



PRESS RELEASE

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui's Assembly Bills 354 and 355 G. C. Gates, editor

Two poorly written and unconscionable bills, seeking to deprive Nevadans of their fundamental rights to own firearms and carry them, have been proposed in the Assembly. Both of these bills cannot survive legal challenge under any rational standard and certainly not in light of the *Bruen* decision. We look forward to the difficult path in the Legislature they must navigate, Governor's Lombardo's veto if they do, and for some reason if they should become law, the inevitable successful legal challenge that will wipe them off the books forever.

AB 354

This bill, prohibiting firearms at or near "election centers," has many arbitrary and overbroad parts that are clearly unconstitutional. The Second Amendment does not stop because of an election. Disarming citizens at polling places will not stop voter intimidation but will encourage it and may even ease acts of violence by malicious individuals.

In these fraught political times, citizens do not deserve to be disarmed simply because they are going to vote. Many polling places have no credible security or metal detectors. Even if they did, malicious actors could target disarmed voters waiting in line. A firearm for self-defense does not discourage anyone from voting, nor in most cases will anyone ever know if a voter has a concealed firearm.

No doubt proponents of this bill will say that anyone who does not feel safe at a polling place can vote by mail. This bill may have, in part, the intention to discourage conservatives from voting as they tend to prefer in-person due to valid concerns with the security and legitimacy of vote-by-mail schemes. If persons feel intimidated by legal, constitutional carry of firearms, perhaps it is they who should vote by mail.

Open carry is a form of speech and is protected by the First and Second Amendments. Nevada Carry does not support armed intimidation, but labeling the presence of a firearm, be it a handgun or a rifle, at any sort of constitutionally protected gathering as "intimidation" is disingenuous. Only those who are doing something wrong might view the reminder that arms are the defender of freedom and democracy as something to be suppressed.

AB 355

Joining several other states that have similar laws on the books or proposals, which are facing legal challenges, this bill would seek to deprive adults between 18-20 of the right to own extremely common semi-automatic rifles and shotguns. Semi-automatic weapons only fire one shot per pull of the trigger; they are not machine guns.



PRESS RELEASE

Banning firearms because of demographic characteristics is wrong and discriminatory, even on the basis of age. The claim that those 18-21 are at a higher risk of violence, citing high-profile mass shootings, is often used to support such a ban. This blanket argument could be used in a similar way to disarm 13% of the American population who, if reduced to a single demographic factor, is responsible for approximately 50% of the homicides in the country. Certainly such a thing would be outrageous even to the sanctimonious anti-gun crowd.

This bill would ban not just weapons like the much sullied AR-15 style rifles, but many common hunting and sporting firearms as well. “Assault weapons” is a disingenuous misnomer used to malign perfectly legal weapons suitable for hunting and self-defense. Likewise, “military style” is an attempt to frighten the uneducated and appeal to emotion rather than reason. The Second Amendment clearly protects weapons suitable for military use.

Nevada Carry is a website dedicated to supporting gun rights and helping grassroots Second Amendment activism. We are not a lobbyist group and advocate on a personal basis only.