

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the forty-sixth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, First Session. Our chaplain for today is, is Reverend Robert J. Magoola, St. Mark's from Lincoln, Nebraska, in Senator Conrad's district. Please rise.

ROBERT J. MAGOOLA: Let us pray. O God, our creator, whose character sustains and guides us through the chances and choices of life, we come before you today with gratitude for all the ways in which this uni-- your Unicameral looks after your people in the great state of Nebraska. And we thank you for choosing this body of leaders, from among us, and for gifting them in many ways. We do ask that you give this your people knowledge and understanding and depth of insight into the lives of the people you've placed under their care, this time, I know they need to work the endless long hours ahead of them, wise discernment in choosing what is good and helpful, and wisdom to know the best path ahead for the sake of your people. We pray for your encouragement to keep working together even when they disagree in challenging circumstances. Trusting that these, our prayers, will find favor in your sight, to you, our great God, we will give honor, glory, and gratitude. Amen.

ARCH: I recognize Senator Hardin for the Pledge of Allegiance.

HARDIN: 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.

ARCH: Thank you. I call to order the forty-sixth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, First Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

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

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any corrections for the Journal?

CLERK: I have no corrections this morning, sir.

ARCH: Thank you. Are there any messages, reports, or announcements?

CLERK: There are, Mr. President. Your Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by Senator Brandt, reports LB595 to General File with committee amendments. Additionally, amendments to be printed from Senator Spivey to LB69, and a communication from the governor concerning two appointments to the Nebraska Educational

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

Telecommunications Commission, as well as a notice that the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee will meet for executive session at 10:00 in Room 2102; Transportation, 10:00, 2102; and Urban Affairs at 11:00 in Room 2022; Urban Affairs, 2022, at 11; Transportation, 10:00, 2102. That's all I have at this time, Mr. President.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We will now proceed to the first item on the agenda.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB293A. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

ARCH: Senator Guereca for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB293A be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB293A does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB185. First of all, Senator, there are E&R amendments.

ARCH: Question is the adoption of the E&R amendments to-- Senator Guereca for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB185 be adopted.

ARCH: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. The E&R amendments are adopted. Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB185 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: This is a debatable motion. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

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

ARCH: Senator Dover, will you yield?

DOVER: Yes.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

M. CAVANAUGH: I just-- could you quickly remind me what your bill does?

DOVER: It simply allows landlords and tenants to communicate with emails instead of the mail. Currently in statute, in order to give notice, it has to be put in the mail. And I think we know how reliable the mail service is today. And so this allows a tenant to opt in or opt out, it's their choice to electronic communications, which would be emails because-- and emails because they obviously have a date--

M. CAVANAUGH: OK.

DOVER: --in them.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. I thought--

DOVER: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: I, I just-- I think I missed the floor debate so I appreciate that, that was all--

DOVER: Wasn't much of a debate.

M. CAVANAUGH: Well, there you go. Thank you. I yield the remainder of my time.

DOVER: Thank you.

ARCH: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB185 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB230, there are no E&R amendments. Senator Hallstrom would move to amend with AM597.

ARCH: Senator Hallstrom, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

HALLSTROM: Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. AM597 is fairly simple and straightforward. We have a fiscal note impact on this bill at this time, which we are going to be eliminating if AM597 is adopted. I appreciate the work of PRO into getting a alternative source of funding so we don't have an A bill. This amendment would provide for the transfer of funds from the Department of Revenue Enforcement Fund to the General Fund in an amount sufficient to eliminate the need for an A bill to LB230. And I would ask for your green vote for advancement or for adoption of the amendment. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, for a motion.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator John Cavanaugh would move to bracket the bill until June 9, 2025 with MO93.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on your motion.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. Well, I rise in support of LB230 and I appreciate Senator Hallstrom's work to eliminate the General Fund fiscal impact and so I would be supportive of AM597. My motion is because we are at a point now-- there we go, now it's bracketed to June 9. I was confused for a second there. Brackets the bill till June 9. So for those of you who aren't really, you know, or who are new to the system, bracket to June 9 means that we would put this bill on hold, take it up on June 9. So an affirmative vote on this doesn't actually kill the bill, but it might effectively kill the bill because June 9, if you all know, is the last day of the Legislature, which means it wouldn't have time to be on Final Reading at least this session, I guess you could bring it up on next year. But anyway, so this session we've been very productive. We've passed 49 bills, I think have been presented to the governor, governor for signature, another 22 or so are on Final Reading at the moment. And a lot of other bills have moved and are either on Select or now have a priority on General File. So we've been very productive and we've had some of these conversations, yesterday in particular, about the harm of a Christmas tree bill, of a bill that contains a whole lot of other things like the-- that HHS bill yesterday. And we've had a few conversations about bills when we in haste last biennium, 2023, I think it was, when we passed a whole lot of bills by virtue of jamming them together as Christmas tree bills. And one of the reasons we did that was at this point in the session 2 years ago, we had only passed a handful of bills past General File, so we hadn't gotten a lot of work done. But we've gotten a lot of work done this year, and so there's not as much of a press to incorporate a bunch of bills. So this bill is on Select File, it was universally popular on General File. I think it got no, no opposition votes. I could look it up again here, but I don't-- if that's right, my recollection is that there was no opposition to this bill on General File. And so we are now at a point where several other bills that don't have a priority are looking to move from-- move-- jump pass Select, essentially onto Final, and not have a first-round debate and be able to become law without that going through the whole process. So that's one of the things-- it's a common thing that happens. Usually what happens though is, it'll be-- a less controversial bill will get incorporated into a maybe more controversial bill, meaning that if you're going to hitch a

ride, as we would say on Select File, that the bill you would put on here would not be something that creates drag for a bill. That's not what we're talking about here today, is there are at least 3 bills that are being proposed to be added to this bill that had no opposition, that had opposition, and that will create drag for this bill. And so I put the bracket motion up here, as Senator Conrad would say, to structure the debate, because I'm in favor of LB230, but I want to structure the debate in such a way that I want to talk about-- take some time talking about why we shouldn't be adding more bills to this bill and particularly controversial bills. So I like LB230. I appreciate Senator Hallstrom's approach to this. It is a bill that regulates kratom or kratom. I'm not sure which is the right pronunciation, and I would like to see how the transcribers write that because it might just read kratom, kratom or something like that or kratom, kratom. But I appreciate a bill that seeks to regulate rather than criminalize or outlaw some, some conduct. And I do appreciate a bill that takes an attempt to exercise our power for health and safety, protecting the public so they know what they're going to get so that when they buy something that it, it is clean, safe, reliable. So I think that LB30 [SIC] strikes the right approach as it pertains to our regulatory authority over consumables. And so that's why I support LB230. There are subsequent bills that go in a different path, that criminalize additional conduct, that increase penalties that are different than LB230, which are-- makes them more controversial. And so when we're talking about how we're going to pass, move bills forward or how we're going to make progress in this Legislature, I think it's important that we take a deliberate approach and that we don't just jump onto things in the interest of getting things done. When we do what we sometimes we call a vote-a-rama, where you have a whole bunch of bills that are jumping onto Select because it's the last, you know, opportunity to move onto Final Reading when you get later in the session, and some folks are voting so fast, you don't know what you're voting for. And, and then bills don't get thoroughly debated on the floor. And we don't get to, you know, really suss out what the problems with something are. So that's, that's one of the problems with stacking bills onto a bill at this point in time. So I think I've got a few minutes left here so I might talk a little bit. So the, the-- right now, this bill, we have Senator Hallstrom's amendment, which, like I said, I support, which helps eliminate the fiscal note on the underlying bill. And then we have a bill from Senator DeKay, which is-- I guess would ban nitrous oxide, sale of nitrous oxide in some venues. We have a bill from Senator Riepe that would schedule some drug that I can't pronounce, that my understanding is, I've heard and he can correct me at some point if he so chooses,

is maybe an antidepressant sold in France that is not currently scheduled at the federal level, but would be then incorporated into the Nebraska schedule. And then we have Senator Bosn's bill that creates an enhancement penalty for overdoses resulting in death. And the-- that last bill is one, colleagues, that was heavily debated last Legislature, took the full time on at least the first round of debate and was a very controversial bill. And so I think that it's, it's ill-advised for us at this point in time to start incorporating bills that have historically been very controversial, that will be controversial at this point. I know that bill did not come out of committee unanimously, does not currently have a priority. And so I think it, it has the potential to cause real problems for this bill. I think that the other 2 bills potentially do as well. I think there's a germaneness question. Senator Halltrom's bill addresses the regulation of kratom or kratom, but it does not open up the Controlled Substances Act, which I think both, at least Senator Riepe's bill does and I think Senator Bosn's bill does. I don't know about Senator DeKay's bill. And so there's that question that we have to hold ourselves to a standard of germaneness on bills as well, because, again, we have had-- we've developed some bad habits, honestly, in the last 3 years in this Legislature. One of them is we don't hold ourselves to a high enough standard for germaneness because we wanted to get things moving and passed when we're trying to get things in. We didn't hold ourselves to a standard in terms of how many bills we were sticking in to other bills, and that caused-- causes a real problem because there's been a number of people around here who said, well, I didn't vote for that. And I said, no, you did. It was in a package. You voted for it. And say, well, I liked something else in it so I voted for, for it anyway, but I really don't like it. And we've had people bring bills to repeal sections of bills that they voted for because they didn't know it was in there. And that's really problematic for your constituents. It's problematic for just statutory construction. And it's just bad policymaking that we put so many things together that people don't know what they're voting for. And so I think it's really important that we continue or we, we revert to a standard that we are not putting bills together unless they are logically and consistently in sequence to the issue for which that, that the bill is addressing. So there are a number of times where putting 2 bills together makes sense. There are a lot of bills that go together. I'm going to run out of time, but I can talk about this a little bit more with some examples. We put together-- out of General Affairs, I know we put together 2 of Senator Hughes's bills that I thought were pretty consistently together about regulation of vapes and taxation for Zens, I think is what they call them, might be the name brand. But we put

things together that were logically and consistently in sequence to each other. And that's-- that is the fundamental essence of germaneness, it's not to put bills that are at cross-purposes or bills that are and have nothing to do with each other into one bill just to get them passed. We want to-- we have 3 rounds of debate for a reason. We have an 8 hour on the first round so that people can have a robust conversation about the justification, the rationale for a law proposal, we have 4 hours on Select.

ARCH: Time, Senator.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

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

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I do rise in favor of the bracket motion at this point in time. Similar to Senator John Cavanaugh, I also rise in favor to the AM, AM597, and in favor of LB230 in its current iteration. I think that the, the conversation being structured the way that it is, is helpful in just sort of understanding what people's opposition here might be today. LB230, this bill to regulate the sale and the, I guess, consumption of, I say, kratom, but kratom, kratom, not entirely sure which one is correct, is a good bill and it's one that on General File we voted on and I believe it had very universal support. I'm pulling up the vote here. Yeah, 39 yes votes, not a single no vote. And then there were 8 present, not voting because people were probably busy and there was no call of the house. So for a bill that had that kind of universal support to have an amendment such as Senator Bosn's AM600, which I know is not on the board yet, but I do anticipate we will get to it, at least in conversation here later today, is problematic. And I think the problematic nature of that is exactly what's already been summed up in the opening on this bracket motion, which is that a bill with very little opposition and no discussion whatsoever about sentencing enhancements, which is always a contentious discussion in this body, is now acting as the vehicle for which an additional amendment, which was its own entire bill, could find its way to the floor of the Legislature. I understand that amendments often get attached to bills, and there is sometimes more of a relationship than others, and we will always have discussions about germaneness. But I think my bigger issue with what it's down the line here with AM600 being attached to LB230 and AM597 is the fact that it is a very contentious issue and has been a contentious issue, historically, being attached to a bill that was, for all intents and purposes, consent calendar or agreed upon. For those watching at home, generally speaking, in the Legislature, when a

bill comes out early from a committee and makes its way to the floor, that's indicative of the fact that there's not a lot of opposition. I know that the Speaker does a really good job of trying to get bills on worksheet order, we call it, where they come out of committee and they make their way to General File. And prior to the necessity of trying to find or needing to find priorities, we just simply work down a worksheet of the bills as they come out onto the floor. A bill that's on worksheet order when it comes up on the board, not always is agreed upon, but what it generally means is it's one of the less contentious bills. But as the session goes on, you end up with these much more high profile, maybe hotter button issues that people tend to debate, I think, in a little bit more of a serious way. AM600, which is the one from Senator Bosn down the line, is a very similar, if not identical bill to one that was debated, I think, last year in this Legislature. It has been debated before and was ultimately pulled. And we did not get to a vote on it because of the contentious nature of the debate and the discussion. And I will tell you, colleagues, if AM600 remains attached to LB230, this will be a fight and a conversation that we have as a body moving forward. My hope for Senator Hallstrom is that we can maybe clean up the bill a little bit and take off that amendment and allow LB230 to go forward with maybe 1 or 2 of the smaller amendments, as certainly, Senator Hallstrom's, which I think does simply clean up the language with regards to the cost. And I do appreciate his efforts on that. I know Senator Hallstrom would appreciate, I think, a bill sailing through as well. And I would like to assist in that. But as long as AM600 is attached to this bill, it's going to be a problem. And part of the reason I think it's going to be a problem, without even delving into the meat of what it does, is that it continues to, I guess, approach lawmaking in this Christmas tree fashion in a way that simply makes it so bloated that it is difficult for us to have a legitimate debate about all the things that are within that bill. I anticipate we're going to continue to talk about sentencing. We're going to continue to talk about whether or not, in fact, increased penalties actually help Nebraska. And I anticipate a good debate about this today. But, again, it is the presence of that AM600 that I think creates the drag on this bill. So I look forward to having conversations with Senator Hallstrom, maybe, off the mic about ways that we can proceed on this and, and avenues forward in order to continue to do the people's work and get to the rest of the agenda today. But as of right now, I do believe that we are at an impasse. And so with that, colleagues, I would encourage you to listen, pay attention to the debate this morning. I think there's going to be some interesting things that are talked about, and hopefully we can all get together and find a way forward. With that, thank you, Mr. President.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of LB230. I rise in support of AM597. I will probably be present, not voting on MO93, but I support preserving this bill as it is with Senator Hallstrom's amendment. I, I think that it's important. I feel-- actually, I feel really bad because I feel like I've, like, spoken on every single one of Senator Hallstrom's bills. I told him this morning it wasn't personal. I'm sure it's hard to not feel that way this morning, but I, I do really appreciate Senator Hallstrom bringing this bill and the amendment for which is essentially a pay for. So I think that's important for us to adopt. But I am opposed to some of the pending amendments that I think are poison pills and will, you know, lose a lot of votes on this bill and are substantively different for a bill that could have just moved forward in a couple of minutes, and now it's potentially going to have to take a full 4 hours. Because if we get to the amendments and it gets adopted, then this goes 4 hours. And if we don't get to the amendments, unless there's an agreement to pull the amendments, this goes 4 hours. So, so, yeah, it looks like right now we're going to be going for 4 hours. So I know there's an inclination to call the question in this body frequently, and I mean people can do that, but that doesn't change the fact that this is still going to go 4 hours without some sort of change to what's pending on this bill. So people can engage in the conversation. They can go sit in the senators' lounge and drink their coffee. If you recall, last biennium, Senator Erdman was very upset that we couldn't drink coffee in our temporary lounge across the way. But don't worry, colleagues, you can drink coffee in the senator's lounge and there is a new coffee maker, so enjoy that luxury. But for right now, we should just settle in, because this is going to go 4 hours. And you can help that by talking and calling the question, because those things take time or you can catch up on your correspondence. That's up to you. Yeah, so I was looking this over last night because I wanted to see what Senator Hallstrom's amendment did and where it was in the list of amendments, and it very specifically does a pay for, for this bill. And I appreciate that, especially since we're trying to balance a budget. I'm going to grab my laptop. Because we're going to-- we're trying to balance the budget and so having regulatory things-- I actually-- I, I will confess, I did not look at the fiscal note. So I will do that quickly because I don't actually know how much of a pay for we needed. I just looked at his amendment. So the fiscal note-- oh, there's a new one. OK. So it's \$251,000 in General Funds this biennium or this year

and then \$121,000 next biennium. And then there's revenue, but it says see below. Well, I don't know what to see-- so what are-- I don't know what we're anticipating for the revenue. That's interesting. Well, operative date is July 1, emergency clause. Emergency clause means on Final Reading we're going to need 30 votes. Except as otherwise provided in the act, no political subdivision. So the bill requires the Department of Revenue to establish, operate, and administer a program to register kratom products and for-- to answer Senator John Cavanaugh's question about what the Drafters will or the transcribers will do, they will just put in k-r-a-t-o-m--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: --everytime you say it. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, that's what I thought, other Senator Cavanaugh, that they would just write k-r-a-t-o-m every time. So, again, I rise in support of LB230 and AM597. And I have a bracket motion to delay the vote on this bill until June 9, which, as I said before, has, you know, historically has been interpreted as a kill motion, you would call it, which would stop a bill. I think that there are scenarios in which you would, you would actually bracket a bill for a time. I talked about that as an idea on the LR. I can't remember Senator Hansen's amendment or constitutional amendment proposal about legislative pay. I thought a bracket motion to a specific date maybe would have been appropriate there, and then we could have taken it up at that date, you know, and we could have even bracketed it till the next session, because, again, that bill doesn't need to be up until it would be on the ballot in 2026. So it just has to be passed by the end of the second part of the biennium. But one of the reasons I put up this bracket, even though I support LB230, is that we are getting to a point now where we are going to take up priority bills soon. We actually started taking up committee priorities already. These are Select File worksheet order bills, meaning they did not have a priority. And though there are some 80 or so priorities, I don't know the number, 49 of us, plus 25 Speaker priorities, plus the committee priorities, somewhere, somewhere near 100 priority bills, which is a lot of bills. You know, we-- this year proposed something around short of 800 bills. So 1/8 of the entire Legislature's proposals get some sort of priority. And then, of course, the remaining 7/8 are looking for a ride, as we would say. And my-- I think that that-- it's totally in everybody's purview, your objective is, you introduce a bill, if you think it's a bill that

should become law, you introduce it and then you work to try and get it to become law. And sometimes that, you know, rises to the level where someone will use their personal priority on a bill, try and get committee priority, try and get a, a Speaker priority to get-- to guarantee that that bill is going to move. And so a lot of people have selected their, their priorities and gotten the Speaker priority. And then another option is to amend into another bill that is moving. And so LB230, again, moved on General File with no opposition. Senator Hallstrom has brought an amendment to fix the only issue with it, which was the cost. And so this bill is more or less without problems and would probably have passed in minutes, if not shorter, onto Final Reading, and then it would've been taken up on Final Reading, whenever the next time was we did Final Reading. But now other bills that have not been prioritized are, are hoping to move, and they-- everybody can have the reason they want, they think it's really important, they-- it's a, you know, it's something that means a lot to them and I respect that. But there's also we have to respect the process and the reason we would have to respect the practices when we have not respected the process in the last several years, we have created a subpar work product. Senator Hardin, yesterday, said the great phrase garbage in, garbage out. I thought that was a fantastic phrase, and runs the risk of describing some of the work that we produced in the last couple of years, where we jammed a bunch of bills into bills at the last minute, didn't have time to discuss them, rushed them across the finish line. Just a couple of high points on that, the good life districts, which now we're on fix number 3, I think maybe 4. LB34 from the special session, which some folks will say didn't miss a year of the property tax credit. Some people will say that it did. People disagree about that. But the one thing I will tell you is that that was a known flaw in that plan before that bill got pushed, but it got pushed so late, so quickly that it didn't get elucidated on the floor to the degree that it probably should have, and maybe would have stopped the bill if that had been subjected to an 8-hour debate. But because it was a late floor amendment, I remember I divided the question, we were fighting on the floor, I was trying to keep that amendment off, and then it got pushed in over my objections. And with about 5 minutes left, I think the Clerk actually had to explain to us what the votes meant because it was so convoluted. And as a result of that convoluted rushed process, we passed a tax reform that many Nebraskans now don't like and feel like they've lost a year of their taxes. We have a bill brought by Senator Hardin, actually, to fix that. And there's much disagreement about what that bill does. And part of it is because we did a bad job on the floor--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

J. CAVANAUGH: --trying to rush things through. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Rountree, you are recognized to speak.

ROUNTREE: Good morning. And thank you, Mr. President. And good morning, colleagues, and good morning to all of those who are watching online. I rise this morning to support the bracket motion on Senator Cavanaugh's bill-- MO93. I think LB230 is a great bill and I support the amendment to that. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, when we heard this bill, we had a lot of great testimony. A lot of the suppliers that came in and testified, and it's very rare that you will have someone coming and asking for that type of regulation. Anyone coming to ask that they be regulated or modified or, or for over watch. But as we listen to this bill, which was a great bill, we had a lot of testimony to come in. And I just want to state, again, for the record, we had introducer Senator Hallstrom; and then we have Walker Gallman from Global Kratom Coalition; Christine Vanderford, they own a shop, Kure CBD and Vape; Sarah Linden, Annette Dubas, and Joseph Fraas, and Mac Haddow. We only had a couple of opponents to this bill, but this was really good. They were coming and asking, we want to make sure that we are doing what's right and responsible not only for our businesses, but taking care of the public and those. And we put in some other types of guardrails as we use that term, it's only going to be sold to anyone 21 and over, and they have a lot of protections that are in place to ensure that it doesn't reach a population that is not intended for. Senator Hallstrom went back with an amendment to eliminate the fiscal note, which was a good amendment, so this was a good bill. As I was listening to the Education hearing yesterday, I also heard of a bill that had passed last year, which was, as you call it, a Christmas tree. I'm a freshman senator, so I don't understand all the terms, but I do know what a Christmas tree looks like with all the ornaments. So one of the Christmas tree bills, and I guess attached in that was one of the bills that was not a great bill, as one of the other senators said. And there would have been an option during that passing that they could have put a motion on the floor and pulled that not so great bill out. If we run this bill, which LB230, I think is a really good bill, it's one that was asked for, and if we Christmas tree it and we put other things on it that's going to make it not so great of a bill and it's going to have contention and it has an opportunity not to pass, then we have failed in what we are called to do as legislators here in the body. So I'm going to go ahead and close my comments there. I believe that when we heard this bill, it

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

was a good bill. Any questions that we had about that we got those modified. And it's one that I think can stand alone on its own, and it could do what it was intended to do. So thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the rest of my time.

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

BALLARD: Question.

ARCH: The question has been called. Do I see 5 hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Has everyone voted who wishes to vote? Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 5 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

ARCH: Debate, debate does cease. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on your motion.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Wow, quick question called, though not a rhyme, what is that, alliterative with different letters. Quick question called, I guess-- well, quick and question. So, yeah, so folks obviously want to jam through bills without a discussion. So I disagree with some of the amendments that follow. I'm OK with some of the amendments that follow, but that's not the point. And this is at this point, folks, I think, think, well, let's just call the question really quickly and then we'll get what we want, we'll get our desired outcome, and then we'll be able to continue to do that. Here's the problem, folks. We should hold ourselves to the standard. And those of us that believe this Legislature should do its job right are going to hold you to that standard every day. So if you think that you can call the question repeatedly and move on and get what you want, you're wrong. There are enough of us that believe in this institution and believe we should do the job the right way, that we will hold you to that standard, even if it costs us more time and more work. And we have shown that, demonstrated that time and again. So go ahead, I guess, I think you shouldn't. I think it's disrespectful. I think that we should follow the process, allow the 12 or so people who haven't spoke that are in the queue to get an opportunity to speak before you call the question. But just keep in mind that we can continue to talk and to find times to talk and opportunities, and we will do that. So I put up a bracket motion and I would ask for your green vote on the bracket motion, because it will delay this bill to a later date. It does not kill this bill if we don't want it to. We can take up this bill again on June 9 and we can move it to Final at that point, and

then we can take it up at the very beginning of the second part of the biennium. But LB230 is a good bill, AM597 is a good amendment, and they were unanimously popular, out of committee and on General File, but there are other bills that are attempting that are, are controversial bills that require 8 hours of debate, require a full debate on General File, require a priority to move at this point that are attempting to jump onto this bill and slide past. And as I was telling you, if you were listening earlier, that in the last several years we have made some mistakes by rushing through bills on this floor. We have passed bills that then we've had to come back and repeal or correct where people have regretted voting for because they didn't know they voted for it. We passed bills in 2023, Christmas tree bills that had dozens to 20 bills in them in the interest of getting things passed. And at this point, as I said, we have passed 49 bills sent to the governor. We have moved another 20-some to Select or to Final, and we have 100 bills that are committee priority, personal priority or Speaker priority. And some of those bills do have multiple bills in them that will then be taken up on General File. None of them moved past General File, we were having a, a extended debate on the HHS bill that was a Christmas tree bill yesterday. And I think as a result of that extended debate where that's not the first bill up today, partly because I think people want to have a little bit more conversation and thought about what's in that package. So we should not be purposely rushing to get things done and added onto bills just to pass them. This is a body of 49 people, all of us should engage in conversation and debate and deliberation, and we should hold ourselves to a high standard when we are trying to change the laws of the state in Nebraska, because that's what we're doing here. We're going to change the law, how it affects people, what it does. And we should take that seriously and we should take the time to do that. So I'd ask for your green vote on the bracket motion and, I guess, I would ask for a call of the house, Mr. President.

ARCH: 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. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 27 or, excuse me, 28 ayes, 2 nays to bracket the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: The house, the house is--

CLERK: I'm sorry, for the call of the house.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: 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 Prokop, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Prokop, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Cavanaugh, we're still waiting for Senator Prokop, would you like to proceed or wait? Senator Prokop, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. All unexcused members are now present. The question, the question before the body is the bracket motion. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There's been a roll call vote requested. Mr. Clerk, please call the roll.

CLERK: Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Arch voting no. Senator Armendariz voting no. Senator Ballard voting no. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Bostar. Senator Brandt voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh not voting. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh not voting. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Clouse voting no. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator DeBoer. Senator DeKay voting no. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Dover voting no. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Fredrickson voting no. Senator Guereca not voting. Senator Hallstrom voting no. Senator Hansen voting no. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft voting no. Senator Hughes. Senator Hunt. Senator Ibach voting no. Senator Jacobson voting no. Senator Juarez voting yes. Senator Kauth voting no. Senator Lippincott voting no. Senator Lonowski voting no. Senator McKeon voting no. Senator McKinney. Senator Meyer voting no. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Prokop voting no. Senator Quick voting no. Senator Raybould voting no. Senator Riepe voting no. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator Sanders voting no. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Spivey not voting. Senator Storer voting no. Senator Storm voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Wordekemper voting no. Vote is 4 ayes, 36 nays to bracket the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: The motion to bracket is not successful. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator John Cavanaugh would move to reconsider the vote just taken on MO93.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh, you're welcome to open on your motion.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I believe-- is this a 10 minute, Mr. President?

ARCH: Yes, correct.

J. CAVANAUGH: All right. Thank you, Mr. President. So, colleagues, I appreciate the votes. I think I got 4 on that. So I thought maybe folks might want to reconsider. I mean, I guess I didn't vote for it, so maybe I would vote for it on the second attempt. But I know there's more folks here than were here originally, so kind of set the table for you again. On the bill, up here we have LB3 or LB230, which is Senator Hallstrom's kratom bill. I'm looking at Senator Lonowski. Did I get that right? Yep. Kratom. Senator Lonowski educated me that it's kratom. And so LB230 is Senator Hallstrom's bill to regulate kratom. AM597 is an amendment to shift the fiscal impact to a cash fund, if I recall right. And so I support LB230, I support AM597. I think this is a good approach to regulating a substance that folks have been using. If you're driving down the road and you see a gas station that has-- well, I don't know what the thing is, but it's sort of a marquee, but small on the side of the road, and it will say buy kratom here. And I've always wondered what it was or what's going on there. So it's something that just seems to be sold at gas stations, but people use it recreationally for relaxation, I guess. And, obviously, we have a rich tradition in this country of allowing adults, in particular, to consume recreationally substances responsibly, if they so choose. And so there was a proposed bill this year that would have banned kratom. And I was opposed to that bill because I think banning things is the wrong way to go. I think regulating it is better. Regulation means that we can ensure that it is, it is what it says it is. So if somebody goes to a gas station and buys kratom after Senator Hallstrom's bill passes that they can be assured that it is whatever kratom is so that it is that substance as opposed to some other, you know, not kratom substance. And so I think that's, that's good, it's for health and safety, regulation for where it can be sold, age limitations, things like that are all, I think, reasonable constraints on this industry. And so I think LB3-- LB230 is a good approach to that. AM597 just fixes the fiscal impact to the General Fund so that we can enforce LB230 without having to pass a General Fund A bill which is otherwise we would have to do. So the reason-- with all of that in place, the reason that I have a bracket motion up and a reconsider, is that we are now at the stage of the Legislature, Day 46, so we're past the midway point where folks are starting to get nervous that bills that they care about or passionate about are not going to have an opportunity to be heard on the floor, are not going to have an opportunity to become law, and I respect and appreciate that feeling. I have several bills of my own that I feel that way about, that I don't think are going to get heard on the floor, are not

going to get an opportunity to be debated, are not going to get an opportunity to become law. I've worked on them. I'm passionate about them. But just because we're passionate about something, just because we've worked really hard on it, just because we really want it to become law, does not mean that we should change procedure, that we should attach bills that are not germane, that we should jam up bills with a whole lot of other bills, and that we shouldn't put controversial bills into noncontroversial bills. We have done that in the past and it has caused problems. I've talked about the good life districts. I've talked about the LB34 from the special session with the Property Tax Credit Fund. I think there were some bills out of Education that last session that folks are trying to change, I heard. But there have been many bills in the last couple of years. In 2023, when we Christmas treed up, we passed maybe 20 total bills, but we passed, you know, bills that were inside of those bills in, in the hundreds and people weren't able, clearly, if there's 20-some bills in a bill, they weren't able to make a determination about what they were actually voting on, whether they wanted to vote for something. It's called logrolling, right, where you are forced to vote for something you don't like because it's attached to something you do like. We've done that a lot in my time here, and it is generally a disfavored method of legislating. So the reason I put up these motions is to say we should not go down this path on this bill, but we should not go down this path on other bills. There is-- there have been bills we have attached on Select, a certain number of bills already for bills that were going from Select to Final, and it is a thing we do, but we should be very careful when we do it. We should limit it to noncontroversial bills. We should limit it to things that are very closely related. So things that passed the germaneness standard. We can talk about germaneness at some point if we really want to get into that conversation. But we should hold ourselves to a standard that we're not going to just pile up bills just because we really want to pass them. We should have bills move through the process, go to committee, have a hearing, be executed on, voted on the floor, and then get a priority at this stage to move forward and get debated. That's the way that the process should work. And then once something is voted out of committee and has a priority, it gets debated on General File, which is an 8-hour debate, and it gets debated as its own issue, not tied up with several other bills. Sometimes, yes, committee packages, which we had yesterday, was clearly a problem. The HHS Committee kicked out a bill that was so large that the introduction of it took 4 minutes, I think is what somebody said just to read off the title of the bill, that's a very long bill, has a lot in it. There was a lot of debate, just questioning the wisdom and putting all of those things

together. And that became an extended debate for that reason. And I think that is a good thing to do is to have people ask their questions, the criticisms of the individual parts. But it is hard when one person, say, Senator Dungan had an issue with one part of the bill and Senator McKinney had a problem with a different part of the bill, and they both had their times on the mic, and they got to talk to Senator Hardin, ask Senator Hardin questions about it. It kind of becomes a little confusing for those of us who are trying to wrap our minds around it, because then it's not a, a straight conversation about that bill, right? It's the "popcorning" around to different issues. And so keeping bills limited to their, their subject, their single subject, which is a constitutional requirement, but keeping bills to one subject makes it easier to for the Legislature to be clear about what we're doing, for those senators to understand what they're voting for, for people to make a determination about whether they're happy with their senator's vote or not. And it just makes it easier for us to make good law. If we're going to start piling a bunch of bills on Select File, because that's the last opportunity for that bill to move, we're going to make the same mistakes we've made in the past, which is pass things really quickly that then people regret having passed, and we're going to have to come back and fix it. And I know we're all excited about the prospect of coming back and being able to pass other laws again, but we should try and do it right the first time. Hi, kids. There's kids up on the balcony, for the record. So this is an opportunity right now. We can say, let's just pass Senator Hallstrom's bill as is with his cleanup amendment, and take every bill, meet every bill as it is, and not attempt-- not look at bills as an opportunity to sneak one by, not an opportunity to move something that wouldn't otherwise be moving. We should only be using, when we're putting bills together, they should be very much related, logically, consistently related to the underlying bill. And they should not be controversial, meaning that they shouldn't have a lot of opposition. Certainly, bills can have some opposition, and we can discuss what the merits of different oppositions are. But-- so right now we're on a motion to reconsider. So, of course, I would ask for your green vote when we get to that point, the motion to reconsider. And I would ask for your green vote on AM597. And, ultimately, the green vote on LB230, as currently amended. If we start amending it with other things, I might have a different position on whether or not we should turn LB230 into law. And I know I can talk about the specific amendments that are on here. I did have a conversation with Senator DeKay about his amendment, and he does feel strongly about it, and says that the folks who it, it seeks to regulate are looking for that bill. And he might have a very good argument. He has an argument

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

about why it would be germane to this bill, and that's fine, but we're trying to put 3 or 4 other bills onto this at this point in time, and maybe if we were only having conversation about Senator DeKay's bill, it'd be a different conversation. But the fact that we're trying to get more into this is one of the reasons we're going to have an extended conversation about this bill. And, again, if we continue-- if this is going to be the procedure this year,--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

J. CAVANAUGH: --have extended conversation about a lot of bills. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Storm would like to recognize some special guests, 53 fourth through sixth grade students from Mead Elementary School and some special guests there, Henry NyGrin, who's the nephew of Keisha Patent in Fiscal Analysis, and Grayder Girmus, grandson of former Senator Albrecht. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. All of you, please. Returning to the queue, Senator Spivey, you're recognized to speak.

SPIVEY: Thank you, Mr. President. And good morning, colleagues and folks, and folks watching online and our young people upstairs in the balcony. I rise in support of the reconsider MO94. And I really appreciate the conversation this morning and echo a lot of the sentiments of our colleagues. I do think having discussion is important as a body, and I appreciate the work that the committee has done on LB230. I did vote yes on LB230, and at this time with the bill as is, I would continue to still support LB230. I appreciate the amendment from Senator Hallstrom for AM597, and at this time would support that. And I think the discussion this morning is around the, the larger question around creating these packages of bills that are not as aligned to the intent of the introducer and what that bill seeks to do or accomplish, and then what we as a body then decide on and just push through or not. And as I was looking at the amendments that are to come, I have some concerns just around some of the penalties and criminalization that we're seeing in those amendments, some of the changes and definitions and, and it was drastic. And as Senator Cavanaugh mentioned, which I appreciate, there needs to be an opportunity for us as a body to grapple with some of the most-- or more complex pieces of legislation that we have forward. We have to ensure that the intent is not there, and just not package it into a bill that has a path forward because we want to just push through and get things done. I think that is important and, and part of our role. We were elected for a reason and we need to sit in those

conversations, we need to spend time debating and ensure that we are aligning to the best interests of the people that we are here to represent. I have said before, as a freshman senator, I really appreciate being able to critically think and, and challenge my colleagues and vice versa, that people can bring a different perspective. On the LR that Senator Hansen brought around senator pay, there was a really great debate and discussion around that and things that I did not think of. And I got to provide my point of view. And, again, that's how we, how we make the sausage, how we create really great legislation. And so I think circumventing that process to push things through is irresponsible, and that we could really be intentional about, again, how we are showing up for the people that we are set to represent and ensuring that we put forward the best policy, and that it aligns to being germane, that it aligns to the original intent of what we are here to do. And so, again, I appreciate the, the conversation this morning. I am in support of LB230 and AM597 as stands. I am not confident I can support with the proposed amendments to follow because of the criminalization, the, the major changes and drastic changes in definitions, and that I don't think it aligns to the original intent of the bill and what I thought my yes vote would be going to. And so I hope that folks punch in and we continue to have this conversation this morning, and I yield the rest of my time, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Strommen would like to recognize some special guests, 10 members, seventh and eighth graders from Platte Valley Christian School in Ogallala, and they are seated in the north balcony. If we could ask you to rise and be welcomed by your Nebraska Legislature. Returning to the queue, Senator Hansen, you are recognized to speak.

HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I wouldn't mind having just a brief discussion, since we're going to be on the microphone here for a while and everyone's going to be taking up time, about the use of rules in the whole process of legislating bills and moving things forward. And so I hear what Senator John Cavanaugh is saying, and the idea that he has a concern about our ability to move things forward and get to an amendment that he does not like. But the whole idea that somehow we are abusing the rules to get to something we want to get to is preposterous. Everybody uses the rules in a certain manner to move things forward that might benefit them or a bill that they want to get to in some way, shape, or form. Not uncommon at all. We've been doing it forever. If anybody's been here with Senator Ernie Chambers, they know the master of using the rules to take up time, which is what's happening here. They're using the rules to their advantage, which makes sense. I don't fault them for that. I wish we could kind of move

forward in a more kind of collegial manner. But they're using the rules to their advantage. Just like in some cases, others might use the rules to their advantage. But to get on the microphone here then and say, hey, look, look what they're doing. That's bad. I can't believe they're doing this. Think of the institution. But then they put 6 floor amendments on this amendment. They reconsider every vote. You call the house every time when you know everybody's here. You do a roll call vote. You take your time saying yea or nay. So every time anybody watching here, who may be unfamiliar with the whole process, any time you see somebody kind of trying to take up time and they start saying we want to bracket or we want to do a roll call vote, that's not legitimate. If you're doing a roll call vote on a bracket motion that only gets 4 votes, probably not the best motion to do in the first place, unless you're doing it to take up time. Which, again, I don't fault people for doing that. And then do a roll call vote every time. Every time you see that, that's people typically taking up time to not get to something down the road. But then don't you come along here and say, because we're trying to do something like call the question, that we're destroying the institution. That's ridiculous. Just recognize it for what it is. Move forward. And I'm fine with it. But the whole idea of, like, calling other people out for using the rules in a bad way, like we're bad people. Come on. And I hate to get on the microphone to even say this, but just want to call for what it is. And let's keep moving forward with the reconsider vote here and debate. I'm fine with that. So all right, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, again, I rise in favor of the motion to reconsider, in favor of the bracket motion, and also in favor of AM597 and LB230. I absolutely agree with Senator Hansen that the rules are the rules, and that's what we've all agreed to. And certainly we're all operating within the parameters of those rules. And I think that part of the points being made here today is a discussion about, I guess, what-- the way that we should proceed forward, not how we should proceed forward. So there's always this delineation between process and content. And I know sometimes we debate based on process, and we have a debate about how we're proceeding and what exactly we're doing to achieve certain ends or certain goals. But then there's also the content that we're discussing. I want to focus my discussion, I guess, on this time on the mic with regards to the content. Senator Hallstrom's bill, LB230, I think seeks to achieve a really valid goal and that is to embrace some regulatory structure. And I think it's a conversation that we as a body have been having as a whole as it pertains to a bunch of

different substances and, and different, I guess, practices. So this year in the Legislature, we're talking about a constitutional amendment with regards to online gambling. We're talking about CBD, hemp, delta-8, medical marijuana. There's all of these substances, alcohol taxes, there's all of these things that we are talking about how we, as a Legislature, can properly regulate them in a way to achieve the goal of allowing individuals to have the liberty to do as they see fit, while still ensuring safe consumer protection, and certainly ensuring that we as a state remain fiscally solvent. I think that Senator Hallstrom's bill, LB230, seeks to achieve that goal. And I appreciate Senator Hallstrom actually bringing that forward. I'll admit that prior to this session, I actually spoke with some individuals in the kratom or kratom industry with regards to questions they had about potential legislation for creating the framework with which to regulate the sale of kratom. And it seemed like a good idea to me, but unfortunately I, because of the rules, already had 20 bills, essentially, in the hopper that I'd been working on throughout the interim getting ready to introduce. And so I was unable to, to work on that issue. So I'm very appreciative of the fact that Senator Hallstrom picked up the mantle on that, and I think really led the charge on creating a good piece of legislation that came out of the committee, I believe-- I'm pulling up the committee statement here-- unanimously. Came out 8-0. The only opponents were a couple of individuals. I, I don't know whether or not their concerns were addressed early on, but my concerns, having read the bill, have been addressed. So as it stands, LB230, I think does achieve a good outcome, AM597 is kind of a cleanup. And so that's why I'm in favor of those. I have hesitations about some of the other amendments that are further down that are being added onto LB230, and I've spoken with some colleagues off the mic about this. And Senator Hansen is correct, we, we have kind of a, excuse me, a push and a pull with the rules of we always have to utilize the rules in such a way that achieves the goal of moving forward with the people's business, but you don't want to abuse the rules. I, I believe that adding things onto a bill on Select File is acceptable. I think we do that all the time, and I think that we embrace the notion that because we're limited in our time here in the Legislature, it sometimes serves the, the goal of helping the people to put some bills together. But it's nuanced, right? It's not an either or. It's not a binary. It's not either good or bad. You have to address each individual bill and the amendments that are on that bill in a manner where you can look at them, determine if it, it seeks to achieve the same goal, and whether you support that individual package, essentially, moving forward. In this circumstance on LB230, I have objections to one of, if not multiple

amendments that are further down, specifically, AM600 as I've said before, and as I've expressed respectfully to Senator Bosn, is a bill that had a lot of opposition, not just amongst members of the body, but also stakeholders in the community. And, again, for watchers of the Legislature, you'll know that that exact same bill was debated previously and was very contentious. And so whether or not one agrees that it should be contentious, the reality of the situation is that the amendment that is attached further down is contentious. It is one where there are objections and where reasonable minds can disagree, and it's one that I really do think should stand on its own, and certainly not attached to a bill that does not seek to achieve any of the same goals with increased penalties. It does not open up the same statute. And so I, I think that is where the, the crux of my objection comes from.

ARCH: Time, Senator.

DUNGAN: And so with that, I would encourage your yes vote on the motion to reconsider. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in continued support of LB230 and also support the amendment my friend Senator Hallstrom has filed as to the underlying bill, AM597. At this time, I also support the motions and the reconsideration, as the body needs to work through this contentious issue, both procedurally and substantively as well. And I want to commend Senator Hallstrom for bringing forward a commonsense regulatory approach to an emerging issue. I had the opportunity to watch most of the Judiciary hearing this day, and I think I even texted Senator Hallstrom during that and commended him for his regulatory approach in bringing forward this measure. I was happy to support this on General File and looked forward to it making its way throughout the process in the remainder of the session and being signed into law. I actually think a regulatory approach is a much sounder way to deal with other measures before the Legislature, such as in regards to the CBD regulatory measures that my friend Senator Cavanaugh has brought forward, rather than the bans that Senator Kauth and Senator Storm have prioritized and brought forward, for example. But I do want to talk about the concerns with many of the amendments that have been filed beyond Senator Hallstrom's amendments. They generally seek to create new crimes or to enhance existing crimes. And let's take a step back and make sure that we have the appropriate context. Friends, it's well-established that Nebraska has one of the most significantly

overcrowded prison systems in the country. Usually, we're toggling back and forth between our sister state of Alabama, and that still holds true today. Due to this incredible pressure on our state budget, due to the fact that we know mass incarceration is one of the most expensive, least effective ways to deal with societal problems, all 3 branches of government, prior legislatures have worked collaboratively with the Council of State Governments on justice reinvestment in 2015. They worked with the CJI folks in 2023. Go back and look at the reports. The reports show, clearly, creating new crimes, enhancing new crimes are the critical drivers in regards to mass incarceration and prison overcrowding, which is burdening our state budget. And our Corrections Department is growing at a faster rate than education and health care and infrastructure and other key critical priorities. Now, we also know from reading the CSG report, reading the CJI report, and even looking at the LB50 taskforce, which issued a report in November 2024, and members of this body are a part of, there is a consistent analysis over many years that says do not continue to create new crimes and enhance existing crimes that exacerbates prison overcrowding and mass incarceration. We also know, for example, that even though Nebraska has one of the most significantly overcrowded systems in the country, we also have a relatively small system population wise. That's why smart approaches like the one that Senator, my good friend Senator Holdcroft brought forward are so meaningful because if we're able to make small adjustments in terms of diversion on the front end through our problem-solving courts or prevention or otherwise, if we're able to make small, modest meaningful reforms on the back end to cut down on recidivism and help to advance our shared public safety goals, that can make a huge difference in solving our prison overcrowding and mass incarceration problem. And every expert that has looked at the Nebraska system has concluded the same. And the reason we need to have this analysis is so that cooler heads can prevail when measures that seek to increase crimes, create new crimes, enhance existing crimes come forward, because they do indeed have a cost, and they have been analyzed in regards to the broader criminal justice issues in Nebraska. I urge that members stop hanging ornaments on this Christmas tree, and I urge the body to be able to have an opportunity to move--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: --forward with Senator Hallstrom's bill and amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Everytime. And there's-- I have a plastic mat here, too. So I'm, like, you'd think, but everytime I shock myself. Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, you know, don't hate the players. Hate the game. Isn't that the saying? I, I don't mind people calling the question. I, I do agree that it's poor form to call the question when only 2 people have spoken in the entirety of the debate. But I don't mind people calling the question, especially if I'm the one taking time, because it takes time. I don't mind people calling the question. I don't mind people calling the house. I don't mind people doing the roll call vote. All of those things take time. And, and if that's what you're looking to do, then that's what you're going to do. And I've seen it happen in things that I agree with and things I disagree with. But, you know, I've actually only called the question-- I can't even-- I know I have called the question, but I think it was in my first Legislature biennium, and I was very nervous about doing it. And I only did it because we had been debating for several hours, and I was the only person in the queue that could call the question, so I did. And I was like, what do I do? And they said, you just say question. Nothing else? No, nothing else. You can't say anything else, just say question. And I was, like, OK. I've lost that timid side. But, no, I don't mind people doing that. I think, you know, the rules are the rules. Use the rules. When we had the discussion back at Legislative Council at the Innovation Campus in 20-- December of 2023, and there were massive rule changes being proposed, basically, in response to me. And the press asked me about it and they said, well, what are you, what do you think? What are you going to do? And I said, I'm going to use the rules. Whatever the rules are, I'll use them, I'll figure them out. So I'm cool with that. I do think that part of the intention here in using the rules is to preserve a bill that is, I think, pretty universally well received by this body from getting things attached to it that are more controversial. And that's our prerogative to do as well. And I'm going to vote for this bill, and I'm going to vote for this AM. But if things that I disagree with get attached to it, then I'm not. And I'm trying to preserve the bill in front of me to be something that I, I can continue to support. And there's no shame in doing that, and there's no shame in trying to attach things to a bill. But you got to, you know, it's, it's got to break your way, I guess, I don't know. So people can call the question and people can file motions and amendments. And we can all enjoy a cup of coffee down in the cafeteria together at the lunch break if we want. So I do appreciate, though, the conversation about, maybe more about how the bill packages are made, because we have had Christmas trees and things happen over the years that have led to some slipshod work. Most recently would have been in the special session when we passed LB3,

which turns out was unconstitutional. So that's fun. But we'll hear more about that during the budget process. But, yes, we did, in fact, during the special session pass a bill that was blatantly unconstitutional. So we're going to have to fix that or have a court case, I guess. Those are the options before us. I'm hoping that we will fix that through the Appropriations budget this year, so that we don't have to have a court case and court fees. And I did receive an inquiry from a reporter about federal funds to our state. And they asked about our deficit with federal funds with the cuts to Medicaid, etcetera--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Oh, OK.

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

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, again, colleagues, I rise in support of LB230, support of AM597, support of MO94, which is to reconsider MO-- the vote on MO93, which is the bracket till June 9. And so that's where I'm at. I-- to be clear, I don't think anybody is a bad person for using the rules or calling the question. And as the other Senator Cavanaugh just said, you know, everybody uses what they've got. You know, the rules are a tool. They're also a way to structure the way we interact with each other in debate. And using the rules is a fair and appropriate way to do things. I just was saying calling the question quickly is just, you know, not-- it's in poor taste. It's not a good idea. It does-- and it's not going to get the desired outcome. So my point was, if your desire is a certain outcome, that's not going to be the way to get there. And-- but, again, nothing wrong with using the rules. Everybody, if you're doing your job right here, at some point in time, you will need to use the rules. And I know that there's a certain set of us that uses the rules more than others. But I will tell you that in my time here, I have had folks who are in the philosophical majority come and ask me questions about how they can use the rules because they need to and they don't have to do it as much. And so it is in your interest to learn the rules. It is in your interest to use the rules when it serves you. And certainly there's nothing wrong with using the rules. I'm using the rules currently to structure this debate, to have a conversation about how-- well, one, what I think we should pass, and, two, how I think we should pass things. So on this bill, I think we should pass LB230 with AM597 and leave it at that. Let that go forward, start regulating the kratom, kratom industry-- got the case of the yips about how to pronounce it-- kratom, kratom, kratom industry and, and, and leave it

at that. And I don't think we should go down this path of adding controversial bills to a bill that was not controversial. And I've had a few questions about what's the distinction here? Right? So last year we passed a bill, I don't remember all what was in it, but it was some tax credits and I disagreed with some and I agree with others. And it was filibustered. And then, ultimately, we didn't actually take it to cloture. And so when we stopped taking it, when it was no longer being like a full filibuster and there were some amendments being put on it, that it was a controversial bill, obviously, it was already being filibustered on its own, I added a bill onto that bill that was not a controversial bill. So the distinction there was the underlying bill was controversial. The addition was not controversial. That is a distinct thing from a noncontroversial bill having a controversial bill added to it. Because my, my noncontroversial bill that was added was to help people buy diapers. Very popular bill. A lot of people liked it. Put that-- that bill got put into the package. And the controversial portion of that bill had something to do with reproductive health care that was, you know, funding of places that give some sort of advice that is not-- they don't recommend abortion or something like that. I don't remember exactly the specifics of what the, the credit did, but it was controversial and it was clear it had the votes. And so folks who were fighting it decided no longer to fight it. And so I proposed an amendment that was not controversial, that was germane, that was relevant on topic. And that is a distinction from here where we're talking about a noncontroversial bill, no opposition, got to this point, was going to fly by, but for controversial amendments that were put on it right before, you know, it was being put up or whatever, being put on it on Select. I guess I don't know when they were filed. So, again, nothing wrong with using the rules either side as long as we use them fair. And I think there's nothing wrong with being opposed to bills, and I think there's nothing wrong with advocating for bills that you support. I oppose a certain number of these amendments, but I also oppose us legislating in a way where we are just trying to hitch things onto stuff without full debate at every level and without having people have an opportunity to object. And so that's really the crux of my opposition to adding more bills on Select, especially controversial ones. I do think-- again, not opposed to adding bills on Select.

ARCH: Time, Senator.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: I would like to recognize some special guests. They are located in the north balcony. Students from TeenPact Leadership Schools in

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

Lincoln. Please rise students and be recognized, welcomed by your Nebraska Legislature. Returning to the queue, Senator McKinney, you are recognized to speak.

McKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of the motion to reconsider the bracket motion. Been listening to the conversation. Although I wasn't here physically, I've been listening, and it's an interesting conversation. I did support LB230 coming out of committee, and I supported it on General File. And I would support AM597. As been stated prior, you know, regulating some things are not always a bad thing, especially when some of these things could potentially have harmful effects and harmful impacts. So that's why I supported this bill, because I think there, there at times need to be guardrails in place to just protect the public and Nebraskans from, from things that could potentially be harmful. Then looking at the list of potential AMs on this, I supported-- I believe I supported Senator DeKay's bill, the nitrous oxide bill, to, to that. I don't think I supported Senator Riepe's-- I don't know if I voted no, but I know for sure I didn't support it. And the other one, Senator Bosn's bill, I'm for sure I voted no. And if all of those were attached, I would then become a no vote on this bill. Because, in my opinion, the bill wouldn't be in its spirit that I originally supported it for. And there would be things that-- there would be a thing or things attached to it that I couldn't support. And that's why I'm standing up. I think LB230 as introduced and with AM597 is a decent bill. And, you know, is aiming to do the right things. I know Senator Hallstrom, Hallstrom has had some bills that I've stood up against multiple times this year, but I'm really not standing up against LB230. It's really in support of it. So it's kind of opposite of my prior stances on some of his bills. It's to stand up for this bill and stand up and say, let's keep this bill clean and get it across the finish line as a clean bill. That's why I'm standing up. I know at times we all try to get our bills attached to things, and I probably will do the same as some people might say yes, and some people might say, no, Senator McKinney, I don't think that's a good idea. I'm not going to support it. And we have that fight and we have that conversation because as Senator Hansen stated, the rules are the rules, and as long as the rules are the rules, I'm going to try to play the rules to my advantage as much as possible, because that's our job as senators is to use the, the rules to our advantage for our constituents. And I, and I also think that's what, you know, my other colleagues are trying to do, utilize the rules with amendments to get their bills across the finish line. And that's all fair. It's all part of the game. So it is what it is. And this motion to reconsider is a part of the game as well. It's a part of the rules,

it's what we agreed upon once we came back into this session. So that's why we're here. So, honestly, let's just keep LB230, LB230 with the AM to, I guess, it does to pay for language or whatever to make sure, like, it's coming from a fund. And that's, that's cool. But if certain things do get attached to this bill, I definitely will not be voting for this bill. And that's just me. That's Senator McKinney. Some others might still vote for it and some might not. But that's where I stand on this and thank you.

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

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I again rise in favor of the motion to reconsider and in favor of AM597 and LB230. For those watching at home, the reason I say that every time is just to make sure it's clear on the record where we fall on that. And I think sometimes people get frustrated if they think we're not talking about what's on the board. But I do want to situate the conversation as to what's on the board. I want to echo a lot of the sentiments that were just made by Senator McKinney. I've said them before, but that I do think there are a number of things about this bill that are positive. And certainly there are some that I think are problematic. I was wondering if Senator Hallstrom would be willing to yield to just a couple of general questions about this bill.

ARCH: Senator Hallstrom, will you yield?

HALLSTROM: Yes.

DUNGAN: Static electricity there? Senator Hallstrom, I, I have had a chance to read the bill, but I was just curious, could you clarify for me, are there any criminal penalties that are implicated with the bill, LB230, as it's currently written?

HALLSTROM: I do not recall that there were any criminal penalties in the bill that is before us, LB230.

DUNGAN: And that's, that's my understanding as well. I don't think it actually imposes any additional criminal penalties. With AM597, does that also then impose any additional criminal penalties or enhancements?

HALLSTROM: No, that is simply a, a transfer of funds from another fund that will allow us to eliminate the need for an A bill on LB230.

DUNGAN: And I always appreciate-- yeah, being able to get rid of the A bill is always helpful. And then to the best of your knowledge, does

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

anything in LB230 or then the AM597 that's on the board open up the Controlled Substances Act in the way that some other amendments or bills do?

HALLSTROM: I don't know the entirety of the Controlled Substances Act, I think there is perhaps one, Chapter 28. I can't remember whether that was because of the amendment or the original bill. I'd have to look at that, Senator Dungan.

DUNGAN: OK, thank you very much, Senator Hallstrom. And I, I appreciate him answering questions about that. The reason I bring that up is I just want to be clear that when we're talking about amendments to different bills, as I said earlier, I think there is, oftentimes, some nexus that can be drawn between amendments, especially on Select File and the underlying bill. But I do think there needs to be some connection between what you're talking about doing with the amendments and what the underlying bill does in the broader sense. And, clearly, the AM that we're talking about here today, without talking about it, is the AM600, which is again filed by Senator Bosn, which was her LB6, which is down the line trying to be attached to LB30 [SIC]. And in that bill, what you see is an enhanced penalty, and you see an opening up of some criminal statutes that are not really touched by LB230 or AM597. And I think that that's where part of the objection here comes from. It's not to say they both don't deal with substances or things like that, but when you're talking about whether or not there is, in fact, the rational relationship between an amendment and the underlying bill, I think it's good to look towards what they seek to do and, and what parts of statute they open up simply because they both deal with issues from the Judiciary, to me, does not mean that they should be attached. This is not a conversation necessarily at this juncture about whether it can be attached, it's a conversation of should. And I think the ongoing objection that myself and others have highlighted is that when you're talking about a bill like LB6 or AM600, as it's now filed on this, on this as an amendment, it doesn't matter, I guess, whether you think it should be objectionable or not. It's whether or not it is going to cause drag on the bill. And, clearly, everybody I think who has spoken thus far is in favor of LB230, and I'm fairly certain everybody who has spoken so far is in favor of AM597. And so I guess the, the problem that I see with this is the attachment of this anchor of AM600 down the line, which ultimately could bog down an otherwise good bill that, frankly, I think should proceed. We do have a number of other issues on the agenda today, and I know that those are probably going to roll over into tomorrow. The Speaker had indicated earlier this week that we are done essentially with worksheet order, meaning I think from here on

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

out, the vast majority of bills we're going to take up are committee priorities, Speaker priorities or individual priorities or, hopefully, consent calendar. And I do anticipate there will be a number of amendments on those bills. I'm not opposed to amendments getting attached on General File, on Select File, and maybe even in some rare circumstances, pulling back from Final Reading to Select. But it's the content of those that I think is important to talk about, and the one that we are discussing with regards to AM600--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

DUNGAN: --is the one I have an objection to. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. And, again, good morning, colleagues. I just wanted to draw the body's attention to the LB50, Nebraska Sentencing Reform Task Force Report, which was published in November of 2024. And, again, there's input and participation and membership from a variety of different stakeholders in the criminal justice space, prosecutors, public defenders, policymakers. I believe the Attorney General's Office was involved as well. I believe law enforcement was involved as well. And as part of the modest but meaningful criminal justice reforms that Senator Wayne eschewed through the body with LB50, there was also an agreement that all stakeholders would continue to study and would continue to talk about additional criminal justice reforms, and that includes revisiting or taking a look at our criminal sentencing structures, and that's for a bunch of different reasons. We-- it's no surprise to anyone that Nebraska pushed forward against the data, against the analysis, with building and committing hundreds of millions of dollars to build a massive new prison, which will be at or near capacity the day it opens its doors and does little, if anything, to address our criminal justice challenges in Nebraska. So the 20-- the November 2024 Report from the LB50 Task Force shows us where we are today. The system overall is at about 145% of capacity. Different facilities have different levels of overcrowding: CC-- Community Corrections Lincoln, 126%; Community Corrections Omaha, 192%; NCCW, 113%; NCYF, just below 100%, that's our youth facility; Nebraska State Penitentiary, 153%; OCC, 196% of capacity; RTC, 167% of capacity; Tecumseh, 107% of capacity; and the Work Ethic Camp at almost 200% of capacity. The recommendations in the report from a variety of consultants and leaders in the criminal justice space have been clear that unless Nebraska commits to criminal justice reform, it's not build 1 new prison, friends, it's build 2. And massive new prisons cost hundreds

of millions of dollars. And you're in a budget deficit of your own creation. So unless you get serious about sentencing reform, you're committing to a path that is the least effective, most expensive way to deal with societal challenges. And you're committing to a path which taxes Nebraska taxpayers to death to fuel mass incarceration and racial injustice. And you just need to be clear about that. You know, a few days ago, we had an opportunity to connect with former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. He was in Nebraska to talk about a host of different policy issues. I attended that event, and I asked that-- I thanked the Speaker for working together with a diverse group of stakeholders back in 2017, when he used his voice to fight for smart criminal justice reform, which is a powerful right-left coalition. And the Speaker weighed in and at that point in time was helping to abolish or reform mandatory minimums for nonviolent offenses. And he asked me how criminal justice reform was going in Nebraska today. And I said not that great. And I explained to him where we were at, and he said, you know, our way actually makes people safer. And I said, yes, Mr. Speaker, I do know. Smart criminal justice reform actually advances our, our shared public safety goals, but continually creating new crimes, continually enhancing new penalties without any meaningful, smart justice reform is a burden on the--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: --taxpayers and is a burden on society. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

STORER: Thank you, Mr. President. I apologize, when I was in the queue earlier, I was over in an exec meeting, so I jumped back in and I'm going to, I'm going to just take a minute. I think it's important, as we sit here in the Nebraska Legislature in the state of Nebraska that we acknowledge that today, Tuesday, March 18, is National Ag Day. So for, for just a moment, please take a moment, thank a farmer, thank a rancher. We are-- and I'm going to brag just very briefly about my-- the industry that my husband and I have been in for 4 generations, which is the beef industry. And, again, District 43 of which I represent, proud to say top 2 cow counties in the nation. And Nebraska leads the nation in every aspect of the cattle industry. I think that's something that we need to continue to focus on and be very aware of. So when you go sit down and have that beautifully marbled steak, which, by the way, the marbling comes from the corn fed to those animals in a very skilled environment, remember, remember the folks that are out calving out the calves today, feeding and getting

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

those livestock to, to harvest so you can enjoy Nebraska beef. With that, I would like to yield the remainder of my time to Senator Bosn.

ARCH: Senator Bosn, 3 minutes, 30.

BOSN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues, I have heard the cries for me to pull my amendment. It is not an anchor, it's a great bill so I won't concede that. But I will-- I have let the front know that I am pulling my amendment. I expect fully that all of those who were crying over my bill to go up and pull all of their amendments in good faith so we can move forward with the bill that everyone has talked about how great it is, Senator Hallstrom's bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ARCH: Returning to the queue, Senator Spivey-- Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I appreciate Senator Bosn's comments. I've been talking with a few folks about the amendments. It sounds like we may be close to a point where we're ready to move on, but I just-- I'm trying to talk with everybody who has expressed a interest and concern about the amendments on this bill and to see where we're at. So I'll probably take a few more minutes if there are other folks in the queue or who wanted to talk to see if we could get ourselves to a point where we're ready to move on. Because, as I said, I guess I should start out with I support LB230, AM597, and if we are taking off the amendments that are causing drag on this bill, whether you like them or like the bill or not or the amendments, it's true that that's the drag. But if we're taking those off, we may be able to move onto some other bills. I think that we've had a good conversation about procedure here, and I think it is important that we continue to hold up our end of the, you know, our obligation to make sure that the law, the bills we pass are the best we can, and that we can get them in the best shape that we can, even on Select File. So I'm going to go have a few more conversations with folks and see if we can get to a point where we can maybe move onto some other amendments. So I'm going to yield the remainder of my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, you're recognized to speak. Senator Dungan, you're recognized to speak.

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. I, I appreciate Senator Bosn's comments, and I appreciate that there's been, I think, a real dialogue going on here today. Just to echo what Senator John Cavanaugh had just said, I think there's maybe just a couple of other conversations that

are happening. So I'm not-- I think this is my last time on the mic on this motion to reconsider. So I just want to take a few moments to say that I do genuinely appreciate the back and forth that's been going on here today. I know Senator Hallstrom had some bills earlier in this session that had a little bit of drag, and so I've spoken with him off the mic a number of times to reiterate this is not certainly personal. I've also spoken to Senator Bosn and reiterated that this is certainly not personal about her. This is part of our job, and it's our job as legislators to have these conversations with regards to things that we do or don't support, and utilize the debate process to get to different subjects and make sure that we fully understand what it is that we are putting onto bills. I think the underlying notion of LB230 is a positive one. I think the underlying notion of AM597 is positive. I'll admit that I've not had as much time to dive into Senator Riepe's amendment and Senator DeKay's amendment, but I do understand that they both seek to achieve different goals outside of kratom. But I do think that they seem a little bit more, I guess, similar to maybe what we're talking about here, but I'm not entirely sure. So I think there might be some more questions that people have about that. But I do appreciate Senator Bosn's willingness to continue working with the body. I think as chair of the Judiciary Committee, she has obviously a lot on her plate right now, and I, I think that this has been a good conversation for us all to have. So I appreciate her willingness to continue these discussions both on and off the mic. And I would encourage my colleagues to continue to engage or pay attention to what we debate on this bill. And my hope is that we're able to move forward here shortly with some more of the people's business. So with that, I will yield the remainder of my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak. This is your third opportunity.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues, really enjoying the activity and the debate and deliberation in the Chamber today. It's actually one of my favorite parts of legislating when everybody really has a chance to focus on and sharpen the issues, both from a procedural perspective and a substantive perspective. And you see the energy in the Chamber and the discussions are rich, and it really reinvigorates collaborative approaches to getting through the bills on our agenda and pays great dividends in regards to the work that we have before us as well. So I appreciate Senator Bosn's leadership and making a hard call in regards to her amendment. And goodness knows, I have been in her shoes many times on this floor, and it is never particularly pleasant or fun when you are working hard and in good faith to find avenues to move forward bills that you care

deeply about and have brought forward for legitimate purposes. But I appreciate her leadership and graciousness in regards to taking the tenor of where we are in the debate and figuring out the best way to move forward. Looking at the other amendments filed, again, I think Senator Hallstrom's underlying bill is good, his amendment is good. And, friends, remember what LB230 is. It's a civil regulatory system for kratom, and that's the appropriate lens that we should take to advance consumer health and safety in regards to these emerging issues. There are not criminal penalties in regards to LB230 or the related amendment. When you look at my friend Senator DeKay's amendment that is later down on this measure, it also takes, I believe, a similar approach in regards to general, general, a general regulatory approach in terms of some aspects of, I think, what certain retailers can provide or not provide in regards to certain substances. I completely appreciate, and so I don't have a major objection to that. I think it's germane. I think it doesn't touch upon the larger aspects of criminal justice reform. And I'm looking at what my friend Senator Riepe has filed as well. Substantively, I don't have a significant concern about the measure that Senator Riepe is trying to attach here, even though I am trying to get up to speed and learn more about it, because I didn't have a chance to watch that hearing in great detail. But I do think that perhaps that amendment might be misplaced from LB230, which is a civil regulatory measure to advance consumer protection. And I understand that Senator Riepe has brought forward his measure also to try and keep the public safe in regards to what he sees and has identified as some unregulated substances that, that might be out there. But I believe his measure really touches upon and is grounded in a criminal justice approach. And so I think that perhaps Senator Riepe's measure, which it doesn't seem like there's a significant amount of opposition to for a variety of different reasons, may be ill placed within LB230. So I want to have an opportunity to learn a little bit more of that, perhaps work with Senator Riepe and others to find another vehicle that does indeed open up the criminal law statutes more specifically that would vitiate or alleviate the germaneness issues that we've been talking about in regards to this bill and related amendments today. Just for the sake of consistency and moving forward, I think that may be a better approach. Now we're also a bit constrained for time, not just because we have adjournment in an hour, but we're having this debate on Select File, which is another perhaps hard lesson to learn together in loading up a measure that sailed through General File, now at Select File, when we only have 4 hours of the debate, and we haven't perhaps had an opportunity to see if there are other vehicles available--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: --to accomplish the same ends. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Jacobson would like to recognize some special guests, 26 fourth grade students from Sutton Elementary in Sutton, Nebraska. They are located in the north balcony. Students, if you would stand up and be recognized by your Legislature. Returning to the queue, Senator Guereca, you're recognized to speak.

GUERECA: Thank you, Mr. President. I have kind of been trying to speak all day, but have been running around, so I-- oddly, the comment I wanted to say the first time punched in is the comment that, that I'll say now is that we're a deliberative body, we're an institution that has rules. And what I wanted to say at the beginning is we're a deliberative body. Let's, let's have discussions. Let's, let's be thoughtful in representing the interests of our constituents. And I think that's what we saw today. We, we had discussions, sometimes a little more animated than other times. But we used the, the rules of this institution to, to come to some sort of a consensus, some sort of governance. So, truly, I commend all of us for being willing to have those discussions, to be willing to debate on the mic, to have conversations off the microphone, to come to a point where, where we think we're moving forward, we're able to, to govern. And, you know, this-- that's the beauty of the Nebraska legislator. And I just wanted to highlight that. And with that, I'll yield the rest of my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

JUAREZ: Thank you, Speaker Arch. I appreciate having a few minutes to speak with my colleagues today. For me, it's already been a rough week, and today is only Wednesday-- Tuesday. Thank you. That even makes it even more worse. It feels longer. So first of all, I wanted to make a comment in regards to my bill that I was trying to select as my priority. That, of course, ended up getting squashed due to the federal threat that we had on our funds in the state of Nebraska. And, of course, being a freshman senator, I-- you know, I really-- it was really a tremendous setback for me. And, again, these are all new experiences. And I'm definitely going to learn from the action that was taken. And I think the hardest part for me was reading in the article about how the governor was pleased by that end result, and I would just like to remind my colleagues that, you know, when you're eating everyday at home or eating this summer and think about the food on your plate, and if it was provided by the efforts of our

immigrants. I am not going to back off on this bill. It's just temporary delayed. And then last night, when we were speaking about the DEI issues that were brought forward in a bill, again, it was very difficult for me trying to understand these ramifications that are happening with the perspective of wanting to do away with DEI in our colleges. I definitely think that it is going to be a tremendous setback that we-- like, obviously, we're not going to realize it immediately, but down the road, I think it's going to bring negative consequences. And I appreciated all the speakers that came to support us, and I am not-- I am in favor of LB230 and do agree with having it go to bracket on June 9 and, I guess, we'll see what will happen, but I will yield the rest of my time. Thank you.

ARCH: Senator DeBoer, you are recognized to speak. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized to speak.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to avoid touching this so that I don't get shocked again. I, really, at this point don't have much to say, but I know that there are some conversations happening, so I wanted to get in the queue so that those could finish up because I believe we are coming to an agreement as the 2 different sides, I guess, on some of the pending amendments. So if anybody else wants to get in the queue, that hasn't gone 3 times. Actually, how many times have I spoken? Is this my third?

ARCH: This is your second.

M. CAVANAUGH: Oh, great. I guess I can get back in the queue then. Fantastic. Well, I have been using this time. I told Senator Hallstrom-- well, first of all, I feel bad. It's not personal. I feel bad that, like, I've talked on every single one of his bills. At least I consistently have spoken on your bills. But this is a bill that I like. I appreciate it and I'm voting for it. But I have been taking this time to go through the HHS priority bill and-- section by section to look at all of the things that are in there. So that's been helpful. And just seeing-- I've been-- on the sheet that we got yesterday, I've been going through and I've been putting X's next to the things that I don't like and putting checkmarks next to the things that I do like. And there are things that I am putting checkmarks next to. So it's not, like, I hate it all, but I do hate how the bill is being presented. So I am just going to grab my laptop for a second so I can talk about this bill. So one of the things that I like to do, I'm going to just take this opportunity to let you all know how you can be more informed on floor debate. So what I would-- what I normally do on a bill that I wasn't in the hearing, which this one I

wasn't in the hearing, is I go to the online comments to see what some of the online comments are. So for people who are wondering if you-- when you put, put your online comments in, if anybody ever reads them. Yes, I read them. I might not read all of them when there's, like, 1,000 on the bill, but I do read the online comments. I do see that other people are in the queue, so I'm going to get out and get back in so that I don't have to speak back to back. And now I'm back in, I don't know, maybe-- I look around, like the queue is-- it's an interesting thing. Now I'm in. I'm not in. OK. We'll figure it out. I've taken myself out several times. OK. Just so you know up front, I'm out of the queue trying to put myself back in the queue. Thank you. OK. Technology is fun. OK, so there are 17 proponents and 3 opponents and 1 neutral for this bill. And a lot of them-- the proponents are talking about-- I actually am not really familiar with kratom, kratom. Now, I've got the yips, Senator John Cavanaugh. Gosh darn it. OK, I'm going to see what the opponents had to say. The prevention director-- we would prefer kratom be added to the list of controlled substances in attempting-- instead of attempting to regulate it. Ah, I see. Yeah, well, as we've seen, legalizing other substances and commercializing them leads to big industry gaining over-- well, I, I mean, I can understand that. I, I guess this is where my libertarian spirit kind of comes into play that, like, if people want to smoke something and they're of legal age, I mean, I guess go ahead. I-- it's as long as you're not blowing it in my face or in a restaurant, I'm not really particularly concerned about what people are doing in their own lives. So I try to be consistent about that and just stay out of it.

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: Senator Sanders would like to recognize some special guests, they are from Leadership Bellevue, 13 members from Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, and they are located in the north balcony. Please rise and be recognized and welcomed by your Legislature. Returning to the queue, Senator DeBoer, you are recognized to speak.

DeBOER: Good morning, colleagues. I'm sorry about missing my opportunity on the mic a few minutes ago, I was trying to work on some aspects of the bill. I wanted to kind of give a general overview about what we're hearing in the Judiciary Committee about the sorts of things that, that this bill is addressing. When Senator Hallstrom brought LB230, part of the reasoning he brought it for was because what we're seeing is a lot of substances that are traditional that

have been used, like kratom, I believe is a kind of tea that has been used in Southeast Asia, I believe. And some of these other substances that we are seeing include-- including this Tianeptine and some others, they're naturally occurring sort of traditional versions are what we're hearing in the testimony helpful, supplemental type things. It's when they're concentrated through a process that does not respect their natural tendencies, that we get these kind of synthetic versions that are much more powerful and can be detrimental to folks. And it's the conflating of the natural with the synthesized that has caused some concerns in our committee when folks come in and say, you know, we don't want these substances to be readily available, but that is kind of conflating the types of substances there, which is why these regulatory schemes are the best form, because the traditional version is not problematic. It has supplemental benefits. Folks, you know, believe them. They-- I can't say that they are tested by the FDA or anything like that because, of course, they haven't been. But they're, they're substances that are traditionally used and are reported to have benefits. But when they are put through a process concentrated and made into a synthetic version of themselves, that's problematic. Now Senator DeKay has a nitrous oxide bill, that obviously is not a synthetic in the same sense, but nitrous oxide does have uses, just shouldn't be inhaled or however it's ingested to be a, a drug basically. And so I asked Senator DeKay to put in an exception, because I have a dispensing device where you put whipping cream into this device, you put a little nitrous oxide cartridge on it, and it makes the spray cream like you can buy premade in the store, but this is you just make it yourself. It's a lot cheaper, and you don't have to throw away all the, the red and white cans. So what he did is he put an exception in to make that work. He expanded-- you can't-- his original bill said it was only for certain places that if you sold this stuff, it was bad. He expanded to everywhere. Makes sense if it's, you know, not legal to sell in one place, it shouldn't be illegal, you know, legal to sell in another place. But then he made sure about accepting those sort of specific culinary uses, and then these others, which are clearly not for culinary purposes based on the amount and several things like that. So what we have with Senator DeKay is a well-crafted bill that is keeping the things in that we want to keep in, and keeping the things out that we want to keep out. So that's, that's what we're working on here. So I am in favor of the DeKay bill. I'm in favor of the Hallstrom bill. The Tianepine bill, which is the bill that Senator Riepe is trying to attach here on Select File, perhaps needs to go through all 3, all 3 parts of debate, all 3 readings. And, therefore, I think it may be best added to a different, a different bill. I was a not voting out of committee

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

because I still needed more information, because there was a significant amendment that was made between the, the hearing and when we were voting on it in committee. So that's why I was not voting and I still would say that I probably would like some time to look through it.

ARCH: Time, Senator.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator John Cavanaugh, seeing no one left in the queue, you're recognized to close on your reconsider motion.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, colleagues, for the conversation. We've been scrambling to get things in order to a place where everybody's comfortable. But I think we are about there, so I'm going to withdraw my motion to reconsider at this time. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Without objection, so ruled.

CLERK: I have nothing further on AM597, Mr. President.

ARCH: Colleagues, the question before the body-- oh, excuse me, Senator Hallstrom, you're recognized to close on AM597.

HALLSTROM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I respect the discussion that we've had today. I don't appreciate the result. Senator Bosn had a good bill. I'm not sure what we're going to do with Senator Riepe's amendment yet. It'd be disappointing if that is withdrawn as well. But we will find another venue if that is the case. And I fully believe that Senator Bosn's bill will rise again like the Phoenix. So we'll have another opportunity to discuss that issue as well. I do want to note Senator Cavanaugh, John, in his opening remarks, said some of us respect the institution. I don't know who us is. I profoundly respect this institution. That's the reason I'm standing here rather than somewhere else. No place I'd rather be. And I don't think that the fact that we're moving to amend bills on Select File has anything to do with any of our respect for the institution. With that, I would ask that AM597 be adopted, we move onto other measures on this bill, and then advance LB230 as amended. Thank you.

ARCH: Colleagues, the question before the body is the adoption of AM597. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

CLERK: 37 ayes, 0 nays and the adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

ARCH: AM597 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Bosn has AM600 with a note that she would withdraw.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: In that case, Mr. President, Senator DeKay would move to amend the bill with AM689.

ARCH: Senator DeKay, you're recognized to open on AM689.

DeKAY: Thank you, Mr. President. I want to first thank Senator Hallstrom for giving me the go ahead to at least attempt to put AM689 onto his bill as a vehicle. AM689 is my bill LB184, what is otherwise known as a nitrous oxide retail sale ban bill. LB184 represents an effort to try to put more guardrails in place as it pertains to the retail sale of nitrous oxide propellant products, sometimes known as whippets. Nitrous oxide, also known as laughing gas, is one of the most popular drugs used worldwide according to research from the UK-based Global Drug Survey. Nationally, there is a growing trend of nitrous oxide propellant products being sold in vape stores, kratom dispensaries, smoke shops across the country, including in Nebraska. One such product is known as Galaxy Gas, which is marketed under the guise of making whip cream. I've handed out pictures of, of what this is. This picture was taken earlier this session at a vape store in Nebraska, courtesy of Senator Hughes. Those are 1-liter canisters, which is on the small end for this type of product. They can come in 2-liter, 3-liter, 4-liter, or larger size canisters as well. The manufacturers of these canisters say that this product is intended exclusively for culinary use for flavored whipped cream, but these colorful and bright packages, largish canister size, food flavoring, and quotes like 99.9 pure nitrous oxide demonstrates a deliberate effort to encourage misuse of their product by minors. I have yet to find a flavored nitrous oxide propellant product at a Walmart or Hy-Vee, but I can tell you these products are currently in certain vape shops, kratom dispensaries, and other similar retailer establish-- establishments like some liquor stores here in Nebraska. At the public hearing, Sarah Linden, founder and the owner of Generation V, a regional vape shop chain, testified in support of the measure and provided technical support testimony to the Judiciary Committee. She testified that the flavored nitrous oxide propellant

products, like those produced by Galaxy Gas, should not be on the market because such products are being marketed to minors and have no real use other than to get people high. Approximately 44 states have enacted laws relating to nitrous oxide and other similar inhalants, whether to regulate possession, sell, or distribution. However, in Nebraska, the sale and use of nitrous oxide pretty much is unregulated outside the medical industry. LB184, as amended by AM229, would put guardrails in place here in Nebraska. It would create an outright retail sale ban of flavored nitrous oxide products like Galaxy Gas in the state, whether it be sold in physical storefronts or online. For reference, I borrowed the language Senator Hughes created in the last biennium to crack down on online vape sales. The penalty for retailers would include misdemeanor charges and civil fines if they are found selling these flavored nitrous containers. LB184, as amended, also creates a limited retail sale ban on nonflavored nitrous oxide products with exemptions for medical, industrial, automotive, and culinary use. This is to make clear that vape shops, liquor stores, kratom dispensaries, gas stations, and similar establishments are not just selling nitrous oxide products to get people high. If you want to buy your whipped cream at a gas station, and there are some nice gas stations and truck stops that do that, you can still buy that product under this amendment, you just would not be able to buy a 4-liter canister of flavored nitrous oxide at a gas station or a vape shop. I did work extensively with the Nebraska Grocers Association, Nebraska Retail Federation, and Nebraska Petroleum, Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store Association to make sure LB184 would not inadvertently ban the sale of whipped cream, spray cheese, or similar products. I do want to reiterate again that LB184, as amended, is a retail sale ban on flavored nitrous oxide. LB184 does not deal with the possession of nitrous oxide. Additionally, LB184 does not add nitrous oxide to controlled substances list. All the penalties would be against the retailers, which the groups I just mentioned worked with me on to get an agreement on the penalties. LB184 was heard on January 23 and was reported out of Judiciary Committee on a unanimous 8-0 vote. There was 1 proponent at the hearing, Sarah Linden, on behalf of Generation V. There were no opponents to the bill, and I would appreciate a green vote on AM689. With that, I would yield the balance of my time to Senator Hughes if she would like it. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Hughes, 4 minutes, 40.

HUGHES: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Senator DeKay. I just wanted to be really quick and stand up that-- thanking Senator DeKay for bringing this, this was something that was brought to my attention. I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

went with the Department of Revenue, we visited 3 stores here in Lincoln, different vape stores, just because of my interest in vape regulation and, and that. And so we went to 3 different stores. And I was so surprised to see very large canisters of flavored laughing gas, essentially, mango, banana, all different flavors for sale along with a multitude of vape products and other things. And Senator DeKay and I had a conversation about that. And, and then he brought this legislation, and I appreciate his work with the industry and for the legitimate uses, uses of this for whipped cream and things like that. So the-- there-- he did hand out a picture in the body that I took at a vape store, actually in Seward, showing the, the, the big canisters of flavored vape. So, again, I appreciate this. I will absolutely support this bill. And thank you, Chair. I yield the rest of the time.

ARCH: Seeing no one left in the queue, Senator DeKay, you're recognized to close on AM689. Senator DeKay waives close. Question before the body is the adoption of AM689 to LB230. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

ARCH: AM689 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Riepe would move to amend the bill with AM577.

ARCH: Senator Riepe, you're welcome to open on your amendment.

RIEPE: Thank you, Mr. President. Before I start, I would like to express my extreme appreciation to Senator Hallstrom for agreeing to allow this germane amendment. I introduced amendment AM577 to LB230, which incorporates the provisions of LB475, a bill advanced by the Judiciary Committee with an amendment. This amendment addresses a growing public health concern by adding Tianeptine to Schedule II of the Nebraska Controlled Substances Act, and includes an emergency clause to ensure immediate enforcement. Tianeptine, often called gas station heroin, is an unregulated drug marketed as a cognitive enhancer under brand names like Salza Red and Neptune's Fix. However, in higher doses it acts as an opioid antagonist, leading to severe addiction, withdrawal symptoms, and overdose risk. Poison control centers across the country have reported a dramatic rise in cases, and at least 11 states have already banned or regulated this substance. Of those, roughly 5 have-- it has a Schedule II, the rest in Schedule I. I've opted for Schedule II since it-- since in Nebraska, that's where opioid antagonists are located, like hydrocodone, morphine or codeine,

which still have a medical use but are easily abused substances. Schedule I is, by and large, composed of your harder street drugs like meth, heroin, and fentanyl. This substance has fallen through the cracks of federal oversight. It is neither FDA approved for pharmaceutical use in the U.S., nor controlled by its addictive and destructive properties. As a result, states have been forced to take action. This amendment is before us today because of a constant-- constituent whose son struggles with addiction, including a Tianeptine-- including Tianeptine. He was shocked to discover that it is legal-- legally sold in Nebraska without restriction. During the Judiciary Committee, we heard from a mother who lost her son to Tianeptine in Florida. Although her tragedy occurred out of state, my state-- staff independently confirmed that Tianeptine is available in Omaha shops. While the Nebraska State Forensic Lab has not yet identified it in reports, it is only a matter of time before we see cases here. We have a unique opportunity to act now and prevent this issue from escalating in Nebraska. By placing Tianeptine in Schedule II, this amendment ensures it is strictly controlled, aligning it with substances that have limited medical use but a high potential for abuse. The emergency clause is necessarily-- necessary to immediately halt its unregulated sale and to make it consistent with the underlying bill. Senator Hallstrom has agreed to this amendment. Again, I appreciate his support and ensuring Nebraskans take a proactive action. AM577 allows us to address this issue efficiently and get ahead of the problem before it worsens. I, I urge your green vote on AM577 and the underlying bill of LB230. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Riepe, you're recognized to close, and Senator Riepe waives close. Question before the body is the adoption of AM577 to LB230. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

ARCH: AM577 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, next item.

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

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB230 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB230 advances. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB290. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

ARCH: Senator Clements, you are recognized to speak.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. I was not here when LB290 was debated the first time, I was excused, and haven't heard the debate about this, and I would have some questions about what are the changes here. Would Senator McKinney yield to a question?

ARCH: Senator McKinney, will you yield?

McKINNEY: Yes. Thank you.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Senator McKinney. Regarding the change in the area where this money can be spent, where is this new area?

McKINNEY: It's literally pretty much in the same geographic area. It's just allowing for a slight flexibility, it's still in the Inland Port Authority area. It's not moving across town or anything. It's in the same vicinity.

CLEMENTS: Is it going outside the 2-mile area? Is that why it needs to be changed?

McKINNEY: It-- yes, yes, but there's a reason. So where the project is currently slated to be constructed, since then, there's been some issues with one of the phases dealing with a lot of, like, land and environmental issues, which kind of makes it potentially unviable. So the, the, the Port Authority and the grantees would like some flexibility to potentially look at other locations within the same geographic area around the same, same areas. That's all.

CLEMENTS: Is this changing the board or the people that are--

McKINNEY: No.

CLEMENTS: --having authority over the project?

McKINNEY: No.

CLEMENTS: All right. Thank you. The-- and what is going to be built in this area?

McKINNEY: It'll be a, it'll be a business park.

CLEMENTS: OK, a business park. Is there-- is this changed area going to expand into more residential properties, houses?

McKINNEY: No, that is another reason why the flexibility is being sought, because one of the other phases is looking at some pieces of residential and the residents are opposed to that. So they would like to look at other sites within the same geographic area to, to do the business park.

CLEMENTS: So the-- part of it is to not remove some of the residences.

McKINNEY: Yes.

CLEMENTS: Is that true?

McKINNEY: Yes.

CLEMENTS: And then what-- if there aren't residences there, what's, what is there now where they want to build?

McKINNEY: Well, they haven't been looking because they don't have the authority to.

CLEMENTS: Oh, OK.

McKINNEY: Yeah. Yep.

CLEMENTS: But the current 2-mile radius does have more residential?

McKINNEY: Some, some pieces do, some don't.

CLEMENTS: All right. And the-- is this expanding how much is going to be spent?

McKINNEY: No, the, the allocation is the allocation. They're not asking for no more money. This has no fiscal note.

CLEMENTS: Very good. Thank you, Senator McKinney.

McKINNEY: No problem.

CLEMENTS: I'd like a record vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Andersen, you are recognized to speak.

ANDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to this, as I have done in committee, and I've done in General File. So let's talk about what's happened. So the state got \$1.04 billion in COVID money. Of that, \$450 million was allocated to do COVID repair and allocated for the space in north Omaha. Since that allocation and determination, they could not spend the \$450 million of ARPA money. So they, then, used that on a water project in Lincoln, then took \$450 million of General Fund money and allocated it towards supposedly the COVID damage repair projects in north Omaha. Then they can't find-- they can't spend all the money that they wanted to in the specific identified area in the census tract, and now they want to, to expand the area to be able to do more economic development. However, when you ask Senator McKinney about how much money is left out of the \$450 million, that's unclear, and the projects are unclear. So I guess at the macro level, we look at it and the money came in for one purpose, and the money was used for another purpose. Different money was moved over to fill that purpose, but now we've changed it from COVID repair funds, projects to now doing economic development in north Omaha. What I would say is, with the \$300 million shortfall that this Legislature has right now, we probably should stop the, the economic reinvestment in north Omaha, we capitalize the funds, and we look at reprioritize how we spend the money across the state. There's more worthy projects than would just sit in north Omaha. And with that, Mr. Speaker or Mr. President, I yield my time.

ARCH: Senator Hughes would like to recognize some guests from the York County Farm Bureau members, [INAUDIBLE] Kearney, Franklin County Farm Bureau, David Grimes, Aaron Kavon, Karah Perdue, and Stuart Spader. They are located in the-- under the south balcony. Returning to the queue, Senator Spivey, you're recognized to speak.

SPIVEY: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning again, colleagues and folks watching. I just wanted to get in the queue again, because I talked about this bill on General File to provide some insight to folks as I think that there is a misunderstanding in interpretation of the bill and the question that's in front of us at hand. I appreciate Senator Clements and his questions regarding the additional clarity. And as I talked before, as someone that is representing the district which this is impacting, and a member of the advisory committee, this is around moving the boundaries 2 miles and so that the projects can be completed without disruption due to environmental damages and displacing residents in the area. The money and the allocation was decided way before the folks in this body had opposition. And so the body committed to this investment of ARPA funding for north and south Omaha. I want to be clear on that, because the comments remove a whole

geography within the Omaha metro area, and that when you look at the pandemic and the implications of a global pandemic, economic development is actually a viable intervention and lever that could be used. It was approved by the feds. There's guidance and information around how dollars can be used. And so, again, there, there are 2 separate conversations happening. And as we've seen on other bills, we should really make sure that we are addressing the issue that's in front of us. And I, I can appreciate the additional conversation. But, again, that, that is a larger piece that can be addressed. And so this is about geography allowing the projects to be successful without disruption to people, which I think everyone can care that they should be able to stay in their homes and that it can be a viable, continued project. I think that there is a larger conversation around the disinvestment in specific neighborhoods, and the research and understanding people need to do around economic development, the history of intentional disinvestment at a system level, like with redlining, which I have brought up as an example for folks to sit within or understanding social drivers of health that include economic development, housing, health, transportation, and a number of other things. And so I support LB290 as I did in General File. I think it is really clear as a cleanup to ensuring that the, the decision that this body made in previous sessions can be honored and can be successful. And I welcome, again, for folks to engage in a larger conversation around systemic disinvestment, what does the state need to do and how they show up, and would encourage any folks that would like to see these projects in real time to reach out to myself, Senator McKinney, Senator Juarez, and Senator Dunixi [SIC] who represent these areas because there are amazing things that are happening, just like when folks go host and go see things happening in Norfolk or Scottsbluff and other regions of our state. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator McKinney, you are next in the queue.

McKINNEY: Thank you, Mr. President. Kind of off topic, but I just also wanted to congratulate my legislative aid, Rochelle Golliday, on her acceptance into Brown University. She will be pursuing her master's in international public affairs as a Watson Policy Scholar on a full-ride scholarship. So I just wanted to congratulate her on that as we move forward. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB290--

ARCH: Please, the motion. Senator Guereca, for a motion, please.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB290 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: There's been a request for a roll call. Mr. Clerk, please call the roll. There's been a request to place the house under call. Question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 24 ayes, 2 nays to place the house under call.

ARCH: 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 Conrad, please return to the floor. The house is under call. All unexcused members are now present. There's been a request for a roll call. Mr. Clerk, please call the roll.

CLERK: Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Arch voting yes. Senator Armendariz voting yes. Senator Ballard not voting. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Bostar voting yes. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Clements not voting. Senator Clouse voting yes. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator DeKay voting yes. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator Dover voting yes. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Guereca voting yes. Senator Hallstrom not voting. Senator Hansen not voting. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft not voting. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Hunt. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Jacobson not voting. Senator Juarez voting yes. Senator Kauth not voting. Senator Lippincott not voting. Senator Lonowski not voting. Senator McKeon not voting. Senator McKinney voting yes. Senator Meyer voting yes. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Murman not voting. Senator Prokop voting yes. Senator Quick voting yes. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator Sanders not voting. Senator Sorrentino not voting. Senator Spivey voting yes. Senator Storer not voting. Senator Storm not voting. Senator Strommen not voting. Senator von Gillern not voting. Senator Wordekemper not voting. Vote is 26-- Senator DeKay not voting. Vote is 25 ayes, 3 nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB290 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item. I raise the call.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB144. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB144 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB144 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB478. I have nothing on the bill, Senator.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB478 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB478 does advance. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB177. First of all, Senator, I have E&R amendments.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB177 be adopted.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. They are adopted. Mr. Clerk.

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

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB177 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB177 advances. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB325. Senator, I have in E&R amendments.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that the E&R amendments to LB325 be adopted.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. The E&R amendments are adopted. Mr. Clerk.

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

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB325 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB325 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB248. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB248 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB248 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB105. I have nothing on the bill, Senator.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB105 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB105 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB266. Senator, I have nothing on the bill.

ARCH: Senator Guereca, for a motion.

GUERECA: Mr. President, I move that LB266 advance to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. LB266 does advance. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: It already moved. The bill already moved.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate March 18, 2025

ARCH: Items.

CLERK: Mr. President, some items for the record. Your Committee on Transportation, chaired by Senator Moser, reports LB207 to General File with committee amendments. Additionally, your Committee on Health and Human Services, chaired by Senator Hardin, reports LB257, LB319, LB202, LB203, LB437, LB676 to General File, some having committee amendments. Additionally, your Committee on Education, chaired by Senator Murman, reports LB213 to General File with committee amendments. Your Committee on Agriculture, chaired by Senator DeKay, reports LB646 to General File with committee amendments. Notice of committee hearing from the Business and Labor Committee, as well as the Revenue Committee. Appointment to the Nebraska Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee. Amendments to be printed from Senator Storer to LB80, Senator Fredrickson to LB676, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh to LB230, Senator DeBoer to LB340, Senator Sanders to LB649, Senator Ibach to LB646. New LR, LR74 from Senator Wordekemper. That will be laid over. LR75 from Senator Sanders will also be laid over. Name add: Senator Sorrentino-- name withdrawn, excuse me, from LB290. Mr. President, notice that the Health and Human Services will hold an exec session at noon in Room 2022; exec session, HHS, noon, 2022. And the Exec Board will be holding an exec session in Room 2102 at the conclusion of their public hearing; 2102, Exec Board, exec session. Finally, Mr. President, a priority motion, Senator Sanders would move to adjourn the body until Wednesday, March 19 at 9:00 a.m.

ARCH: Colleagues, you've heard the motion to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, nay. We are adjourned.