

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 28, 2013**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 4:06 p.m. on Thursday, March 28, 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. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: 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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Melissa Mundy, Committee Counsel
Karen Pugh, Committee Secretary
Macy Young, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

K. Kevin Benson, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Brett Kandt, Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Scott F. Gilles, Esq., Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Harvard (Larry) Lomax, Registrar of Voters, Clark County
Tom Lahey, representing Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee

Chair Ohrenschall:

[Roll was taken.] We have two items on our agenda. Assembly Bill 301 was scheduled for a hearing today; however, in the interest of time, we will not be hearing it today but will reschedule Assembly Bill 301 for a meeting date in the near future.

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)

We will move forward with the second item on the agenda, which is the work session.

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Committee members will find copies of the work session notebooks before them. Each has copies of the work session documents for the bills and resolution scheduled to be discussed today. Copies of those documents are available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). I will start with A.B. 35.

Assembly Bill 35: Makes various changes to provisions governing elections. (BDR 24-398)

I want to remind everyone that this is a conceptual document. If the Committee votes to adopt the amendment, the exact language may change after it is sent to the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for drafting.

Assembly Bill 35 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Office of the Attorney General and presented on February 12, 2013. [Read from work session document (Exhibit C).] The bill makes a number of changes to campaign finance law as noted in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 294A as well as several housekeeping amendments to eliminate repetitive language. The cover sheet for the bill and the work session document details the eight primary substantive changes, including aligning reporting deadlines for special and general elections, expanding reporting requirements for recall elections, clarifying that expenditures on behalf of a candidate or question also include expenditures against a candidate, requiring reports even if a ballot question is removed from the ballot, adding deadlines for the disposal of unspent campaign contributions for certain public officers who resign from office or candidates who are removed from the ballot or are not elected, and clarifying reporting obligations for candidates who end their campaigns without a formal withdrawal, who run unopposed, or who lose in the primary. This bill also sets forth a process for formally ending a campaign, and it provides that the penalties for campaign finance violations are cumulative and do not preclude seeking other civil relief or criminal penalties.

Numerous amendments were proposed at the hearing and subsequent to the hearing by the Attorney General. The major amendment that was proposed at the hearing was the substitution of the phrase "for or against" in the place of the two subparagraphs in the original bill draft, which was done in the interest of brevity. If you will turn to the mock-up, pages 3, 9, 22, and 41 all contain the amendment regarding "for or against."

On page 36 you will see the amendment that was proposed by the Attorney General, which is to clarify that the choice to formally end a campaign using the procedure described is optional and not required.

A second amendment, found on pages 44 and 45 of the mock-up, added a definition for "coordinated" and "coordinating" to further clarify the independence of an expenditure for reporting purposes. Again, this was used to further clarify the independence of an expenditure as it would relate to sections 9, 15, 19, and 35 of the bill.

With that, I would be happy to answer questions to the extent that I am able. I also see the Attorney General's Office is in the audience if the Committee has questions of any substance.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you, Ms. Scholley. Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Hickey:

These are important pieces of legislation; however, they are long and some of our colleagues would not forgive us if we missed some things. One of the amendments pertains to the change in language to "for or against" compared to the previous language "on behalf of." I know this was a clarification that we thought better defined it. I would like to hear from the Attorney General's Office a brief review of how they arrived at this specific language. I know it was in conjunction with our concerns, and I think that language was discussed previously, but I would like to hear the reasoning again before making a decision on it.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Kandt, Mr. Benson, could you come forward, please.

K. Kevin Benson, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General:

The original bill draft language added two new paragraphs that I believe did the same thing as the words "for or against." As you recall, in the current law, it talks about a person or political action committee (PAC), et cetera, that makes an expenditure "on behalf of" a candidate. All we are trying to clarify here is that language "on behalf of" means both an ad that attacks a candidate and an ad that is a positive support ad for a candidate. Instead of the two-part analysis that was in the original bill, we thought it was cleaner and shorter and more understandable to simply replace it with "for or against."

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Hickey, does that answer your question?

Assemblyman Hickey:

That does satisfy me. I would like to ask about the other major amendment, on page 44, which deals with the change in "coordinating" and "coordinated." If you would, please provide a more detailed explanation about how this solves the concern that some of the members of the Committee expressed during the original hearing on the bill.

Kevin Benson:

At the original hearing on the bill, several of you asked questions about what it means to coordinate an expenditure. What we are trying to clarify here is what is called an "independent expenditure," which, as the name implies, is made independently of a candidate's campaign. By adding this definition we are trying to achieve a little clearer definition of what "coordinated" means. Just to be clear, a coordinated expenditure is not prohibited; it is simply treated as an in-kind contribution that is reported by the candidate as opposed to the person making the expenditure. A good example is when a person receives campaign literature that was designed and produced by a candidate's campaign. The individual talks to the campaign about it, and then spends money out of his own pocket to essentially re-disseminate that same literature. That is a classic example.

Brett Kandt, Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General:

In the definition we also attempted to provide some specific examples of what it does not mean. Once again, we did that in the effort to gain clarity.

Assemblyman Hickey:

There was an earlier point that someone could get certain information off a candidate's website and use it. To me, "coordinated" implies you were working actively to allow this person to use certain information, but we all know, especially in the digital age, information is readily available and people can get it, and they may not have coordinated with you at all. So, if that happens, is a candidate, or an incumbent, protected in your view?

Kevin Benson:

That is addressed in section 40, subsection 2, paragraph (a) of the amendment. As Mr. Kandt stated, that text provides a description of what is not included: "the use of images or information obtained by the person making the expenditure from publicly available sources, such as websites, newspapers, or public records, and not as a result of any suggestion, direction, solicitation, cooperation or consultation between that person and the candidate or group of candidates." I believe this covers the situation that you are discussing.

Assemblyman Hickey:

I realize we are here to make those determinations, but is there any area or an instance where you think there could be some confusion with respect to this amendment?

Kevin Benson:

I think the amendment is clear. We are using language that has been used in other jurisdictions to address some of these issues. The language has been edited to make it conform better with how we use terms in our election and campaign finance laws. These are not new concepts, and I think that they adequately cover the issues and provide some clarity as used in other jurisdictions.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Mr. Benson or Mr. Kandt from the Attorney General's Office? [There were none.] I appreciate all the hard work of Mr. Benson, Mr. Kandt, and Assemblywoman Flores, who spent many hours on this bill trying to work out all the issues. If there are no other questions or comments, I would accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 35.

ASSEMBLYMAN MARTIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will give the floor assignment to Assemblywoman Flores.

We will now move on to Assembly Bill 48. We did receive a late amendment from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nevada at 2:45 this afternoon. Unfortunately, it arrived too late for all the parties to consider, and I have informed the ACLU that they should try to work with the Office of the Secretary of State to find a possible amendment when the bill is presented to the Senate.

Assembly Bill 48: Makes various changes relating to elections. (BDR 24-383)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 48 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Office of the Secretary of State and heard in this Committee on February 14 and again on February 21. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).] This bill also makes both substantive and nonsubstantive changes to campaign finance laws and as with A.B. 35, the nonsubstantive changes eliminate repetitive language. The primary substantive changes in the bill are adding criminal penalties for voting or attempting to vote as an unqualified elector

or under someone else's name, addressing vacancies occurring in nonpartisan races after the close of filing, requirements relating to the provision of lists of candidates to the Secretary of State, changing the deadline for nominations by minor parties, changing deadlines for adoption of regulations by the Secretary of State, and adding definitions for "committee sponsored by a political party" and "independent expenditure." The amendment further addresses reporting in vacancy nominations in connection with special elections, clarifies the definition of campaign expenses, clarifies various reporting requirements including the applicability to nonprofit corporations required to register with the Secretary of State's Office, extends deadlines for online registration, eliminates the Legislative Commission's approval of disclosure forms, and also amends the content and due date of compilation reports by the Secretary of State.

Amendments were proposed and discussed at the hearing as submitted by the Secretary of State and others. Subsequent to the hearing, additional amendments were proposed by the Secretary of State to address concerns raised in testimony and by the Committee.

Going through the mock-up of the bill with amendments, in section 1 you will see that the criminal penalty has been lowered to a D felony. In section 2, on pages 2 and 3 of the bill, the method for filling a vacancy in a nonpartisan race after close of filing has been modified, as proposed by the Clark County Registrar of Voters. In section 9, on pages 8 and 9 of the bill, is the clarification amendment proposed by the Carson City Clerk/Recorder regarding the return of a voter registration by the postal service.

Section 16 of the bill is a proposal by the Secretary of State relating to some changes to the definition of "independent expenditure." In section 21, on pages 12 and 13 of the bill, is an amendment proposed at the February 14 hearing regarding expenses incurred by a candidate, and relating to repayment or forgiveness of loans.

Section 30 relates to raising the reporting threshold for persons or entities making independent expenditures from \$100 to \$1,000. In connection with this, because nonprofit corporations are required to register and are already included within the definition of "person," you will see numerous places in the mock-up where the references to "nonprofit corporation" have been deleted.

And that is the end of the changes in the mock-up from the Secretary of State, Clark County Registrar of Voters, and the Carson City Clerk/Recorder. Following page 58 you will find the amendment proposed by Mr. Wagner on behalf of the Independent American Party that would change the

abbreviations on general election ballots relating to independent candidates and independent parties.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you, Ms. Scholley. I see Deputy Secretary Gilles here in the audience in Carson City, and Mr. Lomax is standing by at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas. This is a very voluminous bill with many changes. Are there any questions on Assembly Bill 48?

Assemblyman Hickey:

This is a large bill with arguably not major changes but some significant ones. Mr. Gilles, can you briefly explain to us the major concerns that you heard voiced in the previous hearing, and do you believe that those concerns are adequately addressed in the bill as amended? I also have a specific question with regard to the Independent American Party amendment when we crossed out "IND" and put "NPP." I would like to know what "NPP" stands for, if you worked with the Independent American Party on this amendment, and if, in your opinion, it will be helpful.

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

I will address the nonprofit corporations, which came up in the first hearing. If you recall, there were some concerns from some groups representing nonprofits that the language we added had created some unwanted and unintended consequences. I promised to revisit that issue, and we did. If you will indulge me for a moment I want to give you a little background on what the current law states, what our initial change did, and where we are at now. I believe the changes we made have satisfied these groups.

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 294A.140 and 294A.210 dictate the reporting requirements for groups who raise or spend money for elections, not candidates. These sections do not apply to Political Action Committees (PACs) that advocate for ballot questions. Currently, the law requires that all persons who make any independent expenditures are required to file a report. "Persons," as defined in Chapter 294A of the NRS, is a broad definition and does include nonprofit corporations. There is a second set of groups who have a reporting requirement in those statutes, and that group includes PACs, political parties, and committees sponsored by political parties. With our initial bill we attempted to add nonprofit corporations into this second group so they would have to file a report regardless if they made any expenditure. We have now pulled that language back out with our amendment and again, to be clear for the record, a nonprofit corporation is still going to have to report if they make an independent expenditure. If they are out there spending money to influence an election, they still have to report, but they will not have that

lower standard that PACs, political parties, and committees sponsored by political parties have for their report-triggering event.

What we have added addresses all groups, nonprofits, PACs, persons, et cetera. The new language increases the threshold that triggers their report as well as what they must report, such as the itemized contributions and expenses. Current statute sets the report trigger at \$100, and our amendment increases that to \$1,000. Once you are filing the report, you only have to itemize contributions and expenses over \$1,000. Again, this is for these groups I just described; it does not apply to candidates, nor does it apply to legislators when you file your reports. This is not a revolutionary change; PACs that advocate ballot questions currently have the same \$1,000 threshold for their reports. We think this is an appropriate change in reporting standards, as this will require groups who spend significant and relevant money in Nevada on political races to report their contribution sources and how they spend that money. At the same time, the increased threshold should provide for some privacy for the smaller donors who get involved in our elections through PACs and nonprofit corporations. This issue was raised several times by persons testifying before this Committee, so we hope this satisfies some of their concerns.

Again, nonprofit groups that brought the initial concern to our attention have said they are satisfied with these changes. To reiterate, they will be treated the same as they were previously except that their threshold, along with all of the other groups, has been increased. They are still going to have to file those reports.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Part of my question was about the Independent American Party amendment and what "NPP" stands for. I am glad that we took out "independent" because people do get confused.

Scott Gilles:

I was not aware that the Independent American Party was suggesting this amendment to the bill until today. I have not had the opportunity to discuss this with the Secretary of State, and I believe more thought may be needed on this issue. At first glance it appears that this is a proposed change to the terminology or abbreviations as used on a ballot. There is a regulation in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) Chapter 293, which clearly dictates that our office prescribes all the political party abbreviations for the ballot. The reason for that is to make sure that all the counties are using the exact same abbreviations. I am not certain on this. Perhaps Legal should weigh in on this, as to whether the changes to what appear to be examples here would actually

dictate that the Secretary of State needs to use those particular abbreviations on the ballot. I do not have an answer to that question right now.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Therefore the spirit of this amendment is going in the right direction?

Chair Ohrenschall:

Let me interject, Mr. Hickey. I had hoped that Mr. Wagner and the Secretary of State's Office had been able to talk about this, but it sounds as if there is still some disagreement on the issue. This may be something that we consider with one of our Committee bills later on in the session. Are there other questions for Mr. Gilles?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

Mr. Gilles, first I want to say that someday the Secretary of State's Office will bring us a 2-page bill instead of a 50-page bill. If your procedure is handled through regulation, that is simple to change. I understand what they are requesting—no political party (NPP), because then it is very clear that the candidate is not an Independent American but rather no political party. Do you not already have the ability to change that through regulation?

Scott Gilles:

I do not think we would need to change it through the regulation. I think the regulation gives our office the authority to prescribe the abbreviation going forward. The point I was trying to make of the changes herein is that I read the statute as giving an example of how the ballot should read with the abbreviation, not necessarily requiring making the change to the actual abbreviation for an independent. I think John Wagner can probably testify to this more because this is an issue he has brought up in previous sessions, and I know he has noted that there is voter confusion as a result of the independent title for registered voters who do not have a political party.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Assemblywoman Flores worked with Mr. Wagner two years ago and she has some insight to share.

Assemblywoman Flores:

This issue did come up on both Assembly Bill No. 81 of the 76th Session and Assembly Bill No. 82 of the 76th Session, and this is a continuation of those campaign finance reform bills. I understand what Mr. Wagner and his fellow supporters are stating in regard to possible voter confusion, but we are still at a point where we are addressing whether such a change would cause confusion or actually clarify it. They are suggesting "no political party," which

is "NPP," but there is also a designated abbreviation for "nonpartisan," which would be "NP." Does that really clarify the issue? We do not know, and quite frankly it has not reached a point where everyone can agree what is going to result in clarification.

So, here we are again, having spent a substantial amount of time clarifying everything else in A.B. 48 and everyone is happy with the amendments as proposed, except for, unfortunately, the amendment proposed by Mr. Wagner and his colleagues.

Chair Ohrenschall:

This could be considered later on if the Independent American Party and the Secretary of State's Office are willing to talk. Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Duncan:

There were concerns from the Independent American Party, and I believe it was Ms. Hansen who brought it up during the hearing, about equal protection for the Independent American Party presidential candidates filing before the major parties are required to file. I did not see that addressed in the amendments presented, and I was wondering if you could comment on the constitutional question raised. I think they were saying that it violates the ruling in the U.S. Supreme Court case *Anderson v. Celebrezze*, 460 U.S. 780 (1983). Can you address that?

Scott Gilles:

I believe the subject you are referring to is our change to the deadline for minor parties to provide their presidential nominee in presidential election years. We moved the deadline back one week from the first Tuesday in September to the last Tuesday in August. I would defer to Mr. Benson to discuss the legal merit to that and whether or not that is unconstitutional. As we sit here today, I am not aware that it is unconstitutional.

I can tell you about the practical reason why we made that change. We are finding that the major parties, who are treated differently from minor parties throughout the chapter, are holding their presidential conventions later and later. Why is this a problem for us? Because they do not have to give us their nominee until after their convention. Again, why is that a problem for us? Ballot production. Our clerks have to finalize the ballots, have them printed, and mail them out again, particularly in relation to the 45-day deadline for military voters and overseas voters.

This past election cycle we had about a week and a half between when we received the major party presidential nominee and that first Tuesday

in September deadline. The clerks in our office basically had to sit there, waiting for that deadline to end. We had already received all the nominations from the minor parties, but they have up until that first Tuesday in September to give us their final nominee. So, we had to wait before we could certify the nominees for that race and begin ballot production. We were able to get it all done, but it creates a major rush the later we wait for ballot production. Both Larry Lomax and Allan Glover, who are here, can speak more to the practical issues of getting the ballot prepared. But that is the reason why we pushed it back one week.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Duncan, I did check with our legal counsel about the U.S. Supreme Court case, *Anderson v. Celebrezze*, and they do not agree with the assertion made by the Independent American Party.

Assemblyman Duncan:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Duncan, does that satisfy you or do you want to hear from Mr. Benson?

Assemblyman Duncan:

Maybe I just did not understand it, but if we are waiting longer for the major political parties to name their nominee, why does it matter? Is it simply that you want to have your ducks in a row for all the other parties, and then you are waiting on the last two? I guess I do not understand the mechanics of how ballots are finalized and printed. Why change the deadline a week if we are still waiting into late August?

Scott Gilles:

Again, it was because we had to wait for that deadline to pass after we received the major parties' nominees. That week is significant in early September, when the clerks are preparing the ballots and getting them off to the military voters by the 45-day deadline.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Lomax, you wanted to comment.

Harvard (Larry) Lomax, Registrar of Voters, Clark County:

The Independent American Party has eight months to decide on their candidate and they are entitled to wait as long as they want. But repeatedly in elections, the major parties get us their candidates, and then we cannot begin to produce ballots until this deadline, which is the first Tuesday in September. That one

week to us is money that the Clark County taxpayers are paying because it drives us into overtime. And it makes no sense that we have all the major parties' candidates, and we have to sit there. We have never received a new candidate from the Independent American Party in that time frame, but we cannot start processing because they have the ability to delay a candidate until that time.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Mr. Lomax, we appreciate your clarifying that. Are there any other questions about Assembly Bill 48? Seeing none, I will open it up to a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 48, WITH THE CLARK COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS' AMENDMENTS AS FURTHER AMENDED BY THE OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE, THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE AMENDMENTS, AND THE CARSON CITY CLERK/RECORDER'S AMENDMENT ON PAGE 8 OF THE BILL.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblyman Hickey:

I am going to vote for this, but I reserve my right to change that vote, contingent on what occurs when we deal with these issues, although not necessarily this amendment as indicated. There is some real confusion, and I believe this is the Committee to address this. Frankly, I think the Secretary of State's Office needs to be aggressive about solving this problem before the next election cycle.

Chair Ohrenschall:

You are referring to the "NPP" issue or the presidential nominee issue?

Assemblyman Hickey:

Yes, the definition of an independent that I think has caused confusion.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I encourage both parties to work together. Is there any other discussion?

Assemblyman Duncan:

I second what Mr. Hickey said. I also want to take a look at the case law to ensure that there is no equal protection issue. I am going to vote for this bill

out of Committee; however, I reserve my right to vote no on the floor if I am not satisfied.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Is there any more discussion?

Assemblyman Oscarson:

I had a conversation with Ms. Hansen and Mr. Gilles earlier, and I appreciate the time that they spent explaining the issue to me. However, like my colleague, I will vote for this out of Committee today but reserve my right to change my vote should additional information come to light.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I appreciate that. Is there any other discussion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will give the floor assignment to Assemblywoman Flores.

Assembly Bill 175: Revises provisions relating to uniformed-service and overseas voters. (BDR 24-635)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

The next bill in the work session is Assembly Bill 175, sponsored by Assemblyman Elliot Anderson. This bill makes changes to the Uniformed Military and Overseas Absentee Voters Act. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).] At the hearing, the Secretary of State's Office submitted an amendment with the support of the bill's sponsor that simply expands the ability to sign documents or materials to any action relating to military-overseas ballots.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions from the Committee on Assembly Bill 175? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HICKEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 175.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will give the floor assignment to Assemblyman Anderson.

Senate Joint Resolution 4: Urges the Government of Turkey to grant the Ecumenical Patriarch international recognition and to respect the human rights and property rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. (BDR R-885)

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Joint Resolution 4 relates to the Ecumenical Patriarch, international recognition for same, and also a resolution urging respect for the human rights and property rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. [Read from work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).] With the concurrence of the resolution sponsor, Mr. Ohrenschall has proposed an amendment to be added as a cosponsor.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions from the Committee on S.J.R. 4? [There were none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FLORES MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLIOT ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to myself.

Again, we will not hear Assembly Bill 301 today, so I will open the meeting to public comment. Is there anyone wishing to make public comment?

Tom Lahey, representing Nevada Legislative Affairs Committee:

I am in favor of the bill that you just passed, but I wanted to provide a little counsel and advice. Have any of you ever been to Turkey or to Ankara? Turkey is primarily a Muslim country, and here we have a situation where we are trying to tell the Turkish government what to do. I would be very careful how you handle this issue. You do not want to create an international incident. They take very small things very largely. I might recommend that you get some advice from the Secretary of State's office in Washington, D.C., about how you want to proceed on this.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you, Mr. Lahey. Senator Raggio and myself were the chief cosponsors of a similar resolution, which was passed in the 2009 Session. Many states have passed resolutions like this. It is in the vein of religious freedom, but I do appreciate your comments and advice.

Is there any other public comment? [There was no response.] I will close public comment. I will now adjourn this Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. Meeting adjourned [at 4:51 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karen Pugh
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

Date: March 28, 2013

Time of Meeting: 4:06 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 35	C	Susan Scholley	Work session document
A.B. 48	D	Susan Scholley	Work session document
A.B. 175	E	Susan Scholley	Work session document
S.J.R. 4	F	Susan Scholley	Work session document