

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND LABOR**

**Eighty-second Session  
February 20, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor was called to order by Chair Pat Spearman at 8:04 a.m. on Monday, February 20, 2023, in Room 2134 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Additional space for overflow was provided in Room 2149. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Pat Spearman, Chair  
Senator Roberta Lange, Vice Chair  
Senator Melanie Schieble  
Senator Skip Daly  
Senator Julie Pazina  
Senator Scott Hammond  
Senator Carrie A. Buck  
Senator Jeff Stone

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Nicole Cannizzaro, Senatorial District No. 6

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cesar Melgarejo, Policy Analyst  
Bryan Fernley, Counsel  
Veda Wooley, Counsel  
Kelly K. Clark, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Sandra Koch, M.D., Nevada Association of the American College of  
Obstetricians and Gynecologists  
Lindsey Harmon, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor  
February 20, 2023  
Page 2

Bill Sims

Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada

Donna West

Sara Evans, National Organization for Women, Nevada Chapter

Mary Dungan

Lisa Lynn Chapman

Darcy Johnson

Tess Opferman, Nevada Women's Lobby

Hailey Lindsley, Planned Parenthood Mar Monte

Sarah Watkins, Nevada State Medical Association

Briana Escamilla, Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains

Leann McAllister, Nevada Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics

Carlos Calderon, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada

Annette Magnus, Battle Born Progress

Paul Catha, Culinary Union

Daniella Reynolds, Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada

Serena Evans, Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence

Erin Rook

Sarah Rojas

Steven Goode

Erica Roth, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

Alexander Marks, Nevada State Education Association

Amber Falgout

John J. Piro, Clark County Public Defender's Office

Lilith Baran, American Civil Liberties Union

Quentin Savvoir, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People,  
Las Vegas

John Phoenix, Nevada Advanced Practice Nurses Association

Unidentified Speaker, Planned Parenthood Generation Action,  
University of Nevada, Reno

Laura Martinez, Nevada Disability Prevention Coalition

Cyrus Hojjaty

Melissa Clement, Nevada Right to Life

Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom

Bob Russo

Kendall Malcomb

Hilary Ramos

Norma Scurlock

Don Nelson, Nevada Right to Life

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor  
February 20, 2023  
Page 3

Lynn Chapman, Independent American Party  
Celes Parks  
Stephanie Kinsley, My Children's Advocate  
Lorena Cardenas, My Children's Advocate  
Elisheba Dlote, Love Life Movement  
Joy Trushenski  
Richard Nagel  
Scott Johnston  
Grace Trujillo  
Jenann Logan  
Kelly Quinn  
Betsy Strasburg  
Karen Stephens  
Mariann Humphrey  
Renee Rezendes  
Alida Benson, Nevada Republican Party  
Teresa Bedoy  
Adama Diego  
Andrea Aguilar  
Rachelle Puaina  
Jim DeGraffenreid, Nevada Republican Party  
Erin Phillips  
James Pels  
Henry Thorns

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 131 sponsored and presented by our Majority Leader, Senator Cannizzaro.

**SENATE BILL 131**: Revises provisions relating to reproductive health care.  
(BDR 54-44)

SENATOR NICOLE Cannizzaro (Senatorial District No. 6):

I am pleased to present Senate Bill 131, a bill seeking to codify Governor Steve Sisolak's Executive Order 2022-08, issued June 28, 2022, which provides further abortion protections and reproductive freedom in this State. For 50 years, the right to privacy and control over one's own body, including the right to seek an abortion, was widely accepted as a protected right under the United States Constitution. The legal status quo that existed for over

50 years under *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* was supported by most Nevadans and Americans. I have not lived a day in my life when *Roe v. Wade* has not been the law of the land. It was by no means perfect, but it served the Country well, providing nationwide stability and legal protection for women. It allowed people to seek reproductive care without undue government influence.

Unfortunately, last summer the Supreme Court upended those 50 years of precedent. It is unheard of to wipe out a legal precedent that has existed for more than 50 years. In a decision commonly referred to as *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health*, the Supreme Court enforced the wishes of an extreme ideological minority. It took the rare step of erasing an established constitutional right. In doing so, the Court massively expanded government power and the government's ability to control Americans' bodily autonomy.

Under the new *Dobbs* legal framework, the regulation of abortion and reproductive health care has been returned entirely to the states. In many states, the results have been horrific. Ohio enacted one of the most restrictive abortion bans in the Country. Last summer, a ten-year-old rape victim was forced to travel to Indiana for an abortion that made national news. Court filings have shown that at least two other Ohio minors, made pregnant by sexual assault, had to leave that state so as not to have to carry their rapists' babies. In Mississippi, the family of a teenage rape victim traveled over 500 miles to seek care after the state's only abortion clinic closed.

Mississippi law bans abortion after six weeks, even in cases of rape and before many women would even know they are pregnant. The six-week calculation begins on the first day of the last period, long before most women would know they are pregnant or test positive on a pregnancy test.

In Texas and other states, restrictive state abortion bans have denied many women timely care because doctors and hospitals fear repercussions. Serious issues can occur with ectopic pregnancies, where time is of the essence. Women with unviable pregnancies may have to forego safe abortion procedures, waiting days or even months for a dangerous miscarriage or other life-threatening condition to arise.

The impact of other states' restrictions and barriers to access is significant, and we feel it here in Nevada. For example, women of color, low-income women

and rural women are more likely to face barriers to accessing reproductive health care. This can lead to higher rates of unintended pregnancy, maternal mortality, mental and emotional damage and other adverse health conditions.

Nevada's statutory protections were put into place November 6, 1990, when Nevadans voted overwhelmingly to approve Nevada Question 7, the Abortion Legal to 24 Weeks Statute Referendum and affirmed *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 442.250. The referendum protected most abortion procedures and an individual's right to choose.

Nevada laws were amended in 2019 through S.B. No. 179 of the 80th Session, known as the Trust Nevada Women Act. These changes aligned informed consent laws with current medical standards of care, removed outdated criminal penalties and repealed outdated statutes that prohibited the use of medication to end a pregnancy. As the laws in other states become more backward and restrictive, women will have to take even more drastic action to protect themselves.

Women are coming to states like Nevada where the right to an abortion is protected. Las Vegas and Reno are already seeing an influx of out-of-state patients at clinics. In the Las Vegas area, the number has doubled since last July. Clinics across the State are seeing patients coming from Idaho, Texas, Arizona, Utah and even as far away as the East Coast. Providers expect those numbers to increase.

While the situation is unfolding, extremist politicians and their allies nationwide are not content to outlaw abortion in their own states. That is why this bill is so important for Nevada. These states plan to push their new ability to use their own power to the limit in the quest to eradicate reproductive freedoms nationwide. They are targeting patients, providers and anyone who assists them, even if they live in a state like Nevada. Just last week, the Virginia governor helped kill a bill to enhance data-privacy protections for women who use computer applications to track their menstrual cycles. The bill was designed to protect that data from being used to prosecute women who seek reproductive care.

Legislators in Texas are considering new bills to increase the power of local district attorneys to prosecute abortion providers and penalize organizations that

help Texans receive abortion medication via the Internet. It criminally punishes companies that financially support out-of-state abortion travel and expands private right-of-action lawsuits against anyone who assists a Texan in seeking an abortion.

Legislators in Missouri and elsewhere have also introduced bills to ban out-of-state abortions. These bills' sole purpose is to harass patients and providers, along with the family members, friends and organizations that may support them.

Most of these bills have stalled in the short term, but we often see that today's fresh idea can quickly end up on a governor's desk when it comes to restricting reproductive freedom. It is these new threats that are arising across the Country that S.B. 131 works to address.

After *Dobbs*, Governor Steve Sisolak signed Executive Order 2022-08. The Executive Order prohibited Nevada's State agencies from aiding others to prosecute a person receiving reproductive health services in Nevada. It limited extradition of a person charged with violating another state's law relating to reproductive healthcare services. It prevented certain State boards from disciplining their licensees for providing services related to reproductive healthcare. This Executive Order means that another state that is seeking to pass a law to prosecute providers or women here in Nevada cannot overstep their bounds. These services are perfectly legal here.

Today, it appears the Executive Order is still in effect, which is great news. But both incoming patients and healthcare providers cannot rely on an Executive Order that could be gone tomorrow. Senate Bill 131 will further strengthen reproductive rights in Nevada as it codifies the protections of Governor Sisolak's Executive Order and NRS.

I will provide an overview of the provisions of this bill. First, as defined throughout the bill, reproductive healthcare services include medical, surgical, counseling or referral services related to the human reproductive system. That includes, without limitation, services related to pregnancy, contraception, the termination of a pregnancy or any procedure or care found by a competent medical professional to be appropriate, based on the wishes of the patient.

In accordance with Nevada laws, section 1 prohibits healthcare licensing boards from disciplining or disqualifying licensees solely because they provided reproductive healthcare services or were subjected to judgment, discipline or other sanctions from another state for providing certain reproductive healthcare services. If the service is provided, it would have been lawful and consistent with practice standards in the relevant profession in Nevada.

Section 2 prohibits the Governor from surrendering or issuing a warrant of arrest for a person in Nevada who is charged in another state with a criminal violation if the alleged violation involves providing, assisting or receiving reproductive healthcare services, unless such acts would constitute a criminal offense under Nevada laws. Section 2 also excludes from this prohibition circumstances where the executive authority of another state demands a surrender of a person who was physically present in the demanding state at the time of the commission of the alleged offense and then fled from that state.

Section 3 prohibits State agencies in the Executive Branch from providing information or the use of certain resources to assist an investigation or proceeding initiated in another state related to providing, assisting or receiving reproductive healthcare services except under limited circumstances.

Section 4 requires healthcare licensing boards to examine the feasibility of providing opportunities for licensure reciprocity to providers of health care who provide reproductive healthcare services in other states. The goal is to facilitate the provision of quality reproductive healthcare services to persons from other states who seek such care in Nevada.

Reproductive rights are an essential aspect of individual freedom and autonomy. Other states have seen, and will continue to see, draconian antichoice and antifreedom laws proposed. This bill sends a message that reproductive freedom is respected here; patients and healthcare providers are safe and welcome in Nevada. That is consistent with Nevada law. This concludes my formal remarks, I urge your support of S.B. 131.

SENATOR DALY:

I have a question in section 2, on the "notwithstanding" language there. There is a general provision in law that gives the Governor a certain amount of authority. This would then restrict that general authority and his specific language. Would this remove that authority in this certain circumstance and in

accordance with the rest of the section? It is my understanding that under statutory construction and judicial review, the specific language would override the general language in case of a later interpretation. The intent of the legislation is to limit anybody's authority to restrict these activities. If this bill is passed by the Nevada State Legislature, then this becomes the intent of the Legislature, in case anybody is checking. Is that correct?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Yes, that is correct. The provisions under section 2, subsection 1, referencing NRS 179, deals with the Governor's authority to participate in extraditions. The Governor's ability to sign an extradition warrant is a unique authority. It is within his discretion to sign those warrants. Sometimes governors do not sign extradition warrants. Maybe it is a low-threshold property crime or the cost outweighs the benefit. If the extradition request is for a murder or a robbery from another state, the Governor would sign the extradition warrant. Technically speaking, the Governor does have wide discretion in signing extradition warrants.

This language is specific: When another state is seeking to extradite someone from Nevada who has participated in reproductive healthcare services here—where those services are legal—our Governor does not have the discretion to sign that extradition warrant. We would also prohibit another state from seeking to extradite someone from Nevada for the care received here.

SENATOR DALY:

Would the specific language take precedence over the general language? That is what I wanted to check.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

That is correct.

SENATOR DALY:

My second question is in section 3 regarding agencies providing information. I know executive orders only cover the Executive Branch and State agencies. Maybe in the legislation, we would want to extend that. I know the agencies track diseases, outbreaks and various things. It seems to me it would be logical to extend this to the extent that we can. An executive order could not cover that, but we can at the State Legislature.



SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

That is correct. What we want is to ensure that our State agencies will not be compelled by other states to share reproductive healthcare information that might be used to prosecute patients and service providers. These are services that are obtained legally here in Nevada under the laws of our State. This would not prohibit other information-sharing agencies from providing things other than what we have defined as reproductive health care. What we are seeking was already within the intent of the Executive Order.

As a Legislature, we do have the ability to restrain information-sharing with other states. We are trying to ensure that another state cannot come into Nevada, seek information about patients and providers and use it out of state to prosecute and go after those providers and patients.

SENATOR DALY:

It only applies to State agencies. If we want to extend it to local governments, to the extent they have that knowledge and put the same restriction on them, then the Governor could not do an executive order. But the State Legislature still can.

Obviously, the language here pertains to State agencies and licensing boards. We will review how it applies to local governments. The intent is to keep that information from being disseminated and used for nefarious purposes.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

I want to follow up on what Senator Daly said. The NRS 268.001 states that Nevada is a "Dillon's Rule" State. That means we have the power to set those parameters for local governments as well.

SENATOR STONE:

First, I want to make it clear, I do not support prosecuting women who want abortion services in Nevada. Does this bill prevent the Governor or any other executive agency from surrendering issuing warrants for alleged criminals whose alleged crimes have occurred in another state? Do sections 2 and 3 only apply to reproductive healthcare services rendered here in Nevada, or both?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

What this bill does not do is say that the Governor and the State do not have the ability to participate with other states if they are seeking extradition arrest warrants or investigations for things unrelated to reproductive healthcare services that do not occur in Nevada.

This bill is specific to reproductive healthcare services rendered here in Nevada. It applies to the patients who seek those services and the providers who perform those services here in Nevada.

SENATOR STONE:

All states belong to what is called an interstate compact, an agreement between states to cooperate with the extradition of alleged criminals for alleged crimes. The U.S. Constitution, Article IV, section 2, clause 2, the Extradition Clause, reads:

A person charged in any State with Treason, Felony or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall on Demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

I have a question for you or legal counsel. Under the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, can we select the crimes for which we are willing to extradite? Clearly, the Governor has a choice to extradite. How will other states respond? Will they allow us to extradite criminals from their state?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

You have touched on something that is common in extradition. Even though there is a requirement for states to cooperate in extradition proceedings, there are times when other states will not extradite someone for whom we have an outstanding warrant.

It is not until they come into the State of Nevada and are arrested by law enforcement that they are prosecuted for the crimes for that outstanding warrant. The Governor may decide not to sign an extradition warrant. That is discretionary. There are interstate compacts that come into play. If our State completely stopped extraditing anybody, there may be more questions; that

could become an issue between states. However, that is not what S.B. 131 seeks to do.

This Executive Order has been in place since June 2022. Since adoption, I am not aware of any issues with extradition proceedings or interstate compacts. I do not believe S.B. 131 provides a basis for another state to completely stop cooperating with our extradition processes.

Other states in a similar situation to Nevada are reviewing ways to protect reproductive rights and health care. These states want to protect the rights of people who come to their state seeking legal health care. If, for instance, an antichoice state sought extradition of a patient who sought legal medical care here in Nevada, S.B. 131 protects against that. That is uniquely rare for another state to do because, technically, they would not have jurisdiction.

We are now seeing states that are passing these laws, granting themselves jurisdiction to go after patients and providers. This bill is in response to that. I leave it to legal counsel to offer opinions on the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Under Nevada law, it is not mandatory for the Governor to sign an extradition warrant. That happens infrequently, but it is not uncommon.

SENATOR STONE:

This bill says that you will explore reciprocity with other states for women's health professionals. Why limit it to women's health professionals? We have a shortage of healthcare physicians throughout the State. If the reciprocity is granted to doctors who claim they are reproductive doctors, can they just come here and then decide to become general practitioners and circumvent the licensure process?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

This bill is specific. The intent is to help protect our providers and patients here in Nevada. We have a small number of providers—eight I believe—here in the State. You do not want a doctor who is treating a dying woman with an ectopic pregnancy to have to pause to think about being subject to legal action. That pause could cost the woman her life for an unviable pregnancy.

This bill supports reciprocity, where appropriate, for reproductive healthcare services. We know that there are providers who are being shut out of other states. Those clinics are being closed and those doctors have nowhere to go.

We do not have enough providers here in Nevada to care for all the patients. This bill gives us the ability to widen that network. The boards and commissions here will understand this language is specific to reproductive services. It is not a way to gain entry to do medicine in Nevada. The boards and commissions can still regulate those professions.

I agree that we need to grow and expand our medical provider network. That is not unique to reproductive healthcare services, but this bill is specific. It is intended for a particular practice area. Since the *Dobbs* decision, this has become a health emergency with patients who cannot get care and providers who cannot give care.

SENATOR STONE:

In contrast to the laws of states like Utah, Arizona and Idaho, Nevada does not mandate parental notification for minors getting an abortion. Nevada is already the second largest trafficker corridor in the Country, next to Mississippi. I have received hundreds of emails from people, and this seems to be the common theme: "Won't this bill make it easier for human traffickers of minors and pedophiles?" They can simply cross State lines from Utah, without having parental consent laws there, to seek abortions for minors and return them to their chain of human trafficking.

Will this not make us a sanctuary state for abortion? We do not want Nevada to be known for this. We offer entertainment, sports and tourism as big parts of our economy. Do we want abortion tourism to be another thing the State is known for?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

The idea that this bill creates abortion tourism ignores the reason women and patients seek reproductive health care. These are desperate situations. The idea that we are going to classify that as tourism is exceedingly problematic and abhorrent. It is not tourism. A woman or even a minor is not seeking reproductive health care as a basis for tourism. That is a red herring to intentionally distract from what this bill does and makes it into something it is not.

The point is someone who is seeking reproductive health care should be able to go to a provider and seek the medical care that she needs. Period. It is not for us to delve into why a woman sought that particular care.

I have sponsored many pieces of legislation dealing with sex trafficking. This has nothing to do with it. If we want to tackle sex trafficking, we must be more diligent about how we identify and prosecute perpetrators, support families and communicate with children. The children, their parents and the school guardians must be aware. I can give you data on it. I have experience dealing with that issue in a professional setting. There are many reasons it is difficult to target sex trafficking in this State.

But this bill is not a sex trafficking bill. It does not create abortion tourism, a term I find offensive. This is a bill that lets patients and providers know that they can continue to do what is legal under Nevada law without being prosecuted for it. This bill says, "We are not going to participate in another state's prosecution of you."

SENATOR BUCK:

Are medical providers mandatory reporters? If they suspect abuse, pedophilia or sex trafficking, do they not have to report it? We have many emails asking that question.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

That question is a red herring—a way for someone to distract from what the bill really does. This is not a sex trafficking bill. It is not an abortion tourism bill. It is not about child abuse or pedophilia. That is not what this bill is about. Medical providers are still subject to all the conditions of their licenses. They must still comply with any laws applicable to them. This bill does not change that.

This does not change the procedures of the providers or the services that are available in Nevada. The idea that this will open a nefarious port for people to come here and do things that are outside of existing law simply ignores the language of this bill and current NRS.

Medical providers are still required under their licenses to continue to practice in a safe and appropriate manner. Mandatory reporters will continue to report. This bill does not change that. If a state says, we want to prosecute a patient, the healthcare provider cannot participate in providing information regarding the health care that was provided to that patient.

SENATOR BUCK:

We do not currently prosecute women or doctors. The people spoke in 1990. I guess I am failing to see what the bill does.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

As I delineated in my remarks, since the *Dobbs* decision, other states are passing laws seeking to prosecute patients and providers of reproductive health care. It is not for another state to decide what is legal or not here in Nevada. That is for Nevada to decide. And as you mentioned, the voters decided that abortion would be legal here in Nevada in 1990.

This bill also supports reproductive healthcare providers. If a medical provider in another state is subjected to disciplinary action, not because they provided incompetent care, not because they violated the terms of their licenses, but merely because they practice reproductive health care, that state has now determined that reproductive healthcare services are illegal there. Then the provider may be subject to some sort of sanction or discipline in that state for providing the services.

If that healthcare provider comes to Nevada seeking a license, this bill says they cannot be denied a license solely based on providing those services in another state.

If they provided inaccurate services, if they defrauded patients, if they did not comply with the medical standards of their profession, then certainly Nevada's licensing boards can deny their licenses. It also says State agencies will not provide information about reproductive healthcare providers. Here in Nevada, that is perfectly legal.

It would be like if another state were to say, "marijuana is legal in Nevada, but we do not like marijuana, it is not legal in our state and we want to prosecute somebody for smoking marijuana while they were in Nevada." They cannot come across the border and try to prosecute somebody for something that happened here in our State.

In the wake of these other states' draconian laws that seek to overstep their bounds, this law is necessary. We must protect patients and providers who are doing things legally here in Nevada.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I want to focus more on the providers. Nationally, there is a provider shortage for reproductive health care. We have seen countless providers across the Country subjected to violence, harassment and threats.

It is not easy to provide women's health care in the current political climate. I am concerned about all patients in Nevada receiving quality care here at home or wherever they might be. I am concerned about providers coming to Nevada and staying in Nevada.

As I understand it, S.B. 131 provides a necessary backstop to the draconian influences of outside states trying to criminalize medical providers. This care can touch on everything from birth control prescriptions, to addressing an ectopic pregnancy, to carrying the pregnancy to term, or to evaluating the viability of a pregnancy.

This bill will protect medical providers who provide reproductive health care for people who live in Nevada or people who come to Nevada. When you practice medicine in Nevada, you do not have to worry about the repercussions of people from other states seeking to criminalize your actions. If you live and practice in Nevada and use your license to provide good quality care, you are protected. Your government and your State Legislature will back you. We are not going to let anybody come here and arrest doctors, nurses, nurse practitioners or on-call staff for providing healthcare to people who need it.

Without S.B. 131, we cannot make those guarantees to providers. This is a necessary step to develop a complete care system for patients and providers. It ensures that reproductive healthcare providers know that when they provide good quality care to patients, they are not going to be subject to legal criminal action from people outside of the State.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

That is correct. This bill is necessary, so that there is certainty in the law in Nevada. Current law states you can legally seek reproductive healthcare services. There is a wide array of reproductive healthcare services. We should not delineate between what is and what is not appropriate. In Nevada, it is all legal.

In section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b) there is a broad and expansive definition of reproductive healthcare services. They can include contraception, emergency care by a provider for a woman who presents with an ectopic pregnancy or an obstetrician providing care to help a woman to carry a baby to term. It could be somebody seeking an abortion. The definition covers all those different practices. The point is, in Nevada, patients have a choice to seek reproductive health care. That choice was put into place by the voters here. It exists under NRS, and it is perfectly legal here in this State to seek that care.

As the government, we should not be questioning women about the kind of care they seek. We should be telling providers, you can practice reproductive health care for whatever your patient needs, wants and chooses, so you can make sure they are safe. That is why this bill is necessary, so we can assure providers they are not going to be hauled into another state and prosecuted.

The situation is becoming a health emergency for many patients. It is necessary to talk about a lack of providers in a substantial way. We have seen a doubling of reproductive health patients since July of 2022. That is a lot for a strained provider network to continue to provide. That includes everyone who is seeking any type of reproductive care under that broad definition.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Patients already can seek reproductive health care in the State of Nevada as codified. That right has not been taken away. I understand with the *Dobbs* decision, the Supreme Court said the decision was to be handed back to the states. Under this bill, there is a slight expansion of the Executive Order because you are adding a few things to the definition of reproductive health. That is what I understood from your last answer. Most of this bill seeks to restrict what the Governor and State agencies can or cannot do when it comes to people coming into the State.

This bill is about protecting citizens coming in from other states. What does it do for the citizens of Nevada, other than expand the definition of reproductive health care? It seems to limit the ability of citizens of the State to conduct their business.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

First, I will address the idea that the definition in S.B. 131 is an expansion of the definition in the Executive Order. Page 2 of Executive Order 2022-08,



section 4, defines reproductive healthcare services as "all medical, surgical, counseling or referral services relating to the human reproductive system, including, but not limited to, services relating to pregnancy, contraception, the termination of pregnancy, or any procedure or care found by a competent medical professional to be appropriate based upon the wishes of the patients, and in accordance with the laws of this State."

That is verbatim the definition of reproductive healthcare services in S.B. 131 section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b). This definition does not expand what is now legal in Nevada. All these types of care are legal in Nevada. What it seeks to do is to define who is looking for reproductive healthcare services. It may be a Nevadan or it may be someone who comes here from out of state. It could be someone who comes from out of state and then moves to Nevada. It would cover many situations.

If a medical provider is providing incompetent care, if they are hurting patients, if they are defrauding patients, then the provisions of S.B. 131 would not permit that medical provider to maintain a license. It would not prohibit someone from trying to prosecute them or seek a lawsuit against them. That type of conduct is illegal in Nevada.

With respect to the extradition pieces of this bill, if a patient comes to Nevada and seeks care here, that is legal. Nevada is not going to extradite that person to another state or participate in that prosecution.

Certainly, *Dobbs* and the Supreme Court have handed decisions to the states about what should or should not be permitted. It has removed or ignored what was previous law under *Roe v. Wade*, saying there is an inherent right to privacy that would allow for this type of practice to occur in states. Under *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, you cannot put unreasonable restrictions on the ability of someone to seek that type of care. This bill says, here in Nevada, we made the choice in 1990; it is in NRS. You can get reproductive health care and that has not changed. You can seek this type of care. We want to ensure that right is maintained here in our State.

Other states may make a different decision. But what we see in those states is not simply a decision to say, we do not want reproductive healthcare services legal here in our state. Instead, they are saying, if you go to another state and

seek this type of care, we are going to prosecute you for getting that care, regardless of whether it is legal in the state where it was obtained.

You asked what this bill does for Nevadans. It means you can access reproductive healthcare services without worrying about whether another state is going to come after you. If you move to another state, they would not be able to prosecute you for things that you did here in Nevada.

We want providers who practice here in the State to know they are not going to be hauled off to another state. We are not going to extradite them to another state. They can continue to provide that care without facing repercussions or prosecution.

Reproductive health care is necessary health care. It is medically needed for so many patients, whether they are from Nevada or out of state. It is essential to ensure that reproductive health care still exists here in Nevada. This bill says what is legal here in Nevada, is legal here in Nevada. If another state does not want this, that is fine. But our providers and our patients can provide and receive reproductive health care without fear of prosecution or revocation of a medical license. It aligns with *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I think that when I asked about the expansion from the Executive Order, I may have misspoken. I thought I heard you say there was a change that does expand the definition. Is this definition exactly what was in the Executive Order?

If there is an expansion of it from what is current right now, that is okay. The *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* decision says every state can decide what they want to do and who can legally participate, and so forth. Is this definition an expansion of current law?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

It is not. You must put parameters on what is protected. In this bill, we define the things for which a board or commission can penalize or deny a license. This covers reproductive health care. It does not protect doctors in fraud cases or those kinds of things.

In legislation, we must define the goal. Everything that you see in subsection 4 of Executive Order 2022-08 is in the definitions in S.B. 131, section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b). Those healthcare services are all perfectly permitted and legal. They are allowed to be practiced here in Nevada. They align with NRS. They do not expand what we permit here in Nevada. It is simply delineating what exactly is protected under this bill and under the Executive Order.

This bill is not just for somebody seeking an abortion. It applies to any type of medical health care in the reproductive space. It says "including without limitation" services related to pregnancy. If you are pregnant and you want to carry that baby to full term, you need an obstetrics gynecologist to provide you with the right care and guidance to allow you, as a patient, to make the right decisions for your family. For contraception, it ensures that patients can still use contraception and medical professionals can still prescribe, without repercussions, for the termination of a pregnancy or any other necessary procedure.

These services are all legal here in Nevada, including the termination of a pregnancy. It could be that a woman who is trying to have a baby finds out her baby does not have a heartbeat. Another woman might have an ectopic pregnancy and must undergo emergency medical treatment. This bill does not differentiate between those services. It says all these services that are currently legal in Nevada fall under the provisions of this bill and under this Executive Order. It does not expand the type of health care that is provided, it just defines what is covered by this Executive Order and by S.B. 131.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Is there a reason we do not put "licensed" competent, medical professional in the bill? That might be a question for legal as well.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I would defer to legal as to why it might not say "licensed." If you practice medical services without a healthcare license, that does not fall within the parameters of S.B. 131. I do not know if there are other portions of NRS that simply reflect competence or if we are always required to say licensed. This bill is intended to provide licensed, competent care.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Does the term health care include dialysis, open heart surgery or a root canal? Is that the goal here, to keep health care legal? I will ask our Committee members to hold questions until after we hear from people on the phone. We have almost 40 people waiting.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

Yes, you are correct. Reproductive health care is health care. It is legal here. You cannot be prosecuted for what health care you seek here in the State. If someone comes here from out of state, they would not be subject to prosecution for health care for a root canal, because dental services are legal here. The difference is another state will not come into Nevada to prosecute a patient for getting a root canal. But that is what we see in the reproductive healthcare space.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

We have 24 people who wish to testify in favor of this bill and 27 against it, with more on the phone. We are going to split the time into 30 minutes per side, two minutes each. We will start with those in support.

SANDRA KOCH, M.D., (Nevada Association of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists):

I have been a Carson City obstetrician since 1990. I chair Nevada's Maternal Mortality Review Committee. We review all maternal deaths in Nevada to learn how to prevent them. The most important tool to reduce the death rate for mothers is access to reproductive health care. Reproductive healthcare services are being denied to citizens in the U.S., both by laws to criminalize that care and by loss of access to providers of that care. It is not only appropriate but necessary to reassure Nevadans that our State will not arrest any person within our State for receiving or providing care that is legal in Nevada. I urge you to pass this legislation.

LINDSEY HARMON (Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada):

This bill, S.B. 131, is a critical piece of legislation that honors the people I am proud to call my friends and colleagues. When I reflect on the last few years and what we have been through, I am reminded of the heroes who worked countless hours, held the hands of loved ones when we could not be there. They continued to give top-quality care despite the intense pressure of a global

pandemic. Healthcare providers in this Country and in Nevada deserve our utmost respect and admiration.

This bill does just that. It shows doctors that Nevada stands by them, and we see them as the professionals they are. It demonstrates that, even in the aftermath of the U.S. Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade*, Nevada understands the crucial role the State plays for those traveling to seek abortion care.

As a State with a voter-affirmed right to abortion, we must explore every avenue to protect reproductive freedom and the healthcare professionals who provide it. Senate Bill 131 would protect the licensing of healthcare providers, explore licensing reciprocity and prohibit the State from extraditing reproductive healthcare providers. This crucial legislation will also bar the State from participating in investigations into certain reproductive healthcare services. This bill is critically important. We are honored to show our support for this bill and stand with our Nevada healthcare providers.

BILL SIMS:

Passing this bill will solidify that we are here to help those in need both outside and inside Nevada. People are safe to receive the health care that they want or need. I hope that you will listen to most Nevadans who do see reproductive health care, including the right to an abortion, as a State-protected right. Please make sure that Nevada does not participate in prosecuting people for receiving the health care that they choose, no matter who they are or for whatever reason they may receive it.

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

We support S.B. 131. Our organization believes in the tenets of reproductive justice, the human right to maintain personal bodily autonomy, to have or not have children, and to parent children in a safe and sustainable community. The National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda states those rights can only be achieved when we have complete economic, social and political power, along with the resources to make healthy decisions about our bodies, families and communities.

Nevada voters overwhelmingly affirmed in 1990 this right to bodily autonomy and to choose to have an abortion in our State. Senate Bill 131 is a reiteration of Nevada voters' decision that no one shall be criminalized for seeking or

providing abortion care in the State, regardless of where they are from. Antiabortion politicians will not stop with the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. Since then, we have seen attempts nationwide to further criminalize private healthcare decisions. Nevada has upheld the right to abortion during my lifetime. It is appropriate for this Legislature to ensure that we not only protect the rights of Nevadans to receive abortion care but protect the data and privacy of anyone seeking an abortion in our State. This affirms Nevada's values of reproductive freedom and ensures that access to abortion for out-of-state patients will continue uninterrupted, no matter what bans other states enact. We urge your support.

DONNA WEST:

I am in favor of this bill to codify Governor Steve Sisolak's Executive Order to protect those seeking or providing abortion services in Nevada.

In the early 1970s, in the days before *Roe v. Wade*, I was a teenager growing up in Pennsylvania. One of my girlfriends found out she was pregnant. There was no legal abortion in our state then. Our friends saved up and we put her on a bus to New York to have an abortion. She was afraid to travel and have the procedure alone, but it was her choice. Today, I can imagine the fear we would all feel if she and her doctor were prosecuted for this legal medical procedure. Abortion is health care. People should be able to seek a legal abortion or any medical procedure without fear of arrest or prosecution. I urge your support of S.B. 131.

SARAH EVANS (National Organization for Women, Nevada Chapter):

I support S.B. 131. Since 1968, our members have supported and fought for accessible reproductive health care and the rights of LGBTQ people. We ask that you support S.B. 131 to protect patients and providers and affirm Nevada values of reproductive freedom. In my role as a daytime employee at the Division of Child and Family Services, I work directly with sex-trafficking victims. I can tell you the issue is complex. I agree with Senator Cannizzaro that it is a distraction to say this bill causes sex trafficking. It is a red herring to cause more problems; that is a fact.

MARY DUNGAN:

I am here to voice my support for S.B. 131. This bill needs to be passed to codify the protections for our State's patients and those who come here from other states to receive reproductive care, including abortion.

I personally know the importance of this issue. In 1976, I was a 19-year-old girl with a high school diploma and no marketable skills. I found myself in an abusive relationship and got pregnant. I knew it would be wrong and irresponsible of me to have a baby when I could not even take care of myself. I was terrified. Because of *Roe v. Wade*, I was able to move ahead. I served my Country for ten years in the U.S. Air Force. I met the love of my life and have a son who is my greatest joy. I was only able to do this because of the *Roe* decision. I was able to go back to college where I earned both bachelor's and master's degrees. None of that would have been possible if I had not had access to safe and legal abortion.

It pains me now that women are having those rights taken away in many states in this Country. I still remember that time in my life as if it were yesterday. I cannot understand why people want to force women to have babies when their circumstances are not right. I recall the recent testimony of a woman who was pregnant in 1969. She and her husband were excited to be parents, but the fetus died at seven months. She was forced to carry and deliver a dead baby. That makes me feel ill.

Some people call themselves prolife. But what about women's lives? What about their circumstances? Does that not count? We all know that being married or in a relationship is no guarantee that a child will be raised in a secure and loving home. To force a woman to have a child is barbaric and unconstitutional. No one has the right to tell a woman what to do with her own body.

LISA LYNN CHAPMAN:

I am here in support of S.B. 131. I have submitted testimony, ([Exhibit C](#)), which I will read.

DARCY JOHNSON:

I support this bill. I am both sad and horrified that legislation like this is necessary. I am proud that our historic, first-in-the-nation, female-majority

State Legislature is taking this action. Several neighboring states have laws that do not honor the reproductive rights of pregnant people.

TESS OPFERMAN (Nevada Women's Lobby):

The Nevada Women's Lobby was established in 1989 to help represent the interests of women and families in the Nevada Legislature. This includes our access to reproductive rights. Abortion has always been an intensely political matter and has become even more political over the last year. However, we ask this body to look past the politics and think of the interests of those who elected you. Nearly 70 percent of Nevadans support reproductive freedom and, as such, they voted to enshrine *Roe v. Wade* into State law over two decades ago. Nevadans have already made it clear how strongly they feel about protecting reproductive freedom. Now we must pass S.B. 131 to ensure doctors have the protection to continue practicing reproductive health care in Nevada, and out-of-state individuals have the necessary protection to come to Nevada for legal abortions. The Nevada Women's Lobby asks you to uphold the opinion of Nevada voters and pass S.B. 131.

HAILEY LINDSLEY (Planned Parenthood Mar Monte):

I am here in solidarity with many other Nevadans who overwhelmingly support the right to access an abortion in support of S.B. 131. I am a proud Nevadan. I know that this bill is a necessary step to affirm our State's values of reproductive freedom while ensuring that access to abortions for out-of-state patients is uninterrupted.

As a State that has long upheld the right to an abortion, it is incumbent upon lawmakers to ensure we not only protect the rights of Nevadans to receive abortion care but protect the data and privacy of anyone who seeks to provide abortion care in our State. Planned Parenthood Health Centers train their staff to screen for abuse and sex trafficking within our patient base and are mandated to report in those situations. We always prioritize protecting our patients. In fact, S.B. 131 is about protecting our patients and our providers. To receive the highest quality care, there must be no fear of prosecution or retaliation from other state governments. I urge you to support S.B. 131 because we know that every single State-level protection matters in this post *Roe v. Wade* world.

SARAH WATKINS (Nevada State Medical Association):

The Nevada State Medical Association is in support of S.B. 131 due to the protections provided for physicians in this bill.



BRIANA ESCAMILLA (Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains):

We serve Colorado, New Mexico and southern Nevada. Our Chief Medical Officer, Dr. Kristina Tocce, submitted written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)) in support of S.B. 131. I will share excerpts, paragraphs 3, 4, 7 and 8.

LEANN MCALLISTER (Nevada Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics):

We have submitted testimony, which I will read ([Exhibit E](#)).

CARLOS CALDERON (Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada):

As an immigrant, I know how hard it is to overcome language, discrimination and racism. Working with the immigrant community, I see we have another big barrier: access to reproductive healthcare. I can imagine people forced to leave home to seek an abortion. They must stop their lives, find money to cover the cost, get time off work or risk losing their jobs, and find childcare before they make the trip. We are lucky to live in a State committed to protecting our fundamental rights, but we cannot be blind to the pain of our neighbors in other states. In the midterm election last year, most Nevadans supported the right to an abortion. That is why I urge you to support S.B. 131.

ANNETTE MAGNUS (Battle Born Progress):

We support S.B. 131. This issue is close to my heart. We value the right and freedom to make decisions about if or when we choose to have children. That includes the right and freedom to obtain an abortion without fear or judgment. When *Roe v. Wade* was overturned last year, many states, including those neighboring Nevada, swiftly moved to crack down on the rights of residents. They outlawed or restricted access to abortion. I remember thinking about how proud I was to live in a State like ours that overwhelmingly supports a person's right to choose. Naturally, that Supreme Court decision led to people coming to Nevada to seek abortion care. We are thankful we still have our right to choose. We must protect those traveling here and our local providers. They will be subjected to harassment and criminalization and threatened for refusing to cooperate with disgusting antiabortion laws in other states.

I did this work years ago at a health center. I met all kinds of people, many who said it saved their lives. Every time I speak on this issue, I think of them. I will work on this until I die to ensure young people have access to this critical health care. It is nobody's business what I do with my body. Please pass S.B. 131.

PAUL CATHA (Culinary Union):

The Culinary Union supports S.B. 131. We echo the comments of the other supporters.

DANIELLA REYNOLDS (Planned Parenthood Votes Nevada):

I support S. B. 131. When you were elected, you took your oaths of office to support, protect and defend the U.S. Constitution and the Nevada Constitution. We trust you and we thank you for showing up for us every day as Nevadans and for our Country.

We know that our Constitution says all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. As defined by the U.S. Constitution, liberty is when individuals live under a system of laws designed to protect their property and shield them from unrestrained government control and abuse.

In that vein, I urge you to pass S.B. 131, as it prevents the prosecution of patients and providers who provide reproductive health care. It protects citizens' rights and ability to seek abortions regardless of their state of residence. It also protects Nevada's medical providers from criminal prosecution.

SERENA EVANS (Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence):

Reproductive freedom is not just a conversation about choice. It is also a conversation about safety for victim-survivors of domestic and sexual violence. Access to reproductive health care is essential for their safety in planning and being able to break free from an abuser. That is why I am here today in support of S.B. 131.

Victim-survivors of intimate partner violence often experience some form of reproductive coercion if they find themselves impregnated by their abusers. Access to safe reproductive healthcare services is a valuable tool for their safety planning. For many victim-survivors, relocation or seeking care in another state is part of the safety plan.

It is bone chilling to think that a victim-survivor, who relocated or traveled to Nevada to seek reproductive health services, could be prosecuted along with the doctor who provided those services. We have a duty to protect patients, medical providers and the overall autonomy of reproductive choice. This bill ensures safe access to health care and serves as a tool for violence prevention.

ERIN ROOK:

I support S.B. 131 as a queer and transgender survivor of intimate violence. As an advocate for equitable access to health care, I urge you to support this bill. It is not enough for Nevada to ensure that its residents have access to abortion and related reproductive healthcare services. We must ensure no one is criminalized for accessing or providing this care no matter what state the patient is from.

States that seek to limit access to abortion are often the same states that restrict access to gender-affirming care, making this assurance of safe access to health care particularly vital to transgender and nonbinary people. It is also particularly important for survivors of intimate violence who may be fleeing dangerous situations. Not passing this bill would be cruel, and frankly hypocritical, especially in a State whose economy revolves around activities that are illegal in other states. This bill will affirm the value Nevadans place on freedom and reassure residents and visitors alike that their rights are protected here.

SARAH ROJAS:

I support S.B. 131. I feared the worst for my bodily autonomy when *Roe v. Wade* fell. Being from Las Vegas, I have always been proud of how my State passes legislation that represents my best interests. After the Executive Order, I knew that the people I helped elect had no intention of infringing upon my rights and the rights of others. However, that is not the case for patients who come to Nevada for abortion care.

I hope the State Legislature will stand in solidarity with those patients and most Nevadans who support reproductive freedom and become a leader in this fight for essential health care in the U.S. I urge you to support S.B. 131 for the good of the millions of people who now must travel to states like Nevada for basic health care and depend on laws like this to protect them.

STEVEN GOODE:

I am here to testify in support of S.B. 131. It will protect both out-of-state patients and the healthcare providers who come here. Both groups deserve to feel safe, and that can be accomplished with this bill. It will also affect more people than the patients and providers—it will impact their friends and families too. I have friends and family who have received reproductive

health care that in other states might be cause for prosecution. Please protect our people and pass this bill.

ERICA ROTH (Washoe County Public Defender's Office)

I am here to testify in favor of S.B. 131. I offer my perspective as a criminal defense attorney. I have seen firsthand how other states sweep residents into criminal prosecutions. This bill seeks to protect providers, people seeking abortions, and the activists and groups who seek to provide additional services.

ALEXANDER MARKS (Nevada State Education Association):

Thank you. I have submitted written testimony, ([Exhibit F](#)). We are in full support.

AMBER FALGOUT:

I will say ditto to everything. I am incredibly grateful for Nevada because as a mother and a parent, my children will have the right to an abortion. We need to protect all the people coming here.

JOHN J. PIRO (Clark County Public Defender's Office):

We support this measure.

LILITH BARAN (American Civil Liberties Union):

We support this bill.

QUENTIN SAVVOIR (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Las Vegas):

I agree with my colleagues. We fully support S.B. 131.

JOHN PHOENIX (Nevada Advanced Practice Nurses Association):

I am an advanced practice registered nurse. I am here today on behalf of Claudette Rhoades, our president. I will read the testimony, ([Exhibit G](#)), which she submitted. Our members support S.B. 131. I also represent my clinic, the largest provider of LGBTQ-affirming care in the State. We are providers of sexual health, reproductive health and wellness. We stand in support as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (Planned Parenthood Generation Action, University of Nevada, Reno):

I support S.B. 131. Prosecuting those who travel to Nevada to seek help with their reproductive rights is not only unjust but also unconstitutional. We praise that men and women are created equal. Is it really equality when the law prohibits women from seeking private health care for their own bodies? Where women from low-income families who cannot feed themselves or suffer from domestic violence are forced to bring a child into this world? Then if they decide not to give birth, they are punished for their right to choose. With *Roe v. Wade* being overturned, it is time to look at reproductive rights through a critical lens. I urge you to support S.B. 131. It is the first step to take back our right to privacy and right to choose.

LAURA MARTINEZ (Nevada Disability Prevention Coalition):

I agree with the other callers. Anyone, especially a person with a disability, can be a victim. The foster care system is in dire need of help. If we do not pass this bill, people are going to continue to have unwanted babies. That is sad for their generation. Please support S.B. 131.

CYRUS HOJJATY:

I support this bill. Do you know who is more likely to get abortions? Nonwhite. That is right. And if we have more of these abortions, there will be fewer nonwhites out there. That means less crime and less welfare. It is more likely that European Americans will stay a majority. If you can advertise and put clinics particularly in nonwhite neighborhoods, thank you so much. God bless European Americans.

MELISSA CLEMENT (Nevada Right to Life):

Nevada Right to Life is opposed to S. B. 131 because it is a threat to minors. I have submitted testimony opposing this bill, which I will read ([Exhibit H](#)).

Planned Parenthood is looking to cash in on women's heartbreak by offering flights to and from abortion clinics. On Planned Parenthood Mar Monte's website, it states our new flagship health center will be 8,400 square feet. It will have increased space for abortion service at a convenient location near the Reno airport for our out-of-state patients.

They are planning a clinic for West Wendover to take advantage of the State's border with Utah. This bill threatens the ability of any healthcare licensing board

to disqualify unsafe abortionists from practicing in Nevada. Subsection 1 of the bill seems to give abortion providers advantages over other doctors. Medical licensure boards should be free to consider penalties and license revocations from other states regardless of the type of medicine practiced.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Families for Freedom):

Nevada Families for Freedom opposes this bill. I submitted testimony, ([Exhibit I](#)), which I will read. Abortion is big business for Planned Parenthood. This bill eliminates the ability of Nevada to help other states prosecute these predators. This makes Nevada a sanctuary for predators, like sex traffickers, who will force underage girls to get an abortion to hide their crimes. I do not believe these concerns were ever adequately answered. Women and girls are often the second victims of abortion. States can now pass their own laws. Will our health department be able to check the records? Please oppose S.B. 131 to protect innocent women, children and babies.

BOB RUSSO:

I oppose S.B. 131. I have submitted a letter in opposition, ([Exhibit J](#)), which I will read.

KENDALL MALCOMB:

I agree with the previous speakers. The abortion industry is not safe. It is not regulated the way it should be. It encourages the hurt and the pain of young women in horrible situations. It disregards the right to life that many young children are being denied every single day. It is heartbreaking. We should be ashamed of ourselves for allowing this to happen for so long.

HILARY RAMOS:

I am a mom of five. I am here to implore you to vote no on S.B. 131. I do not have a powerful organization behind me but an army of moms and citizens who stand in solidarity to protect underage victims. I have been a resident of Las Vegas since January 2000. Back then, it was known as Sin City.

On October 1, 2017, that changed. A deranged person terrorized our City. We became Vegas Stronger. God brought together a real community out of that. People from across the Country asked us how that shooting happened. Why was a monster allowed free and unlimited access? We learned so much. Hotel policies changed and planning changed. Now we know better, and we do better.

What does that have to do with S.B. 131? Now Nevada can be known as the State that protects children. Can we sit by knowing that, if this bill passes, nefarious actors will abuse it? When people in our Country find out what is happening, will they not ask why we allowed this? I am not here to testify against abortion, or to refuse access to medical care for young women. I am testifying that this will be abused by sex traffickers. We must stand with children. We must protect the minors who will be abused and brought into our State to get abortions, then returned to the streets. We are so proud of our Country's first majority-women State Legislature. Please vote no on S.B. 131.

NORMA SCURLOCK:

I have provided written testimony, ([Exhibit K](#)), which I will read. Nearly 3,000 babies a day are being murdered in our Country. Why aren't we promoting family instead of death? Parents do not have the right to protect their little girls or grandchildren. If it bothers you, stand up for life. Protect our children. May God help us all.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

In your opening statement, you said something about President Biden. Is that fact or opinion? If it is fact, then provide the proof.

DON NELSON (Nevada Right to Life):

Nevada Right to Life has submitted testimony ([Exhibit L](#)) opposing this bill, which I will read.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Independent American Party):

Home Means Nevada is our State song, and I wonder about that now. I have been in Nevada since 1984. It is a beautiful State with wide-open spaces, fishing, hunting, camping, swimming, all the fun things that people want for their families.

When I speak to people now about Nevada, they are telling me it means gambling, prostitution and openly smoking dope. Ours is the State with the most sex trafficking, especially of children. Now we will be the destination for abortions in the Country. When a business comes to Nevada, it brings jobs and employees. Do those employees know that when their children go to school here, the parents will not be notified nor is their consent needed for some surgeries? Do you think people will want to move here knowing their children and grandchildren are at a higher risk for sex trafficking?

We should protect our women and children, but this bill does not do that. There are many dangerous situations in the world today. We should be looking to decrease rather than increase them in our State. Abortion was always illegal for much longer than 50 years. Shame on Nevada if this bill passes.

CELES PARKS:

First, I am a Christian saved by Jesus Christ. I am also a registered nurse in the City of Las Vegas. I am currently studying for my doctorate in Women's Health. I oppose S.B. 131. Every time I enter the hospital, I witness the value and sanctity of life. Every person is created in God's image, and every life is worth being honored.

Nurses around the Nation pledge to provide the best, safest and most humane care to all patients. We are given a code of ethics to abide by in our daily nursing care which shows no partiality and has four main principles. The most important is to do no harm. The principle of this ethic places a responsibility on the nurse to report treatment options that are causing significant harm to a patient. As a prudent registered nurse, I am obligated to make you aware of the treatment that is causing catastrophic harm and death to an entire group of people. It is indisputable. Human life begins at fertilization.

On November 22, 2022, people approved a change to the Nevada State Constitution, in Article 1, section 24. The Equal Rights Bill was approved by voters. It says equal rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the State or any of its political subdivisions on account of race, color, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, disability, ancestry or national origin.

Senate Bill 131 breaches both the Nevada Constitution and Equal Rights by allowing the unjust killing of innocent life in the womb. It denies the rights of a person due to age. All life, without exception, must have equal protection according to God's holy word and the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. God established a standard of value through which life itself has value.



STEPHANIE KINSLEY (My Children's Advocate):

I have been a Las Vegas resident for over 40 years. I agree with the earlier speakers. I want to add that "legal" does not mean "moral." Just because it is legal to have abortions here does not mean it is right or moral. Nevada already has a super low bar on the practice of medicine. So why are we trying to lower the bar for abortionists? Planned Parenthood will be happy; they will be selling baby parts. Abortion in 2023 is just a representation of a woman making poor life choices. It is 2023. You get pregnant one week out of the month. There are more than 40 types of birth control.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Your time is up. The *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 218E.085 states it is unlawful to knowingly misrepresent facts. If you make a statement knowing it is not fact, that is a misdemeanor. You can say whatever you want to as your opinion. You cannot say your opinion as fact unless you can back it up with evidence. That is for anybody. Anyone who has stated something during this time, whether you support or oppose, if you stated something as fact, you have 48 hours to present the proof. Otherwise, we will strike that from the testimony. Consider yourself under oath.

LORENA CARDENAS (My Children's Advocate):

Minors can walk into an abortion clinic without parental consent and have an abortion. That is prime ground for pedophiles. Already we have destinations marketing abortions like spa packages. Now you want to add more provisions to further entice people to seek abortions in our State for profit. This is not a casino where you are profiting from tourists betting on table games. You are profiting from women lying on tables and playing God with the lives of their children. Are you ready to see satanic temples popping up all over Nevada? Are you ready to look your family in the face and tell them you actively aided in that?

You are rolling out the welcome mat for them here in Nevada. This weekend, two young women got into an argument at a grocery store parking lot. One of them shot and killed the other one in front of her two small children. There is no value for life. What is happening in our Country is a tragedy.

The moral compass is gone, and you are perpetuating a desensitized society that your own children will grow up in. How do you not see the danger in that? Stop trying to create laws that will entice abortionists to come here by

forbidding healthcare boards to disqualify them from practice. Stop facilitating abortions, period. Force women to be responsible and stop using abortion as birth control. Stop making our State the abortion mecca of America. Babies are paying the price today. Those who aided in this barbaric act of dismembering babies will pay the price tomorrow. God exists.

ELISHEBA DLOTE (Love Life Movement):

I am a registered nurse working in surgery and a member of the White Rose movement. I want to speak on behalf of all the voiceless and unprotected kids who are not born, kids who need protection. I know this is a moral issue, not a political issue, and I am asking you to look into your heart. I urge all medical doctors to look back and remember their oath, the Hippocratic Oath: "I will do no harm or injustice to them, neither will I administer a poison to anybody when asked to do so. Nor will I suggest such a course. "

Similarly, I will not give a woman a pessary to cause abortion, but I will keep pure and holy in both my life and my art. I oppose S.B. 131 as a license for murder.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Your time is up. Please submit your testimony in writing. I know we have security in Las Vegas. I will not tolerate anyone else getting so out of order. If they cannot listen, then ask them to leave the building. Everyone has a right to speak, but no one has the right to become unruly.

JOY TRUSHENSKI:

I oppose S.B. 131. It is a dangerous bill because it eliminates the ability of a healthcare licensing board to disqualify unsafe abortionists from practicing in Nevada. It will leave women at the mercy of money-hungry hacks. This will make Planned Parenthood happy, since it only exists to abort unborn babies.

Also, we should not leave God out of the equation. There is an 8,000-square-foot, state-of-the-art abortion facility in Reno, near the airport. This alarms me. I do not want Nevada to be known as an abortion destination. I support life choices, teaching abstinence—not pornographic sex education—in our schools, personal responsibility, promoting birth control other than abortion, and making harsher laws against sex traffickers and pedophiles. Other states are doing these things and limiting abortion, not expanding abortion like Nevada. Please vote no on S.B. 131.

RICHARD NAGEL:

Washington Irving once said, "Villainy wears many masks, none so dangerous as the mask of virtue." We must look at this bill and see its impact. The medical industrial complex says how wonderful it is, what it is going to do and how great it is. But there is a dark side that is not addressed in this bill. It could be called Epstein's bill because it does enable pedophiles to bring people across state lines. It needs to be rewritten to stop that. We have a duty to protect the innocent.

SCOTT JOHNSTON:

I oppose S.B. 131. Prohibiting healthcare licensing boards from disqualifying licenses makes this a bad bill for Nevada. I agree it will cause predators and sex trafficking in Nevada. We have laws to take care of these situations. No one will be prosecuted for coming to Nevada for health care.

GRACE TRUJILLO:

I am a mother of three and have been a nurse for 20 years. I have been in the field and have seen and advocated against child abuse. I helped thousands of women and families who have been illegally trafficked here. I try to find them resources. I believe in life, and I disagree with S.B. 131. Look into your heart and see whether this bill benefits us or others. Please consider the voiceless and the ramifications. It will not protect women. It will not protect little kids. I pray you will look into your heart, whether or not you believe in God.

JENANN LOGAN:

I am a flight attendant. This bill, S.B. 131, will create an unsafe environment for Nevadans and our visitors. Please do not support this bill. Please do not make me bring criminals into our State.

KELLY QUINN:

Ditto. I oppose S.B. 131. I have submitted testimony, ([Exhibit M](#)), which I will read.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

The 30 minutes are up. Please submit the rest of your testimony in writing. If you will, just state your name and say ditto, please.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor  
February 20, 2023  
Page 36

BEPSY STRASBURG:

I oppose S.B. 131. The laws of our State should be respected, just like other states. I have submitted testimony opposing this bill ([Exhibit N](#)).

KAREN STEPHENS:

I am a grandmother. I believe in life. I strongly oppose S.B. 131.

MARIANN HUMPHREY:

I oppose S.B. 131. I am a Catholic. I am a mom. I am a grandmother.

RENEE REZENTES:

Ditto.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

We are over 30 minutes for this side. Do we have anyone on the phone?

ALIDA BENSON (Nevada Republican Party):

I am testifying in opposition to S.B. 131. I have submitted testimony, ([Exhibit O](#)), which I will read.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Thank you, your two minutes are up. Please submit the rest of your testimony in writing.

TERESA BEDOY:

My concern is for the young women this will impact. My daughter was raped at the age of 16. The older man who raped her threatened to kill her if she did not get an abortion. We are talking about the unintended consequences of legalizing out-of-state abortionists, who we cannot monitor, coming into our state. I encourage you to read *Rehumanize: A Vision to Secure Human Rights for All*, a book authored by my daughter, Aimee Murphy. After she was raped, she realized if she got an abortion, she would only be perpetuating more violence. I oppose S.B. 131. I implore you to educate yourself on the value of every human being, who is a human at conception and deserving of human rights.

ADAMA DIEGO:

I had an abortion years ago, and because of that, I now suffer from infertility. They tell you to do this, it is safe, but they do not tell you about the long-term medical issues.

ANDREA AGUILAR:

I urge you to vote against S.B. 131. As I listen, the word "hypocrites" comes to mind. You talk about medical rights and medical choice, but you never discuss medical centers that are available for women to help them to have their babies. Those centers provide ultrasounds and prenatal care. I am talking about the Women's Resource Center here in Las Vegas. It provides counseling for the entire family, parenting and budgeting courses, and much more.

You push Planned Parenthood. They do not give women ultrasounds from the very beginning to show a heartbeat. They hide that fact. Hypocrites. You say you are protecting the doctors who give their patients advice. You only want to protect the doctors who are doing what you want them to do. You have been coming between me and my health care for the last three years. That is hypocritical. Stop being hypocrites. Stop dancing around the fact that you are killing humans. These are babies.

RACHELLE PUAINA:

I am a public school teacher and a mother of four. I oppose S.B. 131. It is dangerous for youth. There are young people who date older adults and hide their relationships. These females need protection. The youth will go to Planned Parenthood or an abortion clinic, and they do not have to disclose the adult who got them pregnant. You must consider that. I know there is emotion on both sides.

JIM DEGRAFFENREID (Nevada Republican Party):

I will continue reading the testimony provided by Alida Benson of the Nevada Republican Party [Exhibit O](#).

SENATOR HAMMOND:

In this case, this legislation is proactive or anticipatory. In the U.S., we have had several occasions where one state's laws are a little different from another's. But I have not heard of anybody being prosecuted for going to another state. Have there been any cases, so far, where people are being prosecuted in other states for seeking reproductive health care?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I will answer that, but first I would like to respond to your earlier question about the word licensed.

Section 3, subsection 4, paragraph (a) says "care found by a competent medical professional to be appropriate based upon the wishes of the patient and in accordance with the laws of this State." You are required to be licensed if you are practicing medicine here in Nevada. Otherwise, that is the unauthorized practice of medicine, which is a whole different subject.

Part of the problem with the plethora of legislation being passed in other states since the *Dobbs* decision is that they are seeking to criminalize conduct that, in other states, like Nevada, is otherwise legal.

To your question about going to other states and being subject to different laws: No one in Nevada is seeking to prosecute you for actions that were conducted elsewhere. I am not aware of any cases where that is true. I am happy to provide more specifics to the Committee after this hearing as well.

In the Ohio case of the ten-year-old-girl who sought care in Indiana, the state was seeking to prosecute her for having sought care. That is why S.B. 131 is necessary legislation.

We will see other states pass similar laws to prosecute women who seek health care in another state. We will see laws attempting to extradite healthcare providers. We do not want that here in Nevada; it does not agree with our State law.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

This reminds me of Harriet Tubman. One reason for the Civil War was that free states would not extradite slaves back to slaveholders once they reached freedom. In 1772 in an English court, *Somerset v. Stewart* said humans could not be chattel and therefore cannot be treated like property once they cross a certain line.

I have a question about the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). Are HIPAA rights erased when someone seeks medical care under this bill?

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

This bill does not do anything to unwind any rights. It does not supersede, overrule or render useless any privacy rights that exist.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

I have been a practicing Christian for over 40 years, and I talk to God often. I acknowledge some call God by another name, and you are certainly welcome to that. I am encouraged by the number of people who have come out on both sides. I hope you will all come back for a foster care bill that will be introduced. We want to ensure foster care children are financially secure once they age out of foster care, 18 years after they leave the womb. I invite you all back to support that bill.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I want to clarify a few points in the bill. It does not give carte blanche to providers to provide dangerous, inaccurate medical care outside of their license.

This bill is specific. It provides room for licensing boards and law enforcement to go after doctors and providers who are not providing competent care. Doctors are still required to be licensed in this State.

Section 1, subsection 1, states a healthcare licensing board shall not disqualify a person from licensure and discipline. There are two paragraphs to that: for providing or assisting in providing reproductive care services; or as a consequence of any judgment, discipline or other sanction imposed...for providing or assisting in the provision of reproductive healthcare services.

It is clear that is not something for which you can be disciplined or denied a license. The rest of the section says, "if the reproductive healthcare services as provided would have been lawful and consistent with standards for the practice of the relevant profession in this State."

There is nothing in this bill to prohibit a licensing board or other law enforcement agency from addressing a provider who is providing dangerous, medically inaccurate or unacceptable care. This bill does not exempt providers from any oversight. It does not allow a board to simply give reciprocity without conducting an investigation. Any healthcare service that provides dangerous care, is practicing outside of its license or who is otherwise not meeting standards of care can be disciplined, denied a license or even subject to prosecution.

There has been a lot of discussion about extradition. This bill provides that if the services offered here in Nevada are legal when they are offered and practiced in the State, that cannot be the basis for extradition.

Chapter 179 of NRS allows the Governor to investigate and decide whether someone should be extradited. This is not outside the current status of the law pertaining to extraditions, which gives the Governor latitude to decide whether to extradite someone. This bill provides that if reproductive health care is the only basis for the extradition, then that is not something our State will abide by.

Even in section 2, subsection 1 of the bill, it states "unless the acts forming the basis of the prosecution of the crime charged would constitute a criminal offense under the laws of the State of Nevada."

If you come here and you are engaged in sex trafficking and selling young girls into prostitution, that is illegal in Nevada.

Nothing in this bill shields anyone from being prosecuted for criminal activity, like sex trafficking or child abuse.

Section 2, subsection 2 covers provisions where someone in another state commits a crime there, then flees that state to come to Nevada. That would still be a basis for the Governor to sign an extradition warrant if he so chooses. It says, "the person who is the subject of the demand was physically present in the demanding state at the time of the commission of the alleged offense and thereafter fled from that state." There is nothing that would prohibit another state from seeking the regular course of prosecution for criminal acts that are committed in that state.

As a point of privilege, I would like to add that I spent over a decade representing victims of crime; it is not something I take lightly. It is a red herring and an irresponsible idea to state that this bill might lead to sex trafficking. Frankly, it is a conspiracy theory.

If we want to have a conversation about sex trafficking, I welcome it. It is something I take very seriously. This bill says in Nevada, where these reproductive health services are lawful, they shall remain lawful for the people who are here receiving the services and for the providers providing them.



There is nothing here to protect predators or sex traffickers transporting kids over the border. Those activities are all still subject to criminal prosecution. Nothing about this bill aids or abets those activities. To believe otherwise is to engage in a conspiracy theory, which I am not willing to do.

There is much talk about health care and differentiating between the types of services women and patients are receiving. That is not the law in Nevada. Nor is that what this bill is seeking to do. We are affirming what most Nevadans believe: A woman should be able to seek reproductive care based on consultation with her provider. We have no business standing in the room trying to dictate what constitutes appropriate health care.

This bill is before this Committee because, as you are aware, your jurisdiction revolves around the licensing and the discipline of providers.

We are not here to debate whether reproductive health care is legal. It is legal in Nevada. Nevadans have supported it. As a native Nevadan, I hope this Committee also supports it. We should not be allowing other states to reach over their borders and prosecute people for things that are legal here. I urge the Committee to support S.B. 131.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

We have received letters in support of this bill ([Exhibit P](#)) and in opposition ([Exhibit Q](#)). All documents will be included in the record. We will close the hearing on S.B. 131 and open the hearing for public comment.

MR. HOJJATY:

The question is, why do we have a society of these unplanned pregnancies? Why does our social structure allow this to happen? Much of this is due to promiscuous behavior. We have seen vast changes in our society over the last 60 years. I do not support irresponsible behavior.

ERIN PHILLIPS:

I was going to testify neutral, but now I will speak during public comment. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit R](#)).

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

You said you are neutral, but your testimony is not. We have already talked about this bill. Public comment is reserved for comments on things other than the bills we have heard.

MS. REZENTES:

I heard a woman speak just yesterday. She is a beautiful Black woman and she said she does not want rides to the abortion clinics. She does not want money spent on the tickets.

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

This is public comment. We will not relitigate S.B. 131. I will ask you to stop. You can submit testimony online.

JAMES PELS:

Jesus saved my life. He is the reason I am here. And I just want to say to everybody, God is real. The fear of God needs to be instilled in everybody today. Something tragic is happening in our Nation. Jesus is coming back soon. You need to repent from your sins and believe in your heart that Jesus died and rose again. The blood of Jesus is what covers our sins. I am not here to condemn, just to tell you the news he brought us, and it is great news. I pray you hear this news; it washes you clean, that you will believe in your heart Jesus Christ is the son of God and the Lord of your life. God have mercy on this Nation. God have mercy on the State of Nevada. God have mercy on us all.

HENRY THORNS:

America is great. I would like to thank all the Europeans who came to America. I would like to thank the gentleman who spoke about Europeans. I say come join us; stop being haters. Start coming together like real Americans. China is not playing with us. Russia is not playing with us. But over here, we are fighting each other. God bless America and God bless everybody. I thought racism was over. I thought things were changing. But it is coming back. I remember when you wanted to take the history books out of classrooms because you did not want to know what your ancestors did to us. Now you want to remove the books. You think white is right. We are all Americans. You got black in you, I got white in me, too. I got nieces and nephews who are of all races. I cannot believe what I heard here this morning. I want to move forward. We got a bigger war. We are not going backward.

Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor  
February 20, 2023  
Page 43

CHAIR SPEARMAN:

Hearing no further public comment, this hearing is adjourned at 11:11 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Kelly K. Clark,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Pat Spearman, Chair

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

| <b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b> |                       |   |   |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Bill</b>            | <b>Exhibit Letter</b> | <b>Introduced on Minute Report Page No.</b> | <b>Witness / Entity</b>   | <b>Description</b>                |
|                        | A                     | 1   |   | Agenda                            |
|                        | B                     | 1   |   | Attendance Roster                 |
| S.B.131                | C                     | 23  | Lisa Lynn Chapman   | Support Letter                    |
| S.B.131                | D                     | 25  | Briana Escamilla / Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains      | Support Testimony, Kristina Tocce |
| S.B.131                | E                     | 25  | Leann McAllister / Nevada Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics | Support Statement                 |
| S.B.131                | F                     | 28  | Alexander Marks / Nevada State Education Association              | Support Testimony                 |
| S.B.131                | G                     | 28  | John Phoenix / Nevada Advanced Practice Nurses Association        | Support Letter, Claudette Rhoades |
| S.B.131                | H                     | 29  | Melissa Clement / Nevada Right to Life                            | Opposition Information            |
| S.B.131                | I                     | 30  | Janine Hansen / Nevada Families for Freedom                       | Opposition Letter                 |
| S.B.131                | J                     | 30  | Bob Russo   | Opposition Letter                 |
| S.B.131                | K                     | 31  | Norma Scurlock  | Opposition Letter                 |
| S.B.131                | L                     | 31  | Don Nelson / Nevada Right to Life                                 | Opposition Testimony              |
| S.B.131                | M                     | 35  | Kelly Quinn   | Opposition Letter                 |
| S.B.131                | N                     | 36  | Bepsy Strasburg   | Opposition Letter                 |
| S.B.131                | O                     | 36  | Alida Benson and Jim DeGraffenreid / Nevada Republican Party      | Opposition Testimony              |
| S.B.131                | P                     | 41  | Chair Spearman  | 2 Support Letters                 |

|         |   |    |                |                      |
|---------|---|----|----------------|----------------------|
| S.B.131 | Q | 41 | Chair Spearman | 4 Opposition Letters |
| S.B.131 | R | 41 | Erin Phillips  | Neutral Testimony    |