who support the repeal of the Protection of Marriage provision, hopeful that our efforts will eventually result in marriage equality, a basic freedom we all deserve. I urge you to grant same-sex couples the freedom, along with the responsibilities, to legally marry in Nevada.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you for your testimony. And thank you for bringing your precious children. If anyone was counting time, your children had four minutes, two minutes per speaker. Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Robert Fulkerson, State Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

I am honored to be here with Riley and Pam Roberts. I remember going to meetings on LGBT issues at Pam and her wife's place when Riley was in diapers; it is great to see him up here now. This is a crucial step to winning the freedom to marry in Nevada and it is an incredible chance to move marriage forward in our state so that thousands of families like mine, and Riley's, and the Zaki's, and others, are counting on us to get this passed. [Read from written testimony ([Exhibit V](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Fulkerson? [There were none.]

**Riley Roberts, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I was born in Reno, Nevada, 18 years ago and guess who was there? My mom Pamela Roberts and Gretchen Miller, my loving parents. [Read from written statement ([Exhibit W](#)).]

**Pamela Roberts, representing Nevada Women's Lobby:**

Opponents of same-gender marriage are using at least two of the same arguments that were used to prohibit interracial marriage: (1) it is against

God's law as set forth in the Bible; and (2) children of interracial marriages will suffer. [Read from written statement ([Exhibit X](#)).]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Ms. Roberts, pardon me for interrupting, but I do have to keep everyone to two minutes. Thank you, Riley, I appreciate your courage and how supportive you are of your parents. I will go back to Las Vegas for those in support of S.J.R. 13 (R1).

**Barbara Silva, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Please, I am asking you to pass S.J.R. 13 (R1) so that gay couples can be married. We all have the right to equality in this world. No one should interfere in love, only God, because He loves us all.

**Astrid Silva, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

First of all, I am very proud of my mom. I really hope that you vote for S.J.R. 13 (R1). I had something prepared, but as I looked out the window from the Grant Sawyer Building I saw a cemetery, and my only thought now is when those couples that just want to join their lives are in the final moments of their days, and they are burying their loved ones in those cemeteries, none of us in this room are going to be there holding their hand. None of us in this room are going to be there to give them a word of comfort so why should we decide who gets to be there for them? We should not have a say in this. They are human beings, they are consenting adults, and I hope that you can allow voters to make this choice for their family members, for the people that they love, and for the people who want this state to continue being an open-minded state.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you, Ms. Silva.

**Rafael Lopez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I believe in marriage equality because I believe it is a civil right. This bill solely affects public policy, not religious policy. The U.S. was founded on the separation of the church and state and while religious groups have the right to regulate marriage however they want within their own religious institutions, I do not believe that they have the right to impede on the rights of others on a civil level. Our current state constitution interferes with the rights of LGBT individuals and their right to pursue happiness. As a gay man, my only desire is to receive the same benefits that the state gives to any couple who holds a marriage certificate. If two people want to commit to one another, we should not be discouraging it, but rather encouraging it. Religious institutions cannot grant me rights, only the state can. What this bill means for me is the same opportunity to live happily ever after.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you. We are going to come back to Carson City to hear testimony from those in support of the measure.

**Cindy Davis, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I come from the practical standpoint of a small business owner. I have 25 years of experience in human resources and I currently own a small business consulting with other companies in that area. Over the years, I have had employees come to me and tell me that they wanted equality in the workplace, whether that was for vacation policy, leave policy, or a benefit policy. I did not believe when I first got into human resources that there could be something that was not fair, because I was taught we are always fair. And human resources is where they come to talk about fairness. Especially benefit administration. Employees drive satisfaction and when there is employee satisfaction, we have greater productivity in the workplace. If we have employees that are happy about their benefits and having the same equality and treatment, I think that we are going to be better off as organizations. Regulatory compliance is complicated and I urge you not to add a different title; call it marriage. Marriage has meaning within a hospital, and it allows people to have access to their loved ones. It has meaning when it comes to benefits, it has meaning when it comes to many things that those of us who are not same-sex couples take for granted. Whether it is a school or an emergency room, or business policies, I urge you to help us to let them have the same opportunities that we have. Let the Nevada voters have their say in relation to fairness and equality for all. I hope someday, when I come through Carson City again and I see the marriage license sign on Carson Street, that everyone can be afforded the same opportunity that I have to walk in and get a license.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Davis? [There were none.]

**Angela Golik, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:**

I am a government teacher at Carson High School. What can I say about marriage equality that probably has not already been said a hundred times tonight? What can I say to convince you now that it is the time for society to overthrow this last bastion against equal rights?

Our students decided this year to establish a new club on our campus, the Gay Straight Alliance (GSA). One of our seniors, who is openly gay, had faced six years of bullying and harassment for being gay and decided the way she could speak out against this bullying was to start a group that would help others. A support group. I had this student in my class and I asked her if I could be the advisor. Why would I, a teacher who has been married to the

same man for 18 years, knowing the controversy that may follow with the establishment of such a club at a school, ask to be the advisor of this group? Here is why, and it is why I am here tonight. In my 15 years of teaching, I have seen students crushed by the bullying for being gay. I have seen students hide their true identity to avoid harassment. I have seen students yearn for acceptance and equal treatment, not just by their peers but by society as a whole. Some of these students do not have acceptance from their own parents. They know that being gay means that society will treat them as some sort of second-class citizen. They know that to love freely means that they accept the fact that in Nevada they will never be able to marry the one they love. We teach the children of our country that they can be anything that they want in life, that they can even grow up and become president. But how can we as parents, as educators, as legislators, say that to a child who is gay? Here is the truth according to the *Nevada Constitution*, this is what we should be saying to our children. You can be anything you want when you grow up, unless you are gay. There will be some things that you cannot do that the rest of the society can. I received a letter yesterday from a member of our community that criticized me for being the advisor to this club, and that my time should be spent promoting a different activity for students. I will not stand silent to the necessity that this club provides. It is one of the reasons that I am here today. We have 60 students, both heterosexual and homosexual, who joined the GSA this year, the second largest club on our campus behind the National Honor Society. Our group's mission is not only to teach tolerance but acceptance. Our group provides the support that so many kids need. I can give you a handful of statistics on the effects of bullying that would also include statistics on suicide, but I know that you have heard them. The message that our state constitution sends to these students is one that it is not okay to be gay and so they will continue to always feel inferior to their heterosexual peers. If we change our constitution in support and allow this, it will then be that we no longer will lie to our children that you can do and be anything you want when you grow up.

**Kenzie Tillitt, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I am an 18-year-old senior at Carson High School and I am openly gay. As Ms. Golik stated, we established the GSA at school this year and what that did is create a safe haven for kids that were being bullied for their sexuality and brought awareness to the community and Carson High School about the LGBT community. At the beginning of the year, asking people to join our group was hard. Watching people tear down the posters we had or make fun of us for putting them up was hard. When that happened, it was tough to keep going but we did and just a few weeks ago we celebrated the Day of Silence and what started out as five individuals sitting in a circle at lunch ended up as 25-plus individuals. And those individuals were not all homosexual, but they

saw this group of students, peers, that were standing up for what they believed in and they wanted to be associated with us. My coming out and finding acceptance and tolerance has been easy compared to what others have gone through. In fact, I was voted Winterfest Queen this year. I was voted captain of the soccer team as well. Obviously, my peers have found acceptance through me and I am not defined by my sexuality. I am so much more than that. I am Winterfest Queen, I am a soccer team captain, I am a daughter, and I am a student. I do not let homosexuality define me. Unfortunately, in this state and in our society, I am defined by my homosexuality. At my school, Carson High School, I am held to an even higher standard: a role model and a leader. I step out into reality and I am a second-class citizen because I cannot marry the person I love. I hope one day that the Nevada Legislature and the United States of America, like Martin Luther King, Jr. said, judge me not by the person I love but by the content of my character.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Kenzie, I have talked about people that I admire, and I think I need to add you to that list. I admire everything that you are doing for yourself and your peers at your school. Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Elisa Cafferata, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates:**

Health care is one area where marriage equality is critical, and domestic partnerships do not provide the same benefits as marriage. A recent study showed that partnered gay men and lesbians have a much lower likelihood of receiving employer-sponsored health care benefits. Unlike the benefits that straight couples have, the federal government, and some states, classify the benefits received under domestic partnerships as taxable earned income. That is one difference that is significant for these families. Listening to the testimony, I was struck by the fact that it is very ironic that I was half of a gay marriage in my first marriage. When my first husband and I got divorced, our children were able to be covered by his health insurance. Even though he is gay and I am straight, we were married under the Nevada laws because we were a man and a woman. So we never faced the obstacles that my sister, who is a lesbian, had in terms of setting up the benefits and protections that her children have. If something happened to me, or something happened to my first husband, our children are provided for. It is just ironic that we ended up being able to take advantage and take for granted all these protections that a legal marriage sets up, and that my sister, who is a lesbian, cannot take advantage of. [Ms. Cafferata submitted a written statement ([Exhibit Y](#)) after the close of the hearing.]

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Ms. Cafferata? [There were none.] We are going to switch to Las Vegas. There are a few persons waiting patiently to testify in support of the measure.

**Gary Peck, Executive Director, Nevada State Education Association:**

Our association represents 24,000 educators from one end of the state to the other. I am proud to be here in full support of S.J.R. 13 (R1). It is an important step in the direction of full equality for the LGBT community. I hope I will not sound hackneyed when I tell you that four years ago, when I was involved in the fight for the domestic partnership law, I had the privilege of speaking to an audience of about a thousand celebrants after the Legislature saw fit to enact that bill. My daughter, who was then 4, was in the audience and I recall saying the arch of history bends toward justice. And I remember saying that my 4-year-old daughter would one day be 24 and would be looking back at this point in history and shaking her head in wonderment about what all the fuss was about. I would urge you to pass S.J.R. 13 (R1) to give Nevada voters the opportunity to vote on this most important issue. Give all of our kids, and all of the families that our association members work with on a daily basis, the best opportunity to be in an environment where they have the kind of love, support, respect, and rights that we need. Enable those families to support their kids the way legislators and others constantly encourage them to, so they can be successful in school and be the best that they can be and help lift up our entire state.

**Helen Caddes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a proud lesbian, Nevada resident, and the vice chair of the Stonewall Democratic Club of Southern Nevada. I ask that you support S.J.R. 13 (R1) and I would like to explain why this historic legislation means so much to me. As a child growing up in the 1980s, my chosen sexuality was not just invalidated, it was invisible. In fact, for many years, I did not realize that it was an option. It was devastating to me to believe for years that I would never find true happiness. When I came out at age 16, my life became even harder as I learned there were few resources to support my newfound sexuality. All that I am asking the Legislature for today is the right and the opportunity to one day fall in love with, and marry, the woman of my dreams. To build a life together and have the same legal rights accorded to us as are provided to those who choose to marry members of the opposite sex.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Christopher Preciado, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the chairman of the Stonewall Democratic Club of Southern Nevada. Stonewall takes its name from the famous riots that took place at New York City's Stonewall Inn on June 28, 1969. That marked the first time we came together to stand up against discrimination. From the day we are born, we are taught that marriage is between a man and a woman. Just the other day, I was walking out of the new LGBT center and there was a group of about five or so people playing basketball and they began taunting me, saying disgusting, antigay slurs, and I was dumbfounded. This was happening right outside of the center. I often forget how common it is because I surround myself with people who are supportive and have always celebrated who I am. Stepping outside of my comfort zone there are people who will experience these hardships every day of their lives. If from the moment we are born we are taught that being gay is okay and not something bad, much like Riley, Dalia, and her brother were taught, we can help turn the tide against bigotry and hatred. I urge you to pass S.J.R. 13 (R1) and allow the freedom to marry to come to the state of Nevada.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] We will bring it back to Carson City.

**Carla Castedo, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I do not know that I can say much more than what has already been said. I am a heterosexual and in an interracial marriage, which was considered illegal in the past. I have gay friends and gay family members and I am here in support of them because I believe they should have the right to marry. They should have all the rights that I enjoy.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Is there anyone else in Carson City in support of the measure? [There was no response.] We will go back down to Las Vegas.

**Leo Murrieta, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am openly gay. I am a Christian, and I am the immigrant son of a Pentecostal preacher. I grew up in a conservative household with the belief that gays and lesbians were evil and flawed human beings. When I came out to my family in 2009, I was rejected, not only by my parents and siblings, but also by my church. After this, I went through a six-month period where I contemplated suicide on a daily basis. I continued being depressed by the rejection of my family and church for being gay until I attended an empowerment march for equality in Washington, D.C. I learned there that I deserved equal treatment and the right to pursue happiness, just like everyone else. My life was changed for the better forever. I felt alone in a religiously conservative family but I found



hope when I marched with people who supported my right to equal treatment and happiness. I found some of the best people in my life there, one of whom is sitting right next me. Without the hope that I found in Washington, D.C., I am confident that I would not be speaking to you today, I would be dead. As a gay, Christian immigrant, I ask for your support of S.J.R. 13 (R1).

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Murrieta? [There were none.]

**Sandra Eddy, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a straight ally. I am one of the board members of the Stonewall Democratic Club of Southern Nevada. I respect all people and all religious views and I do not see what that has to do with allowing equal rights in our country. It is important, it is necessary, it is fair. I want to be able to live to say the Pledge of Allegiance and be able to mean liberty and justice for all.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support of the measure? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral on the resolution who would like to be heard? [There was no response.] Senator Spearman, are there any closing remarks you would like to make?

**Senator Spearman:**

I had some additional work to get done and I was down in my office watching the closed-circuit broadcast of the meeting. One gentleman challenged me on my statement that by 2014 there would be \$834 billion, and I am glad that he did, because I was able to go back and look at my source and I got it wrong. I will read to you a quote from the *Deloitte Review*: "Think strategically about untapped consumer segments. It is estimated that the buying power of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) market will reach \$835 billion in 2014" ([Exhibit Z](#)).

I find it stunning that some people would challenge fact. But facts are stubborn and they are impervious to revisionist history and the fact still remains that marriage, not only in this country, but in the world, is steadily evolving. Someone also mentioned the fact that invoking the name of Dr. King and the Civil Rights Movement was probably akin to some type of crime. If you look at Nevada's history, up until 1957 Nevada had a law that prohibited white men from marrying anyone except white women. It was delineated that they could not marry Negroes, Indians, Koreans, or Chinese women. That is documented in Nevada's history. I say that because it was not until the U.S. Supreme Court *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) that Nevada even took a look at that and began to think consciously about changing.

I want to thank all the people who showed up today to testify, both as a proponent and an opponent, because I believe that simply emboldens those of us who seek to work for justice and equality for all. In the words of the Negro spiritual that became the battle cry for the Civil Rights Movement, we shall overcome.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

Senator Spearman, I appreciate your bringing this measure. I am proud to join you, Senators Segerblom and Parks, Assemblymen Martin and Anderson, as a cosponsor of this measure. The *Nevada Constitution*, just like our federal constitution, is a living and growing document and I hope that this body, and the next Legislature, will allow the voters to change their mind.

**Assemblyman Martin:**

I am a primary sponsor on this measure and very proud to be. I am not going to repeat everything that was very eloquently said; however, I cannot get past those who are opposed and do not understand that this is about equality under the law. We cannot create separate classes of people and have separate laws that apply to them and that is what the current law is. We talked about marriage and the benefits of marriage and we talked about social privileges and I cannot emphasize that enough. I received a lot of hate email that said how dare you support this when this is a choice that you are making. It was directed at me. Now I am sure others have received similar things. First of all, I am not a geneticist, I do not know if it is a choice or not, but with the pressure on us as we grew up gay, believe me, if there was a choice, we would not choose this. So I dispute that. However, we make, as people, a lot of choices. We choose what religion we are. We choose who we associate with and we choose who we marry. So what if it is a choice? We would not tolerate having a discussion about marriage and limiting the rights of people based on their race, based on their ethnicity, based on their point of origin, based on whatever. We would not tolerate that in the United States, nor should we. I would argue that this is the last great prejudice. And I urge my colleagues to find the courage, the conscience, and the conviction to support this. I am proud to be an elected official. I walked door to door, my constituents knew this, and they supported me anyway. I ask for your support.

**Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:**

I wanted to publicly thank you, Mr. Chair. It is hard to manage this type of meeting. I appreciate your trying to be as fair as you could be. I know it is hard to make everyone feel completely happy all the time.

**Chair Ohrenschall:**

We wanted everyone to be heard. There are many things going on in this building tonight and many important issues being discussed. Our time is limited, but I think we have allowed everyone to be heard, and I believe we have been very fair.

Before I close the hearing I do want to indicate that all the written testimony that anyone has submitted, or wishes to submit, will be part of the permanent record on this bill. If there are no other comments from the Committee members I will close the hearing on S.J.R. 13 (R1) and I will open it for public comment. [There was no response.] We will close today's hearing of the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections [at 7:31 p.m.].

[Several items were submitted after the close of the hearing and prior to the 5 p.m. deadline of May 10, 2013 as stipulated by Chair Ohrenschall during the hearing on S.J.R. 13 (R1). Written statements in opposition ([Exhibit AA](#)); Written statements in support ([Exhibit BB](#)); Richard Ziser, Director Nevada Concerned Citizens, written statement in opposition and five articles ([Exhibit CC](#)); Richard Ziser, 4/19/2013 press release, Coalition for Protection of Marriage in Nevada ([Exhibit DD](#)); Reverend Dan Edwards, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada, 5/7/2013 *Reno Gazette-Journal* article ([Exhibit EE](#)); Lauren A. Scott, Executive Director, Equality Nevada, written statement in support ([Exhibit FF](#)).]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Karen Pugh  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBITS**

**Committee Name:** Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

**Date:** May 9, 2013

**Time of Meeting:** 4:05 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 301	C	Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 444	D	Susan Scholley	Work session document
S.B. 325 (R1)	E	Susan Scholley	Work session document
S.B. 393	F	Susan Scholley	Work session document
S.B. 405	G	Susan Scholley	Work session document
S.J.R. 12	H	Susan Scholley	Work session document
S.B. 203	I	Senator Justin C. Jones, Clark County Senatorial District No. 9	Presentation
S.B. 203	J	Robert Fulkerson, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada	Written statement in support
S.B. 246 (R1)	K	Senator Justin Jones	Presentation
S.B. 246 (R1)	L	Senator Justin Jones	Matt Nese, Director of External Relations, Center for Competitive Politics, letter in support
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	M	Senator Tick Segerblom, Clark County Senatorial District No. 3	PowerPoint presentation
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	N	Senator David Parks, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7	Presentation
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	O	Senator Pat Spearman, Clark County Senatorial District No. 1	Presentation
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	P	Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Eagle Forum Freedom	Written statement in opposition submitted after the close of the hearing

S.J.R. 13 (R1)	Q	Ed Gobel, Linda West Myers, Private Citizens, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written statement in opposition submitted after the close of the hearing
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	R	Dr. Reverend William Paul Tarbell, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada	Letter in opposition addressed to the U.S. Supreme Court
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	S	David Knell, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written statement in opposition
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	T	Juanita Clark, representing Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada	June Ingram, President, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada, letter in opposition
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	U	Tod Story, Interim Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada	Written statement in support submitted after the close of the hearing
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	V	Robert Fulkerson, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada	Written statement in support
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	W	Riley Roberts, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada	Written statement in support
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	X	Pamela Roberts, representing Nevada Women's Lobby	Written statement in support
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	Y	Elisa Cafferata, President and Chief Executive Officer, Nevada Advocates for Planned Parenthood Affiliates	Written statement in support
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	Z	Senator Pat Spearman	LGBT purchasing power from <i>Deloitte Review</i>
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	AA	Jeffrey Harms, et al	Written statement in opposition submitted after the close the hearing
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	BB	Michael Green, et al	Written statement in support submitted after the close the hearing
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	CC	Richard Ziser, Director, Nevada Concerned Citizens	Written statement in opposition; five articles in opposition
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	DD	Richard Ziser	4/19/2013 Press Release Coalition for Protection of Marriage in Nevada

Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

May 9, 2013

Page 54

S.J.R. 13 (R1)	EE	Reverend Dan Edwards, Episcopal Diocese of Nevada	May 7, 2013 <i>Reno Gazette-Journal</i> article "Marriage equality does not infringe on religious freedom"
S.J.R. 13 (R1)	FF	Lauren A. Scott, Executive Director, Equality Nevada, Sparks, Nevada	Written statement in support submitted after the close of the hearing