

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

**Eighty-First Session  
May 4, 2021**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 4:01 p.m. on Tuesday, May 4, 2021, Online and in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman  
Assemblyman Jason Frierson  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt  
Assemblyman Andy Matthews  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas  
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst  
Kathleen M. Norris, Committee Counsel  
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Committee Manager  
Jordan Green, Committee Secretary  
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Tess Opferman, representing Nevada Women's Lobby  
Arielle Edwards, Government Affairs Specialist, Office of the City Manager, City of  
North Las Vegas  
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom  
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom  
Don Nelson, Spokesman, Pro-Life League, Nevada Right to Life  
Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada  
Allison Genco, representing Dignity Health—St. Rose Dominican  
André C. Wade, State Director, Silver State Equality

**Chair Miller:**

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Today, we will hear two bills. I will open the hearing on the first bill, which is Senate Joint Resolution 11. It will be presented by Senator Spearman, and it urges Congress to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

**Senate Joint Resolution 11: Urges Congress to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. (BDR R-969)**

**Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1:**

Some of you may be asking, what is the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women? For those of you who do not know, it is an international human rights treaty that promotes gender equity: CEDAW for short. It was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1979 and formally instituted in 1981.

As noted in Senate Joint Resolution 11 and by the UN Women, the United Nations entity for gender equality and the empowerment of women, CEDAW "requires eliminating discrimination against women in all its forms, including in the areas of economic development, health, safety and education."

Within its first ten years, CEDAW was ratified by nearly 100 countries, and to date, 189 countries have ratified it. Six countries, including Iran, Sudan, and Somalia, have taken no action to ratify or sign CEDAW. Two countries—Palau, a small island nation in the western Pacific, and the United States—have signed the Convention without ratifying it. This begs the question: How is it that over 97 percent of the countries in the world have ratified CEDAW and the United States has not? After all, the tenets of CEDAW are based on the very issues for which we have been fighting for decades in this country.

According to ThoughtCo ["Why Won't the U.S. Ratify the CEDAW Human Rights Treaty? Only a Handful of Nations Have Not Adopted This U.N. Agreement," updated January 3, 2020, Linda Lowen], the United States was one of the first signatories of CEDAW when it was adopted by the United Nations in 1979. A year later, President Jimmy Carter signed the treaty and sent it to the U.S. Senate for ratification. Unfortunately, in the final

year of his presidency, Carter did not have the political leverage to get Senators to act on the measure. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is charged with ratifying treaties and international agreements, has debated CEDAW five times since 1980. In 1994, for instance, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on CEDAW and recommended it be ratified, but efforts to block its ratification proved successful. Similar debates in 2002 and 2010 also failed to advance the treaty.

Why is Senate Joint Resolution 11 so important? You have heard this for years, but I will say it again, and it is spelled out explicitly in S.J.R. 11: We have a persistent and egregious wage gap in this country. Overall, women are paid 82 cents for every dollar paid to men, which amounts to an annual gender wage gap of \$10,157. It is even worse for African-American women, who typically earn 63 cents; Native American women, who are paid 60 cents; and Hispanic or Latina women, who earn just 55 cents for every dollar paid to white or non-Hispanic men.

I would like to note that in March, we celebrated Equal Pay Day, but that was only for white women. Black women will not see Equal Pay Day until August, and Latina women will not see Equal Pay Day until October. These facts and figures represent the consequences of sexism and the consistent devaluing of women—particularly women who are Black, Indigenous, and other persons of color, or BIPOC.

We know for a fact that the gender wage gap persists regardless of industry, occupation, and education level and that there are numerous causes, including discrimination and bias. Article 3 of CEDAW addresses gender equality directly by employing ratified parties to take "all appropriate measures, including legislation, to ensure the full development and advancement of women, for the purpose of guaranteeing them the exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms on a basis of equality with men."

Senate Joint Resolution 11 addresses other critical concerns, including violence against women, gross inequities in health care services and outcomes, and notable challenges in educational pursuits. Even during the current COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen firsthand that women, the LGBTQ community, gender minorities, the BIPOC community, and other marginalized groups have worn the brunt of the pandemic's worst impacts. Since the start of the pandemic, women have lost more jobs than men, which is eliminating recent gains made by women in the workplace. Moreover, according to the U.N. Policy Brief: The Impact of COVID-19 on Women [April 9, 2020]: "Across every sphere from health to the economy, security to social protections, the impacts of COVID-19 are exacerbated for women and girls simply by virtue of their sex." The brief notes that the pandemic has disproportionately impacted women economically, worsened health care outcomes, and lead to increased gender-based violence.

As I have said before, we all must persist for equality. We must persist in improving human dignity and human rights. We must persist against systemic racism, gender discrimination, and racial discrimination which has perpetuated multigenerational poverty, educational and economic hardships, and health adversities. It includes environmental deterioration.

These problems go beyond just the borders of our country, and nearly all countries have ratified CEDAW in their efforts to address these ongoing concerns. Frankly, I am baffled and bestunned that the United States has not taken the very simple step to ratify CEDAW. For these reasons and others that are highlighted in S.J.R. 11, I urge your support and approval of this resolution. Let us take this fight to the U.S. Senate where they have the power and the ability to once and for all ratify the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Some people believe that this is a way to erase gender roles.

[There were technical difficulties.]

**Chair Miller:**

The audio and video froze on us a few times. The last statement we heard was, "Some people believe that this is a way to erase gender roles."

**Senator Spearman:**

I am not sure if you heard what I said. I wanted to elucidate a couple of things that you may hear in rebuttal in terms of what CEDAW does. Simply put, CEDAW seeks to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women. That is economic, that is educational, and that is violence against women. It is really about elevating the status of women around the world to a place of equality and equity commensurate to people of the male gender. That is all that it does; it does not do anything else. It is very similar to the Equal Rights Amendment. It is really about equality and equity—period. With that, I will answer any questions that you may have.

**Chair Miller:**

Committee members, do we have any questions? [There were none.] I will open testimony in support of S.J.R. 11.

**Tess Opferman, representing Nevada Women's Lobby:**

Day in and day out at the Nevada Legislature, we hear bills about sexual assault, domestic violence, human trafficking, hate crimes, and pay inequality. Our legislators, you all, are working hard to pass policy to help address these inequalities—inequality for women of color, inequality for women addressing their gender identity and sexual orientation, inequality for women in the workplace—but we must not be complacent. It is time we pass a declarative measure to urge Congress to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Please take this measure by supporting S.J.R. 11 and supporting women in our state. Thank you to Senator Spearman for your ongoing support and passion and for your strong leadership. The Nevada Women's Lobby asks for your support today on this measure, and we thank you for your time this afternoon.

**Chair Miller:**

Is there anyone else in the room who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the telephone lines?

**Arielle Edwards, Government Affairs Specialist, Office of the City Manager,  
City of North Las Vegas:**

The City of North Las Vegas offers support for S.J.R. 11. There is a letter of support on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System written by our chief of staff, Rebecca Gibson, for the Committee's consideration [[Exhibit C](#)]. The City thanks Senator Spearman for bringing this bill forward and urges the support and passage of S.J.R. 11. Thank you for your time and consideration.

[There were no more callers in support.]

**Chair Miller:**

We will close testimony in support and open testimony in opposition of S.J.R. 11. We will begin in the room.

**Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:**

[Ms. Hansen read from her prepared testimony, [Exhibit D](#).] We oppose S.J.R. 11, which endorses the United Nations CEDAW Convention. CEDAW was originally passed by the United Nations in 1979. It has never been ratified by the United States for many good reasons.

The language in S.J.R. 11 is very deceptive and mostly refers to wages for women, but CEDAW covers many other issues. On the U.N. website regarding CEDAW it states, "The Convention is the only human rights treaty which affirms the reproductive rights of women . . . ." CEDAW's committee in charge of compliance has interpreted Article 12 to mean approval of abortion and has pressured 44 nations to legalize or increase access to abortion. Any endorsement of CEDAW is an approval of abortion.

Article 16 also orders a massive interference with U.S. laws as well as with our federal-state balance of powers by obligating the federal government to take over all family law, including marriage, divorce, child custody, and marital property. When Edmund S. Muskie was Secretary of State under Democrat Jimmie Carter, he issued a memo stating that the treaty completely fails to take into account "the division of authority between the state and federal governments in the United States." His memo also admitted that this treaty applies "to private organizations and areas of personal conduct not covered by U.S. law." CEDAW sets us on a dangerous road by allowing unelected bureaucrats at the United Nations to interfere with the governance of the United States as well as the state of Nevada.

The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women degraded the chosen role of many women, as mothers for instance, when their committee criticized Ireland for "promoting a stereotypical view of the role of women in the home and as mothers," Belarus for "such symbols as a Mother's Day," and Slovenia because "less than 30 percent of children under three years of age were in formal day care." I have submitted my entire testimony online [[Exhibit D](#)]. [Allotted time was exceeded.]

**Chair Miller:**

Is there anyone else in the room who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.]  
Is there anyone on the lines who would like to testify in opposition to S.J.R. 11?

**Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom:**

[Ms. Chapman read from her prepared testimony, [Exhibit E](#).]

We oppose S.J.R. 11. Dr. Marty Nemko, acclaimed career expert and author, was interviewed by CBS MoneyWatch. Dr. Nemko gave eight reasons why the concept that women are paid less than men is a myth. His primary source was the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Men choose more dangerous careers such as loggers and steel workers. Men work at higher-paying fields by choice. According to a White House report, "in 2009, only 7% of female professionals were employed in the relatively high paying computer and engineering fields, compared with 38% of male professionals." Men are more likely to work in uncomfortable, isolated, and undesirable locations. They also work longer hours. Men are willing to work weekends and evenings.

Even within the same career category, men pursue high-stress and higher paid areas of specialization such as surgery versus women who are pediatricians. Unmarried women who have never had a child earn more than unmarried men according to the data compiled from the Census Bureau. Dr. Nemko's position is this: When women make the same career choices as men, they earn the same amount as men. He says:

This study leads to the unambiguous conclusion that the differences in the compensation of men and women are the result of a multitude of factors and that the raw wage gap should not be used as the basis to justify corrective action. Indeed, there may be nothing to correct. The differences in raw wages may be almost entirely the result of the individual choices being made by both male and female workers.

Please oppose S.J.R. 11. Thank you.

**Don Nelson, Spokesman, Pro-Life League, Nevada Right to Life:**

I am from Sparks, Nevada, and represent the Pro-Life League of Nevada. We often hear and read that CEDAW, like other legislation, has nothing to do with abortion, but the lack of the word "abortion" is often a smokescreen. National Right to Life notes: "The CEDAW Committee also has explicitly held that nations should provide public funding of abortion, and even has criticized nations that have laws in place to allow medical professionals to opt out of providing abortions" [letter dated March 25, 2009, to members of the U.S. Senate from Douglas Johnson, Legislative Director, National Right to Life Committee].

In 2004, the Center for Reproductive Rights said that CEDAW considers discrimination against women to include laws that have either the affect or the purpose of preventing a woman from exercising any of her rights or fundamental freedoms on a basis of equality with men ["CEDAW Advances Women's Human Rights," dated January 1, 2004]. Laws that ban abortion have just that effect and purpose. National Right to Life further noted [letter dated March 25, 2009]:

In 2002, the European Parliament voted to adopt a sweeping report calling for the removal of all limitations to abortion by European Union members such as Ireland, Spain and Portugal, and by nations then seeking membership. The report cited CEDAW as grounds for its assertion that there is an "international legal framework" under which all European Union nations should recognize abortion as a "fundamental right."

In 2002, Joe Biden, then-Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, recognized that CEDAW would attack abortion laws by inserting certain language into the ratification resolution "that CEDAW should not be used to create a right to abortion" [National Right to Life, letter dated March 25, 2009].

If CEDAW were ratified by the United States, it "would be used to assert an international obligation on the federal and state governments to provide public funding for abortion, to refrain from adopting or enforcing restrictions on partial-birth abortions, to refrain from adopting or enforcing laws to protect the rights of parents with respect to their minor daughters, to eliminate conscience-protection laws, and otherwise . . . ." [National Right to Life, letter dated March 25, 2009]. Thank you for your time. We ask you to oppose S.J.R. 11. [Allotted time was exceeded.]

**Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:**

I strongly oppose S.J.R. 11. As an American who values the sovereignty of our nation, urging Congress to ratify the 1979 United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women would set a new precedent in our nation to allow unelected global bureaucrats to decide what we can or cannot do in our own backyard, meaning our nation. Again, this is a dangerous step toward America losing its sovereignty.

Another major concern I have is the connection of this United Nations Convention to abortion. I quote, "affirming the reproductive rights of women." I believe that enforcing this Convention in the United States could cost many lives of the innocent unborn. It could place an international law or obligation on the federal and state governments and override lawful limits on abortion in various states. It could force citizens to fund abortion against their will or conscience.

Passing S.J.R. 11 could also jeopardize the right of parents to be involved in the decision of their daughters regarding abortion. In my opinion, young women, in most circumstances, are not mature enough to understand the ramifications or long-term problems that they may encounter from getting an abortion. Parents must and should be involved in this life-impacting decision.

The current opinion on the wage gap between men and women that is expounded in the media is misleading. Yes, men do earn more than women. The difference is due to life choices. According to economic researcher Rachel Gressler: "The pay gap between men and women is the product of individual and family decisions, not a result of workplace discrimination, which has long been illegal" ["The Gender Pay Gap: Choice, Children, and Public Policy," March 23, 2021, The Heritage Foundation]. Thank you. Please oppose S.J.R. 11. [Allotted time was exceeded.]

**Chair Miller:**

I will close testimony in opposition and open testimony in neutral of S.J.R. 11. I do not see anyone in the room. Is there anyone on the lines wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close testimony for S.J.R. 11. Senator Spearman, do you have any final remarks?

**Senator Spearman:**

I appreciate everyone who called in support and even those who called in opposition. It certainly gave me something to think about. There is a glaring inconsistency when you start talking about the right to life because children who are in the womb are innocent, but those who are innocent on death row deserve to die.

I am also rather curious because, in an effort to make sure that we tackled this pandemic, there was a mandate to wear masks. People felt that the government did not have the right to mandate that they wear masks, but they believe that the government has a right to mandate or to dictate reproductive services.

We talk about women making more or making less. There is irrefutable evidence that more women retire in poverty than men. With respect to women choosing more "dainty" jobs—and I do not think that was the word they used—they said men choose more dangerous jobs. In all the jobs that people used to think women could not do—construction, astronauts, and that sort of thing—women are slowly breaking those types of barriers.

Senate Joint Resolution 11 really is about stopping discrimination, torture, sex trafficking, and other ways that women are devalued in our society. Nothing more; nothing less. For those who are "right to life," I certainly hope they will vote in the affirmative if the question about abolishing the death penalty comes up. As I said before, I am trying to reconcile the contradictions between when a government can tell you what to do and when a government cannot tell you what to do, or between life before birth and life when there is a question of the death penalty. Thank you for taking the time to listen to S.J.R. 11.



**Chair Miller:**

Before I close the hearing on S.J.R. 11, we have a final statement from Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

**Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:**

I appreciate the opportunity to make this statement. I thank the Senator for bringing the bill and the opposition and those who called in support. I think if you look at the legislative body in 2017, there were a much larger number of women sitting in the seats that were formerly held by men. In 2019, we broke the ceiling here in Nevada. In 2021, here we sit with a women majority in both houses and our judiciary. We are the women majority.

I hope that we as a country get to the point where jobs are not a man's job, a woman's job, or male or female; they are simply jobs, and anyone who is qualified to do those jobs can do those jobs. Those jobs that were seen in the past as a woman's job, those occupations should be paid for the work that they are doing. Oftentimes, those were nurses and teachers who were not being paid at the same rate as men. As we have lived through this pandemic, those were the people who got us through it: our counselors, teachers, and nurses, those so-called women's jobs. When we look at employment, people should be paid equal pay for whatever job they do no matter what gender they are.

**Chair Miller:**

I will close the hearing on S.J.R. 11 and open the hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 5. Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 is sponsored by Senator Spearman and urges certain actions to address the public health crisis in Nevada.

**Senate Concurrent Resolution 5: Urges certain actions to address the public health crisis in Nevada. (BDR R-966)**

**Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1:**

I am here to present Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 for your consideration. "Prejudice is a burden that confuses the past, threatens the future and renders the present inaccessible." These are the words of the great Maya Angelou. Prejudice has contributed to the creation of systemic racism and structures of racial discrimination that result in generational poverty and perpetuate debilitating economic, educational, and health challenges that disproportionately affect people of color and challenges that are exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Let me be very clear: prejudice has contributed to the creation of systemic racism. Let me be clearer: I am not calling anyone a racist. I am talking about a systemically racist system that prevails in this country. I just need to make that distinction. I do not want anyone to leave and say I called someone racist—I did not.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 takes a step towards addressing the systemic racism and structures of racial discrimination and their disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) communities in Nevada. Nearly half of Nevada's population is made up of people of color, including people who are Black, Indigenous,

Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islander, and individuals of more than one racial or ethnic background. Racism, racial and ethnic health disparities, and other inequities have led to a disproportionate negative impact on BIPOC communities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

For these reasons and others, during the 32nd Special Session of the Nevada Legislature, we adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 of the 32nd Special Session, which declares that systemic racism and structures of racial discrimination constitute a public health crisis. Now, during the 81st Session of the Nevada Legislature, we must pass legislation to address the public health crisis.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 declares that all Nevada residents shall have equal consideration and opportunity under the laws, policies, and practices of this state. Systemic racism and structures of racial discrimination constitute a public health crisis magnified by the disproportionately high impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. Nevada supports local, state, regional, and federal initiatives to understand, address, and dismantle systemic racism and its impact on the delivery of human and social services, economic development, and public safety. Federal funding should be distributed equitably based on the portion of members of a BIPOC community to address issues that disproportionately affect these communities in direct proportion to their disadvantages by individual racial categories. In addition, through this resolution, the Nevada Legislature affirms its commitment to incorporating the subject of systemic racism and the structures of racial discrimination that constitute a public health crisis into regular business.

I applaud Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno for bringing a bill last session to look at the disparities in maternal mortality among women of color [Assembly Bill 169 of the 80th Session]. These are statistics that cannot be denied. These are facts that have been so glaring and staring us in the face that now it is impossible to overlook. There are several bills making their way through this Legislature that deal with lupus [Senate Bill 175], childbearing, high blood pressure and diabetes [Senate Bill 341], and a number of other things. If you look at those bills, they are all standing on the facts that people in BIPOC communities have suffered disproportionately. Why? Because we are living under a health care system and many other systems that were not designed for our success.

That concludes my remarks with one exception. Today marks the second anniversary of the passing of our colleague, Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson. As I have said on previous occasions, we all have touted, and rightfully so, his commitment to education and his commitment to the mentoring program. Those were two of his passions, but he also had a commitment to health and equity in BIPOC communities. This is one of the pieces of legislation that I hope history will remark was an honor to the work that he did before he left us—minority health and equity. This honors not only his work but the work of so many others who have fought hard to eliminate these barriers that were created because of systemic racism.

There will be some who say, it is not true. I would encourage them to look up Henrietta Lacks. There will be some who say, that was then and this is now. I encourage them to look up the video testimony of Dr. Susan Moore. She was a medical doctor, and one of her last videos talked about her encounter with the health care system. Although she was a doctor and knew exactly what needed to be done to treat her so that her life could be saved, she said in one of her last videos that they treated her like she was a drug dealer and ignored her. Today, that African-American medical doctor is dead because of systemic racism. That is why Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 is so very important.

**Chair Miller:**

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open testimony in support of S.C.R. 5.

**Allison Genco, representing Dignity Health–St. Rose Dominican:**

Dignity Health–St. Rose Dominican is in support of S.C.R. 5. Health inequities and systemic racism have indeed caused a public health crisis. St. Rose is acting to address systemic inequities experienced by BIPOC and other underserved communities. Reversing the effects of systemic racism requires a long-term commitment.

Our first steps include expanding access to care in underserved communities, improving how we track outcomes by race, expanding implicit and unconscious bias training, growing programs that impact the social causes of poor health, and further diversifying our leadership, workforce, and suppliers. One example of that is our ten-year partnership with the Morehouse School of Medicine to develop and train more Black physicians.

St. Rose pays particularly close attention to the social determinants of health, as oftentimes, the social causes of poor health need to be dealt with the same velocity as an acute medical condition. Some of these issues include housing, food insecurity, violence prevention, and access to culturally competent care. Thanks to Senator Spearman for moving this concurrent resolution forward. We vow to be a partner to make sure that health care is equitable for all. Thank you for your time.

**Chair Miller:**

I do not see anyone else in the room. Is there anyone on the lines wishing to testify in support of S.C.R. 5?

**André C. Wade, State Director, Silver State Equality:**

Silver State Equality is a statewide LGBTQ civil rights organization. I am also a member of the Advisory Committee of the Office of Minority Health and Equity of the Department of Health and Human Services, and I am Chair of the Advisory Task Force on HIV Exposure Modernization. I am speaking today on behalf of Silver State Equality but wanted to note the other positions that I hold because they are all interrelated to this resolution.

Just recently, through the work on the Advisory Task Force on HIV Exposure Modernization, we had a report from the Williams Institute on the disproportionality of arrests and convictions related to Black people related to HIV criminalization, which of course is related to public health ["Enforcement of HIV Criminalization in Nevada," May 2021, written by Nathan Cisneros and Brad Sears].

There is a lot going on across the nation and in Nevada in particular. A resolution like this would do wonders for trying to address the ongoing issues that we face. We are here in support and urge you all to support it as well. Thank you for your time.

[There were no more callers in support.]

**Chair Miller:**

I will close testimony in support and open testimony in opposition of S.C.R. 5. [There was none.] Is there anyone to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close testimony for S.C.R. 5. Senator Spearman, would you like to make any closing remarks?

**Senator Spearman:**

I will close with a story that is actually true. My first trip to the South with my mother, I was headed to the water fountain to take a drink at one of the bus stations. I saw a white gentleman walk past one of the water fountains and spit in it. I was seven years old and thought, "Oh my God—No, I do not want to drink out of that." I went to the next water fountain, and just as I put my hand on the apparatus to turn on the water, I felt my mother grab me on the back of my dress and yank me up real fast. Her teeth were clenched, and she was biting her lip. She said, "What is it you want to do? You want to get killed?" I did not know what was going on. She started shaking me, and she was shaking, crying, and yelling. I did not know what happened.

She calmed down and said, "You trying to get killed?" I said, "No, ma'am. I just wanted to get some water." She said, "Do you see that sign there?" I looked at it, and she pointed to the sign that said, "WHITES ONLY." I read that, and then she pointed to the other sign and said, "Can you read that?" I said, "Yes, but I do not know what 'COLO-RED' is. I do not know what that means." She said, "It is 'COLORED.' You are in the South now, and whenever you see that sign, you cannot drink out of anything except the sign that says, 'COLORED.'"

I know that there are some people who believe that racism never existed and that we still do not have a problem with it today, but that incident is ingrained in my mind. I was to find out later that my mother was very afraid because of the Emmett Till story. Indeed, she did not want me to get killed, set on fire, and thrown in a river. Racism is a public health crisis, and I urge your support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5. Thank you so much.

**Chair Miller:**

Thank you, Senator. I will close the hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 5. Our final agenda item is public comment. We will take up to 30 minutes of public comment. We have no one in the room coming forward. Is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] We will wait just a moment to give anyone who is attempting to dial in the opportunity to do so. Has anyone called in? [There was no one.] With that, I will close public comment.

Thank you to our staff and Committee members for another wonderful meeting. We have no other business before us. We will hear two more bills this Thursday, May 6, 2021. This meeting is adjourned [at 4:51 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Jordan Green  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

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

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a letter dated May 5, 2021, from Rebecca Gipson, Chief of Staff, Office of the City Manager, City of North Las Vegas, submitted by Arielle Edwards, Government Affairs Specialist, Office of the City Manager, City of North Las Vegas, in support of Senate Joint Resolution 11.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony dated May 3, 2021, submitted and presented by Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom, in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 11.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony submitted and presented by Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom, in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 11.