

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

KELLY: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the forty-first day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, First Session. Our chaplain for today is Reverend Gregg Gahan of the Craig-Alder Grove Parish, Craig, Nebraska, in Senator Hansen's district. Please rise.

GREGG GAHAN: Let's bow our heads for a word of prayer. Lord God in heaven, we thank you for the ability to elect our leaders. We thank you for everyone who's here today in this room. We thank you for the responsibilities that they've been given to be good stewards of the laws of this state. We pray for wisdom. We pray for a sense of justice. We pray that they will be able to allocate our resources wisely, that they can protect our freedoms so that we can live peaceful and quiet lives with dignity. We pray against the divisiveness that plagues our nation. Ultimately, Lord, we are all accountable to you, our savior and our king. We are very grateful for that. We pray that in your strength these legislators would work together in humility for the good of our state. All this we pray in the name of our lord and savior. Amen.

KELLY: I recognize Senator DeBoer for the Pledge of Allegiance.

DeBOER: Colleagues, please join me in the pledge. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

KELLY: I call to order the forty-first day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, First Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: There's a quorum present, Mr. President.

KELLY: Are there any corrections for the Journal?

CLERK: I have no corrections this morning, sir.

KELLY: Are there any messages, reports, or announcements?

CLERK: There are, Mr. President. A notice from Senator Juarez that she has selected LB299 as her personal priority for the session. Additionally, letter from Senator Spivey noticing that she has selected LB440 as her personal priority for the session. And a letter from Senator Holdcroft that he has declared LB215 as his personal priority bill for the session. Additionally, an announcement: the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee will hold an executive session at 1:30

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

in Room 1202. Transportation, 1:30, in Room 1202. That's all I have at this time, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Hughes would like to recognize Dr. Patrick Hotovy, who's here from York today, serving as the physician of the day. Please stand and be recognized. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LR60. Speaker Arch, you're recognized for an announcement.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, if I could have your attention for just a second. This is just a reminder that Thursday prior to adjournment is the deadline to deliver to me a letter to request my designation of a bill as one of my 25 Speaker priority bills. So that's, that's Thursday before adjournment. This letter does not need to go to the Clerk. You may request more than one bill for me to consider, but you will want to submit a separate letter for each bill if that's the case. Also, request letters need to come from the principal introducer of the bill. Although I do not rule out designating a bill that's still in committee, bills that are on General File have a slight advantage for my selection. I would ask that if you plan to submit a Speaker priority request letter you do so-- don't wait until Thursday at-- before adjournment the last minute. Do so as soon as possible. Additionally, Friday prior to adjournment is the deadline to designate committee and senator priority bills. And I hear some are being read across even this morning. As of this morning, only 12 of the 81 possible senator and committee priority bills have been designated. So there's a lot to come in yet. For committee and senator designation letters, the original is delivered to my office and a copy to the Clerk's desk in the front of the Chamber. And on Monday, I plan to announce my 25 Speaker priority bills. If you have questions about any of this or you have questions about, should I do this or that or the other, feel free to come and talk to me. Feel free to go to my office and talk to Laurie. We can help you with that process. So thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator Hunt would like to recognize a guest under the north balcony: Nitya Haridas, a junior at Lincoln East High School. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Mr. Clerk, please proceed to the first item on the agenda.

CLERK: Mr. President, first item on the agenda: General File, LB293A, introduced by Senator Ballard. It's a bill for an act relating to appropriations; appropriates funds to aid in the carrying out the provisions of LB293. Bill was read for the first time on March 6 of this year and placed directly on General File.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

KELLY: Senator Ballard, you're recognized to open.

BALLARD: Thank you, Mr. President. LB293A is an A bill for LB293, which is sitting on Final Reading. LB293 requires PEOs to offer health benefits plans for-- to file financial statements for the Department of Labor to include the solvency of those health plans. In preparation of the fiscal note, the department estimated they would need \$266,000 in fiscal year and \$272,000 next fiscal year for an additional employee. Since this is on-- uses general funds, LB293 sits on Final Reading. LB29-- LB293A won't be passed until the budget's completed. I ask for your green vote on LB293A. Thank you, colleagues.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Ballard. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And clo-- and waive closing. Members, the question is the advancement of LB293A to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 40 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on advancement of the bill.

KELLY: LB293 advances to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, the Agriculture Committee would report favorably on the gubernatorial appointment of Dawn Caldwell to the State Fair Board.

KELLY: Senator DeKay, you're recognized to open.

DeKAY: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. The Agriculture Committee recommend the approval of reappointment of Dawn Caldwell to serve as member of the Nebraska State Fair Board. Dawn appeared before the committee on March 4. She was very responsive to the committee's questions, and the committee voted-- vote was unanimous to recommend approval. The Fair Board is an 11-member board. Seven members are chosen, one from each from seven state fair districts according to the bylaws of the Fair Board. Four of the members are appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by the Legislature, three of whom are chosen to represent the business communities of their respective congressional district and one to represent the business community of the host city, Grand Island. Dawn Caldwell would continue to represent the business community in the 3rd Congressional District. Dawn is currently serving as the Executive Director of Renewable Fuels of Nebraska since November 1, 2021. Her previous employment includes as head of government affairs for the Aurora Farmers Cooperative in Aurora, Nebraska, as an administrative assistant with Deshler Grain and Feed, and as a UNL extension agent from Nuckolls, Thayer, and Fillmore

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

Counties. She is a graduate of Guide Rock High School and earned a bachelor's degree in animal science from the University of Nebraska. Dawn was first appointed to the Fair Board in 2019 and has served two terms. She has previously served as chair and vice chair of the board. She is eligible for this final three-year term. I ask for your green vote on the committee report. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator DeKay. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And waive. Members, the question is the adoption of the committee report from the Ag Committee. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 38 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the committee report.

KELLY: The committee report is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, next item: the Natural Resources Committee would report favorably on the gubernatorial appointment of Steve Mattoon to the Nebraska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission.

KELLY: Senator Brandt, you're recognized to open.

BRANDT: Thank you, Mr. President. Steve Mattoon is a new appointment to the Nebraska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, authorized by Section 57-904. His term is January 30, 2025 to September 28, 2025 to fill the vacated term of our very own Senator Strommen. Mr. Mattoon is a Sidney, Nebraska native and an attorney specializing in the field of oil and gas law. The Nebraska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission has three members appointed by the governor, who serve four-year terms and meet four to eight times a year. The purpose of the commission is to regulate oil and natural gas exploration in Nebraska in a way that prevents waste, protects rights of all owners, and encourages and authorizes systems that can obtain maximum recovery while protecting the environment. Mr. Mattoon appeared in person before the Natural Resources Committee at a hearing on March 6, 2025, answered a number of our questions from the committee, and was voted unanimously out to the floor for your consideration. Please vote green for the appointment of Mr. Steve Mattoon to the Nebraska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Brandt. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And waive. Members, the question is the adoption of the committee report from the Natural Resources Committee. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: 36 ayes, 0 nays on adoption-- or-- excuse me-- adva-- adoption of the committee report, Mr. President.

KELLY: Committee report is adopted. Mr. Clerk, items for the record.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. The Judiciary Committee guber-- has a gubernatorial report from the Crime Victims Reparations Committee: three appointments to said committee. Additionally, amendment to be printed from Senator Brandt to LB169, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh to LB14. New A bill: LB527A, introduced by Senator Jacobson. It's a bill for an act relating to appropriations; appropriate funds to aid in the carrying out the provisions of LB527; and to declare an emergency. That's all I have at this time, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Please proceed to the next item on the agenda.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB22. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Dungan would move to amend with AM258.

KELLY: Senator Dungan, you're recognized to open on the amendment.

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I'm here today to open on AM258 for LB22. Just as a quick refresher, this is my bill with regards to the at-home nurse visiting for postpartum care. It was passed on General File pretty much unanimously. It came out of committee unanimously. This amendment addresses Senator Clements' concerns about whether or not there would be any impact to the general funds. The language is very simple. It simply says that the money will not come from the General Fund. So just as a quick refresher, any state financial obligations for LB22 come from the Medicaid Excess Profit Fund. We've worked incredibly hard with a number of people to get our fiscal note drastically reduced, and then we were successful in doing so. But in the event that this Medicaid Excess Profit Fund were ever to be depleted, we have an amendment now stating that it will never touch general funds. So this addresses any concerns that were raised on General File. There's another amendment up after this from Senator Raybould. I just wanted to clarify that is a friendly amendment. It simply adds a few definitions as to what at-home nurse visiting is. I know on General File there were some questions about what evidence-based practices are, what at-home nurse visiting is. Senator Raybould's bill simply seeks to add those clarifications and, frankly, limit and narrow the scope, I think, of what does or does not count as at-home nurse visiting. So I would encourage your green vote both on

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

AM258 as well as the subsequent amendment from Senator Raybould. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Dungan. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Dungan, you're recognized to close. And waive. Members, the question is the adoption of AM258. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 44 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the amendment.

KELLY: AM258 is adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Raybould would move to amend with AM348.

KELLY: Senator Raybould, you're recognized to open on the amendment.

RAYBOULD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. Good morning, fellow Nebraskans. Today, I stand in support of AM348. I'm hoping to add my bill, LB104-- which is AM348-- to Senator Dungan's bill, LB22. And I want to thank him. Thank you, Senator Dungan, for allowing me to attach this bill to his. LB104-- AM348-- creates the Family Home Visitation Act and places into statute two important pieces of the home visiting puzzle. First, LB104 creates a definition in statute for what a voluntary, evidence-based home visitation program is, defining it as one with clear guidelines, national certification, and high-quality service delivery. This is to ensure that state funds utilized for this programming are exclusively used for programs with clear success for families. Of note, Nebraska has been funding home visiting in the state since 2007 in the budget, and so this definition is meant to clarify the existing funding. Second, LB104 asks DHHS to submit an annual report to the Legislature on home visiting in Nebraska to peel back the curtain on the successes of these programs and the efficacy of our state investment in home visiting. At the request of the department, we have only asked for this report for three years-- from 2026 to 2028-- to align with the federal authorization of the Maternal and Infant, Early Childhood Home Visiting-- that's MIECHV-- program, the main source of federal funding for home visiting in Nebraska. LB104 had a great hearing on February 7, where the HHS Committee members heard from home visitors and parents from across the state, from Omaha to Lincoln, Columbus, North Platte, and Scottsbluff/Gering. The bill had no opposition testimony, no fiscal note, and was advanced unanimously from the HHS Committee. I would ask for your favorable consideration of AM348 to LB22 and ask for your green vote. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Raybould. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And waive closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM348. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 38 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

KELLY: AM348 is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB22 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. LB22 is advanced for E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB297. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB297 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. LB297 is advanced to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB34. First of all, Senator, there are E&R amendments.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB34 be adopted.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB34 be advanced to E&R for engrossing. Oh.

KELLY: The motion's been made. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized for debate.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Hey, colleagues. What are we doing? We got LB34 and LB302. Did we decide? Because these are daylight saving and-- saving, Senator John Cavanaugh-- and, and standard time. So I just thought, you know, before we move both of them to Final with a voice vote that perhaps people might want to-- I don't-- make a decision. So that's it. That's all I've got to say. I'm going to be voting for LB34 on a record vote because I don't think we want to do a voice vote on these two. And I guess we'll see what happens. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Murman, you're recognized to speak.

MURMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise today to respectably oppose LB34. I want to begin by referencing one of the most recent and reputable surveys on the issue: a Gallup 2025 poll. In that poll, they found that only 24% supported permanent daylight savings time, 19% supported the status quo, and the majority-- 48%-- supported permanent standard time, with the rest not having an opinion. This polling data is also consistent with history. In 1974, President Nixon signed into law permanent daylight savings time. Initially, this move was met with a 79% approval rating, but, by winter, supporter-- support dropped to just 42%. Within the same year, the United States once again scrapped permanent daylight savings time. Even the national boards association spoke-- the National School Boards Association spoke out against the move, expressing concerns over the darkness affecting the safety of morning commutes, especially children walking to school or waiting at bus stops in the dark. I'll also point out to all the parents in the room, it's not easy to put a child to bed while the sun is still brightly shining through the blinds in the summer. Even our children can tell that daylight savings time is unnatural to our bodies. Our circadian rhythms are hardwired to get tired as the sun goes down and get ready for the day as the sun comes up, so mu-- so much so that even a child can tell you this. But if the general public's opposition is not enough for you, let's ask the experts. Permanent daylight savings time has been opposed by the European Sleep Research Society, the European Biological Rhythm Society, the Society of Research on Biological Rhythms, and the American Academy of Sleep Medicine. So when we cast our vote today, let's stop and think about the public opinion. The 2025 polling shows only 19% of Americans support this move. When

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

the very same was tried in the '70s, public support also plummeted. And finally, permanent savings time is opposed by a number of medical and sleep research associations. To address concerns about Colorado, I'll point out the, the momentum for permanent daylight savings time is running out, while the momentum for permanent standard time is picking up. In 2024, the governor of Colorado, Jared Polis, tweeted on X-- formerly Twinner-- Twitter-- and I quote, keeping the state on standard time year-round could benefit residents by providing more consistent daylight during winter. This can improve overall quality of life and would actually save people money on energy too. So why would the governor who had previously signed permanent daylight savings time into law support permanent standard time? Because permanent daylight time needs federal action to take place and permanent standard time does not. If one's main goal is to end the practice of changing clocks back and forth, it becomes pretty simple. Do we want a bill that requires a gridlocked and slow Congress to act or do we want a bill that does not? Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Murman. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I-- you know, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh's right. This probably would have gone by with a voice vote, except that I stood up to request a machine vote. And the reason I asked for a machine vote on this round of debate is so that we could see the count, so we could see how many people definitely voted for LB34, my bill. And then next on the list, I would request-- or, if, if Senator Murman did not request-- which I think he was going to-- a machine vote on his bill just so that on Select File we can see the count of where people are at with each bill before we go into Final Reading. I think this is one of-- you know, I would not prevent anybody from sharing their opinion on the mic if you'd like to speak, but I think that these issues of if we would like Nebraska to have the opportunity to go to daylight savings time if other states around us adopt it and if there's an act of Congress or if we'd like to go to standard time if other states around us adopt it-- these are conversations that we've been having for years in the Legislature. And I don't know if the, the solution's going to be-- not solution, but I don't, I don't know if the outcome is going to be decided through floor debate. So I support moving both of our bills through Select File so we can continue to have conversations and then perhaps have the final debate on Final Reading. I, I support daylight savings time. Colleagues, that's what we're in now when we changed our clocks on Sunday. On Monday, we were blessed with the beautiful warm weather. We-- most of us left the Legislature here-- not me-- but most of us

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

left and saw the beautiful sun outside and we got to go home and the day wasn't over. We got to maybe play catch with our kids or do some lawn work or-- my neighbor was cleaning his car. And this is the time of year that we are in daylight saving time and we can finally enjoy some daylight after work. So my bill would move Nebraska to daylight saving time if an act of Congress confirmed that we were able to do that, which it sounds like that is possible this year for that to have happen, and if other states around us also adopted it. So I've been happy to have conversations on the floor this morning with people just sort of clarifying again what LB34 does. My intention was to just have a machine vote on this so we can simply get a count on my bill and on Senator Murman's bill. And I'm happy to answer any other questions. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized to speak.

JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I, I do think the time has come for all of us to make a decision which direction we want to go here. Initially, I will tell you I like the extra hour of sunlight in the evenings and initially was supportive of this LB34. However, as I've dug into this issue more, I will now be supporting LB30-- let's see-- what is it-- LB302, I guess, the, the permanent standard time for a multitude of reasons. I think one thing that's clear is that my constituents want to stop moving their clocks. OK? They want to go, let's pick one, one or the other. I can tell you, living in North Platte and, and a lot-- and most of my district is in standard time-- or, in areas in central time. Part of my district, pretty up in Mullen, is in mountain time. I can tell you you've got that, if you will, the hole in the donut between North-- I would-- actually, it gets closer to Paxton is where the, where the timeline is at. So they are basically on the same time as Colorado. And, of course, Colorado is one hour behind us. So I think what we want to continue to be aware of is that when you get closer to where the timeline is at, we see bigger gyrations in terms of amount of sunlight in the morning, amount of sunlight in the evening. So it is concerning that there will be times-- if we went to permanent daylight savings time, we would see a sunrise on the shortest day at 9:00 in the morning, which seems excessively late. And I think as things have changed in terms of, of what-- when we first started daylight savings time, there were a lot of compelling reasons to stop-- stop the insanity, if you will, and let's go to one time. Let's go back to standard time. It looks like that's where our neighboring states will probably end up. We don't need an act of Congress to make that change. And it looks to me like that's probably going to be the better way to go. What Colorado does will affect those people that are, that

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

are west of, of my district and really get into Senator Strommen's district. Because right now, you would get to-- west of North Platte, you would cha-- you'd roll your clock back, and then you would be-- you would stay there in mountain time. That area could find themselves where you change your clock until you get into the Colorado border, cross the Colorado border, and then you change your clock again. So right now, it looks to me like, as I work through the, the numbers, going to permanent standard time would be the better way to go. So I'm going to vote no on LB34 and I'm going to vote yes on Senator Murman's bill to go to permanent standard time. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Senator Hansen, you're recognized to speak.

HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, colleagues, I think-- first of all, I appreciate both Senator Hunt and Senator Murman bringing their bills. I am more in favor of where Senator Murman is going with keeping it at standard time. So I appreciate that approach better. I also-- I just like the fact that Senator Hunt is actually bringing this bill to at least kind of advance the conversation forward. But I think it's going to have to come a time here, colleagues, when we have to make a decision on maybe where we're thinking as a body as opposed to-- I, I just think the best approach as a legislative body is to move one bill forward instead of both of them. And so I'm hoping, as we move along here with Select File and Final Reading, that we can make a decision about where you are individually but as we would be as a body as well. So I am going to be voting for Senator Murman's bill. There will be some people who won't vote for either because they don't believe anything should change, or some people who believe Senator Hunt's approach is better. And so-- but maybe instead of voting for both, let's at least kind of see where the numbers lie so we can have a better idea of where we might want to move forward if we want to move forward at all as, as a Legislature. So I'm going to be voting for Senator Murman's bill. I will not be voting for Senator Hunt's bill. But again, that's just my personal belief. People can choose what they want, but let's just kind of make a choice here if we can so we can give some clarity to the people of Nebraska. All right. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to quickly correct myself. I said that for LB34 to go into effect it would take an act of Congress. That's true. It could also take an act of the Secretary of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

Transportation. It would be contingent on that federal policy change in the adoption of year-round daylight saving time by three adjacent states. Currently, Colorado and Wyoming have adopted this. For those of you in western Nebraska, Colorado and Wyoming, they're with what I'm doing. After we had the time change on Sunday, I can't tell you how much my mood has lifted. I think that wintertime is the most depressing thing in the world, and I think it would be really hard to have that year-round. So maybe take no action. Maybe you like changing the clock twice a year. I don't like it dark after work. That's why I brought LB34. And I'll just remind you all that Colorado and Wyoming have already passed this. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Storer, you're recognized to speak.

STORER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning. I'm glad that we are having the debate on this. And I appreciate Senator Cavanaugh encouraging us to get on the mic and make sure this is not just a voice vote. I, I just want to clarify a couple things that have really already been said that-- but I think that are meaningful to the decision that we make here soon, which is, you know, Senator, Senator Hunt's bill, LB34, as she said, would require an act of Congress. We would be dependent upon waiting for them to take action on this. And so passing LB34 just sort of puts us, puts us in a position to be beholden to the United States Congress, which we all know how quickly that may or may not move. In addition to that, Senator Murman's LB302, which advocates-- which would put into action permanent standard time-- again, I've said this on the mic before-- and I just want to emphasize this once again-- it, it is more conducive to all of those-- all of those people that are working outdoors here in Nebraska. It's not just agriculture that works outdoors. We have a lot of construction folks. There's a var-- a large swath of, of people that depend on those daylight hours for their workday. And, and we need to be very thoughtful about that. The other thing that occurred to me when, when we switched here a few days ago is that none of us have ever-- it is refreshing to maybe have a little longer time in the evening. However, it's, it's also a little slower to get things going in the morning when we switch to daylight savings time because it's darker in the morning and to-- we've never lived with daylight savings time in the winter. And I would agree with you, Senator Hunt. Winter can be a little, a little depressing for lack of daylight, but daylight savings time in those, you know, November, December, January months to me would be even more difficult for those of us that are light sensitive because it would be darker later in the morning when we're expected to be at work and productive. So those, those are just additional comments. I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

encourage senators-- I agree. It's time to make a decision. But please, please be mindful that LB34 is contingent upon the federal government taking action, whereas LB302 is contingent upon our bordering states of Iowa, Kansas, South Dakota, and Wyoming taking action. So I feel like we have a little more of a voice with, with actually being able to implement LB30-- LB302 at some point. So I will be supporting LB302. I encourage you to do the same. I appreciate your time this morning.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Storer. Senator Guereca, you're recognized to speak.

GUERECA: Thank you, Mr. President. And I, I want to thank Senator Cavanaugh for kind of putting the brakes on there. When, when you're doing the E&R chair thing, it kind of could speed up pretty quickly, get into a lull, so that was a, a good flag. Certainly, this is something that does deserve prolonged debate. So I will be rising in support of LB34. Like I said, in my district, I have a lot of small businesses, a lot of restaurants, a lot of bars. You know, the introduction of the Glen [SIC] Leahy Mall and the riverfront area is a great place to bring your kids out after school, after a hard day's work, and enjoy good family time. So I-- you know, the, the-- there's definitely an economic interest there in my district. It encourages our downtowns and our small-- and our main streets to, to be bustling with life, to be bustling with economic activity. So with that said-- again, I'll be in support of LB34. And I'm thankful for Senator Cavanaugh for pumping the brakes and allowing us to have this important conversation. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Guereca. Members, the motion was already made to advance LB34 to E&R Engrossing, and there was a request for a machine vote. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There has been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 0 nays to place the house under call, Mr. President.

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Juarez, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused members are present. The vote was underway. Senator Hunt, will you accept call-ins? Yes.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Dover voting no. Senator Juarez voting yes.

KELLY: Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 18 nays, Mr. President, on advancement of the bill.

KELLY: The bill does advance. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File-- or-- excuse me. If I could, Mr. President, an announcement: the Health and Human Services Committee will hold an executive session at 9:45 now under the north balcony. Health and Human Services, exec session now, under the north balcony. Additionally, the Urban Affairs Committee will have an exec session at 10:00 in Room 2022. Urban Affairs, 2022, at 10:00. Some additional items, Mr. President. Your Committee on Banking, Commerce and Insurance, chaired by Senator Jacobson, reports LB278 to General File. Your Committee on Business and Labor, chaired by Senator Kauth, reports LB415 to General File with committee amendments. Some motions to be printed from Senator John Cavanaugh to LB316. Additionally, Senator Storm announces LB316 as his personal priority bill for the session. Senator Storm, personal priority bill, LB316. That's all I have at this time for items, Mr. President. As it concerns the agenda, Mr. President: LB302, Select File. First of all, Senator, there are E&R amendments.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB302 be adopted.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the-- that LB302 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: That is a debatable motion. Senator Murman, you're recognized to speak.

MURMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Continuing on the General File debate, LB302 would, if our neighboring states joined in, end the old tried and failed system of daylight savings time and keep Nebraska on permanent standard time year-round. To begin, I'd like to direct your attention to the letter passed out on your desk from the Nebraska Medical Association. During the General File debate, the argument was made that the claimed health benefits were really just benefits from the time change, not standard time itself. That is not the case. As the letter from NMA writes, permanent standard time would also result in more natural light in the mornings, which is beneficial for health. Research indicates that exposure to light helps regulate sleep and mood. This is particularly important during the winter months, when people experience less natural light. Standard time aligns with these patterns, while daylight savings time forces a later sunrise that disrupts morning light exposure, which can affect mood and productivity. But don't just take the Nebraska Medical Association's word for it. Permanent standard time has been endorsed by the American Academy of Sleep Medicine, the National Sleep Foundation, the American College of Chest Physicians, the National Safety Council, the American Council of Occupational Enver-- Environmental Medicine, Canadian Sleep Society, World Sleep Society, Society for Research on Biological Rhythms, and more. The list of medical research organizations that have backed permanent standard time is extensive and for good reason. I'll note a few different studies and conclusions, which are discussed in a 2022 edit-- editorial from the Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine, which is passed out on your desk. Later sunrises and sunsets, as seen with permanent daylight savings time, are associated with multiple long-term health outcomes, including increases in stroke, heart attacks, diabetes, obesity, and cancer. In a ten-year study of standardized college entrance exam scores comparing students who resided in parts of Indiana on permanent standard time versus seasonal daylight savings time, what was the result? Students residing in daylight savings time areas performed worse on exams. Daylight savings time areas performed worse on the exams in Indiana, where they-- the state does have both ways of, of keeping time. And while it may be true that permanent savings time may boost retail spending, the journal writes: in terms of the overall workforce and productivity, the sleep and circadian rhythm disruption from permanent savings time would negatively affect many outcomes related to performance and safety, including alertness, reaction time, procrastination, learning and memory, judgment, communication, creativity, multitasking, and workforce injuries. Circadian misalignment consistent with permanent daylight savings time is associated with losses in productivity, missed work days, and lower average salaries. Furthermore, when it's-- when we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

speaking on the economy, we should remember that Nebraska farmers and ranchers who are up early to tend to their crops and livestock. There's a good reason this bill was supported by the State Grange. A 2022 study demonstrated that people living in locations with at least 30 minutes later sunrise and sunset than at the time zone meridian have a 21.8% higher motor vehicle crash relative fatality rate. This suggests that long-term effects on drowsy driving and other risky driving behaviors, as well as longer total commute time in dark, make permanent savings time less favorable. In conclusion, permanent saving-- permanent standard time has more support, has a broad support of the medical research associations, including the Nebraska Medical Association, has a number of other benefits, and most importantly, does not take an act of Congress to go into effect. Thank you. And I request your green vote. And if you're still undecided, you're certainly welcome to vote for both. And the final decision will be made on Final Reading. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Murman. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I wasn't going to speak on this bill, but one thing I wanted to point out listening to Senator Murman opening is a lot of the problems that he cites with the time change-- he was talking about decreased productivity, decreased creativity-- OK-- more strokes, more car accidents, things like this-- this is not because of daylight saving time. It's because of the time change. We see that twice a year in the fall and in the spring when we change the time. So these bad-- that's what studies show. The bad health outcomes, the bad productivity outcomes, whatever, that's just because of the time change. And there's, like, a two-week period after each time change when people are at greater risk for these things. But if we adopt a permanent change, whether it's my bill or his bill, people will adapt and that will go away. What people don't like and what they struggle with, obviously, is the time change and the period after the time change, not having a permanent time-- you know, when-- in, in three months, in June, no one's going to be having car accidents and heart attacks because of daylight saving time. That's ridiculous. And what we just don't like is the time change. So it's up to you which one you prefer. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Members, the motion was previously made to advance LB302 for E&R Engrossing. There's a request for a record vote. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 29 nays, 4 nays, Mr. President, to place the house under call.

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All unexcused members outside the Chambers, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Murman would like to announce fourth graders from Superior Elementary, seated in the north balcony. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Sanders has a guest under the south balcony: former senator and colonel, Tom Brewer. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senators Spivey and Ibach, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senator Ibach, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused members are present. The vote was underway. Senator Murman, will you accept call-ins? Yes. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Spivey voting yes. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Jacobson voting yes. Senator Hallstrom voting no. Senator Prokop voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Strommen voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting no. Senator McKinney voting no. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator DeKay voting yes. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Wordekemper voting yes. Senator Dover voting no. Senator Guereca voting no.

KELLY: Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 26 [SIC-- 27] ayes, 15 nays to advance the bill, Mr. President.

KELLY: The bill does advance. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB123. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Sanders would move to amend with AM407.

KELLY: Senator Sanders, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

SANDERS: Thank you, Mr. President. AM407 is a cleanup amendment. The original intent of LB123 was to withhold state funds from the political subdivisions who were not in compliance with the annual audit and budget requirements. After LB123 advanced from committee, we determined the green copy of the bill would not apply to counties as it was originally worded. We had some conversations with the Nebraska

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

Association of County Officials, and the result was AM407. This amendment clarifies that counties are also subject to withholding of state aid if they fall out of compliance. At this time, we are not aware of any counties that would be subject to this. However, this amendment ensures that the same protection would exist for public dollars earmarked for counties as for other plu-- political subdivisions. Please vote green on AM407 to AM123. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Sanders. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And waive closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM407. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 29 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

KELLY: The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB123 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. LB123 advances to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB373. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB373 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB373 advances to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB294. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB294 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed, nay. LB294 advances to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB143. There are E&R, E&R amendments, first of all, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB143 be adopted.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB143 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB143 advances to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB195. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB195 advance to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. LB195 is advanced to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB341. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB341 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. LB341 advances to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB7. There are E&R amendments, first of all, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB7 be adopted.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: There's nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB7 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB7 advances to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB372. There-- first of all, Senator, there are E&R amendments.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB372 be adopted.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB372 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB372 is advanced for E&R Engrossing. Senator Sorrin-- Sorrentino has some guests in the north balcony: AmeriCorps members with International Council for Refugees and Immigrants, from Omaha. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Dorn would like to recognize some guests in the north balcony. They are students from College of St. Mary. Please stand and be recognized. Mr. Clerk, next item on the agenda.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB312. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Riepe would move to amend with AM591.

KELLY: Senator Riepe, you're recognized to open.

RIEPE: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise to offer AM591 to LB312 and incorporate the provisions of LB553. Before I go on, I want to thank Senator Stomer [SIC] for his willingness to accommodate this amendment and-- which had its hearing on February 28. Expands eligibility for student loan assistance and loan repayment under the Rural Health Systems and Professional Incentives Act to include dietitian nutritionist. This aligns with LB312, which en-- extends the same incentives to nurse anes-- "anethetist." I have spoken with both the introducer of LB553 and Chairman Hardin, and I believe this amendment would be both friendly and viable. The bill is still in committee, but at this point-- and just coming out of committee-- but at this point, having an execu-- executive session to move it forward would be-- is a logical issue rather than a political one. Like LB312, LB553 has no fiscal impact and simply ensures that dietitian nutritionists who play a critical role in preventive care in chronic disease management, particularly in rural areas, are included in Nebraska's existing health care workforce incentive programs. Dietitians are vital in addressing health disparities, particularly in food deserts where ob-- obesity, diabetes, and health disease are prevalent. While medications like [INAUDIBLE] and others offer promising treatments, they are not a cure-all. Long-term success depends upon proper nutrition and lifestyle support, which dietitians provide. Including them in this program helps recruit and retain these professionals in underserved communities. Since LB35-- LB312 already expands the same program for another essential provider group, this amendment is a logical and consistent addition. I urge your support for this amendment to strengthen rural health care access and enhance preventive care to Nebraska. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Riepe. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of AM591 and LB312. I just want to say I'm, I'm happy to see Senator Riepe's coming along on LB312. I think it's a good bill, and I think that his amendment just makes a good bill even better. So thank you, Senator Riepe, for your ever-willingness to expand to new horizons. I yield the remainder of my time.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Strommen, you're recognized to speak.

STROMMEN: Thank you, Mr. President. This is a friendly amendment, and I just wanted to say thank you to Senator Riepe for adding this. It utilizes the same funding mechanism and it helps out with our rural health care needs, which we so desperately need and appreciate. So thank you. And I would hope to see your green on this one. Appreciate it.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Strommen. Senator Raybould, you're recognized to speak.

RAYBOULD: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm actually not going to be speaking on AM591. This is a personal privilege. But I, I wanted to thank everyone this morning for passing Senator Dungan's LB22 and then my amendment on the visiting nurses, visiting health care practitioners. And I want to thank also Senator Bostar because of the resolution expressing sympathy to the family of Pat Lopez. And for those Lincoln senators, you do know that Pat Lopez was the Lincoln-Lancaster County health director. She was a remarkable, incredible, brilliant, hardworking, passionate about public health, not only in Lincoln and Lancaster County but throughout the entire state of Nebraska. She was integral in updating, upgrading all the public health programs and systems in our state. That was how passionate she was. She passed away on March 2. And for me, it was so important to be here this morning to celebrate Pat and also stand up for a program that she loved and she had advocated for so many years, helping young families with their newborns, sending out a health care practitioner to help that family undergo the new travails of being a new parent. And one of the proudest accomplishments that she had listed in her program from her rosary last night was of all the things that she did besides being our champion at the helm during the pandemic, well, we're really proud that Lincoln and Lancaster County had the lowest loss of life. She was so proud of the Family Connection program, which provides newborns and families access to public health nurses. And so I just wanted to say thank you all for the resolution in acknowledging the remarkable Pat Lopez and her tremendous accomplishments and her wonderful legacy and passion for serving not only our, our county of Lancaster and city of Lincoln but our entire state. So thank you very much.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Raybould. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Riepe, you're recognized to close. And waive closing. Members, the question is the adoption of AM591. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: 38 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

KELLY: AM591 is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB312 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB312 advances for E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB179. There are no E&R amendments. Senator Juarez would move to amend with AM592.

KELLY: Senator Juarez, you're recognized to open on the amendment.

JUAREZ: Good morning, colleagues. AM592 attaches my bill, LB461 as amended by the Retirement Committee, to LB179. LB461 is a simple fix to the cities of the First Class Firefighters Retirement Act that allows retired firefighters to receive their retirement benefits in lump sum or partial payments. Currently, firefighters in cities of the first class can only receive their benefits in a single lump sum payment, making them subject to unnecessary fees, taxes, and fines. The language to address this issue in AM592 has been approved by both the firefighters and the League of Mu-- of Municipalities. And was passed out of the Retirement Committee unanimously. With that, I want to thank Senator Clouse for letting me attach LB461 to his bill. And I would, would appreciate your green vote on AM592. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Juarez. Senator Wordekemper, you're recognized to ope-- to speak.

WORDEKEMPER: Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to rise up and support this. For those of you that know, currently the way our statute is, the only way firefighters can take their money out of their account, unfortunately, is if they die or are disabled. And at retirement, you have to take all your money out in one lump sum. What this bill will allow is for a firefighter such as myself that just retired when I reach 59.5, I could take a monthly payment, a payment every six months, or-- however I determined to take that out. Currently, doing it just as a lump sum, I would have to move all of my money out of the city's plan into another retirement fund or however, which kind of goes against the thought of more people in a plan, you

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

have cheaper rates. So this, this plan is not a hardship on the cities. It's not a hardship on their retirement plan, actually, by keeping more money in that plan. Should reduce fees. And this change only affects firefighters because we are the only ones that are unable to take our funds out in installments or whatever. Everybody else that works within the city-- I believe also the police officers can take their funds out incrementally. So I rise in support of this bill, and I thank Senator Juarez for bringing it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Wordekemper. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Juarez, you're recognized to close on the amendment. And waive. Members, the question is the adoption of AM592. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

KELLY: The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB179 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB179 is advanced to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB501. I have nothing on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB501 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB501 is advanced to E&R Engrossing. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President: Select File, LB592. I have nothing on the bill, Senator.

KELLY: Senator Guereca, you're recognized for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB592 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. LB592 is advanced to E&R Engrossing. Senator Rountree and Speaker Arch would like to recognize some guests under the south balcony. They are Cole Porter, Katie Porter, and Ruth Ecker, all of Papillion. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Mr. Clerk for items.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB168, LB325, LB13, LB504A, LB248, LB105, LB266 to Select File, some having E&R amendments. Additionally, your Committee on Government, Military and Veterans Affairs, chaired by Senator Sanders, reports LB3, LB193, LR18CA, LR24CA to General File-- excuse me-- as well as LB414, LB696 all to General File, some having committee amendments. Notice of hearing from the Education Committee-- excuse me. Notice of cancellation of committee hearing from the Education Committee. And a motion to be printed from Senator Raybould to LB6-- a withdrawal of LB605. That's all I have at this time.

KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Please proceed to the next item on the agenda.

CLERK: Mr. President, next item on the agenda: General File, LB390, introduced by Senator Murman. It's a bill for an act relating to schools; requires each school board of a public school district to adopt a policy relating to access by a parent, guardian, or educational decision-maker to certain school library information. Bill was read for the first time on January 17 of this year and referred to the Education Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File with committee amendments, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Murman, you're recognized to open on the bill.

MURMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. The committee amendment simply strikes "online" in the bill.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Murman. As the Clerk stated, there were committee amendments. Senator Murman, you're recognized to open on the committee amendment.

MURMAN: Yeah. The, the committee amendment simply strikes "online" on the bill.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Murman. Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Murman would move to amend the committee amendments with FA20.

KELLY: And Senator, you're recognized to open on FA20.

MURMAN: Pull it? Pull it? Yeah. I'd like to pull that amendment.

KELLY: Without objection, it is withdrawn. Seeing no one el-- oh. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Murman yield to a question?

KELLY: Senator Murman would, would you yield to some questions?

MURMAN: Yes.

HUNT: Thank you, Senator Murman. You explained the Education Committee amendment by standing up and saying it strikes "online" in the bill. Can you say more about the bill and what the committee amendment does?

MURMAN: Yes. The committee amendment simply strikes "online" because there was concern in the committee and from myself too that some smaller schools may not have the ability to post on-- the library content online.

HUNT: Have you done an introduction for this bill on the floor yet? This is General File, right?

MURMAN: Correct.

HUNT: Are you going to do an introduction of the bill?

MURMAN: Yes, I am.

HUNT: OK. Is that after the committee amendment?

MURMAN: Yes.

HUNT: OK. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Murman, you're recognized to close on the committee amendment. And waive. Members, the question is the adoption of AM97. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the committee amendment, Mr. President.

KELLY: AM97 is adopted. Se-- Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Murman yield to a question?

KELLY: Senator Murman, would you yield to a question?

MURMAN: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. I apologize. I had stepped out there. And I didn't know what the committee amendment did, but I generally have a rule of voting for committee amendments. So I saw that it needed a 25. But could you tell me what the committee amendment did?

MURMAN: Yes. The committee amendment simply eliminated "online" with the posting the library content because the committee and myself too were concerned that forcing the content to be available online might not be possible for some smaller schools.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. And then I have a, a-- another question about the bill itself because I was trying to catch up on it earlier today. So I apologize again that I'd stepped out. But I, I just want to make sure that-- it says education decision-makers in the statement-- committee statement. Can you tell me a little bit more about who that would encompass?

MURMAN: Yes. That would be, of course, parents or parent or a foster parent. Whoever is responsible for the child would be the decision-maker.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. I-- so what I'm trying to get at is a concern that there's nowhere in your bill that it could be interpreted that people that are not having a vested interest in the children in the schools could interject their ideas about what content is carried in the library. Is that accurate?

MURMAN: Well-- repeat the question.

M. CAVANAUGH: So, like, just a special interest group can't come to a school and ask to see what the content is and then interject their philosophy.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

MURMAN: No, this is a-- just a decision-maker for the child.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

MURMAN: Or the student.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Thank you. I appreciate it. I yield the remainder of my time.

KELLY: Thank you, Senators Cavanaugh and Murman. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm burning one of my times on the mic because I didn't have time to go talk to Senator Murman. But Senator, Senator Murman, you'll want to pay attention to this. You were recognized to open on your bill, and you opened on the committee amendment. And then you were recognized to open on the committee amendment, and you opened on the committee amendment again. So you should put your light on so you can talk about your bill. Because you're not going to be recognized to open on the bill because you already were, so. And I've got some things I'd like to say about the bill after you open. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Murman, you're recognized to speak.

MURMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I have got to apologize. I must have missed my chance to open on the bill, but I will do that now. Today, I have the privilege of introducing LB390. To frame the conversation, I'd like to go back to the floor debate last year when former Senator Albrecht had brought a bill related to po-- potentially inappropriate library content. Those opposed to it repeatedly made the case that decisions about what is and isn't appropriate for a student is a decision for the parents. Different families have different values, so parents should have that oversight in their kids' lives. I do agree with that sentiment. Parents or legal guardians should be the primary decision-makers in a child's life. That being said, the opportunity for parental involvement is limited without clear parental transparency measures. LB390 provides two very simple transparency measures. First, it asks that school libraries provide a catalog of their books. This part is already done at the majority of schools, but the committee has brought AM97 based on some conversations to strike the word "online--" which I already talked about-- as this would give schools greater flexibility to use a system that works best for them. The second part is to ask schools to have some form of method that can be put in place

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

to notify parents of the books their children check out. This could be done through a website or an email system. I've left it a bit broad to allow schools to implement this how they see works-- how the school sees works best for them. On a transparency level, I view this as important so parents can be fully informed and make knowledgeable and family-specific decisions on the content their children are reading. On a practical level, I know as a parent myself how often kids misplace and forget about their library books, so I can see how a system knowing-- system of knowing what books a child has and when they are due could help ensure everything is kept track of. I want to make clear nothing in this bill makes any sort of ban or makes any restrictions on books that are or are not appropriate whatsoever. All this bill asks is to put parents in the driver's seat so they can have conversations with their children based upon their personal family values. We can have commonsense ways to increase transparency and parental involvement without increasing the workload our hardworking educators already do. LB39 came out of committee 6-0-1, with one absent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ARCH: Turning to the queue. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I'm in strong opposition to LB390. This is my first year on the Education Committee, and I moved to that committee to kind of provide more balance on the committees, basically. So I've been learning a lot about what role the Legislature plays in education of students in Nebraska through the work of the Education Committee. We have, of course, school boards. We have Board of Education. We have-- at the district level, individual school level choices get made. And what has surprised me most and makes me feel like I'm going a little crazy because-- of course, I'm a leftist. I'm a progressive. But I feel like a conservative libertarian in that committee because I cannot believe how much we in the Legislature are telling schools to do. And we hear from teachers all the time-- you know, I'm sure all of us before we were elected in our whole lives-- we hear from teachers all the time about what a burden it is on them to comply with all of the requirements put on them from the federal government, from the U.S. Department of Education, from the Board of Education, from school boards, from parents' experta-- expectations, and also from the State Legislature. And this is a bill, to me, that is just giving more chores for teachers to do, more chores and tasks for educators to do. For what? For what? For nothing. So that we lawmakers in this body can go back to our constituents and say we did something. This is not something that we need to do. I think it's, it's, it's busywork. It's chores. It's us meddling in the work of people who already know what they're doing. The Nebraska Legislature keeps pushing

more surveillance, more control, more government interference in people's lives. And LB390 is just another example of this latest obsession with monitoring, controlling, and, you know, controlling way too much what people think, what people do, and what people read. This bill, I mean, basically forces schools to spy on students. It turns librarians and teachers into informants, monitoring and reporting on what books students check out. In my view-- and I said this in the executive session-- I think that students should feel safe exploring ideas, learning about themselves, accessing books that the school library has also already saw fit to put in the library. If the book is good enough to be in the school library and the student wants to read it, I don't think that a note needs to be sent home or a list needs to be made or a tracker needs to be activated so that people can know what kind of media and content these kids are consuming. And we're talking about books. We aren't talking about websites. We aren't talking about-- you know, I've heard concerns over the last many years of kids accessing inappropriate things at school on the internet. That's not what this bill's talking about. We're talking about literal paperbound books in a library that we're going to be tracking what these kids are reading and sending that home to parents. I think that parents already have enough control. Parents already have the ability to reach out to schools, to reach out to librarians and say, hey, you know, in our family, these are our beliefs. And if my child is checking out books about this and that, if they're looking at this title, I would like to know that. And it's my experience and it was the testimony of schools that if a parent came to them and said that, that that would be fine, that that would be the expectation, as it has been forever in Nebraska. And I think if we really wanted to protect students, we'd be investing in mental health services. We'd be supporting teachers. We'd be making sure that students have safe home environments. Instead, we're getting another surveillance bill disguised as parents' rights when what we're really doing is making busywork and chores for teachers. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of the bill and the committee amendment, which seeks to clarify some of the technical aspects herein. I really appreciate my friend, Senator Hunt, lifting up some of the underlying policy concerns and connecting broader dots in regards to what this legislation relates to. Number one, when I read the measure, it's a garden-variety policy directive bill, and it is something that is familiar to us in terms of finding the right balance for local control and having some sort of general standard and policy preference expressed in law about new or

emerging issues or issues that need to be updated in our schools and at the local level. So there's fairly broad latitude in regards to what the measure, LB390, requires for the policy "promulgation," and then it leaves the details to the local schools to figure it out. So I completely understand and agree where Senator Hunt is coming from. And there are broader issues here just in relation to academic freedom and students' rights to learn. And I can tell you-- this is something I mentioned at the committee level. And I know Senator Hunt and I share this perspective as not only policymakers but also as parents. I'm least worried about my kids when they're in the school library. That, that, that's a, a place where I want them to be. I know they have access to great learning materials. I know they have rich conversations with the librarians and the teachers and their classmates about the information that they're accessing there. I, I, I really don't think that there needs to be a heavy-handed approach to regulating school libraries in general, but I do think, even if we find it perhaps disagreeable or even if it's not right for us as parents, it might not be right for all parents. And parents have a fundamental right to guide their children's education. In Nebraska right now, parents can opt their children out of any curriculum for any reason at any time. And I see this as an extension in understanding of those existing rights, which are, are really not debatable. Additionally, I do feel like this is a much more thoughtful approach to balancing the interests of parental rights than subjecting teachers and librarians to criminal penalties, which was the approach last year in this Legislature and almost moved forward but for a few courageous votes and is still astounding to me. There's no doubt that this measure touches upon now very frequent, brewing, pitched debates, particularly at the local level, about banning books. We've seen a resurgence in these kinds of campaigns in recent years. It's well-established, and it's disturbing. But it also fails to recognize the existing policies and legal structures that are in place. Schools already have very thoughtful policies in place in regards to the selection of materials that will be available at the school that meet community standards, that meet academic needs of the students, that are age-appropriate, that have been vetted. And as part of these policies, there's usually also a mechanism in place that if a community member or a parent were to find a selection perhaps problematic, that they can challenge that, that they can initiate a review thereof. And those are some of the long-standing and appropriate means and mechanisms that, that have been a part of curating a vibrant and effective space in our school libraries and our public libraries as well. So I, I definitely appreciate and understand and am sympathetic to what Senator Hunt is talking about here. I also do feel like this is a very measured way to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

move forward in regards to some of those long-standing concerns as comparison to a weaponization of the criminal law against teachers and librarians. I'll punch in again. Thanks--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I appreciate the conversation. As we're talking about kids reading, there's a bunch of kids up in the balcony. Do you guys like to read? Yeah. All right. Good. Reading, as they say, is "fun-damental." But, yeah. So I'm a parent of four kids in the Omaha Public School System, and I get all kinds of communication from the school district about all sorts of things that they're doing. And I am an active parent when it comes to what my kids are reading. And I spend most of my time trying to find something that they will read. So something that they will enjoy, that they're interested in, and then they'll read, you know, maybe a series that then they'll read the next book. But I definitely respect the parents-- every parent's right to make a determination about what's appropriate for their kids to read. And I think that helping facilitate that in a nonintrusive way is important. But as I-- I was reading the bill. I did have a question for Senator Murman about one of the, the sections in the original bill. I wonder if Senator Murman would yield to a question.

ARCH: Senator Murman, will you yield?

J. CAVANAUGH: Oh. Sorry, Senator Murman. I didn't give you a heads-up. I apologize.

MURMAN: Yes.

J. CAVANAUGH: So I'm looking at the original bill-- and I don't think your amendment changed this part, but it's-- I'm on page 2. I mean, the bill's only two pages long. Line 7 is, require the creation of an online catalog of all books in the school district's library categorized by school building, which shall be accessible for viewing by parent, guardian, or educational decision-maker of a student attending such school district. So I guess my first question is-- my kids go to OPS and they all go to the same school right now. In-- is the requirement here that then I'm able to look at the books that are available at the other public schools across OPS, like Central High School, even though my kids are in grade school?

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

MURMAN: No. I-- the education decision-maker or parent of the student that's in the school could request this. So the students would have to be in that school for which you are requesting library information.

J. CAVANAUGH: OK. So I should only be able to see the books that are in the library at the school my children attend.

MURMAN: Correct.

J. CAVANAUGH: OK. So-- all right. Well, thank you. That clarifies that. I think that there may be room to clarify that through an amendment in the bill, because my initial look at it was that I would be able to see all of the books in-- across the entire school district. And so the concern here is-- I totally respect parents' rights to make determinations about what their own kids are reading. I'm concerned when you start compiling lists of books across school districts and across buildings, even, that there is a possibility that someone else will object to the books being in the school that they don't like that my-- that I might not object to. So meaning that they get to object to what my kids are reading. So somebody else is input-- in-- injecting their own issues or opinions about a book into my decision-making. So they are affecting my rights as a parent. So I think there's a read of this where somebody whose kids go to-- Field Club Elementary could look at the books at Washington Elementary, which is where my kids go, and they would be able to say, I don't like that book. And then they get to object to a book that's at Washington Elementary. And I think that's the problem with starting to compile these lists overall, is that it allows people to more efficiently and easily object to things they find objectionable that are not actually about what their own kid is reading. It starts to become about what other kids are reading. So I do think it's important to make sure that parents have rights, but I think it's important to make sure that my parental rights are also protected so that someone else can't object for me to something. So I think that there's room for clarification on that. I think that this is-- I do agree that it is treading into a dangerous territory of objecting to ideas when we are trying to encourage these young people to read as much as possible. And finding something that they find enjoyable to read is really a great thing. And so putting these potential constraints in the way is concerning. But it is much preferable to the bills we were talking about last year, where we were just criminalizing librarians for sharing ideas with people. So thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Hughes would like to recognize some special guests seated under the north balcony. They're members of the Seward County Rising Stars. Please rise and be recognized by your Legislature. Senator

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

Sorrentino would also like to recognize some guests. They're seated in the north balcony: 62 fourth grade students from Arbor View Elementary in Elkhorn. Please rise, be welcomed by your Legislature. Senator Hunt, you are recognized to speak. And this is your third opportunity.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I might take-- if someone would yield me time-- one other time, I might appreciate that. I don't know if I'm going to need it, but I'll let you know. I, I have to respectfully disagree with my friend, Senator Conrad. This is heavy-handed. This is-- I, I'm kind of realizing sometimes there's a political calculus when you're in the minority where you say, you know, last year, they tried to pass a straight-up book ban where teachers were going to be charged with crimes and thrown in jail and fined and this and that. So why don't we let Senator Murman do something weaker this year since we're not going to do a book ban? Why don't we let him just make a list of objectionable books so that parents can go look at it and, and, and know what their kids are looking at? I say no to all of it. Not everything needs to be a law. We do not need to be nanny-ing and worrying over students and teachers from the Legislature in our infinite wisdom, telling them what books they should be allowed to look at. I trust librarians to do that already. And parents already have the right to be involved in their child's education. Schools don't need more government red tape, more surveillance, more politically motivated laws like LB390. And we need to be focused on real issues that would help students, not manufactured crises that are designed to divide us. And, yes, LB390 is a flavor of that. Senator John Cavanaugh's points on the mic raised some questions for me that I was hoping-- I don't-- I'm not going to yield-- ask you to yield for a question because I'm going to run out of time. But if Senator Murman could speak to, on his own time-- and, and I need to look more closely at the bill. Could-- the way this bill is written, could somebody request the information about what my child is reading in their school? Because my family has been, you know-- you know my family has been targeted for harassment, for stalking. You know my child has been doxed at school. You know my child's teachers have been doxed. And we've been sued, you know. And so I know that there are people in Nebraska who would like to target my family further. And if LB390 passes, will that give them another avenue to do that? Will they be able to pull the file on what my kid is reading and then, you know, make some kind of attempt at harassment based on that? That's plausible to me. I can totally imagine that happening. And I bet the people that would like to do that are watching this now and, you know, thinking about-- that this is something they can do in the future. Another concern I have about this bill that I raised in committee is obviously that this bill can put LGBTQ+ students

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

in danger. Some students who are gay, who are not straight live in homes where being suspected of being LGBTQ+ could mean being kicked out. It could mean being disowned, abused. And if parents have automatic access to what their kids are reading and accessing at school, that could out a student, expose a student before they are ready, and put them in serious risk of harm if they are already going home to an unsafe place. We all know-- and we know this in the Education Committee because we hear about it all the time-- that not all students go home to a safe place. Not all students go home to a supportive place. And schools need to be places where kids feel safe to learn, explore, seek support, be curious, read about something they're interested in, not places where they fear being reported for what they read. If a student is going home to people who do not affirm who they are, that could put them in real danger under LB390. This bill assumes that all parents are responsible and supportive, but we know that that's not always true. There are parents who actively try to control what kids think, what they believe, and even who they're allowed to be. And I believe that students deserve access to resources and information and books that their schools choose to stock even if they don't have supportive adults at home. Every single one of us has read a book that our parents wouldn't have approved of. And I think that's a normal and healthy part of growing up. And I said this in the committee executive session too. Part of healthy development is reading something you're maybe not supposed to look at or you don't think your parents would approve of and getting away with it, whether that's learning about a new perspective or exploring your identity or just reading something a little bit rebellious, colleagues. That's part of how young people figure out who they are. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, good morning, colleagues. I really am glad we're having this debate. I think this is an important debate. And this measure actually touches upon so many important areas of public policy, to education, to parental rights, to academic freedom, and the right to learn and free expression. And also to a certain degree, I guess now we're kind of delving into the intersections with our tools of open government as well, as effectuated and displayed through our public records laws. So a couple of things here first. If you look at the measure itself, it's, it's relatively straightforward. And if we need to do some work today or in between General and Select to perhaps provide some additional clarity, we can. But number one, schools already have a catalog available of the materials that are in their library. So there's nothing new or

different there. Most schools already have policies-- again, as noted-- about how materials are curated and provided in their school system that provide for potential concern or challenge. Those are, are long-standing policies not dep-- changed by, by this measure. Again, in Nebraska, we have a long-standing component to balance the rights of parents to guide their children's education, that they can opt out whatever-- their children from whatever curriculum lessons at any time for any reason. Because what might be right for me and my family may not be right for my neighbors. And Senator John Cavanaugh is right. We have to ensure that the focus isn't on empowering the individual parent as it comes to the guidance that they are providing to their child's education, not providing a license to discriminate or veto power to another parent to decide what's right for me and my family in the context of learning and access to materials at our public schools. We see the same thing with the surveys issues that have co-- come up recently. And we have another bill moving forward on this session as well. So when you look at the bill itself, it says they need to create a policy to decide whether or not parents are going to have a clearer option to be-- to avail themselves of this potential notification. So being a public school parent, I see these policies come forward in our student handbook and our parent handbook. We get frequent emails from our school and our school district saying, you know, here's the information we're going to be learning. Would you like to opt in? Would you like to opt out? And I'm guessing that most parents probably aren't going to opt into this system. Maybe they are, maybe they aren't. That's not-- that's up to the parents to decide. We do get notifications from the library when we do have past due books. That definitely has happened in our house, where the kids bring home a book from the library and they're really excited about it and they want to hold on to it longer than the checkout period. So it is helpful to have that notification to know what we're looking for so that we can either get it rechecked out or make sure that we can just identify it, it at the family household level. So that information is already being shared in a variety of different ways. The other pieces that I want to make sure to lift up in terms of clarity-- so under our public records laws, there's already exemptions for student records that protect students' rights and student privacy against unwarranted incursion or review by outside parties or stakeholders. That's the first piece I want to lift up. There's also an exception or an exemption in regards to the library log itself. So I'm not-- while I might as a citizen be able to figure out, well, what is in the-- what is in the library catalog at my public library, I can't see Senator Hunt's checkout history. I can't see Senator Cavanaugh's checkout history. I can't see their kids' checkout history as effectuated through the public records law. So just wanted

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

to lift that up here. But I really appreciate the debate. I think it's smart and I think it's important. And I think we should empower parents and students to learn and have access to materials. And I think that this general measure helps to guide our partners at the local school--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

CONRAD: --level to update their policies. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator McKinney, you're recognized to speak.

McKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time to Senator Hunt.

KELLY: Senator Hunt, you have 5 minutes.

HUNT: Thank you very much, Senator McKinney. Everything Senator Conrad is saying kind of underlines my position that this bill is not needed. Parents already have the right to monitor what their child checks out from the library. This bill isn't about giving parents access. It's about forcing schools to do surveillance for them, which to me is a backdoor book ban. Instead of putting teachers and librarians in the middle of family conflicts potentially, the Legislature should be focused on making schools safe, making schools inclusive, making schools places where all students feel safe to learn without going home and having to, you know, potentially receive some kind of consequence for what they read at school. Schools-- as, as my friend, Senator Conrad, was talking about-- schools already have systems in place to monitor what children check out at the library, and parents already have the right to go see what that is. Mandating an online catalog for every school library and requiring notification systems is expensive. It's time-consuming. It's a burden on districts. It's the Legislature just coming up with a new idea-- this time a watered-down book ban-- to say that we did something when really we're just giving another chore to districts, another chore to teachers, another thing for them to do with the limited time and resources they have during the day. Instead of focusing on teacher shortages, on cuts to funding, on whatever nonsense is happening at the federal level that is freaking teachers out right now in Nebraska, student achievement. Schools will now have to waste resources on redundant bureaucracy because the Legislature thought they may-- might need to make a new list. If we get the software and you log on and we have a new list, that'll solve a problem. There's no problem, colleagues. Parents already have the right to see what books their kids are looking at. I don't believe that this bill at its heart is about transparency for parents. It's about giving

activists a tool to control what books kids are allowed to access. We've seen around the country these types of policies that are used to push book bans, especially books on race, on LGBTQ+ issues and identities, on history, particularly black history in America. Look at what's happening at the federal level. We don't even talk about that in this Legislature. I've been waiting for a chance to get on-- and, you know, that's on me. I've been waiting for a chance to get on the mic and talk about the decimation of the systems at the federal level, which many of you are cheering on, of course, because you think less government is better. But then in the Nebraska Legislature, you vote for bills like LB390, which expands government, expands bureaucracy, and puts chores and new lists, new things to do on teachers. For what? For what? Schools shouldn't have to waste their time defending books that people want removed. They're already dealing with enough. They're already dealing with cuts to funding. They're already-- you know, we have teachers in public schools who are asking questions like, am I allowed to have a rainbow flag on my wall? Am I allowed to say certain things about black history in America? Because this presidential administration, besides getting rid of the Department of Education ostensibly, is coming down on what they call DEI and what Senator Lippincott calls DEI. And by that he means, you know, any kind of inclusion or any kind of acknowledgment of diversity. And teachers are afraid. Teachers are afraid of professional consequences for these things. And I've taken up enough time making this point. But the point is we have to stop undermining student privacy and we have to stop supporting this culture of surveillance. No more surveillance. Nebraska schools need more funding, more teachers, better resources-- all of you, including the governor, agree with that-- not a government-mandated book surveillance system in a climate where teachers are already on edge. They're already underpaid. They already have enough chores to do brought down upon them by the government. And I do not think the Legislature is serving teachers or serving schools by adding one more thing to that list. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Raybould, you're recognized to speak.

RAYBOULD: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to yield my time to Senator Hunt if she would like it.

KELLY: Senator Hunt, you have 4 minutes, 54 seconds.

HUNT: Sure, I can take-- I mean, I can take a few more minutes. I, I do think it's a, it's a big problem that we are doing politically motivated things instead of just straight education policy, that we're

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

giving chores to teachers, and that we're not responding to real problems. Instead, what we're doing is pushing a national agenda that's aimed at restricting access to books and information writ large. Nebraska schools and libraries should not be caught in the middle of a manufactured crisis and culture war designed to stir up outrage instead of addressing real educational needs of students in Nebraska. At some point we have to ask, does everything have to be a law? When we are in our interim period, before we come in here in the Legislature and we're thinking about bills to introduce and now we've got this arbitrary rule that we can only introduce 20 bills-- which has manufactured a psychological urge to introduce 20 bills, whereas before maybe you only would have done 5 or 12 or 15. We're all trying to think of something to do. But at some point we have to ask, have we done enough? Does everything need to be a law? And does everything need to be a compromise? Last year, we blocked a book ban. So maybe LB390's OK because it's not quite a book ban. It's not quite as bad. We have to stop compromising with ourselves and our values, whether you're on the left and you don't want government surveillance of LGBTQ kids or you're on the right and you don't want government surveillance of schools because you want people to have the freedom to learn. LB390 is heavy-handed. It's unnecessary, and it burdens schools with bureaucracy, it micromanages libraries, and it expands government oversight into places where it's just not needed. We don't need to referee every single aspect of public education. Parents already have the right to be involved with what their kid is reading. And those are conversations for families and schools, and those conversations are already happening. As my friend, Senator Conrad, rightly said, parents are already reaching out to schools to opt them out of certain classes. They have the right to do that. They always have. Parents have the right to let teachers know what they do and don't want their kids to be learning and talking about, and they already do, and they already can. These are conversations between family and schools, not conversations for us lawmakers to referee. Again, in our infinite wisdom. We do not know best here. We don't need a law for every disagreement. I think that we can let schools, parents, and local communities figure out what works best for them without this government interference. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to LB2-- LB390. I have introduced an amendment to address one of the points that Senator John Cavanaugh brought up about the clarification over school versus school district. And in the bill on line 10 of page 2, it says

school district. And so my amendment that will be coming forward at some point strikes the word "district" and just "school." If this does move forward, I think it's important that we're not creating, like, in OPS, that a parent at one school has some sort of access to books in other schools that don't impact them or their child. So that's the change I'm making there. I also-- just going back to bills from earlier this morning, the, the, the daylight saving and the standard time bills have sparked a bit of a flurry of text messages in my family group text. And as you may have seen, Senator John Cavanaugh and I did not vote the same way on Senator Murman's standard time bill. And we are also not apparently in lockstep with our own family members. I do have members of my family asking why there's not an option to just stay in the status quo, which I suppose that option doesn't need to be a third bill. Instead, we just don't vote for either bills if we want the status quo. But I will say that the Cavanaugh family from coast to coast is very torn over this issue. And I am literally getting live texts. I am-- I have seven siblings. Two of them are sisters, and my sisters are in complete opposition to me. And this is a weird place for me to be. So I apologize to Maureen and Colleen for not standing by your side on the status quo with the time change. I do enjoy the later daylight. I do not enjoy the dark mornings, but I can suffer through them for now. So that aside, I, I agree with what Senator Hunt is saying this morning on LB390. I, I don't see this as necessary at all. And I feel like we just keep pushing, like, regulations and things like that down to our schools that aren't really-- aren't necessary. So my kids are, are pretty avid readers. And they go to the library. Either my husband or I take them to the library. We try to do it at least once a week. They call it Monday Fun Day, and they go to the library. And, and they don't always go on Mondays, but that's their idea, is Monday Fun Day. And, and so we really enjoy our public library. But they also have library at school once a week. And so we're, we're kind of-- what's that term-- lousy with library books. We've got a lot-- don't know what the origination of that term is, but we have a lot of library books at our house and a lot of book-books at our house. I like having the library books at our house because they eventually leave the house, but then more come back in. But the point is is that our kids are avid readers and we utilize our libraries and we know what books our kids are reading. And how do we know? Well, we ask them. We go with them. We check their backpacks to see what's in their backpacks-- usually library books and homework assignments. So, you know, I, I don't-- if I need to know what's going on with my kids, I will ask my kids. If I don't feel like they're giving me the straight answers, I will contact the school myself and ask. And, you know, there's that idea of, like, personal responsibility. And as a parent, we have, you know, some

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

responsibilities for parenting our children. And I don't feel like it's necessary to have that legislated. There does not need to be a law to help me know what books my kids are reading. I can, I can just talk to my kids. In fact, I would encourage that to be what parents do. Talk to your kids. Talk to them about reading. Read with your kids. Last night, we had a "Who Would Win?" battle of books, which, if-- for those of you who don't know, is when it's, like, two different, like, maybe two different types of sea animals and they tell you all of their, like, fighting skills and defense skills. I see I'm out of time. I will get back in the queue. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Sena-- Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. An announcement: the Judiciary Committee will meet in exec session, 11:30, under the south balcony. Judiciary Committee, under the south balcony at 11:30. Additionally, Mr. President, as it concerns LB390, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend with FA30.

KELLY: Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open FA30.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. This is the amendment that strikes "district." Yes. OK. Sorry. Just having a off-the-mic conversation about an amendment that-- the previous amendment I had, which I realized was totally unnecessary. So I pulled that amendment. This is to strike "district," which was brought up to my attention by Senator John Cavanaugh's questions about, if you have a kid in, in your school, like his kid's school, and it's in OPS, like, does this then apply to all of OPS schools? And so by striking "district," my intention is-- and of course, this is, this is sort of how things can get a little messy in the sausages made. Got to work through this. Does this amendment do what I wanted it to do? I think it does, but I'm sure people will tell me if it doesn't, which is to just make it specific to your child's school, not the whole district. So we aren't giving carte blanche access to any educator-- or, parent, guardian, or educational decision-maker to the entire school district, which, in Omaha, can be a lot of schools. So that is what AM30-- or, FA30 does. FA stands for floor amendment. And I want to finish talking about "Who Would Win?". And it is pertinent, but it's also fun. OK. So who would win? For anybody who has sort of younger aged kids, if you don't know about these books, you should totally get into them. So they're a lot of, like, animal, insect, mammal books. And it makes learning kind of fun. So they give you the statistics. Last night, it was "Who Would Win: Tiger Shark vs. Lemon Shark." And-- so my son made us all vote before he would tell us any of the information who we thought would win. Would

the tiger shark win in a battle or would the lemon shark win in a battle? I already knew the answer because I've read many of these with him. So then after we all voted, then he read us, like, the fighting skills of the tiger shark and the fighting skills of the lemon shark and then the defense skills of both. And they had a score on them. And-- please, earmuffs if you don't want this spoiler, but the tiger shark wins. The tiger shark always wins. The tiger shark beats the great white whale. The tiger shark always wins, so. Don't fall for my son's tricks when he tries to get you to vote for anything other than the tiger shark. The tiger shark always wins. So anyways, we, we were doing this "Who Would Win?" activity. And he has checked out-- every time I think there can't possibly be another "Who Would Win?" book, we fi-- we put it on hold at the public library and we get a new "Who Would Win?" book. It's kind of endless. And I have learned a lot of fun facts about all different species-- some that are kind of gross. The insect ones are gross. They also, since we're in March Madness, they do have basically a March Madness series of "Who Would Wins?" where they do the, you know, sweet 16, and then they do the different rounds and they whittle it down. Guess who wins? The tiger shark wins in the March Madness one as well. The tiger shark makes an appearance in a lot of these because he's got some mad skills. So why am I talking about tiger sharks and who would win? Because I'm trying to show you that, like, engaging with your kids in literacy is kinda key to getting them to love reading. And it's kind of key to knowing what's going on with your kids. And I don't-- you're all perfectly lovely people. I do not need you to, to tell me how to be a parent. My mom does that. And she's a great parent. But, you know, being a parent isn't something that you legislate. And these sort of important moments of our children's lives and education are not things that we need to have the Legislature get involved in. I try very hard. My husband does an amazing job at making sure that my kids are reading age-appropriate. Also, our school library does the same thing of making sure that there's things that are kids-- age-appropriate. We have the book fair twice a year where you can go and your kids buy books. Of course we buy "Who Would Win?" books if they're there. And then the teachers of all the classrooms have books, like, in bins that you can also buy to donate to the, the classroom. So then you-- not only do you get to see what the teachers want to have in the classroom, but you also get to participate in supporting that. And that's a really cool thing that my kids' school does. So I kind of feel like, you know, we're doing all right. We need to improve literacy. We need to focus on improving literacy for children. And the, the-- falling back in literacy is one of the greatest obstacles to academic achievement we have in this state. And so anything that, you know, highlights and elevates literacy for our school-aged kids I think is

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

really important. But I-- what our teachers and our schools need are more resources for literacy, not more red tape and, you know, laws that are kind of dictating the day-to-day nuances of, of education. So I, I hope that we can move away from this legislation and that we can move forward with the rest of the agenda. But I think Senator Hunt has made a lot of really excellent points about just sometimes we feel like we have to do something because it's in front of us. And we don't, colleagues. We don't. We don't need to do this. I can ask my school what books they have. I can talk to my school. And it's already a possibility for me. It doesn't need to be legislated. You all don't need to get involved in what books my kids are reading. But if you want to, I will bring "Who Will Win?" battle books and we can go through those together. Otherwise, I think, you know, let's, let's support our parents and our teachers through strong public policy, through-- just to tout my own bills, like, you know, universal school meals. Let's feed the children. Let's start there. Let's feed the children. And let's give the resources to the schools so that our children are properly educated. And let's focus on those things-- transportation and housing and jobs for their parents so that they show up to school and are ready to learn and that they slept in a warm bed the night before and have food on their tables. Let's focus on those things, making sure that they have utilities, access to Wi-Fi, because that's a reality of learning today. Those are the things that we should be working towards. Those are the problems we should be finding solutions for. This is not a problem that we need to solve. Parents can parent. Educators can educate. We should be looking for ways to support Nebraskans to thrive, not to create more obstacles to education. And if you have a concern about a book that's in a school, I encourage you to go to that school, to that community, and have those conversations with them on a one-on-one basis. But, I mean, right now, I'm really happy about the books my kids have at their school. They are inclusive and representative. They are thoughtful. And they teach my kids how to be good friends. And they teach my kids that it's OK that they are not the same as the kids sitting next to them. They teach my kids that differences are a good thing and that everyone is different. But what I really, really appreciate is that they also teach my kids how to be safe, how to have boundaries that are appropriate. And I don't want anybody taking that away from my children-- certainly not my colleagues here in the Legislature. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Murman, you're recognized to speak.

MURMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to-- I'm-- I'll be short, but I just want to address some of the misspeakings over this bill.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

Senator Hunt said that no one-- someone can see what her child is checking out and maybe threaten or do something harmful to her family because of what's being checked out. The bill specifically says that only parents or the student's-- the child's decision-maker will have-- can be notified on what's checked out. So no one else could see what is being checked out by someone else's child. As far as parents being decision-makers for their child, they definitely are. And this bill only supports that, enables that in a better way, a bigger way by having the, the parent being able to have access to what their child is checking out. And as far as knowing what is in other buildings or other class-- classes in the district, OPS-- and I think most schools-- you can already just google OPS library, and every book in every-- available to every class will come up. So anyone can get on-- online and see what is in the library at OPS and I think most schools in the state. So as far as family conflict and families working together, this bill will only enhance families to work together better. Parents can know what their child is checking out without trying to investigate some other way-- you know, look in their backpack or, or whatever. They can-- I-- they actually have to opt in to be contacted as to-- emailed as to what their child is, is checking out. So it only encourages access for, for parents or the deci-- decision-makers for the child to see what their child is reading and to discuss with them or work with them to, you know, help them with their reading or their studies and give them more guidance if necessary, or less guidance if, if they don't think they really need to further guide their child in what they're reading. So like Senator Conrad said, it's a pretty garden-variety bill. Most-- probably almost all schools in the state already do this, so it just makes it clear what the-- what is good policy on libraries in the state and its-- in the schools. And, and very little-- like I said, very little or probably no cost to the schools because most schools-- probably all schools have the ability to do this already. So no, no cost there either. So as far as the amendment goes, I'm going to vote no on it. I don't think it's necessary. Parents should know, you know-- maybe if their child's going into middle school from grade school, might want to know what's available next year. So I think it's good that parents can see what's in the library in all the buildings. So I'll be voting no, but you can use your own judgment on that. And I encourage your green vote on LB390. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Murman. Speaker Arch would like to recognize some guests in the north balcony: around 30 members of Sarpy Leadership Group from Sarpy County. Please stand and be recognized by your

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

Nebraska Legislature. Returning to the queue. Senator Guereca, you're recognized to speak.

GUERECA: Thank you, Mr. President. Will Senator Murman yield to a question?

KELLY: Senator Murman, would you yield?

MURMAN: Yes.

GUERECA: Should be an easy one. And if you don't know, that's fine. Do you know how many school districts already have a system similar to this in place?

MURMAN: No. I don't know the specific number. We did remove the online part of the bill. So if schools can't do it online, they, they just have to make library content available to a parent that would ask.

GUERECA: All right. Thank you, sir. I guess I rise in-- I have some concerns with, with the bill. And I won't speak to the, to the floor amendment, but, I mean, any time we hear transparency, we, we, we get concerns of, is this a book ban? Is this a step before a book ban? And certainly, we do want to respect the rights of our parents and the amazing job they do raising our excellent Nebraska children. But that-- it's something that we need to be mindful of and keep an eye on. And this-- I think the, the first concern that stands out to me is, who sets-- who determines what is acceptable? I mean, is that, is that a, a panel of parents, teachers, and librarians, administrators, community members? I think that leaves it up to interpretation and can create problems when we're looking at the tremendous number of school districts that we have all across the state. So I think that was sort of the first red flag that I had when sort of looking over the bill. And, and the question that I had for the senator of how many school districts are already doing this I think is important to take into consideration. Is this another unfunded mandate on our school districts that are already stretched to capacity? Our librarians that we're having a hard time hiring across the state, teachers that are underpaid and overworked. Certainly-- you know, again, we have a teacher hiring crisis all across the state. Doesn't matter if you're the smallest school districts or the largest. So we want to make sure that the workload we're placing on them is, is necessary. So if these programs are already existing, then, well, let's let it be. But making sure that these-- our-- that our schools, that our teachers have the capacity to implement this because I think already parents [INAUDIBLE] Senator Cavanaugh was already saying, right? They're already engaging with

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

their kids. They're reading to them. They're checking what's in their book bags. So. Those are just-- wanted to have some conversation on some potential red flags that I had with this bill. But I'll yield the rest of my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Guereca. Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, good morning, colleagues. I haven't had a chance to specifically compare my friend, Senator Cavanaugh's, floor amendment to the underlying legislation. I'm not quite sure it's necessary at first blush for adoption in order to effectuate the stated goals. But we can either take it up now or in between General and Select, and I think either is completely and totally fine, as this is a great debate. And I appreciate her putting in that placeholder to help guide discussion. So the other kind of threads that I want to lift out here is along the line of some of the components that my friend, Senator Hunt, brought forward. Is this bill absolutely necessary? Probably not. I also want to respond to a line of debate that we've heard from a lot of my progressive friends in the Legislature as well. Is this bill worri-- worrisome? In my opinion, probably not. I do think that there's a fundamental perhaps misunderstanding or misapplication in terms of where we are with current laws and current policies. So I've already talked a little bit about how our transparency laws, primarily effectuated through public records, already protect the rights of individual library patrons, already prevent people from, from accessing information about what people are checking out at different libraries, including nonparents or other community members. But I also want to draw your attention to Nebraska Revised Statute 79-2104. This is at-- this is, this is how student files and school files are utilized in Nebraska. And I'm not going to have time to read all of it in one time on the mic, but look at the very, very first section. Any student in any public school or his or her parents, guardians, teachers, counselors, school administrators shall have access to the school's files or records maintained concerning the student, including the right to inspect, review, and obtain copies of such files or records. No other person shall have access to such files or records except when they consent in writing or there's another reason, right? Or disciplinary matters. So conceivably, the library-- the school library is already keeping some sort of maintenance of record as to what the student checks out. A parent already has the right to review that. They already do. That's existing law. It strikes the right balance between in let-- ensuring schools have the ability to do what they need to do through a carefully curated process. And it also strikes the right balance in

ensuring that parents' fundamental right to know and guide their children's education can be effectuated. So we can't divorce this measure from the existing and current law and understanding in that regard. Could we better harmonize it? Does it need to be reaffirmed in any way, shape, or form since we already have clear law and policy on these measures on the books in a variety of ways? Again, is this bill absolutely necessary? Probably not. Does it provide an opportunity for our partners at the local level to review or update their existing policies to make sure that parents know how to utilize their rights in regards to student records or files or things like library books that are the subject of this and that touch upon other areas of law? I do think that there are probably some greater issues on display here as well, where we're, we're seeing or feeling maybe just a lack of trust. We just-- we don't trust Senator Murman on this issue in some instances because of his voracious work in the past to advance policies that criminalize teachers or librarians or that seek to ban books. So there's a lack of trust in regards to his measure that he's bringing forth today. That is clear and palpable and on display. I experienced the same when I brought forward LB31 to similarly empower parents, to similarly provide access, to simily-- similarly reaffirm existing rights under state, federal law, and the constitution. And my friends on the right did not--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

CONRAD: --trust me to move that forward.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Wordekemper has guests in the north balcony from the Fremont Area Chamber of Commerce, about 30 people. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. And Speaker Arch would like to recognize members of Sarpy Leadership Group in Sarpy County. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebrask-- Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. It sounds like my friend, Senator Conrad, and I are in agreement. You know, it's, it's a bill that's not needed. And I do not support-- I'm sure I've slipped in the past, but I really try mindfully to not support bills that aren't needed, that are do-nothing bills, that are bills that codify things that are already happening, that are bills that bring more government intervention and interference in the work of teachers in particular. I understand that Omaha Public Schools, OPS-- the biggest school district in the state-- they already have an online library of all the books in their, in their library. So once again, sounds like the schools and the teachers are handling this just fine. Sounds like the parents are handling it just

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

fine. And I won't be able to support LB390 because it's just a bill that's not needed. But I, I, I alluded earlier-- and I think, I think now is a good time to bring up and kind of tie it back to the conversation about LB390-- that there are things happening on the federal level that honestly, colleagues, Nebraskans deserve to see their state legislators, their state lawmakers address. And in past years, I think that would have been more normal. Like, you would see a lot more kind of discussion of current events and tying it back into Nebraska on the floor of the Legislature. And maybe a little bit more normal to take time on those types of issues. And-- I don't know. I can't believe we're already on day-- what is it-- 41. We're on day 41 and we haven't really gotten into a lot of that. And it's not my intention to take a lot of time. It's only my intention to speak to Nebraskans to tie it back into the issues at hand that are affecting the people I represent and who we affect through our votes here in the Legislature. I know that in Nebraska it's easy to feel distant from the headlines that are coming out of Washington, coming out of New York. But we need to pay attention to what's happening right now because it's important that Nebraskans see their lawmakers making some sort of statement or acknowledgment. I want to talk about this weekend. Mahmoud Khalil, who is a Columbia University graduate student and green card holder, he was arrested in his own home by plainclothes DHS agents. First, they told him that his student visa had been revoked. And then when Mr. Khalil said, I don't have a student visa. I'm a green card holder. I'm a lawful permanent resident. They said that his green card was revoked too. No due process. No warrant shown. No explanation. His wife, who was eight months pregnant, was threatened with arrest if she tried to intervene or do anything. His lawyer tried to intervene only for agents to hang up on her. This is not law enforcement, colleagues. This is not fighting immigration. This is not keeping the border safe. It's political retaliation, period. And someone at the state level in Nebraska needs to stand up and say that. Khalil was a student activist. He was a leader in his campus's pro-Palestine movement. And now in a country that claims to protect free speech, he's in government custody. And for days, he was in a location unknown. Nobody knew where he was. Future uncertain. His rights erased with the stroke of a pen. For what? So it came out that he was being held in Louisiana, I think. And yesterday, just before 5 p.m., a federal judge ordered that he may not be removed from the United States by the Trump administration unless this judge orders it. And there's a conference scheduled for Wednesday. In addition, 14 members of Congress have signed a letter to DHS Secretary Kristi Noem calling for Mr. Khalil's release. And colleagues, this is not about one person. This is a test. This is the Trump administration seeing how far they can push, how much outrage we can

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

withstand, and how easily they can rewrite the laws without any due process. And let's be honest, they are counting on us to not notice. They are counting on nobody to say anything and, and for all of us to move on. Even Ann Colter, colleagues. Even Ann Colter has come out and said this is authoritarianism. This guy is a lawful permanent resident. We cannot just kick him out of the country. And she said herself, there's almost nobody I don't want to kick out of the country. But this is authoritarianism. This isn't how we can allow this to happen. On my next time on the mic, I'm going to go back to why this matters to Nebraska. I see I'm just about out of time. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mi-- thank you, Mr. President. Again, good morning, colleagues. I just wanted to continue a-- in regards to the broader maybe issues at play here or the, the unstated narrative in terms of what's going on with this measure. And I think it's reflective of the body's lack of trust for each other. And some of that is perhaps due to term limits and welcoming in a lot of new members who we haven't had an opportunity or a chance to build really rich and meaningful relationships with when we take up measures. So we're looking at things very, I think, myopically and skeptically in many ways at-- and that's detrimental to our institution and to our work together. So when you look at some of the skepticism and concerns that my friends, my progressive colleagues have brought forward, they're looking, I think, very reflexively also at Senator Murman's work and this body's work to push forward with banning books, to push forward with measures that u-- literally weaponize the criminal law against teachers and librarians that we have fought voraciously in the past years and fought not only voraciously but successfully because of how misguided and wrongheaded those policies were. But that scar tissue remains. That lack of trust is palpable. And when you look at the online comments on a measure like this, there's-- 59 cete-- citizens had an opportunity to weigh in in support. 92 citizens had an opportunity to weigh in with oppositions. 5 came in neutral. And most, if not all of the comments on my read-- there are some nuances there-- but they're really, again, in that very kind of binary ki-- approach to whether or not we should ban books. And that's not the measure before you. That's not what LB390 says or does or is intended to do. But it's part of that ba-- broader mistrust and skepticism because of the scar tissue that exe-- exists from some of those past battles. I think the other lack of trust on display in regards to these issues-- which I'm really having a hard time grappling with but am working hard to overcome to focus on the policy in a principled policy way, not a personal way or a partisan way-- which is

challenging, but is, is our call in this institution. Particularly this year it's very challenging. But the same chorus of voices from my colleagues who punched in and made wild statements against LB31, where are they today? Where are they today? I don't see them filling the queue. I don't see them coming forward with dramatic concerns about transparency or local control or unfunded mandates. But when a measure that has my name on it is before the body that is a similar garden-variety policy directive bill that we take up all of the time, there's no concern. That partisanship and that personal approach is also palpable. It's also palpable. But I'm working with my friend, Senator Murman, not only on LB31 but also on this as a way to keep a focus on what's actually in the bill. What's actually in the bill. Read the bill. I can't force you to read, but you should. Because when you look at LB390, it is not a book ban. It is not a weaponization of the criminal law against teachers and libraries. It restates and reaffirms parental rights that already exist, that are unbending in regards to guiding their children's education, that are fundamental, that are appropriately balanced so that each parent decides what's best for them, their-- and their family, but they don't get to veto over other parents in terms of that decision-making. So I urge my colleagues to put aside the mistrust, put aside the hypocrisy, and focus on the measure at hand. Is it necessary? No, it probably isn't. Is it harmful? No, it probably isn't. And let's use this inflection point in this debate to reset to a principled approach--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

CONRAD: --away from personalities and--

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Conrad.

CONRAD: --partisa-- partisanship. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. If any of my colleagues think that giving conservative Republicans what they want is going to reset the tone or, you know, make them willing to work with me or Senator Conrad or anybody on the left-- you know, I've got a "fell for it again" award for you because that's-- we know that's never going to happen. You know, I haven't misrepresented what LB390 does. I know it's not an outright book ban. I've never said it was. I, I oppose it because I think it's giving chores to teachers. It's a do-nothing bill. Parents already have the rights to know what their kids are looking at at school. And I am-- I have real concerns about a slippery slope and that

LGBTQ+ students can be, you know, possibly punished by their parents and caretakers if they know that they're reading something that they-- the parents don't want them to read. So that's why I'm going to be against this bill. I also want to finish the points I was making about Mahmoud Khalil, who's a Columbia University graduate student who was arrested in his home by DHS. He's a lawful permanent resident and a green card holder. He was disappeared by the federal government, removed from his home and his eight-month pregnant wife. And I want to tell you why I'm speaking about this, because it does matter to Nebraska. If the federal government can target lawful permanent residents today, what stops them from coming for others tomorrow? This is not just something affecting New York. It's not something just affecting D.C. It's not just something affecting Columbia University. Nebraska is home to immigrant families, to DACA recipients, to refugees, to international students, to green card holders like Khalil. If the government can strip the residency without any due process, without any explanation, what protects our neighbors? What protects our coworkers? Our friends? Our family members? And what happens when this escalates? Because we know it will. We saw the warning signs when Donald Trump promised mass deportations. Who else will they target? Teachers? Journalists? Religious leaders? Legislators? They're already targeting teachers who feel like they can't even put up a, a rainbow flag poster in their classroom. Is LB390 helping that? We saw the warning signs at the national convention when Republicans were all holding up signs-- disgusting, shameful-- that said, mass deportations now. We saw it when his administration started monitoring social media for political speech. Now they're using AI to look at the social media accounts of federal employees to see if they're talking about DEI or whatever so they can be targeted for firings. And now we're watching the federal government disappear a man, a lawful resident, for leading a protest, which, in this country-- people who fight for our country, people like Senator Brewer, who was under the balcony earlier, that is the right that these people have fought and died for over the generations: the right to protest, the right to say what you feel, and the right to have free political speech. We may be here in Nebraska. We're not at Columbia University. We're not in Congress. I can't tell you how many people are asking me to do something about this. And it's like, look, I'm just trying to block LB390. I don't have the authority to do anything in Congress, obviously. But people don't understand because they are frantic and there is chaos and they want some kind of stability and security from their elected leaders. Our state has a history in Nebraska of protecting immigrants, of standing up for civil rights, of rejecting authoritarianism. We have a proud, nonpartisan libertarian tradition in this state. And we have the platform,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

colleagues, to demand answers. I think that we need to call on Nebraska's congressional delegation to condemn this unlawful detention of Khalil. We need to publicly stand in defense of due process and free speech regardless of political ideology. And we need to ensure that Nebraska does not cooperate with any illegal or politically motivated immigration enforcement actions. History will ask if we stood and rolled over and let the federal government take control of our state or if we fought back. And we have the responsibility to sound the alarm before it's too late. Because the truth is, if they can take away Mahmoud Khalil's rights, they can take away yours too. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to rise in support of FA30. I, I appreciate Senator Machaela Cavanaugh bringing this. It looks like FA30 is an amendment that clarifies the language about the districtwide obligation for keeping a list of all the books. And I appreciate Senator Murman answering my questions on the microphone when the debate really just was getting started. And he clarified that the intention of the bill was to make sure that parents had access to the books in their schools and not necessarily that they'd have access to books in other schools. And I think FA30 just clarifies that, which is where we ended up on that conversation, is-- I said I was reading the bill to say that you-- they would have to make it open to parents or lawful guardians districtwide. And that didn't sound right to me. Didn't make sense. It don't-- doesn't really pursue-- it doesn't serve the purpose or the intention of this bill, which is to protect parental rights as it pertains to their kids. And I don't really have an interest in what books are in other schools in OPS. I really only have an interest in what books are in the schools that my kids are in. And so this amendment clarifies that and I think more truly serves the intention of this bill. So I hope everyone will support FA30. I hope Senator Murman will support FA30 because it clarifies and just gives legislative language to what he stated the intention of this bill was when he and I spoke about this on the microphone just a few minutes ago. So I'd ask for your green vote on FA30. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on FA30.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I-- FA30 is-- just strikes "district" from line 10 of page 2. So it said "school districts," and

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

now it would just say "schools." So as Senator John Cavanaugh just mentioned, it keeps it to, to the school that your child is in. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Members, the question is the adoption of FA30. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Arch not voting. Senator Armendariz. Senator Ballard not voting. Senator Bosn not voting. Senator Bostar. Senator Brandt not voting. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Clouse. Senator Clouse voting yes. Senator Conrad voting no. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator DeKay. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Dover. Senator Dungan. Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Guereca voting yes. Senator Hallstrom not voting. Senator Hansen. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft voting no. Senator Hughes. Senator Hunt voting yes. Senator Ibach voting no. Senator Jacobson voting no. Senator Juarez voting yes. Senator Kauth voting no. Senator Lippincott voting yes. Senator Lonowski voting yes. Senator McKeon voting yes. Senator McKinney. Senator Meyer voting no. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Prokop. Senator Quick not voting. Senator Raybould. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator Sanders. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Spivey. Senator Storer voting no. Senator Storm voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Wordekemper voting no. Vote is 12 ayes, 18 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the amendment.

KELLY: The floor amendment fails and is not adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill.

KELLY: Members, the question-- Senator Cavanaugh, you are--

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. So I, I honestly didn't think that my amendment would get adopted, though it did lose votes going to a roll call. I didn't do a call of the house either because I was-- figured with 14 votes, whatever. But just so everybody knows, that amendment struck the word "districts" from line 10. I was surprised that Senator Murman didn't vote for it since he agreed with Senator John Cavanaugh in the intention of that amendment was to not have it be to a full school district but to the school itself. So I-- I would use this example. My kids are in West Side. Senator Fredrickson's kids are in West Side. We can't go to each other's child's school. It's only

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 11, 2025

per-- as the parent, guardian, educational decision-maker, it's specific to the school our child is in. So that's what that amendment would have done. Thanks to those who voted for it. And-- yeah. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Murman, you're recognized to close.

MURMAN: I urge your green vote on LB390. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Murman. Members, the question is the advancement of LB390 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 2 nays, Mr. President, on advancement of the bill.

KELLY: LB390 advances to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk for items.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Your Committee on Judiciary, chaired by Senator Bosn, reports LB385, LB388, LB453, LB499 to General File, some having committee amendments. Additionally, your Committee on Revenue, chaired by Senator von Gillern, reports LB305, LB628, LB391, LB401 to General File, some having committee amendments. Your Committee on Health and Human Services, chaired by Senator Hardin, reports LB119 and LB217 to General File. Amendments to be printed from Senator Hallstrom to LB230. Notice of committee hearings from the Revenue Committee. Additionally, communication from Senator Raybould as chair of the State-Tribal Relations Committee informing the Legislature that the committee has selected LB78 as the committee priority bill for the session. Additionally, communication from Senator Kauth informing the Legislature that the Business and Labor Committee has designated LB415 as a committee priority bill for the session. Business and Labor, LB415, committee priority bill. Notice that the Agriculture Committee will meet in executive session in Room 1023 at the conclusion of the public hearing today. Agriculture Committee, 1023, at the conclusion of the public hearing. Finally, Mr. President, a priority motion: Senator Meyer would move to adjourn the body until Wednesday, March 12 at 9:00 a.m.

KELLY: Members, you've heard the motion to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. The Legislature is adjourned.