THE THIRTY-SIXTH DAY

CARSON CITY (Monday), March 13, 2017

Senate called to order at 11:36 a.m.

President pro Tempore Denis presiding.

Roll called.

All present.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Pastor Nick Emery.

We come before You, Lord, during this gathering today of Senators in Nevada, and we are grateful for both the moments of victory and joy as well as the teachable and humbling moments we experienced in the journey.

Scripture says: Let love be genuine; despise what is evil; hold fast to what is good; love one another with great affection; outdo one another in showing honor.

May this group of leadership be those who love the people they serve with a genuine love. May they rise up against the evil that may rob those they love and serve. Prepare in them the strength, wisdom and goodness they will need to conduct the business of this great State. We pray that You would hold onto them, Father, as they pursue what is good, guide them in their love and service this day and throughout this week.

We pray, in the mighty Name of Jesus.

AMEN.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

By previous order of the Senate, the reading of the Journal is dispensed with, and the President pro Tempore and Secretary are authorized to make the necessary corrections and additions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. President pro Tempore:

Your Committee on Government Affairs, to which were referred Senate Bills Nos. 148, 197, 198, has had the same under consideration, and begs leave to report the same back with the recommendation: Do pass.

DAVID R. PARKS, *Chair*

COMMUNICATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

March 8, 2017

THE HONORABLE AARON D. FORD, *Senate Majority Leader*, State of Nevada Senate,
Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701-4747

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER FORD:

This letter serves as my formal request to address a joint session of the Nevada Legislature on Monday, April 17, 2017 at 5:00 p.m. It is my understanding that this date is available.

I thank you in advance for this opportunity and look forward to seeing you on April 17. Should you have any further questions, please call Ashley Jonkey in my Reno office at 775.686.5770.

Sincerely,

DEAN HELLER
United States Senator

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING AND REFERENCE

By Senators Farley, Cannizzaro, Spearman, Ratti, Ford, Atkinson, Denis, Manendo, Parks, Segerblom and Woodhouse:

Senate Bill No. 257—AN ACT relating to children; requiring the State Plan for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families to authorize certain assistance to be provided to a person who provides certain care for a child to whom he or she is not related; expanding the rights of children placed in foster care; creating the Normalcy for Foster Youth Account in the State General Fund; authorizing money in the Account to be used to provide opportunities for children to participate in certain activities; providing civil and criminal immunity to a person with whom a child has been placed who acts in accordance with certain standards in approving or allowing the child to participate in certain activities; requiring the Division of Child and Welfare Services of the Department of Health and Human Services to hire a consultant to conduct a study of the child welfare system in this State; making appropriations; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Farley moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Health and Human Services.

Motion carried.

By Senators Gustavson, Hardy, Gansert, Hammond, Manendo, Parks, Settelmeyer, Woodhouse; Assemblymen Kramer and Krasner:

Senate Bill No. 258—AN ACT relating to common-interest communities; establishing the requirements for a written notice to request an owner or a tenant to cure a violation of the governing documents of an association without imposition of a fine; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Gustavson moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

Motion carried.

By Senators Manendo, Parks, Cannizzaro, Segerblom, Gustavson, Atkinson, Cancela, Denis, Farley, Ford, Gansert, Hammond, Hardy, Ratti, Spearman, Woodhouse and Assemblyman Carrillo:

Senate Bill No. 259—AN ACT relating to motor vehicles; requiring certain persons to install an ignition interlock device following a revocation of a driver's license, permit or privilege to drive; revising the provisions governing the period of revocation of a driver's license, permit or privilege to drive related to certain offenses involving driving under the influence; requiring the court to order certain persons to install an ignition interlock device in certain circumstances; revising provisions governing the installation of an ignition interlock device following a conviction of driving under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Manendo moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Transportation.

Motion carried.

By the Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy:

Senate Bill No. 260—AN ACT relating to pharmacists; authorizing a pharmacist to engage in the collaborative practice of pharmacy under certain conditions; requiring a pharmacist who engages in the collaborative practice of pharmacy to maintain certain records; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Atkinson moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy.

Motion carried.

By Senators Parks, Kieckhefer, Segerblom, Farley, Cancela, Denis, Ratti, Spearman, Woodhouse; Assemblymen Yeager, Brooks, Carlton, Bilbray-Axelrod, Cohen, Fumo and Swank:

Senate Bill No. 261—AN ACT relating to public health; authorizing a physician to prescribe a controlled substance that is designed to end the life of a patient under certain circumstances; prohibiting persons other than a patient from administering a controlled substance that is designed to end the life of the patient; imposing requirements on certain providers of health care relating to the records of a patient who requests a controlled substance that is designed to end his or her life; providing immunity to certain providers of health care who take certain actions relating to prescribing a controlled substance that is designed to end the life of a patient; prohibiting certain fraudulent or coercive acts for the purpose of causing a person to self-administer a controlled substance that is designed to end the life of the person; authorizing the owner or operator of a health care facility to prohibit providers of health care from providing certain services relating to a controlled substance that is designed to end the life of a person; providing that the cause of death of a person who self-administers a controlled substance designed to end his or her life is the terminal condition with which the person was diagnosed; prohibiting a person from conditioning provisions of a will, contract, agreement or policy of insurance on the request for or acquisition or administration of a controlled substance designed to end the life of the person; prohibiting a person from refusing to sell or provide health or life insurance or denying benefits to or imposing additional charges against a person because the person requested or revoked a request for a controlled substance designed to end the life of the person; providing a penalty; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Senator Parks moved that the bill be referred to the Committee on Health and Human Services.

Motion carried.

SECOND READING AND AMENDMENT

Senate Bill No. 85.

Bill read second time and ordered to third reading.

Senate Bill No. 112.

Bill read second time and ordered to third reading.

GENERAL FILE AND THIRD READING

Assembly Bill No. 24.

Bill read third time.

Roll call on Assembly Bill No. 24:

YEAS—21.

NAYS—None.

Assembly Bill No. 24 having received a constitutional majority, Mr. President pro Tempore declared it passed.

Senator Spearman moved that all necessary rules be suspended and that the bill be immediately transmitted to the Assembly.

Motion carried.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Assembly.

Initiative Petition No. 1.

Initiative petition read third time.

Remarks by Senators Cannizzaro, Kieckhefer, Settelmeyer, Cannizzaro, Atkinson, Segerblom and Hardy:

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Initiative Petition No. 1 requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), the Secretary of State, and the county election officials to establish cooperatively a system that enables a person who is obtaining or updating a driver's license or identification card to register to vote or to revise his or her existing voter registration information at that time.

A person may opt out in writing from automatic voter registration or updating of his or her existing voter registration information. If the person does not opt out, certain personal information will be transmitted to the appropriate county election official who will determine if the application to vote is complete. The county election official must notify the person whose application is incomplete that additional information is required. The voter registration information also will be transmitted to the Secretary of State for inclusion on the statewide rolls. A person who does not indicate a political party affiliation will be listed as nonpartisan on the rolls and may revise that affiliation at any time.

The DMV must inform the person that: the decision of whether to participate in or opt out of automatic voter registration will not affect the person's transactions with DMV or the DMV's services; the person's decision cannot legally be disclosed to the public, and any information collected by DMV for automatic voter registration cannot legally be used for any purpose other than voter registration.

The Secretary of State must adopt regulations to carry out the program. However, the Secretary of State cannot require additional documentation that is not otherwise required by this petition or federal law.

Because this system for automatic voter registration applies expressly to persons who apply for "driver's licenses" or "identification cards" from the DMV, it does not apply to persons who apply for the issuance or renewal of a driver authorization card from the DMV pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 483.291.

Article 19, Section 2, of the *Nevada Constitution* provides that the Legislature may enact or reject the provisions of an initiative petition within 40 days of transmittal from the Secretary of State. If the Legislature takes no action or rejects the petition, the Secretary of State shall submit the question to the voters at the 2018 General Election. If the petition is not enacted into law this Session, but instead is submitted to the voters and approved at the 2018 General Election, it becomes effective upon completion of the canvass of votes by the Supreme Court after the General

Election. Under such circumstances, it could not be "amended, annulled, repealed, set aside or suspended by the Legislature within three years from the date it takes effect."

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I have not seen evidence that there are massive numbers of people who are voting illegally in our State, and our Secretary of State has indicated that she has not seen this either. This does not, however, mean it does not exist. We should be doing everything in our power to strengthen the integrity of our voting system. Unfortunately, the initiative petition before us today does the opposite of that. On its face, it looks very simple. It requires that when anyone receives a driver's license or ID card, or changes their address for a driver's license or ID card, they are automatically registered to vote in the State of Nevada. There are, however, many people who have driver's licenses or ID cards who are not eligible to vote in the State of Nevada. This includes people with driver's licenses but who are not citizens of the United States. There are 21,676 driver's licenses and ID cards held by people in Nevada who are not legally eligible to vote. These people use a Green Card as their primary form of identification when presenting themselves to DMV to receive their driver's license or ID card. When one of these people go to renew their driver's license or ID card, or change their address, this initiative petition will register that person to vote, despite the fact they are legally ineligible to vote.

The protection offered in this initiative petition is that DMV will theoretically present the individual with the legal requirements for Nevada voter eligibility stated under *Nevada Revised Statute* 293.485. The person will be required to sign, under penalty of perjury, that they are eligible to vote. If this was just related to citizenship, it might be easy, but this statute also details complexities about how long someone must have lived in the State or district in order to vote, as well as age requirements for registering to vote. For example, if a prospective voter will be 18 at the time of an upcoming election, they are eligible to register to vote according to this statute; it is not as simple as merely asking if one is a citizen of the United States.

If we expect people to fully read the description of voter eligibility as they complete the form for a driver's license or ID card and make a correct decision, we may be making an incorrect decision on how people process these things on an online form. This law is not necessary. It has been described as a necessary step to bring us into compliance with the National Voter Registration Act, but just last week, the Director of the DMV signed a memorandum of understanding that brings us into full compliance with people who have threatened to sue the State. We have taken the steps necessary to fulfill our obligation under the National Voter Registration Act.

The necessity of the initiative petition before us is also not real. I have not seen a lot of evidence of massive voter fraud. Of the people who have driver's licenses and ID cards who used Green Cards to receive them, more than 100 have filled out the voter registration form, and those forms were submitted to the county registrars to register those people to vote. I do not know if these people voted or not. Often, elections are decided by a slim margin. A few years ago, in my District, there was an election that was decided by 11 votes, so automatically registering over 21,000 people to vote who do not legally have the right to vote will have outcomes on elections in our State. If you believe we have significant voter registration fraud in our State, this is probably not the initiative petition for you. But, if you are like me and have not seen significant evidence of that, this initiative petition is going to create it, and I urge you to reject it.

SENATOR SETTELMEYER:

Having served on the Committee, I rise in opposition to Initiative Petition No. 1. The discussions held in Committee focused on one thing—passive declination versus active declination. In Nevada, we currently have a passive-declination system which requires a person to decline, not just sign. This would change this system. Going to an active-declination system would require the State of Nevada to spend $1.4 million. There are far better things the State can spend money on. The concept may have been to bring us in compliance with the Mobile Voter Act, but the National Voter Registration Act has within it language that states "in order to decline, don't sign." That is our current language. This puts us in conflict with 52 U.S.C. 20504 which states "Unless the applicant fails to sign the voter registration application..." We heard testimony from Legal disagreeing with that in Committee. But, to me it is clear, unless an applicant fails to sign the voter application, which is what section 52 U.S.C. 20504 says.

I also have a problem with section 7, subsection 4, of this initiative petition which reads: "The Secretary of State shall not require a person to provide any documentation in order to apply to register to vote or to have his or her voter registration information updated." This could create a situation where a person could never, in the State of Nevada, be required to show a photo ID to vote, even if a bill was passed requiring this. For those reasons, I am in opposition to this legislation.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

The DMV already collects information if you fill out the voter registration application at their office. They send the information to the Secretary of State and to the county election officials for verification of legal voting status. This initiative petition would not change any of that. We did have testimony related to those who were Green Card holders or who might otherwise fill out the voter registration application. They can do that now, and nothing about this initiative petition would change the verification requirements on the part of the State to ensure those who are registering to vote are actually eligible to do so. Election officials in the counties are doing this, as is the Secretary of State. The only change, as noted by my colleague from District 17, is whether individuals are being asked to opt in or opt out, and that was discussed in Committee. Other testimony we received in Committee from the counties indicated there were third-party vendors that might be committing voter registration fraud and that registering through the DMV might help them tamp down on this.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

I rise in support of Initiative Petition No. 1. I was also on the Committee that heard discussion about this initiative petition today, we have people registering people to vote in parking lots, grocery stores and theaters. This would provide a safer way to register people to vote. When you apply for a driver's license or ID card, you are required to submit documents to verify your identity, such as a birth certificate or a social security card. That legitimizes the process more than what we have in place today. I do not see this as a partisan bill, and I do not think the debate should be partisan. This is about registering our citizens to vote.

It brings us closer to having more of our people registered to vote in Nevada; whether they choose to vote after that or not is up to them, but this allows them to be registered. We heard from the Elections Department that nothing will change; they will still verify those registrations as they come through. Regardless of whether a person opts in or does not opt out, they still need to be verified by the Department. We will not have 21,000 illegal people voting; they will be verified by the Elections Department. We do not have voter fraud in this State, and the Secretary of State testified to this, so this is not an issue. I do not see what the problem is with making sure everyone is registered to vote. The option will be available for people to opt out, and we will need to provide education so people will be aware of that as we move forward. Oregon has done this and has had no issues. They have increased not only registration, but also voter participation, and that is what this should be about. We need to look at the larger picture, and that is increasing participation in our election process. This initiative petition goes a long way in doing that. I urge your support of this initiative petition.

SENATOR SEGERBLOM:

I was also on the Committee that heard this initiative petition. The problem in this Country is that not enough people are registered and not enough people vote. This initiative petition will make sure that more people are registered. We need to move on and make sure those people vote, that elections are fair and that we have the best people elected. Our problem is not voter fraud; it is that not enough people are registered. This initiative petition will go toward making sure those people are registered. I urge your support.

SENATOR HARDY:

Last week, I visited DMV, and while filling out my form, I noticed that the Secretary of State's voter registration application was on the back of the form. I do not understand why we are spending time, energy and debate on this initiative petition when the voter registration form is currently on our DMV materials and only needs to be filled out. It already works the way it is, and that is the

key. We can already register at DMV while completing paperwork there. I am against this initiative petition.

SENATOR KIECKHEFER:

I would like to clarify that I believe we should be registering our citizens to vote. Green Card holders are in our State and Country legally, but they are not eligible to vote. When we talk about the verification process that election departments go through, these do not include verification of citizenship. When they receive an application from DMV, based on a driver's license, legally received because a person is a holder of a Green Card, that person will be put on the voter rolls. This is a simple flow-through process. There is no verification of that person's legal standing to vote. They verify residency and age, but they do not verify citizenship—there is no method to do this. To suggest that individuals who hold Green Cards will not get registered to vote is not true; they will, and that is the issue at hand.

Roll call on Initiative Petition No. 1:

YEAS—12.

NAYS—Gansert, Goicoechea, Gustavson, Hammond, Hardy, Harris, Kieckhefer, Roberson, Settelmeyer—9.

Initiative Petition No. 1 having received a constitutional majority. Mr. President pro Tempore declared it passed.

Initiative petition ordered transmitted to Assembly.

Senator Ford moved that the Senate recess until 4:45 p.m.

Motion carried.

Senate in recess at 12:17 p.m.

SENATE IN SESSION

At 4:55 p.m.

President pro Tempore Denis presiding.

Quorum present.

MESSAGES FROM THE ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, Carson City, March 13, 2017

To the Honorable the Senate:

I have the honor to inform your honorable body that the Assembly on this day passed Senate Bills Nos. 58, 70.

CAROL AIELLO-SALA
Assistant Chief Clerk of the Assembly

Mr. President pro Tempore announced that if there were no objections, the Senate would recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Senate in recess at 4:55 p.m.

SENATE IN SESSION

At 5:07 p.m.

President pro Tempore Denis presiding.

Quorum present.

MOTIONS, RESOLUTIONS AND NOTICES

The Sergeant at Arms announced that Assemblymen Thompson and Assemblywoman Tolles were at the bar of the Senate. Assemblyman Thompson invited the Senate to meet in Joint Session with the Assembly to hear Representative Amodei.

Mr. President pro Tempore Denis announced that if there were no objections, the Senate would recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Senate in recess at 5:08 p.m.

IN JOINT SESSION

At 5:12 p.m.
President pro Tempore Denis presiding.

The Secretary of the Senate called the Senate roll.
All present except Senator Segerblom, who was excused.

The Chief Clerk of the Assembly called the Assembly roll.
All present except Assemblywoman Neal, who was excused.

Mr. President pro Tempore appointed a Committee on Escort consisting of Senator Ford and Assemblyman Araujo to wait upon the Honorable Representative Mark Amodei and escort him to the Assembly Chamber.

Representative Amodei delivered his message as follows:

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATURE OF NEVADA
SEVENTY-NINTH SESSION, 2017

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President pro Tempore, Governor, cabinet officials, Mr. Chief Justice and your colleagues, members of the Nevada Legislature, thank you very much for the opportunity to come kick off the federal address season. You may know that back in the day, I was not a big fan of this particular thing when I was a member. I used to sit over in that part of the room, and when whoever it was—and I was very bipartisan about it—would come in this door, I would exit through the back door there. To let you know that I have not completely forgotten about that, I intend to be, as were some of the judges that I practiced in front of in my earlier days, crisp and not take up much of your beautiful spring evening. So, hang on, here we go.

I want to talk about just two things and then the third part involves this bag, but I will be crisp nonetheless. The first one is a pretty complex topic: What are you going to do? The second one is a tribute to Harry Reid. What are your questions? What are you going to do?

As the person given the responsibility of representing Nevada's original congressional district, I can tell you there is not much going on in D.C. right now. Everybody loves everybody, there are no issues which are contentious, the Executive Branch is getting along well with the Legislative Branch, and of course the Supreme Court is having a great time with things looking like four-four and somebody is set to do whatever. Nonetheless, when you say, What are you going to do, let us talk about the most smooth topic of, What are you going to do, especially in view of today, and that is the subject of health care.

Do not worry; nobody's eyes need to roll back in their head. As a person who has spent almost 20 years, his entire political life, in the Legislative Branch, I can tell you that I am a process guy. It does not mean that you always get things the way you want it. It does not mean people always testify at those meetings in accordance with what you may think your thoughts are. I am an absolute true, complete believer in the legislative process, as I originally learned it in this building, and the damnedest things happen when you have a hearing with witnesses. And so, as we march down this health care road—no disrespect to anybody on either side of the aisle or my colleagues back in the swamp—I will tell you that when there are references to regular order which talk about

a markup, I think that is an opportunity for everybody to practice their partisan floor speeches. The problem is, there are not any witnesses—you know, folks who are sometimes considered shareholders, people who have views, whether they are with yours or against yours. As some of you may already know, it is incredibly frustrating, as one of the folks with one of those 435 votes on the south end of the building. Interestingly enough, the south end of the building is the House of Representatives in D.C., and here we are at the south end of the building in the Assembly where I started my go-around. I will try to avoid those references to the north end of the building here that I often refer to back there because sometimes they are less than flattering, but they are, in fact, bipartisan since we still have a bipartisan delegation there.

Let me just say this: We will continue, during this health care debate, to study the issues, to do things like say How will it affect Nevada? I understand how the budget is affected by Medicaid. So one of the basic questions we have for all of those people back there practicing those Floor speeches is how much Nevada gets for Medicaid now and how much it would get under your proposal. That is a good place to start because, quite frankly, we do not have the luxury—or the curse, depending on what your view is—of not having a balanced budget in this State. So, when you talk about how that works, when you talk about the effect on Nevada when you have an access problem—we have access problems in southern Nevada, much less the Truckee Meadows and rural Nevada—you need to know those sorts of facts.

Therefore, when you ask "What is this going to do to improve access," remember this started out seven years ago, as we need reform. Another question that comes up is, "How is this going to reduce costs?" Because if it is not, what about pharma? What about insurance company regulations? What about all those things? Not all of them can be done in reconciliation. The challenge, as you folks well know, is you have to keep your head on a swivel and you have to look at that stuff. So, it is very much a jury that is out, if you will, in terms of what is going on. Ultimately, my vote will be based on the impact to Nevada. What does our budget do with this? Is it the right thing to do?

I will end the health care discussion with this, I remember seven years ago, Nancy Pelosi came under some criticism for passing the Affordable Care Act at two o'clock in the morning. Bad things were said. Just as an observer, here is a casual observation. If that was a real bad thing to do seven years ago, you probably should not have run the committee all night long and voted at 0-dark-thirty in the morning, past two o'clock this time. Quite frankly, right now it looks as if Nancy Pelosi was more efficient—maybe not right, but much more efficient with her people's time. Not a great start.

Let me go to topic number two. It may come as a surprise to some people in this room that Amodei wants to say thank you to Senator Harry Reid. I do. Do you know why? Lately, there have been some people that have some minor concerns—some of them might even be within one hundred or two hundred feet of where I stand now—about public lands. I think it is worth having a little lesson about our history in public lands for a minute, before we get to the best part. Once again, let us take a look at the facts and see what makes sense. Here is some food for thought, the single most successful piece of public lands legislation in the history of the Nation is the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act, a piece of legislation that was bipartisan and is about 20 years old. It has done what for the folks in Clark County—not just Clark County, though? It has given people in places like the Clark County Commission, the Las Vegas City Council, the North Las Vegas City Council, the Henderson City Council, and the Boulder City Council the ability to have local control over if, when, and how they grow, by a process which is completely transparent and sells at public auction federal land surrounding the most vibrant commercial area in our State, directly to developers. What do we do with those proceeds? You folks know the list. There is an education component, there is a natural resources component, and some of it goes back to the federal government. Quite frankly, it was a visionary piece of legislation that is still working well. It even dealt with endangered species issues on the desert tortoise. So there it is.

In the five and a half years that I have had the responsibility of representing the State, and specifically this part of the State, we have passed a couple of more bills. I want to make it real clear: They would not have passed without Harry Reid's support. The Nevada Native Nations Land Act transferred 60,000 to 70,000 acres and the McDermitt tribe up in northern Nevada that had checkerboard throughout its Indian reservation received about 19,000 of those acres. As those in

the judicial business know, if you are chasing a suspect and you are on tribal land, then you are on federal land, then you are on tribal land, it makes jurisdictional issues kind of tough.

I have to tell you about the speed at which public lands legislation moves. When I went up to meet with them originally, they said, we need a little help on this lands thing. We have this checkerboard and we would like to get that. I said, we do not keep the gate. If you have a county commission resolution or something from your tribal council or whatever, we will introduce it and we will see how it goes. They said we had a bill. Really? Have you got a copy of it? Yes, we do. So somebody went back into the tribal offices and came back out with a Senate bill that was introduced in 1972 by Alan Bible and Howard Cannon on behalf of the McDermitt tribe. They get the patience award. Nonetheless, finally we got that done.

The other one is the Northern Nevada Land Conservation and Economic Development Act, a bill that created 75,000 acres of wilderness. It never would have happened without United States Senator Harry Reid. We had some problems. It was a Lyon County-centric thing. For five years, there were some folks up in Humboldt County fighting for the Pine Forest Range Wilderness. They did everything from the bottom up—landowners, conservation groups, the whole nine yards. They came together and said, here is what we want. They had been working on it for five years, and it had not gone anywhere. So, this bill started to move and they say, we are going to do this new wilderness—50,000 acres, Wavoka. Here you go. But, those folks up in Winnemucca had been doing the right thing for five years. I am not going back up to Winnemucca and say, guess what, the newest wilderness area in the State is one that, quite frankly, started real fast and finished in front of you folks. So, we added that in, but we came down to a final snag on an issue. There were some folks who said, we do not want you to be able to put mechanized equipment in a wilderness area to fight wildland fires. Well, we have had it in bills before. Would you rather see it burn up? We do not want that. It was Harry Reid who said, it is going. We put, under those circumstances, mechanized equipment in wilderness areas to try to fight the fires. So, I want to say this because it is a controversial time in terms of public land bills in some minds. Let me just give you a federal report before we move on.

As we speak, 25 percent of the counties in Nevada have either requested, through their county commissions, public lands bills to be introduced or are starting to draft some. Those four counties represent, with their combined population through their county commissioners, about 90 percent of the population of the State. You can guess who two of the four are. As long as I am given the responsibility of representing this State—and by the way, that has changed a little bit after the election, as the only guy in the elephant pasture in the house—you are riding for the brand of the State, at least I think you should. When we talk about public land bills, regardless of where they are in the State and when we look at our history, where more than eight out of every ten acres in this State is federal land, which is part of the existence. We will continue to listen to people. I have gotten a lot of feedback on House Resolution 1484. The bill will change. I think, quite frankly, if somebody went to the Governor and said, we are going to give you 10 million acres and you get to manage it, those of you who sit on the budget committees, as well as the Governor, would probably say, do not call me, I will call you. We have heard that. The issue here, right where I started with public lands, is local control—local control that gave local officials, elected officials in Clark County, some key power to decide how they wanted to grow. We are going to continue to look for ways to increase local control in the 115th Congress, and if it is not through ownership, then that is fine. There are other ways. When the bill comes out, you will see it. We will take more input. Remember, I am a process guy. We will see where that ends up. I am looking forward to continuing that discussion and moving along down that road.

That is probably enough. I see the light is starting to fade outside, so I want to get to the most important part of the evening and what will hopefully set the standard for other people. I was in Elko about three years ago. I notice that Judge Parraguirre is missing, so he cannot represent the sheepherder nation, but Pete Goicoechea was nice enough to stay so he can represent part of it, and I know there are other folks of Basque heritage in here. I was up in Elko going over the schedule for the next day, talking to my rural representative up there. I said I have this meeting with the coffee klatch in the morning. She said, no, it is the P.I.C.O.N. club. I said, oh, okay; the drink; I get it. I am not masculine enough to drink them without going into vapor lock but most of you are. I see Mr. Ellison over there smiling. I know he has never had one, but bear with me. She said, no P-I-C-O-N—P.I.C.O.N., People in Charge of Nevada. That is what they call themselves.

Now, most of you know I am not a very clever guy, but I thought that was very clever. Let us do a logo and have chapters all over the State, in different cities and towns so everyone can have their own chapter of People in Charge of Nevada. It has been going on for a couple of years, and I must apologize. We have a D.C. chapter; we have Las Vegas, Mesquite, Ely, and Winnemucca chapters. Elko got to be chapter number one—sorry, they thought of it. So we have all these chapters. I thought about this being scheduled for tonight, and I thought, we do not have a State P.I.C.O.N. chapter. I apologize for that. I am here tonight to remedy that situation. I have had State chapter P.I.C.O.N. Club hats made for each member of the Assembly and the Senate so that you can all be People in Charge of Nevada. The Sergeant at Arms will distribute those to members. Knowing that there were other people here, I would also like to distribute, for the State chapter, the first hat to you, Governor Sandoval, with your name on the back. Secretary Cegavske, since you are in charge of paperwork and filing and stuff like that, your hat is in here. Would you please see that these are distributed to the Controller, the Attorney General, and the other officials whose names are on the back? I would very much appreciate it.

Even though I am an inactive member of the State Bar, forgetting the Supreme Court is never a good idea, active or inactive. Mr. Chief Justice, I have seven hats here for the members of the Supreme Court. Welcome to the State chapter of People in Charge of Nevada.

And, with that, Mr. President pro Tempore, Mr. Speaker, thank you for your kindness and indulgence. Those conclude my remarks, and good luck in the rest of your Session.

Assemblyman Wheeler moved that the Senate and Assembly in Joint Session extend a vote of thanks to Representative Amodei for his timely, able and constructive message.

Motion carried.

The Committee on Escort escorted Representative Amodei to the bar of the Assembly.

Senator Roberson moved that the Joint Session be dissolved.

Motion carried.

Joint Session dissolved at 5:35 p.m.

SENATE IN SESSION

At 5:37 p.m.

President pro Tempore Denis presiding.

Quorum present.

GUESTS EXTENDED PRIVILEGE OF SENATE FLOOR

On request of Senator Farley, the privilege of the floor of the Senate Chamber for this day was extended to Lisa Spencer.

On request of Senator Parks, the privilege of the floor of the Senate Chamber for this day was extended to Christian Marie Martin.

On request of Senator Roberson, the privilege of the floor of the Senate Chamber for this day was extended to Linda Gingras, Adam Brian Gochnour, Lorraine M. Gochnour, Wade Gochnour, William Matthew Gochnour and Carrie Paldi.

On request of Senator Segerblom, the privilege of the floor of the Senate Chamber for this day was extended to Senator Bob Beers, Davan Hilton and Jennifer Hilton.

On request of Senator Woodhouse, the privilege of the floor of the Senate Chamber for this day was extended to Audrey Shea and Margot Shea.

Senator Ford moved that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday, March 14, 2017, at 11:00 a.m.

Motion carried.

Senate adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Approved: MOISES DENIS
President pro Tempore of the Senate

Attest: CLAIRE J. CLIFT
Secretary of the Senate