

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate February 3, 2026  
Rough Draft

**KELLY:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the nineteenth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, Second Session. Our chaplain for today is Senator Lonowski. Please rise.

**LONOWSKI:** Let us pray. Gracious, God, help me [INAUDIBLE] today with humility and gratitude, mindful of the responsibility placed upon these women and men who serve the people of this state. We give thanks for the freedom to gather, to debate, and to govern, and for the trust citizens have placed in this legislative body. We ask for wisdom for our lawmakers as they deliberate on issues that affect families, communities, and future generations. Grant them clarity of thought, O Lord, honesty of purpose, and the courage to do what is right, even when it, even when it is difficult or unpopular. May we listen carefully, speak respectfully, and seek understanding across differences. We pray for unity without uniformity, for cooperation without compromise of conscience, and for progress rooted in fairness and compassion. Help these leaders remember those whose voices are often unheard: the working families, the elderly, the young, the struggling, and the hopeful. May every decision be guided not by personal gain, but by the common good. God grant patience during disagreement, humility in, in success, and grace in moments of failure. May this Chamber be a place where integrity prevails, where truth is valued, and where service is held above self-interest. We also ask your blessing of the staff, families, and communities, and support this work behind the scenes. Keep all who serve safe in body, steady in spirit, and strong in resolve. May justice guide every action, wisdom inform every vote, and compassion shape every law. Thank you, Lord, for your guidance. Amen.

**KELLY:** For the Pledge of Allegiance, I recognize Colonel Tom Brewer, a guest of Senator Clements.

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

**KELLY:** I call to order the nineteenth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, Second Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

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

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate February 3, 2026  
Rough Draft

**KELLY:** Are there any corrections for the Journal?

**CLERK:** I have no corrections this morning, sir.

**KELLY:** Any messages, reports, or announcements?

**CLERK:** There are, Mr. President. Your Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by Senator Brandt, reports LB823, as well as LB827 and LB1127 to General File. Notice of committee hearings from the Education Committee. Communication from the Governor concerning appointments to the Public Employees Retirement Board. And amendment to be printed from Senator John Cavanaugh to LB956. That's all I have at this time.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Hansen would like to recognize some guests in both balconies: members of the Nebraska Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association and students from Creighton (University), University of Nebraska Medical Center, College of St. Mary's, Clarkson College, Southeast Community College, and Nebraska Methodist College, please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Holdcroft would like to recognize the doctor of the day, Dr. James Watson of Gretna. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LR328, LR330, LR331, and LR332. Please proceed to the agenda.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, first item on the agenda, General File, LB669 from Senator Storer. When the Legislature left, the bill pending was the bill itself an IPP pursuant to Rule 6, Section 3(f) from Senator Hunt that had failed to be adopted, and Senator Spivey reconsidering said motion with MO389.

**KELLY:** Senator Storer, you're recognized for a 2-minute refresh.

**STORER:** Good morning, and thank you, Mr. President. I will just again update and refresh on LB669. This is a bill that addresses domestic violence and human trafficking to screen those women when they come in for an abortion. I want to reiterate, this bill does nothing to impact or change how women access that service. We're adding a provision that they receive-- the question be asked to them as to whether or not they're in a domestic violence or human trafficking situation. Upon a yes answer to that question, if that would be the case, they are then to be given a private location to make a phone call to the national hotlines, and it's the national hotlines because they will immediately connect them with local resources. This is about finding women who

need our help at a juncture where there is a high probability that, that they are being brought there specifically in the situation of human trafficking. There's been a question about whether or not this is sort of isolating the, the abortion clinics or, or targeting an abortion clinic? It's not targeting an abortion clinic. It is identifying the likely probable place that a human trafficker abusing a woman is going to take her if and when she's pregnant because she is not valuable to a human trafficker pregnant. This is common sense. So I ask for your support on LB669, and I ask for a no vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone, and a no vote on the notion to reconsider. I would like to get on to the, to the amendment that I have worked faithfully with my colleagues that had concerns on in good faith and--

**KELLY:** That's your time, Senator.

**STORER:** --would like to get to that amendment today. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Storer. Senator Spivey, you're recognized for a 1-minute refresh on your motion.

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, Mr. President, and good morning, colleagues and Nebraskans. I'm asking you to reconsider your vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone on LB669. I think it's not ready yet. And I do appreciate Senator Storer for wanting to work with us, for the folks that have concerns. I am one of those colleagues. And I don't think it is ready given the intent in where we are. I am punched back in to go back into more detail around that because a 1-minute refresher cannot go over all of those points. And so I would ask for our colleagues to really pay attention to debate. I think this is meaningful debate. We are raising great questions and having-- in doing what we were sent here to do, talk and have great discussion about what's in front of us, what we intend to pass, the consequences of what we pass, and our hopes for that type of legislation. So, again, I hope folks are paying attention that they get into the queue to actually dialogue and debate and have discourse, and I ask for your consideration for the reconsider that I have up on the board. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Spivey. Moving to the queue, Senator Kauth, you're recognized to speak.

**KAUTH:** Question.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

**KELLY:** The question's been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor-- Senator Cavanaugh, for what purpose do you rise?

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, this is the third day of debate on this bill. This is the third time I have been in the queue. This is the third time I have had the question called before I've been able to speak. I wanted to speak to the motion to indefinitely postpone. I want to speak to the reconsider motion. I am being deprived of that option. Nobody has spoken yet today. I ask that the President make a ruling instead of putting it to the body. There has not been full and fair debate. I would like the opportunity to speak to the motion at hand. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye-- your point of order is overruled. Senator Cavanaugh, your point of order is not well taken. The reason would be yesterday Senator Spivey opened with 10 minutes on the motion to reconsider and then Senators Lonowski and Lippincott each spoke to the issue.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Mr. President, I am not those people. I have not had an opportunity to speak to this, nor have numerous people who are in the queue had the opportunity to speak to this. What is the precedent that you are using for this? Yesterday, two members spoke on this motion.

**KELLY:** Senator, the body will decide whether there's been full and fair debate. The question--

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** --the question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 27 ayes, 9 nays to place the house under call.

**KELLY:** The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All 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. All unexcused members are present, all unexcused members are present. Members, the question is, shall debate cease? There's been a request for roll call, reverse order. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Senator Wordekemper voting yes. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator Storm voting no. Senator Storer not voting. Senator Spivey. Senator Storer, I'm sorry. Senator Storer voting yes. Senator Spivey, not voting. Senator Sorrentino voting yes. Senator Sanders voting yes. Senator Rountree voting no. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Raybould voting no. Senator Quick voting no. Senator Prokop not voting. Senator Murman voting yes. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Glen Meyer voting yes. Senator Fred Meyer voting yes. Senator McKinney voting no. Senator Lonowski voting yes. Senator Lippincott voting yes. Senator Kauth voting yes. Senator Juarez voting no. Senator Jacobson voting yes. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Hunt voting no. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Holdcroft voting yes. Senator Hardin voting yes. Senator Hansen voting yes. Senator Hallstrom voting yes. Senator Guereca voting no. Senator Fredrickson voting no. Senator Dungan voting no. Senator Dover voting yes. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator DeKay voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting no. Senator Conrad voting no. Senator Clouse voting yes. Senator Clements voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh voting no. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator Bostar not voting. Senator Bosn voting yes. Senator Ballard voting yes. Senator Armendariz voting yes. Senator Arch not voting. Senator Andersen voting yes. Senator von Gillern voting yes. Senator Storm voting yes. Vote is 30 ayes, 14 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Debate does cease. Senator Spivey, you're recognized to close.

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. Again, good morning, colleagues and Nebraskans. I want to first just make sure we reframe the conversation because I think it's gone in a lot of different places and, and what the intention around this reconsider is in the IPP motion. So, yes, good faith agreements have been having dialogue around the different amendments, what things need to be changed. Those conversations are happening. And so it seems very premature to call the question when the conversation on the mic are around those conversations on and off the mic. We want to put it on the record. We want to be able to have and, and be able to uplift some of those conversations when it is between two colleagues talking. And so it doesn't feel appropriate to continue to call the question when there has not been full and fair debate and those-- that dialogue is continuing to happen about LB669. I also want to uplift that Chair Bosn did acknowledge that some of the concerns that are being brought on the floor now from folks that are not on Judiciary Committee came up in committee. That these same things were opportunities or places of tension and it was not yet worked out. And so, again, with this motion to reconsider, it is also

rooted in that the chair has acknowledged that it wasn't ready. And that it's not ready. And so an IPP or a bracket or return to committee is absolutely appropriate given that these issues were acknowledged before. And so some of the concerns and why I'm asking you to reconsider your vote on the IPP, I started to bring up yesterday and ran out of time. And, and now we're here, where I'm closing on my reconsider motion, was really rooted in the foundation for reproductive coercion. And I want to make sure people understand the definition and what I understand to be the intent of the bill. The intent of the bill from my understanding is that when there are victims of intimate partner violence, folks that are being sex trafficked, that they are losing their autonomy as it relates to their reproductive health. They are unable to make decisions about that full spectrum of reproductive health, however the bill in front of us is very narrowed in focus. So I think that there is misalignment in where the statutes are living. It is around-- and in places around anti-abortion procedures. It is not rooted in the full understanding of reproductive coercion and what does that look like. And so I wanted to read the definition again from the National Domestic Violence Hotline who conducted the study and some of the research that I started to uplift yesterday. 3,400 people took this survey that utilized the hotline. So, again, this is data from people that are most impacted that are experiencing what is in front of us today. So the definition of reproductive coercion and abuse are behaviors intended to maintain power and control in a relationship by dominating a partner's reproductive and sexual health. So that is what's in front of us that we need to answer. And so some of the places in LB669 only speak to if a person is assumed to be coerced to have or terminate their pregnancy. Not that they are being acknowledged, that they could be coerced or forced to continue a pregnancy that they don't want to have. Reproductive coercion also includes, because it's around reproductive health, around birth control and access to birth control when appointments are set. And the bill does not address that in that way. It's taking a finite approach to thinking about someone's pregnancy journey and if they are being coerced to terminate. And so I think it is limited in scope and it doesn't truly get to the intent, from my understanding, which is to ensure that people have access to the resources that they need if they are being abused or trafficked. So I see my light is on. I'm in the queue a couple down, I wanted to continue this conversation on the data and the research because I have the opportunity to work in my day job in the reproductive health and well-being space. And so I think that there are opportunities to better educate and, and have discourse and dialogue around what

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

survivors and folks are needing in order to truly escape these situations and have a lifeboat, in the words of Senator Storer, and I just don't know if we're there yet. And so I'm asking for your green vote on the reconsider because I think that there is more dialogue that needs to happen around this bill and I, I don't think the alignment is there from the intention to what is actually being produced in policy. So, again, I ask for your green vote on the reconsider. And I thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Spivey. Senators, the question is the motion to reconsider. There's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Arch voting no. Senator Armendariz voting no. Senator Ballard voting no. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Bostar not voting. Senator Brandt voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Clouse voting no. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator DeKay voting no. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Dover voting no. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Guereca voting yes. Senator Hallstrom voting no. Senator Hansen voting no. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft voting no. Senator Hughes voting no. Senator Hunt voting yes. 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 McKinney voting yes. Senator Fred Meyer voting no. Senator Glen Meyer voting no. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Prokop not voting. Senator Quick not voting. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator Sanders voting no. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Spivey voting yes. Senator Storer voting no. Senator Storm voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Wordekemper voting no. Vote is 13 ayes, 32 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to reconsider.

**KELLY:** The motion to reconsider is not adopted. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Thank you, Mr. President. LB669, introduced by Senator Storer. It's a bill for an act relating to abortion; restates legislative intent; eliminates defined terms; changes requirements for voluntary and informed consent; changes requirements relating to civil actions; harmonize provisions; repeals the original section. The bill was read for the first time on January 22 of 2025 and referred to the Judiciary Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File with

committee amendments. Mr. President, Senator Hunt, I have MO172 to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee.

**KELLY:** Senator Hunt, you're recognized to open on your motion.

**HUNT:** Thank you, Mr. President. This motion is to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee. I appreciate Chair Bosn taking time on the floor yesterday to share her position that the bill was indeed not ready when it came out of committee. I would, I would appreciate some more insight about why the regular process in the committees of this body has become to not do the difficult work, sometimes the tense and combative sometimes work in committee in the little rooms that we go into to work out the details on these bills, why we aren't doing that anymore. Somebody came up to me earlier and asked, you know, can somebody just articulate the real problems with the bills because was the-- you know, the question was, was the attempt to get an amendment for the bill, to get AM1924 introduced by Storer to amend this bill, was that really in good faith? Yes, it was in good faith. Yes, I would like to fix this bill. But there's no way that I'm going to be supporting an amendment that isn't supported by the medical community. What we're hearing from doctors and nurses and their representatives out in the Rotunda is that at no point were they considered in the crafting of this legislation. And that, Chair Bosn, is something that would have been valuable to have happen in the executive session of your committee. Get the input from these stakeholders, have Senator Storer bring you an amendment that considers their needs and wishes. One thing I know for sure, you know, this statute, Section 28-325, that's the abortion statute. And what this bill would be doing, especially with this amendment, is putting obstetricians, gynecologists, into the abortion statutes for the first time. And the NMA, the physicians, the providers, the people who are representing them, would like to know what implications that has for these providers who are not abortion providers going forward and also kind of what, what can of worms that opens. That's something Speaker Arch should be worried about with his background in, in health care administration. That's something the introducer should be worried about, and it's something that Chair Bosn should have taken seriously before deciding to vote this out to the floor. We all absolutely share the goal of helping victims of abuse, helping people who have been trafficked. But at face value, when you look at the measures that are successful in this body, something that has to do with abortion, versus something that's not successful, what we were debating last week allowing trafficking victims who are trafficked due to the negligence of a hotel, that they can't even sue the hotel that let it

happen to them. None of you stood up and, and made sure that we passed that. And there's endless examples of this hypocrisy that I could point out to you, but you don't care. You don't care as long as you feel like you can be fighting abortion at the end of the day. OK, so we've got an amendment that has watered down this bill significantly. It sounds like-- what message did I get? I can share the breaking news with you. And this can all change. Everything changes very quickly. But someone from the, the physician side, from the Nebraska Medical Association said they're trying to get it fixed. Their fix is to water it down entirely to make it voluntary training and take out mandate and penalties. The NMA doesn't want this. Doctors don't want to continue having these chores, these tasks put on them in statute, things that they are already doing to ensure that their patients are safe, things that increase the cost of compliance. I'm not talking about just financial costs. I'm talking about the mental and emotional capacity, that the people who are just working to keep people safe and healthy have to make sure they're checking off these boxes so they're not out of compliance with a bill that the Judiciary Committee decided to vote out to make themselves feel good and now the doctors have another chore. The people who are providing this care don't want this. Would Senator Machaela Cavanaugh yield to a question?

**KELLY:** Machaela Cavanaugh, Senator,--

**HUNT:** Senator.

**KELLY:** --would you yield?

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Yes.

**HUNT:** Would you like to share some of the views that you didn't get time to share, because they keep calling the question?

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Yes, thank you.

**HUNT:** OK. Thanks.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Senator Hunt. I, I wanted to speak to why I opposed LB669 and why I supported the IPP motion, the indefinitely postpone motion. And it's for a very personal reason, colleagues. When I was pregnant, the last time I was pregnant with my son, I had a miscarriage. I was pregnant with twins and the, the-- one of them was inviable, and that was in December of 2017. In July of 2018, when I was in the delivery room filling out the paperwork, hoping for a healthy pregnancy or delivery, I was asked what I wanted to do with

the remains of my deceased child. And as I'm sure you can tell, right now, so many years later, it is still traumatic to think about. Something that my husband and I mourned privately, we were-- then had to face, yet again, because of actions taken by a Legislature. And they were well-intended actions. The best of intentions, really, to give families an opportunity to decide what to do with the remains of their unborn child that did not survive. But it forced me in this delivery room to have to revisit a heartache that I wasn't wanting to revisit right then. It isn't about partisanship, it isn't about abortion, and it isn't human trafficking for me. What it is about for me is that when we do things in this body, there are consequences, there are real-world consequences, and there are other options other than to legislate this. And I don't think that Senator Storer has any malice whatsoever, I don't think she wants to traumatize anyone at all. But I do think that in codifying this type of thing in statute, we are opening that up to happening again and again. We should have significant and robust training on human trafficking. We should have significant and robust training on how to talk to people who have been identified as having the signals of being a trafficked individual. But [INAUDIBLE] making every medical professional ask every pregnant woman who is dealing with a number of different reasons as to why they have to terminate a pregnancy-- in my case, I didn't have to have an abortion. Because it happened so early on in the pregnancy that essentially it just was reabsorbed into the placenta, which honestly would have been, I guess, the remains that I would have been having the hospital do something about. I'm not positive. Don't quote me on that. I'm not a doctor. I just play one in the Legislature. I, I don't think that we should be doing things like this. And it's, it's not because I believe in reproductive health freedom. It's because I think that medical professionals-- and we have a board of medicine, we have a 409 process, which is how we do credentialing and reviewing. We have robust guardrails around this. That is where these things should be happening. That's where implicit bias training should be happening. That's where the human trafficking training on victims should be happening is through those channels, not through us. Because when we put something in statute, women like me have to fill out paperwork saying what we want done with the deceased remains of a child that I mourned 9 months prior in a live birth. And, honestly, the birth wasn't easy, and there were complications. So that wasn't fun for me either. So thank you, Senator Hunt, for sharing your time with me. I, I do wish that our colleagues would have listened to my story. It was not easy to share. I have shared it previously with the Legislature, and I, I thought long and hard about whether it was appropriate to

share yet again, and I felt like it was necessary. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senators Cavanaugh and Hunt. Senator DeKay would like to recognize a guest, Mark Kirby, under the north balcony, the General Manager of the Butler County Public Power in David City. Please rise and be recognized by the Nebraska Legislature. Returning to the queue, Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak.

**CONRAD:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. First, just a, perhaps, quick process point, and then I did want to add some substantive comments into the record in regards to this debate on the matter before us, which I have concerns about. And I, like my friend Senator Cavanaugh, have punched in multiple times over many days and this is my, my first chance to, to speak so I appreciate it. But, colleagues, I appreciate all of the good, hard work that members are engaged in in regards to this measure and other bills that members are discussing and working on and trying to count votes on and trying to remove opposition points so that they can have a good debate and increase the likelihood of success for the bills that are important to them. And those conversations are happening across the political spectrum in line with the spirit of our nonpartisan Legislature. But I do want to note that collegiality and nonpartisanship shows up in a bunch of different ways, great and small. And in regards to the structuring of this debate and an aggressive strategy to call the question, which is members' right to utilize if they see fit. It's not going to accomplish the goal, but instead it just takes more time, derails the conversation, and it fails to recognize what everybody already knows. This measure is going to take 4 hours on General File. And if, in fact, there were good faith negotiations that found a path forward, break the log jam, then those amendments get up quickly. And the procedural motions are part of that negotiation and they come down fast. So that's how the process works when there is good faith negotiation happening. And what we see on the board and what we see filed wouldn't be a barrier to moving a good faith, well-negotiated issue forward very, very quickly. But that's not what's happening here. So I, I do just want to note that. I've also heard from neighbors back home in north Lincoln who say what the heck is the Legislature doing? We're in the middle of an affordability crisis. We're in the middle of a budget crisis. Why are you debating some of these measures? And, again, I don't set the agenda, my colleagues in the minority position don't set the agendas, that belongs to the Speaker. My friend Senator Lonowski has decided to prioritize this bill because it's important to him. So I give respect and deference to

each member when they elevate an issue that they think is the most important thing for the body to take up. But that's why we're here today. The other pieces I want to add in regards to the substance on this measure are a couple of points that have evaded discussion thus far. So there was some discussion at the committee level. It's been generally noted in General File debate by proponents, thus far, that there are new obligations and requirements they want to impose in order to address or identify potential human trafficking. I understand the good intent behind that. But they've also glossed over the fact that, and there's also components of this legislation to, quote unquote, clean up obsolete law or dead letter law or technical issues in code that are no longer good law. So number one, that part of the repealers that they have put forward here were declared unconstitutional, not by the Nebraska Supreme Court, but actually by federal courts. Because the law that the Legislature passed forced doctors to provide misleading information and created confusing, contradictory, and false standards. So that's the first part. The other part is I was here when LB594 was passed and I addressed many of those concerns during the debate that the court later agreed with. But if you go and you do a line by line look at what Senator Storer has before us and what LB594 had before us, it's, it's not an apples to apples. The repealers don't match the bill that they are alleging that they're attempting to clean up as dead letter law because of prior court rulings. And I want to know why. I also want to know why other sections in this code, which arguably are equally obsolete in dead letter law, particularly post adoption of the constitutional amendment by Nebraska voters on reproductive rights in 2024--

**KELLY:** That's your time, Senator.

**CONRAD:** --remain untouched. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Machaela Kavanaugh, you're recognized to speak.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President. I would have preferred to have been speaking on the IPP motion initially, but since that has been dispensed with, I do support the recommit to committee motion. I think that there, there needs to be more work done on this piece of legislation if it were to move forward. I think that there's probably other avenues to achieve the goals of this legislation that should be explored. And I, I know that there's-- the bill that was introduced, and I know there was an amendment filed yesterday, and so I'm not sure if that's what we're supposed to be speaking to or not, but I just

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate February 3, 2026  
Rough Draft

want to reiterate that my concern is that making a blanket policy for how doctors are interacting with patients around reproductive health care and decisions that have to be made is going to have consequences that don't meet the, the intent of this. When we're forcing women-- and I'm looking at this, the amendment, and it says: that in a place or manner that ensures the privacy of, of the pregnant woman, so at least 1 hour prior to the performance of an abortion. OK. So let's, let's just level set here as to an abortion. An abortion is not just terminating an unwanted pregnancy. An abortion can also be terminating a wanted pregnancy. There is not a distinction. When you go in and you terminate a pregnancy because the baby is no longer viable or the mother's life is in danger, it is still an abortion. It is still called an abortion, it is still checked the box on your medical record as an abortion, it is an abortion. So when we have a woman go in to have an abortion for whatever reason she's going to be met with these questions. You cannot account for that. You cannot count for why you're having an abortion. So back to the earlier comments that I made about my own miscarriage, which is what most people like to think of an abortion as, and the only reason I even use the term miscarriage for myself is that I didn't have an abortion because it happened so early in my pregnancy that it happened when I had a twin. And it was absorbed into that pregnancy, I didn't have to have an abortion. But I might have, I had to be monitored, I had to have follow-up visits and ultrasounds to see if I needed to have an abortion for my nonviable pregnancy. So now, if this were enacted, I would have to go through these questions about being trafficked, about being coerced. I don't think people are listening that are in support of this bill. I really wish you would. It's really important. Miscarriages that have to have a medical procedure to end the, the pregnancy is an abortion. Those women under this would have to be asked questions about coercion. That is problematic. We need training. We need to train our medical professionals on how to identify when somebody might be being trafficked and we need training on how to handle that situation. But blanket policy changes that are going to impact women who are terminating a wanted pregnancy is not OK with me, and I'm going to stand firm against this. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**HOLDCROFT:** Question.

**KELLY:** The question's been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye; all

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

those opposed vote nay. There's 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 no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 15 ayes, 8 nays to place the house under call.

**KELLY:** The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house under call. Senator Guereca, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused members are present. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye-- there's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Senator Andersen voting yes. Senator Arch not voting. Senator Armendariz. Senator Ballard voting yes. Senator Bosn voting yes. Senator Bostar. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator John Cavanaugh voting no. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh not voting. Senator Clements voting yes. Senator Clouse voting yes. Senator Conrad voting no. Senator DeBoer voting no. Senator DeKay voting yes. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator Dover. Senator Dungan voting no. Senator Fredrickson voting no. Senator Guereca voting no. Senator Hallstrom voting yes. Senator Hansen voting-- I'm sorry, Senator-- yes. Senator Hardin voting yes. Senator Holdcroft voting yes. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Hunt voting no. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Jacobson voting yes. Senator Juarez not voting. Senator Kauth voting yes. Senator Lippincott voting yes. Senator Lonowski voting yes. Senator McKinney voting no. Senator Fred Meyer voting yes. Senator Glen Meyer voting yes. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Murman voting yes. Senator Prokop not voting. Senator Quick voting no. Senator Raybould voting no. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting no. Senator Sanders voting yes. Senator Sorrentino voting yes. Senator Spivey voting no. Senator Storer voting yes. Senator Storm voting yes. Senator Strommen voting yes. Senator von Gillern voting yes. Senator Wordekemper voting yes. Vote is 29 ayes, 12 nays, Mr. President, to cease debate.

**KELLY:** Debate does cease. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to close on the motion.

**HUNT:** Thank you, Mr. President. We got, I'm waiting for someone to bring this to me, but we got an email from a member of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists against this bill. And when we have some time on the mic coming up here, I'd like to share that

into the record and I'll also distribute it to, to, to our colleagues here. We cannot advance bills that affect health care providers when we don't have any input from those health care providers in the policy that we're crafting. I mean, say what you will about abortion, about the morality of that, about what is really a miscarriage. Thank you. I think that what's important is that we stick to the matter of the bill, which is that we are putting new requirements and new, new rules, new law affecting physicians into the abortion statute, Section 28-325, that affect physicians who don't perform abortions, that they were not consulted in the crafting of this legislation, that they do not want this legislation. And that now, just a process note, the bill has been voted out of committee. We are debating it on the floor. There was an amendment that was worked on over the weekend, AM1924, to try to improve the bill. I could say slap something together to improve the bill, but that would be disrespectful to the people who worked on the amendment. But then it does feel slapped together, when then I hear from doctors and nurses and their, their representatives in the health care lobby that they weren't consulted on the amendment. And then I hear from other leaders in the body that I don't need to name, I guess, that they didn't even know the doctors didn't like it, that they didn't know they were consulted. And so now we're kind of like scrambling to try to fix a bad bill when honestly, colleagues, we need to move on. The truth is that-- and I told the Speaker, he said do you think we'll be able to get to an amendment? No, because not until I see an amendment that the doctors can live with. We do way too much legislating in this body that affects Nebraskans that we know nothing about, that is none of our business, that none of us have anything to do with. Whether we're talking about, you know, requirements that we're giving to teachers, whether we're talking about requirements that we're giving to doctors and physicians. There are many cases, colleagues, where we don't know best, and we come, I've done it too, we come into the Legislature with what we think is a good idea, maybe it's something you float out there to your constituents and they affirm that it's a good idea. It is a good idea to make sure that patients who are seeking reproductive health care, whether they're-- whether they want to be pregnant, whether they don't want to be pregnant, whether they're ending a pregnancy, whether the pregnancy is ending itself, this is a fraught time for any woman. And if they are experiencing abuse, trafficking, whatever, of course, they need the care and support to get through that. Nothing about LB669 or AM1924 changes that. And nothing in this bill is going to, you know, change the standard of care that doctors are providing. What it's going to do is give them a chore. What it's going to do is continue to

set the example in this body that we throw together legislation, that we cram it through and make it work no matter what. Frankly, because, because of the introducer, because it's a Republican bill, because it touches the abortion statute, and so we all believe we've got to make it work. It's been a great disappointment to me to see the abandonment of focus on good legislation. And this could be good. It could be if we did not have the distraction of the procedural calling the question, calling the house, roll call vote, reverse order, because now what we're engaged with is floor management instead of trying to fix this bill. The people in the lobby who represent doctors and nurses would like some time to come together and find an amendment that works. If I were the Speaker, I would take that seriously and I would pass over this knowing that it's going to go 4 hours or I would round up my, my piggies, my little corral of people here, and I would say stop calling the question. Let them tire themselves out, let them make their little points, let them say their stories because we're working on an amendment because we want to make sure that if we pass something it's something that doctors and nurses like.

**KELLY:** That's your time, Senator.

**HUNT:** Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hunt. Members, the question is the motion to recommit. There's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Arch voting no. Senator Armendariz. Senator Ballard voting no. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Bostar. Senator Brandt voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh not voting. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Clouse voting no. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator DeKay voting no. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Dover. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Guereca voting yes. Senator Hallstrom voting no. Senator Hansen voting no. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft voting no. Senator Hughes voting no. Senator Hunt voting yes. Senator Ibach voting no. Senator Jacobson voting no. Senator Juarez not voting. Senator Kauth voting no. Senator Lippincott voting no. Senator Lonowski voting no. Senator McKinney voting yes. Senator Fred Meyer voting no. Senator Glen Meyer voting no. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Prokop not voting. Senator Quick not voting. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator Sanders voting no. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Spivey voting yes. Senator Storer voting no.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

Senator Storm voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Wordekemper voting no. The vote is 11 ayes, 30 nays, Mr. President, to recommit the bill.

**KELLY:** The motion to recommit is not adopted. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, first of all, an announcement. The Referencing Committee will meet at 11:00 in Room 2102. Referencing Committee now in Room 2102. As it pertains to the bill, Mr. President, Senator Juarez, Senator Juarez would move to reconsider the vote just taken with MO391.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Juarez, you're recognized to open.

**JUAREZ:** Good morning, everyone, and good morning to my fellow Nebraskans who are listening today. I wanted to get up to speak today to provide information not only about, you know, in my personal life and the pregnancy mission journey that I had. And I also wanted to, you know, express my support with Senator Cavanaugh, you know, and the harsh circumstances that she endured, you know, in her life when she was pregnant. There may be other women in this room who had experiences of that nature, and I'm sure that that was really difficult. But I can tell you that my pregnancies were definitely the opposite extreme. I had two children, and I remember vividly in my mind when I've been sitting here and thinking about this topic that my doctor told me that my uterus wall must have been made out of cement because with both of my pregnancies I had difficulty in naturally giving birth. And I actually waited and waited and went past my due date because I really wanted to have my infants naturally, you know. I'm sure that's the goal of every mother, right, to be able to do that. And, instead, I remember from with my first child that the doctor had said, OK, well, call me when you get contractions. Well, what happened was the contractions never came. And I remember my mom telling me, Margo, you need to call the doctor. And I told my mom, no, Mom, the doctor said I'm not supposed to call him until I start my contractions. So I kept waiting and waiting and waiting and finally after my mom is not laying off on me on calling the doctor, I eventually did. I eventually called him and, and, of course, I ended up going into the hospital. And they even tried to induce me, and I never dilated. So, truly, my pregnancy experiences for me were nothing what I expected. And, of course, I had a cesarean. And then it comes pregnancy number two. And I was really optimistic that this experience

was going to be different, right? And that I was going to-- again, I wanted to hold out to deliver my child naturally. But, again, it did not happen and I had another cesarean. And I do want you to know though, I did wait a little bit again. I did ask the doctor to give me some time and he was willing to cooperate with me, but eventually he said, Margo, we got to go in. And it was like the whole routine was a total replay. And I was induced. And I remember my husband sitting in the chair, reading a newspaper, and just looking up at me and rolling his eyes, because he knew once again what we were going to be facing. But I know that my experience is unique and that there are women who definitely have problems with getting pregnant. But I really hope that in their interactions that they have with their doctors that I feel confident that their doctors have the competency to give them the advice that they need, which is why I think that the language in this bill, you know, is not appropriate. I think this is something that a doctor definitely can handle with his patients. And I don't feel that the state needs to be dictating this to what goes on between a woman and her doctor in, in the privacy of a patient's room. So I hope that everyone really understands the feedback that we're getting, especially from the medical community. And I wish that we weren't having-- sending the wrong message, like we don't know what we're doing, and that we, we really can make a change here. And I yield the rest of my time to Senator Conrad. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Juarez. Senator Conrad, 4 minutes, 35 seconds.

**CONRAD:** Very good. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you to my friend, Senator Juarez. The other points that I wanted to lift up just in terms of substance that should facilitate a favorable vote in regards to the reconsider and the motion to recommit which is before us is the following. So, again, there is an effort to address coercion in the context of reproductive health. I wanted to make clear that existing law, as passed by this Legislature in 2011, notably Nebraska Revised Statute 71-6902.02, reads: No parent, guardian, or any other person shall coerce a pregnant woman to obtain an abortion. If a pregnant woman is denied financial support by her parents, guardians, or custodians due to their refusal to obtain an abortion, the pregnant woman shall be deemed emancipated for purposes or eligibility of public assistance benefits, except that benefits may not be used to obtain an abortion. Again, that was from, I believe then, my friend, Senator Lydia Brasch, who brought forward LB69 in 2011. There is already a clear public policy and prohibition against parents, guardians, or any other person coercing a pregnant woman to obtain an

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate February 3, 2026  
Rough Draft

abortion. Arguably, this also, if in fact is happening, touches upon existing laws within the Nebraska Criminal Code as well, as it should. So I do just want to note that, perhaps, there are some redundancies in regards to the substance of the underlying measure as well. Another piece that I wanted to lift up from a substantive perspective is proponents have talked a lot about their desire to increase awareness and training and identification and resource provision, laudable goals. I do want to note that this, again, measure has to be taken up in context to the existing public policy framework that exists in Nebraska to combat human trafficking, which has been long-running since at least 2006. I know it started when I was here during my last term, has pretty much always been nonpartisan, bipartisan in nature. There have been grants. There have been changes to criminal laws. There have been task forces. There have been numerous policy recommendations to support survivors and victims and to ensure justice. And there's also-- there's actually a very, very lengthy list of policy work that this Legislature has done in this regard, including, and I noticed this after reading the Attorney General's annual report in regards to combating human trafficking that emanates from his office. And you can check for yourself on his website. There are a host of materials available free of charge in multiple languages that the Attorney General puts out for anybody who would like to help to raise awareness on this issue, learn more about how to spot these issues, connect survivors to resources. There's posters. There's online trainings. There's materials. There's requests for trainings that the Attorney General and task force members do literally for law enforcement, for other stakeholders all across the state. And they handle dozens if not more of those trainings each year, those can already be solicited for training by any health care association and would be a great resource to utilize. So I do just want to note that this measure shouldn't be lifted just myopically in regards to what's on the board, but needs to be addressed in regards to, perhaps, redundancies. There's already prohibitions on coercion to abortion in our civil code and, perhaps, touching upon our criminal code. There is already a significant framework to identify, train-- to identify and train stakeholders across Nebraska about how to address human trafficking, how to connect survivors with resources that should be contemplated in this measure. I see I'm out of time. Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Juarez.

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

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate February 3, 2026  
Rough Draft

**DUNGAN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I do stand in favor of Senator Juarez's motion to reconsider the vote of Senator Hunt's motion to recommit to committee. And I stand opposed to LB669, both in its current form and even with the amendment that's been worked on. I want to start just by talking briefly about the objections that I've had here today to a number of different things, both in process and in content. For those avid watchers of the Legislature, you know that I sometimes talk about process and content because I think that those two things often are separate and you can have frustrations or concerns about both when it pertains to a bill. We've talked quite a bit here today about the way that we do debate and the way that cordiality is afforded to our colleagues. I don't want to belabor that point too much, but I do think it's worth noting that calling the question when nobody has, in the queue, spoken yet immediately after an opening or a, I guess, a refresh on a motion definitionally does not allow any debate. So I don't understand how it could be full and fair debate. I know that people in this body sometimes get tired of the process working, and sometimes colleagues can be frustrated with the debate that takes place. But look no further than the first week of our Legislature when we started debating things on the floor, colleagues, and the filibuster that was being led was by members of a political persuasion that many in this body actually agree with. And so the rules are in place and the deliberative process is in place in order to protect individuals who are seeking to have their voice being heard. And you-- we've talked about this a lot and you hear about this lot in orientation, you never know when you're going to be in the minority of an issue. We do have a nonpartisan Legislature, I love that. It means that we don't have any internal party structure that tells anybody what to do within the body. And what that means is that we each, on every issue, can have our own perspective and our own opinions, and I think that it's important to remember you never know when you're going to be on the minority of an issue. So these rules are in place to allow the process to work. And Senator Conrad and others have highlighted the fact that when we have these debates, it is in order to either get to a goal or to be able to work through these pieces of legislation. The procedural motions that are in place here today are because the people who have objections, myself included, to this legislation do not believe that the amendment in its form addresses those problems. And I'll talk about that more in a second. So my objection to the process of calling the question, it's not simply pounding one's feet and being upset about it, it's that it does fly in the face of the way that this debate works. And I would respectfully push back on any ruling that

there's been full and fair debate when not a single person has had an opportunity to speak that, that day on a motion or after a refresh. I myself have found myself on the other side of issues before and have been encouraged by colleagues to just get up and call the question, and I've refused to do it. Even though I wish the question would be called, I've refused to call the question because it's only been one or two people that have spoken and I see the queue is completely full. And, yes, there are times when I think it is necessary, but it's, it's something that I think we should be more careful about. And so I would just encourage my colleagues to continue to be thoughtful, continue to be considerate of the rules, and I understand everybody has the right to do as they see fit. I'm not trying to chide anybody, I'm just saying, please, when you're looking through the queue and considering your strategy, think about whether or not there actually has been full and fair debate, because the rules really are only as good as those who decide to follow them and I think that we deserve better, colleagues. So with that, I'll move on to some of my objection to the content of the bill. Essentially, I understand that I've made some of these points when I spoke yesterday, but one of the biggest problems I have with this amendment and the bill itself is that it is conflating health care and reproductive health care with human trafficking. And I understand that human trafficking is a problem that many people are trying to seek to fix. But by conflating abortion and human trafficking in the statutes, and necessarily by law putting those two things together, it is exacerbating a problem of politics instead of actually addressing the underlying issue of human trafficking. In addition to that, I think the amendment adds additional requirements on doctors, and as Senator Hunt just pointed out, the Nebraska Medical Association, I believe, is opposed to that and I believe that we should be listening to the professionals that are going to be impacted by this. And as I think we're going to hear more about here today, the amendment doesn't contemplate a number of issues that it introduces with regards to what is a first appointment, who is actually necessary for effectuating some of the screening, and there are a number hoops and, I guess, problematic red tape that we could be putting in place here that we are putting in place with that amendment for doctors who are seeking to provide health care. So with that, colleagues, I do encourage your green vote on the motion to reconsider so we can recommit this to committee. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Dungan. Senator Spivey, you're recognized to speak.

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. And, again, good morning, colleagues. Appreciate the debate we are now having on this and being able to have space to kind of unpack some of these threads that have been lifted up by my colleagues. I wanted to kind of go back to the framing of working with partners and what interventions can look like. And, again, I think we are agreed that we need to support victims of intimate partner violence, folks that are being sex trafficked, and what can we do as a state through policy to achieve that, and where the disagreement and the tension and debate is sitting is how we get there. And so that is the, the intention of, of me getting on the mic and to discuss it. It's not around if we support folks that are navigating these horrendous experiences. Yesterday, Senator Lonowski got on the mic and reminded me about my LB751, which looks to get ahead of and understand why black women and girls who make up a small percentage of the population have disproportionate numbers of going missing. Which is true, it could be because of sex trafficking, it could be because of DV, but we do not know that. And so the intention of my bill with LB751 is to figure that out with key stakeholders. It commissions a study with law enforcement officers, whether that's State Patrol, [MALFUNCTION] FBI, folks that are on the ground doing direct service, the Nebraska Commission on African American Affairs, who is looking at complexities in the black community holistically across Nebraska, it's bringing folks together to curate what could be with policy recommendations. It is not a dictation now of that answer. And so I think if we take that same principle that I was reminded of yesterday, that is what my conversation is rooted in, in LB669 and why I support the motion to reconsider because that has not been taken. I have the privilege to work with Dr. Mary Kinyoun who is the chair of Nebraska ACOG in my personal, or excuse me, my professional capacity around reproductive well-being. And Senator Hunt passed out her email that I want to make sure that I uplift because I think it's really important. As we curate policy we have to ensure that people that are most impacted that will have to implement the policy that we passed are at the helm of what does it look like. And in this email Dr. Kinyoun specifically uplifts her concerns with LB699 [SIC] as well as the proposed AM1924. The amendment does not get to it, and so, again, I think the motion to reconsider and look at a recommit to committee is valid and warranted. The-- from Dr. Kinyoun, the initial bill seeks to legislate informed consent processes for [MALFUNCTION]. As the women's health-- as women's health providers, we are routinely screening patients for domestic violence and coercion. Legislation that would give funding or education on how to spot trafficking and coercion or actually help victims would be far more meaningful. So

right now, as it stands, what is proposed in LB669 and AM1924 is not the help that the providers on the front line working with these victims are asking for or say would be meaningful at this time. Dr. Kinyoun goes on to say that she also worries that with requiring patients to verify in writing, that coercion questions were asked, that they may be far less likely to report this abuse. That same comment was actually brought up on the record in the hearing from the Nebraska Coalition around sex trafficking and domestic violence, as well as was brought to the primary introducer around an issue with this bill, that having someone testify in writing that these were asked creates harm. I see my time is up, almost up, and so I will just also add here this amendment also worries Dr. Kinyoun in her professional expertise and opinion because the first pregnancy appointment into abortion legislation is not a standard of care. So again, colleagues, I think the question in front of us is, is this the right model to get to what the intention of the, of the legislation is? And I would say no. There misalignment with the inherent functionality of LB669, as well as AM1924. It is not ready for prime time. It's not ready to be able to be moved forward. This is not something that can be worked on between now and Select. I know we like to do a lot of that. So it's not in that type of place. And so that's why I support the motion to reconsider and the motion to recommit to committee so that work can happen and then come to the floor if it works for all of the stakeholders and partners involved. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**J. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I rise in support of the motion to reconsider, but I pushed my light to be in the queue every day so far. So I was also pushed to be in support of the IPP, the motion to reconsider the IPP, the motion to recommit to committee, and now the motion to reconsider the recommit. And I wanted to follow on what other folks have said. So we all know, I don't think it's any surprise to people, that an issue that touches on reproductive health care, access to abortion, prescribing how doctors interact with their patients is going to be an extended debate, that there's going to be a lot of conversation about this, this issue. And so we're already, you know, limiting this to a 4-hour debate, but the fact that folks just want to rush ahead and jump past any objections and ignore them, you know, is, is not helpful in terms of actually getting to a solution that helps people. I think everybody here agrees and has, I think, gone to great lengths to express our shared desire to decrease sex

trafficking and coercion of women in all aspects of life. And so I think there is a sincere hope to find a solution that would actually improve people's-- the situation. And so we just heard the letter that Senator Spivey was reading, that this was done without consultation of professionals who actually engage in this area and over their objections. I have, you know, several comments about this, but one thing I would comment on is that in looking at this bill, I don't see, it's unclear whether there is a requirement that this be-- the consultation be performed outside the presence of the other person who is the potential abuser. So, you know, there's obviously the risk for that continued coercion if this is not part of this advisement is that we're not doing it in an appropriate way. We're in such a rush to pass this bill that we're not going to-- we're not doing it in a way that actually will help people. And so one of the reasons I rise in support of the reconsider is I do think this bill should be recommitted to committee. I would point out that this bill came out without a committee amendment, without consideration of fixing the problems that have been admitted by the proponents were recognized in the committee hearing. That's what the committee amendment is for, is to fix the problems that were raised at the committee level. So this is a friendly suggestion, as Senator Dungan was talking about, there's the use of the rules and understanding what the rules actually do. And if you understand what the rules do, and you can master them, you can use them to your advantage. And continually calling the question on a, a bill with motions and amendments in an interest of cutting off conversation and, and just getting to an amendment that's way filed down is, is, you know, both just disruptive, but not going to achieve your objective. I would tell you, though, proponents of this bill who want to get it amended, a way to get an amendment on the board that you like would be to vote for a recommit to committee. It'll go back to this committee, this committee would then get to craft a, a committee amendment and then it could be reported to the floor again with your proposed fixes that you think you need to make to this bill. So the reason you're calling the question all this time to get to a specific amendment, you could just recommit this bill to committee, then have that amendment as the committee amendment or whatever compromise after you hopefully speak to the medical professionals about this. And, actually, take into consideration their criticisms and concerns and maybe make a bill that is less controversial and is more in service of the goal. So that is an opportunity that is available to you that a lot of people are ignoring just because of the floor tactics that are being employed. No one's taking a step back and thinking, how do we accomplish the goal that we want to accomplish? So

voting for the reconsider, voting for the [MALFUNCTION] would send this back to committee to allow you to get an amendment on the board. So I would suggest folks who are in favor of this bill and in favor of the amendment would vote green on the reconsider, vote green on the recommit. I'm running out of time. I did want to make one other point because I probably won't get to talk again for a very long time. So one of my problems with the, the way this debate's been going is people point to many or lots of or, you know, there's lots of different ways of presenting data that are imprecise and very misleading. And so there's this data that I'm particularly interested in at the moment. There's one Pope in the whole world, and so, you know, there's a world of 7 billion people or so, and so that's clear statistic. But if you were to say how many Popes per square mile in Vatican City, it's five. So there's five Popes per square mile in Vatican City, but one Pope in the whole word. So what the point is, you can massage data in any way you want to--

**KELLY:** That's your time, Senator.

**J. CAVANAUGH:** --convey a message. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**MURMAN:** Question.

**KELLY:** The question's been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? There's been a request for a roll call vote. There's been a request for a call of the house. The question is, shall the house be placed under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 14 ayes, 7 nays to place the house under call.

**KELLY:** The house is under call. All senators, please record your presence. All unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senators Hallstrom, Raybould, Hughes, Strommen, and Hansen, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senator Hansen, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused members are present. Members, the question is the, the motion to cease debate. There was a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

**CLERK:** Senator Andersen voting yes. Senator Arch not voting. Senator Armenderiz. Senator Ballard voting yes. Senator Bosn voting yes. Senator Bostar. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator John Cavanaugh voting no. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting no. Senator Clements voting yes. Senator Clouse voting yes. Senator Conrad voting no. Senator DeBoer voting no. Senator DeKay voting yes. Senator Dorn voting-- Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator Dover. Senator Dungan voting no. Senator Fredrickson voting no. Senator Guereca voting no. Senator Hallstrom voting yes. Senator Hansen voting yes. Senator Hardin voting yes. Senator Holdcroft voting yes. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Hunt voting no. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Jacobson. Senator Juarez voting no. Senator Kauth voting yes. Senator Lippincott voting yes. Senator Lonowski voting yes. Senator McKinney voting no. Senator Fred Meyer voting yes. Senator Glen Meyer voting yes. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Murman voting yes. Senator Prokop not voting. Senator Quick voting no. Senator Raybould voting no. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting no. Senator Sanders voting yes. Senator Sorrentino voting yes. Senator Spivey voting no. Senator Storer voting yes. Senator Storm voting yes. Senator Strommen voting yes. Senator von Gillern voting yes. Senator Wordekemper voting yes. Vote is 28 ayes, 14 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Debate does cease. Senator Juarez, you're recognized to close.

**JUAREZ:** Thank you very much. There needs to be a focus on systemic changes when women go into their OB/GYN office. The bill defeats the purpose of that by placing mandates on health care professionals who are already trained as mandatory reporters to see signs of abuse in their offices. A bill like this would make the experience of a possible pregnancy more invasive for women. Who are already in a vulnerable state. Why isn't this body discussing the issue of Nebraska being one of the most dangerous states for women of color to give birth in? Why are we not discussing social services to help mothers and pre and postpartum care? Why aren't we supporting lower income mothers financially, but rather we are discussing ways to make the process of childbirth more stressful for women? Why are we not bringing legislation that takes a research-based approach to solutions that expand reproductive health care to our citizens? We need to realize that reproductive care is the first step in caring for our families here in Nebraska. When we create legislation that improves that pre and postpartum care in our state and improves the lives of the families we say that we care so much about, it is not a singular issue that requires a singular answer, but one that requires comprehensive legislation. The state is very focused on assisting

survivors. When considering legislation that claims to support victims, we must examine the full content. A Legislature that consistently restricts abortion access cannot credibly claim to prioritize survivor safety while eliminating one of the most essential forms of care survivors depend on, advocacy organizations that weaponize medical consent bills that seek to expand prenatal care and make this about abortion access. Reproductive care does not always equate to abortion. The lack of understanding we show as lawmakers when it comes to what women need when they are creating a family is something concerning. If supporting victims were truly the goal, we would be dismantling barriers to abortion care, not reinforcing them. We would be expanding access, not limiting it. And we would be honest that survivor support does not stop at abortion process access, it requires it. We should ground any discussion about supporting survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence in evidence, not assumptions. Although this bill is presented as a resource for victims, it falls short of delivering the kind of support that research consistently shows are effective. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Juarez. Senators, the question is the motion to reconsider. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed-- request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Senator Andersen voting no. Senator Arch voting no. Senator Armendariz. Senator Ballard voting no. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Bostar. Senator Brandt voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Clouse voting no. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator DeKay voting no. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Dover. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Guereca voting yes. Senator Hallstrom voting no. Senator Hansen voting no. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft voting no. Senator Hughes voting no. Senator Hunt voting yes. Senator Ibach voting no. Senator Jacobson. Senator Juarez voting yes. Senator Kauth voting no. Senator Lippincott voting no. Senator Lonowski voting no. Senator McKinney voting yes. Senator Fred Meyer voting no. Senator Glen Meyer voting no. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Prokop not voting. Senator Quick not voting. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senator Sanders voting no. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Spivey voting yes. Senator Storer voting no. Senator Storm voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Wordekemper voting no. The vote is 13 ayes, 29 nays to reconsider, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

**KELLY:** The motion is not adopted. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, Senator Hunt would move to bracket the bill until April 17, 2026.

**KELLY:** Senator Hunt, you're recognized to open.

**HUNT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, another problem with the bill has come to my attention from stakeholders who reached out to me. One person mentioned, it doesn't look like there's anything in the bill or in Storer's amendment that clearly accounts for whether the abuser trafficker is present. Colleagues, are you listening? There's nothing in the bill that accounts for whether the abuser or trafficker is present in the room at the time of this exam. It just says that the woman has to be asked or evaluated, quote, in a place, in a manner that ensures the privacy of the pregnant woman. But it doesn't say anything about what if her husband is there, what if the abuser is there, what if the trafficker is there? Senator Bosn, Chair Bosn, this is exactly why you shouldn't have let this out of committee. The bill has problems with the language. Even if you love the idea, it's wrong. According to this bill, the trafficker or the abuser could be sitting right next to her on the exam bed. Let's have another amendment come out about that. What are you doing? You-- I'd also like to share-- ridiculous, you-- I'd like to also share this email from this doctor from ACOG, from the American gynecologist, OB/GYN, that professional group. She is from the American College-- Nebraska American College of OB/GYN. She wanted to voice her concerns with LB669 and the proposed amendment. She says: The initial bill seeks to legislate informed consent process for women seeking abortion. As women's health providers, we are routinely screening patients for domestic violence and coercion. She's saying we're already doing that. Legislation that would give funding or education on how to spot trafficking and coercion or actually help victims would be far more meaningful. I also worry that with requiring patients to verify in writing that coercion questions were asked, they may be far less likely to report their abuse. That's been addressed with the amendment. Requiring licensed health care providers can do this-- to do this can also be excessive. I work in a general OB/GYN clinic that does not provide abortion care. And in our clinics, we often have our social workers and medical assistants ask these screening questions. Patients often feel more comfortable reporting to them. So, again, this-- I think that this is addressed by the amendment that they don't have to disclose this to the physician, they can say it to a social worker or something else. Once again, another chore for compliance for something that this

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate February 3, 2026  
Rough Draft

physician says is already happening. And this physician does not provide abortions, yet now her practice would be written into the abortion statute. Very good, very productive, well done. This amendment also worries me because adding a, quote, first pregnancy appointment into abortion legislation is not standard of care. It is safe for a provider to meet the patient, evaluate them, and safely provide pregnancy termination in the same visit. And, again, this is not something she provides. Separate visits are barriers to care for patients. It's also unclear to me what the, quote, first pregnancy appointment is. I had this question too. What is the first pregnancy appointment? When I was, when I was pregnant, I remember going to the doctor and I, I agree that that's a little bit murky and I, I think that's also unclear. For example, some of my pregnant patients see their primary care provider pediatrician first. Some may report pregnancy at a cardiology or neurology visit prior to seeing an OB/GYN, exactly. Are these folks responsible for this screening? Once again, Chair Bosn, a problem with the language in this bill. If the first pregnancy appointment is not with a pediatrician, is not with an OB/GYN, is not with a normal family care provider, are they the person then responsible for the screening if they're at the cardiologist, if they're at the neurologist, or if they go to an appointment that they already had scheduled and did not know they were pregnant and then they find out at this appointment that they are pregnant, is that then the first pregnant visit? Once again, Chair Bosn, a problem with the language. Senator Storer is well-meaning, and she's not an attorney. You are, and you are responsible for the problems with this bill. I'd like you to get on the microphone and not say question, but answer some questions about this bill. Finally, in practice, Dr. Kinyoun continues, we also see people being coerced to continue pregnancies and not to have an abortion. This is something I encounter not infrequently. This bill does not address this form of reproductive coercion, so seems to be unfairly targeting abortion clinics and not doing anything to help protect women. We as women's health providers, especially those that provide abortion care, are always asking about coercion during the consent process, and we screen our patients for domestic violence. There is a sharp increase in domestic violence during pregnancy. So this is at the forefront of our minds with interacting with patients. This bill seems to be trying to overregulate the field of OB/GYN in a disproportionate way to the rest of the house of medicine is regulated-- to the way the rest of the house of medicine is regulated. And then she encourages all of us to reach out to her with questions or concerns. All of you have this email in your inbox, I believe, and I've distributed it on the floor.

So you have her cell phone. You have this doctor's personal cell phone that she has shared with you, her elected representatives. She says she's working labor and delivery today, so text might be easier. Chair Bosn, Senator Storer, if you guys would like to have the support of the health care providers, Speaker Arch, if you want the support of the NMA on an amendment for this bill, they are reaching out to you in good faith to work together. I hope that you take that opportunity. There-- it should be alarming to all of us with sharing the goal of protecting women from coercion that there is nothing in the bill that clarifies that the person doing the trafficking, the person responsible for the abuse isn't in that hospital room with this woman at the time of this exam. There isn't anything in the bill that specifies where that exam is taking place. Could this exam be if someone goes in for an MRI? Could it be if they're seeing a cardiologist? Could it be if they are already in there for a scheduled visit and they find out they're pregnant at that visit? That's not infrequent. There have been many bills in this Legislature that passed with unintended consequences, and then we had to come back later and fix them. That's something that typically a chairperson like Senator Bosn would catch before it comes out of committee or would be willing to work in good faith with opponents to remove the opposition. We started on Friday working in good faith with proponents of the bill as one of the opposition leaders myself. We started Friday working in good faith, talking to the Speaker, talking to the introducer, trusting that they were going to bring an amendment that addressed the problems of the opposition. All of that trust, Senator Arch, has been blown up by your crew continually calling the question and refusing to allow full and fair debate to occur. I know that you can't control what everybody does. I know that on the Republican side you have your own infighting and your own drama. But I would like to see one leader of this Legislature step into their power, step up, and say we are taking LB669 seriously, we want the introducer to have the chance to bring a worthwhile amendment, and in order for that to happen we have to preserve trust with the opposition. At our Legislative Council meeting in November last year, when all the new freshmen came in for the first time and we got to know each other, Speaker Arch led a whole workshop on trust on how we cannot be productive together as a body, as the only one-house Legislature in the country, as the only nonpartisan Legislature in country, and as the smallest Legislature in the country, with only us 49 members, there's a lot of advantages to that, but a disadvantage is, if we lose trust, there's really nowhere else to go. If you burn a bridge in here, you don't really have that many bridges left. That's a big difference of the way we work here in

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 3, 2026

Rough Draft

Nebraska. We have to preserve that trust so that we can be productive. And by standing up, calling the question, preventing full and fair debate, it's only increasing the tension of the well-meaning, good faith actors, including Senator Storer, Speaker Arch, members in opposition and members of the lobby who are representing health care providers, who want to make sure that if we pass LB669, which seems to be a possibility still at this point, that it's not having these unintended consequences that slip through the fingers of Chair Bosn. And that's something Chair Bosn should want, too. Let's get this right. And we can do that if we maintain trust, but we will lose trust, and you will not be successful--

**KELLY:** That's your time, Senator.

**HUNT:** --if you continue to bully people off the queue. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hunt. Mr. Clerk, for items.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, reference report from the Referencing Committee concerning LB1262. Additionally, your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB202, LB320, LB663, LB103, LB821, LB548 to Select File, some having E&R amendments. Additionally, your Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by Senator Brandt, reports LB979 to General File with committee amendments. Your Committee on Health and Human Services, chaired by Senator Hardin, reports LB722 and LB720 to General File, LB720 having committee amendments. Notice of committee hearings from the Urban Affairs Committee and the Judiciary Committee, as well as the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee. Communication from Senator Strommen designating LB258 as his personal priority bill for the session. Amendment to be printed from Senator Lonowski to LB824. New LR, LR338 from Senator Murman. That will be laid over. Senator Hughes, LR339, also will be laid over. The Transportation and Telecommunications Committee will have an executive session after today's hearing in Room 1510. Name add: Senator Hardin, name added to LB669, Senator Murman and Senator Lippincott to LB938. Finally, a priority motion, Senator Riepe would move to adjourn the body until Wednesday, February 4 at 9:00 a.m.

**KELLY:** The question is the motion to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. The Legislature is adjourned.