

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
March 10, 2017**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 8:03 a.m. on Friday, March 10, 2017, in Room 3138 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 www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Keith Pickard
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Assembly District No. 20



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Brad Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Janet Jones, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jon Sasser, Statewide Advocacy Coordinator, Washoe Legal Services; and representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevada
John Springgate, representing Nevada Justice Association
Jennifer Noble, Deputy District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office; and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association
Marlene Lockard, representing Nevada Women's Lobby
Corey Solferino, Sergeant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Brian O'Callaghan, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Kimberly Surratt, representing Nevada Justice Association
Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
John Wagner, Carson City Vice Chairman, Independent American Party of Nevada
Patti Jesinoski, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada

Chairman Yeager:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We have two bills and a work session today. We will begin with the work session.

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

We have four bills for the work session today. We will start with Assembly Bill 38.

Assembly Bill 38: Revises provisions relating to bail. (BDR 14-399)

The bill was heard in Committee on February 17, 2017 ([Exhibit C](#)). This bill defines electronic transmissions and authorizes the electronic transmission of the notice of transfer to the surety on the bond and the bail agent who executed the bond when a bail bond posted for an original offense charged must be transferred to the clerk of the court in which a related public offense is later charged. The notice of the defendant's failure to appear is authorized to be electronically transmitted, and notice is considered to have been given when the transmission is successfully initiated. Lastly, this bill requires every bail agent, bail enforcement agent, bail solicitor, insurer authorized to write surety in this state and every subsidiary corporation of any such insurer to maintain a means of receiving electronic transmissions and to receive electronic transmissions.

There is one amendment for this measure. John McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Ben Graham, Governmental Relations Advisor, Administrative Office of the Courts, propose to reduce the time from 45 days to 14 judicial days when a court will issue a warrant and provide notice if the defendant has failed to appear (section 3); delete language that a notice of electronic transmission is deemed to have been given when successfully initiated (sections 2, 3, and 4); require a request for a delivery receipt under certain circumstances (section 3); delete the language "bail enforcement agent, bail solicitor" thereby ensuring that only the appropriate parties are required to maintain a means of receiving electronic transmission (section 5); allow bail agents and insurers a sixth-month period where they may continue to receive notices by mail, then require electronic notification after six months unless the agent or insurer makes a showing of good cause to the court that he or she is unable to receive notice by electronic transmission (section 5); and change the effective date from July 1, 2017, to October 1, 2017.

Chairman Yeager:

I want to thank the interested parties, and especially Assemblyman Fumo, for working on this amendment. We have a consensus that this bill now works, and we did address the concerns that were raised during the hearing.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 38.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The floor statement will be assigned to Assemblywoman Tolles.

Assembly Bill 142: Establishes provisions concerning children seeking federal status as special immigrant juveniles. (BDR 38-739)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 142 was heard in Committee on March 8, 2017 ([Exhibit D](#)). This bill authorizes the district court to make the factual findings necessary to enable a child to apply for status as a special immigrant juvenile with the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services of the Department of Homeland Security. The findings may be made by the district court at any time during a proceeding held in the district court or a division of the district court having jurisdiction to make judicial determinations regarding the custody and care of juveniles. A person may file a petition with the court requesting that the court make the findings to enable a child to apply for status as a special immigrant juvenile. If the court determines that there is evidence to support the findings, the court is required to issue an order setting forth such findings. This bill also provides that any records containing information concerning the immigration status of such a child that are not otherwise confidential must be sealed and made available for inspection only by certain persons. This

bill further requires the Nevada Supreme Court to adopt any rules and procedures necessary to implement the provisions of the section. There were no amendments for this measure.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 142.

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN KRASNER VOTED NO.)

Chairman Yeager:

The floor statement will be assigned to Assemblyman Ohrenschall.

Assembly Bill 146: Enacts the Uniform Recognition and Enforcement of Canadian Domestic-Violence Protection Orders Act. (BDR 3-617)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 146 was heard in Committee on February 28, 2017 ([Exhibit E](#)). This bill enacts the Uniform Recognition and Enforcement of Canadian Domestic-Violence Protection Orders Act. The measure provides for the enforcement and registration of domestic-violence protection orders issued by Canadian courts. The state and its agencies and political subdivisions and certain persons who enforce a Canadian domestic-violence protection order based upon a reasonable belief that the order is valid or refuse to enforce such an order based upon a reasonable belief that the order is not valid are provided immunity from civil or criminal liability. There were no amendments for this measure.

ASSEMBLYMAN PICKARD MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 146.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Watkins:

There were a number of concerns during the original presentation. We worked with all the stakeholders, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, the City of Henderson, and the Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History, to come to a consensus so now the bill, as written, alleviates all those concerns. Everyone in the field has the tools they need to verify these orders to the best of their abilities. Everyone is comfortable with the language as written. Since there is no amendment, I apologize to Assemblywoman Cohen, Assemblywoman Tolles, Assemblywoman Krasner, and Assemblyman Pickard, as I was not able to add them as sponsors.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Yeager:

The floor statement is assigned to Assemblyman Watkins.

Assembly Bill 191: Revises provisions governing parentage. (BDR 11-761)

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 191 was heard in Committee February 27, 2017 ([Exhibit F](#)). The bill requires the State Board of Health to develop and distribute to certain agencies a declaration for the voluntary acknowledgement of parentage. The voluntary acknowledgment of parentage is deemed to have the same effect as a judgment or order of a court determining the existence of the relationship of parent and child if the declaration is signed in this or any other state by the parents of the child.

A signed declaration for the voluntary acknowledgment of parentage is required to show consent by a person who intends to be a parent of a child born by assisted reproduction. The intended parent or parents or the prospective gestational carrier or gestational carrier of a child who is the result of a gestational carrier arrangement may commence a proceeding in any district court to obtain an order designating the contents of the birth certificate of the child if certain requirements are met. The measure prohibits the adoption of certain children of whom Nevada is or was the home state except upon an order of a district court. The bill removes the requirement that a petitioner must have resided in Nevada for a period of six months before the granting of the petition for adoption of a child. There were no amendments for this measure.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 191.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Yeager:

The floor statement will be assigned to Assemblywoman Cohen.

That concludes our work session this morning. We will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 177.

Assembly Bill 177: Revises provisions relating to domestic violence. (BDR 3-210)

Chairman Yeager:

We have an amendment to the bill, and that is the version you want to follow along with during the testimony.

Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30:

Assembly Bill 177 has an amendment, which we will be working from today ([Exhibit G](#)). I have been working for many years on trying to protect victims of domestic violence. Anyone is able to take out a temporary protection order before it has even been adjudicated in court. Those orders are issued for a limited amount of time, and sometimes these cases

can proceed longer than that limited time. In those cases, the next step would be to get an extended protection order. One of our concerns has been that often with the extended protection order, it must be served to the person it is brought against; if they are unable to serve that protection order, it can stop, and the victim of domestic violence may no longer have protection.

This bill is attempting to lengthen the time a person can be served and allow the temporary protection order to stay in place. If a person is unable to be served the continuation, they would attempt to reset a trial to have the extended protection order brought forward. That can occur twice, for up to 180 days plus the original 30 days from the temporary protection order.

Jon Sasser, Statewide Advocacy Coordinator, Washoe Legal Services; and representing Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada; and Volunteer Attorneys for Rural Nevada:

Each of the organizations I represent has programs with attorneys who represent victims of domestic violence. They help them through the protective order process and continue to represent them in divorce or custody actions.

We have had problems with people evading service between the time the temporary protective order is obtained and the time of the hearing on the extended protection order. This bill addresses that issue. If you are unable to serve in the time period, even if you get a continuance to try to serve them, it is not clear as to whether or not the order remains valid after the 30 days. This bill first cleans up the fact that the order remains valid until the next hearing for a period of up to 90 days; then if you are still unable to serve, an extension of a second 90-day period could be obtained. If you have not been able to serve after that second 90-day period, the case is finished unless you need to come back for an additional protective order. In each of these cases, you must make a showing to the judge that you made sufficient attempts in trying to serve the person during that period. There is a lot of time pressure during the first 30 days, and it would be a great help to have extra time to serve the person. If someone has not been served and violates the protection order, the police cannot arrest them for violating an order if they do not know what the order is. According to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), when the police arrive, they serve the alleged perpetrator the protection order at that time. They essentially say, Go away, and if you come back, you will be arrested.

I appreciated working on this amendment with the district attorneys and the Nevada Justice Association.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

There was a good collaborative effort with those who initially had concerns with the bill.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I have a question from the old bill that I am not sure has been corrected in the amended version. In the original bill, you said that this bill authorizes the court, if the adverse party fails to appear, to "Grant a reasonable extension of time and set a date for a new hearing." Was that changed in the new bill? Does it mean after the expiration of the first protection order, if the adverse party fails to appear that there would be no protection until the next hearing?

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

Could you please direct me to the section you are referring to?

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

It was in section 1, subsection 4; I want to make sure there is protection.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

Are you referring to section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (a), "Grant a reasonable extension of time and set a date for a new hearing . . ."?

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Yes.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

Yes, that has been removed in the amended version of the bill.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

So there would be that continuous protection?

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

Yes, that is the point of this amendment.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Mr. Sasser, I have a question regarding the anecdotes you have heard on concealment of service. Can you describe exactly how people are evading service?

Jon Sasser:

There are a number of ways they evade service. In Las Vegas, being so close to the California border, they will often go back and forth between state lines. If you cannot find the person at their job, and as the police are very busy, the person they are trying to serve can dodge the police for some time.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Has there been any thought on updating and bringing service into the twenty-first century and using other ways of serving? The clinic at the William S. Boyd School of Law would post on Facebook, for example. Are there any constitutional impediments?

Jon Sasser:

That question should go to the district attorneys or trial lawyers in our office. If you are violating this order, you are also guilty of a crime. There are constitutional issues in terms of notice and what the order is for a violation to be a crime. For the civil portion, I think this is a gray area constitutionally. As you recall, the original version of the bill had an ability to use publication to get the extended protection order served. There were concerns regarding that language, and it was taken out of the bill.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I understand due process of a notice, but I am thinking of an actual notice, even if it is by electronic means, possibly a text message with a read receipt. There have to be other ways we can modernize this to get notices sent out.

John Springgate, representing Nevada Justice Association:

I am here representing the Nevada Justice Association in support of this bill and the amendment. Our concerns were primarily the same as Assemblyman Anderson's in relating to that question. The problem is that a violation of a temporary protection order or an extended protection order is not only potentially a civil contempt, but also a criminal offense. Our concern was that the provisions for publication or other methods of notice did not give good tools to prosecutors who are prosecuting a violation to show that there was actual notice and had satisfied the due process concerns to lead to a good conviction.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

I will leave this modernizing issue out, as I do not want to get in the way of your bill.

Chairman Yeager:

Under the amended version of the bill, the applicant would get a temporary protection order, and then there would be a hearing set for an extended protection order. If at the time of the hearing the adverse party does not show up, it would be on the applicant to make a showing of proof to the judge that they had been trying to serve and were unable to, or that the adverse party tried to conceal themselves from service. Under those conditions, the temporary protective order (TPO) would be extended 90 days for another hearing to be set on the extended protective order. Is that correct?

Jon Sasser:

You are correct.

Chairman Yeager:

For the next hearing within 90 days, it would work in a similar manner; if the adverse party appears in court, they could litigate the wisdom or validity of an extended protective order. The applicant would have to make a showing of either concealment or due diligence to get a second extension of 90 days?

Jon Sasser:

That is correct—an extension of the TPO. There would not be an extended order unless there was personal service during that time.

Chairman Yeager:

After that, there would be no extension. You can receive 210 days through extensions of a TPO, and without a hearing and the adverse party, you would not be able to obtain an extended order?

Jon Sasser:

That is correct.

Chairman Yeager:

Thank you, I wanted to clarify this for the record.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I will have to leave and return to my other committee hearing. My attaché will notify me if any questions come up during the remainder of the testimony. Mr. Sasser will do any closing remarks.

Chairman Yeager:

We will open the meeting for supportive testimony for A.B. 177.

**Jennifer Noble, Deputy District Attorney, Washoe County District Attorney's Office;
and representing Nevada District Attorneys Association:**

We would like to thank Assemblyman Sprinkle, Mr. Sasser, and Ms. Bailey Bortolin for working with our concerns. We are hopeful that it will assist victims in getting the protection they need. Service of process must be completed in writing; unfortunately, processing through email will not work.

John Springgate:

Our main concern was addressing the service requirements. We are in support of A.B. 177.

Marlene Lockard, representing Nevada Women's Lobby:

We are in full support of A.B. 177. On a personal level, I am vice chair of the Committee to Aid Abused Women in Washoe County. We operate the Temporary Protection Order Office in the court. I am not testifying on behalf of the Committee to Aid Abused Women. This bill would help the entire process.

Corey Solferino, Sergeant, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

The most dangerous calls that we respond to are domestic violence and traffic stops. We are definitely in support of this legislation. I had initially signed in as neutral with a few concerns; however, with the amendments, we have changed our position to full support.

**Brian O'Callaghan, Government Liaison, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:**

With the removal of a possible fiscal impact, we are in full support of A.B. 177.

Chairman Yeager:

We will now open the testimony to opposition. [There was none.] Is there any testimony in the neutral position? [There was none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 177.

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 229.

Assembly Bill 229: Revises provisions governing domestic relations. (BDR 11-701)

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Assembly District No. 20:

I am here today with Kimberly Surratt to present Assembly Bill 229. This bill is being brought forth because as Nevada families have changed dramatically through the years, our family law has not. This bill gives us the opportunity to update our family law section. Ms. Surratt will present the bill. I want to let you know in advance that there will be two amendments, one that Ms. Surratt will present and the other is adding sponsors to the bill.

Kimberly Surratt, representing Nevada Justice Association:

I am here today as a nonpaid lobbyist for the Nevada Justice Association, and I am also a member of the Executive Council of the Family Law Section of the State Bar of Nevada, and a private family law attorney.

We asked the Legislative Counsel Bureau to produce a bill that would gender-neutralize our family law chapters. You can see that it is quite the endeavor by the number of pages in the bill, so I will not go through every change in the bill. The main change was that any time the word husband or wife was mentioned, it changed to either a married couple or spouse, and mother or father changed to parent. In section 14, the current laws states, "If the husband neglects to make adequate provisions for the support of his wife" However, the opposite situation can occur where a wife neglected to make adequate provisions for support of her husband. Given the current changes to the gender definitions, you can see that it would be difficult for us to argue this in family court. Another example is in section 26, subsection 4; it speaks about a wife changing her name to her former name upon divorce, and there is nothing about a husband changing his name. It is getting more common that this occurs in both cases. Between domestic partnerships and nationwide marriage equality, we have ongoing problems with these chapters without them being gender-neutralized.

The Washoe County Clerk, Nancy Parent, requested the word "maiden" be removed in the two references in section 2. There is information in that section about what is used in the marriage license about the mother's maiden name, and we could be talking in some contexts about two fathers.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Ms. Surratt, do you have a section-by-section breakdown that you could provide?

Kimberly Surratt:

I can create one for you.

Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:

Mr. Chairman, I think that would be very helpful for all of the Committee. I am sure that many statutes are based upon outdated stereotypes, so that breakdown would be helpful to ensure that there would be no reason for the bill to be rejected.

Assemblyman Pickard:

This bill addresses the equal protection issues that we have had for years. I want to make sure I understand two points of the intent of this bill. First, in section 15, it talks about findings of misconduct; however, we are a no-fault state. When it speaks of misconduct, what is it trying to identify?

Kimberly Surratt:

Section 15 is based on *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 123.100, which I believe is also outdated in its totality. The intent of this bill was to gender-neutralize and have the reading of the bill showing equal protection. We have not modernized the substance of each of the statutes that are within this bill. That is being worked on by the Family Law Section to be brought to future sessions.

Assemblyman Pickard:

In section 19, subsection 3, it appears that once the couple has separated, the earnings and accumulations are their separate property rather than maintaining them as community property. I am wondering if that was the intent of this bill.

Kimberly Surratt:

The intent was to gender-neutralize the language and be more generic with the terms of husband or wife, and not correct the separate sections. Section 19, subsection 3, is another issue within the family law chapters that is prime for subsequent legislation.

Chairman Yeager:

To clarify this bill, it attempts to gender-neutralize all these different sections. This bill seeks to protect us from an equal protection challenge, correct?

Kimberly Surratt:

Yes, that is correct. There are many things that need to be modernized and corrected in the family law chapters; we are just beginning to work on them.

Chairman Yeager:

We will now open the hearing for supportive testimony.

Wendy Stolyarov, Legislative Director, Libertarian Party of Nevada:

The Libertarian Party's founding statement of principles, written in 1971, reads, "Each individual has the right to exercise sole dominion over his own life and has the right to live his life in whatever manner he chooses, so long as he does not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live their lives in whatever manner they choose." In 1975, the Libertarian Party published a pamphlet demanding "repeal of legislation prohibiting unions between members of the same sex, and the extension to such unions of all legal rights and privileges presently enjoyed by partners in heterosexual marriages."

Given the Libertarian Party's long history of opposing restrictions on the gender of individuals who wish to marry, we were delighted by the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to legalize same-sex marriage nationwide in 2015, and are equally happy to support A.B. 229. Indeed, we find A.B. 229's choice of language, "two persons, regardless of gender," to be excellent.

While this may be a simple cleanup of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, given the Supreme Court's decision, we appreciate the vital importance of changing the language to protect people who love each other, no matter their shape. The Libertarian Party of Nevada, therefore, supports A.B. 229 and thanks its sponsors wholeheartedly.

Chairman Yeager:

We will now open the hearing to the opposition testimony.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

I am speaking today in order to put some of my concerns on the record. The issue of gender marriage and how it will affect the freedom of religion is of particular concern. In the *Nevada Constitution* Ordinances it says, "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." In Article 1, Section 4, it says, "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed in this State . . . but the liberty of conscience [conscience] hereby secured" Our concern has to do with how this might be implemented and if churches and others practicing their religion might be impacted. In my church, there have been instances of government discrimination and persecution. In Missouri, there was an extermination order placed on our church, and members had to flee out of the state and leaders were jailed. In Utah, there were problems with people not being allowed to vote and others being jailed. So we are very sensitive to those things that might impact religious liberty. In talking to the clergy in this state, we find that they have determined not to do weddings because of their concern of being forced into holding ceremonies for any-gender marriage. I am here to place this on the record and to make sure, while you may be protecting the rights of some, that you will protect, with perfect toleration as the *Nevada Constitution* requires, the religious concerns of others.

John Wagner, Carson City Vice Chairman, Independent American Party of Nevada:

Our concerns parallel Mrs. Hansen's.

Patti Jesinoski, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I am here in opposition of A.B. 229, religious freedom and the First Amendment. How long and how many pages will the new marriage licenses be?

I would like to quote some data I have seen on gender identity. The new gender identities have increased because of cooperative actions between Facebook and United Kingdom groups. Professor Stephen Whittle, Vice President of Press for Change is reported as saying, "Gender identities are complex and for many people, describing themselves as just a man or just a woman, has always been inadequate. By challenging the gender binary, Facebook will finally allow thousands of people to describe themselves as they are now and it will allow future generations of kids to become truly comfortable in their own skins. Simon Milner, Facebook Policy Director for the United Kingdom, Middle East, and Africa, stated, "Ensuring users feel comfortable being their true selves while using the network is a priority." Before the new update, Facebook was already allowing users to customize and choose any gender they wanted. Users could make up and create anything as their gender, literally anything. Facebook has now recognized 71 different gender identities. How will the law be changed to identify all of these in a marriage? What if they choose to use a different word instead of spouse?

Tolerance and freedom of religion are First Amendment rights. There is the Wyoming Supreme Court who censured a state judge for publicly stating her refusal to perform same-sex marriage ceremonies citing religious objections. By a 3-to-2 vote, the court said Ruth Neely, a magistrate in the small northwestern Wyoming town of Pinedale, violated the state code of judicial conduct. As we are hearing from the previous bill, neither a judge nor the pastors nor the priests are going to be able to say they have a religious right not to perform the marriage. It appears that they are going after Christians and whites—especially conservative white women. It is easy because no matter how upset we get, we Christian white women are not going to kill you.

I leave you with these parting thoughts from past President Barack Obama speaking to the members of a Muslim-American community at the Islamic Society of Baltimore, February 3, 2016. "We're one American family. And when any part of our family starts to feel separate . . . it tears at the very fabric of our nation. And so if we're serious about freedom of religion—and I'm speaking now to my fellow Christians who remain the majority in this country—we have to understand that an attack on one faith is an attack on all our faiths."

On September 23, 2015, President Barack Obama spoke when Pope Francis was at the White House:

You remind us that people are only truly free when they can practice their faith freely And here in the United States we cherish our religious liberty, but around the world, at this very moment, children of God, including Christians, are targeted and even killed because of their faith. Believers are prevented from gathering at their places of worship. The faithful are imprisoned, and churches are destroyed. So we stand with you in defense of

religious freedom and interfaith dialogue, knowing that people everywhere must be able to live out their faith free from fear and intimidation.

Chairman Yeager:

We will now go to neutral testimony. [There was none.] I would invite Assemblywoman Spiegel and Ms. Surratt to come up for any closing remarks.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I would like to address one of the questions that was raised. Regarding marriage licenses, it is not being materially lengthened, and it is printed out on pages 2 and 3 of the bill. I want to make sure the record is clear that the legislative intent of this bill is to clarify some of the language in the family law section to reflect the status of Nevada families. It is not to go after anyone's religious beliefs in any manner.

Kimberly Surratt:

Thank you, and I appreciate your time.

Chairman Yeager:

I know the amendments you referenced were fairly simple, but if you could please provide those to Committee staff so we will have them for any potential work session, it would be helpful.

At this point, we will close the hearing on A.B. 229. We will now open the meeting up for public comment. [There was none.] The meeting is adjourned [at 8:55 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janet Jones
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 38, dated March 8, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 142, dated March 9, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 146, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 191, dated March 9, 2017, presented by Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 177, presented by Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle, Assembly District No. 30.