

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

**ARCH:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the seventeenth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, Second Session. Our chaplain for today is Pastor Jon Winkelman from Lincoln Berean Church, and he is the guest of Senator Dover. Please rise.

**JON WINKELMAN:** O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is your name in all the earth. The whole earth is full of your glory. You are the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. You spoke all things into existence by the word of your power. By your power and might all things hold together. It is in you that we live and move and have our being. Father, we come into your presence this morning with thankful hearts. We give thanks for your Son, Jesus Christ, and his finished work on the cross for sin. Through faith in him and his death, burial, and resurrection we are able to have a relationship with you. We give thanks also for you, the God of Eternity, the Sovereign Lord of the universe who works all things together for your glory and our good. I ask today for your hand of blessing on the Nebraska Legislature. I ask, Father, that every senator, staffer, and lobbyist would know that you are with them. I pray, Lord, that today there would be a spirit of unity in this room and in this building. I praise you and thank you for the diversity that is here. In this room, there are differences of opinion, and that is a good thing. Remind us today, Lord, that those with a different view on policy are not the enemy. In this building today, may there be a desire to work towards solutions that give people across this state the opportunity to flourish, to grow, and to provide for those they love. I ask, Father, that through the work of the legislators and their staff today you would be exalted and people would be blessed. We ask these things in the precious name of your Son, Jesus. Amen.

**ARCH:** I recognize Senator Ballard for the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

**ARCH:** Thank you. I call to order the seventeenth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislature, Second Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call.

**KELLY:** Mr. Clerk, please record.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

**CLERK:** There's a quorum.

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

**CLERK:** There are no corrections this morning, sir.

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

**CLERK:** There are, Mr. President. Your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB110, LB397, LB441, LB794, LB717, and LB719, as well as LB718 to Select File, some having E&R amendments. Additionally, report for registered lobbyists for January 29, 2026 will be found in today's Journal. Additionally, agency reports electronically filed with the Legislature can be found on the Nebraska Legislature's website. That's all I have at this time.

**KELLY:** Thank you. Please proceed to the first item on the agenda.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, concerning the agenda, the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee would report favorably on the gubernatorial appointment of Mike Anderson, Dennis Butler, Blake H. Dillon, Clint Jones, Stephen J. Matus, and Thomas R. McCaslin to the Nebraska Motor Vehicle Industri-- Industry Licensing Board.

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

**MOSER:** Good morning, and thank you, Mr. President. The Transportation and Telecommunications Committee held confirmation hearings Tuesday, January 27 for six appointees to the Motor Vehicle Industry Licensing Board. Their mission is to license and regulate dealers of motor vehicles, trailers, and motorcycles within the state. It's a ten-member government-- Governor-appointed committee. Board members serve three-year terms. The chair of the board is the director of the Department of Motor Vehicles. The other members are split between one member of the general public, one new motor vehicle dealer from each of the three congressional districts, two used motor vehicle dealers, one trailer dealer, a factory repre-- representative, and one motorcycle dealer. Six appointees have been approved by the TNT Committee. First is Mike Anderson, the owner of Anderson Auto Group in Lincoln. He's a second-generation auto dealer, has, has been awarded the Time Dealer of the Year Award. Dennis Butler has served as the State Chamber of Commerce Health counsel and the Nebraska Association of Benefits and Insurance Professionals and has detailed knowledge of new car dealer operations through his work in the insurance agency. Blake Dillon has already served on the Motor Vehicle Industry

Licensing Board and has also served on the Blair YMCA Foundation Board and is also a member of the Blair Rotary Club. Clint Jones currently serves on the boards of the OneNebraska Federal Credit Union and the Nebraska Independent Automobile Dealers Association. He has owned Clock Tower Auto Mall since 2010 and received the 2023 Nebraska Quality Dealer of the Year Award. Steven Matus is general manager of Champion Homes. He's new to Nebraska, having spent 20 years in Oregon, and is looking to get involved with the board to give back to his community, as he has been involved with it through his business. Thomas McCaslin is the principal dealer with Gateway Motors in Broken Bow. This is his second appointment to the board. The TNT Committee recommends these be approved by the Legislature, and we'd appreciate your positive vote. Thank you.

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

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President. I just rose to acknowledge that I have known Mickey Anderson for quite some time. And I-- when I heard his name this morning, I was excited to hear that he'll be serving on this board or commission. And, and I just think that he's done a great job. He's been a great steward in the city of Omaha. And I have a personal connection. My nephew ou-- out of high school got a scholarship to go to Metro Community College to work in automotive repair, and he was hired by Mickey and his company. And it was just a really cool program and great for kids that are going to do something different than a four-year, traditional college pathway. And Mickey was really supportive of my nephew and gave him an opportunity right out of high school to do something that he loved and was passionate about. So I'm excited to see he's gonna be serving the state in a different capacity, and I'll look forward to voting for him. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**SORRENTINO:** Thank you, Mr. President. I too wanted to offer my support for Mike Anderson. Done business with his father and Mike for many years. He'd be a good, solid nomination for this committee. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Sorrentino. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Moser, you're recognized to close. And waive closing. Members, the question is the adoption of the committee report from

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

Transportation and Telecommunications. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**ASSISTANT CLERK:** 37 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of the report, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Committee report is adopted. Senator Strommen would like to recognize a guest under the south balcony: Mindy Wiegand, the Cheyenne County Clerk of the District Court. Please stand and be recognized by the Nebraska Legislature. Mr. Clerk.

**ASSISTANT CLERK:** Mr. President, Transportation and Telecommunications Committee would report favorably upon the appointment of Matthew B. O'Daniel and Chad J. Tessman to the Mo-- Nebraska Motor Vehicle Industry Licensing Board.

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

**MOSER:** Good morning again, and thank you, Mr. President. The Transportation and Telecommunications Committee held confirmation hearings on Tuesday, January 20 for two appointments to the Nebraska Motor Vehicle Industry Licensing Board. The board's mission is to license and regulate dealers of motor vehicles, trailers, and motorcycles within the state. First, we have Matthew O'Daniel. He's an auto dealer at O'Daniel Honda. He's a third-generation car dealer, graduate of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and has held multiple management positions in the industry. Second of all, we have Chad Tessman. He's the owner of Velocity Auto Sales. He's also president of the Independent Auto Dealers Association of Nebraska. The T&T Committee recommends these confirmations and would appreciate your support. Thank you.

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

**CLERK:** 33 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of the committee report, Mr. President.

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

**CLERK:** Mr. President, some items to read in. Committee reports concerning gubernatorial appointments to the Natural Resources

Committee. Additionally on the agenda, Mr. President: General File, LB538, introduced by Senator Hardin. It's a bill for an act relating to education; it requires each school board to adopt a policy relating to discrimination and harassment, including anti-Semitism, as prescribed; creates the position of Title VI coordinator within the State Department of Education and provides powers and duties; requires each postsecondary educational institution governing board to adopt a policy relating to discrimination and harassment, including anti-Semitism, as prescribed; requires the Coordinating Commission on Postsecondary Education to employ a Title VI coordinator as prescribed; and provide powers and duties; harmonize provisions; and repeals the original section. Bill was read for the first time on January 22 of 2025 and referred to the Education Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File with committee amendments, Mr. President. When the Legislature left the bill yesterday, pending was the bill itself, the Education Committee amendments, as well as an amendment from Senator McKinney.

**KELLY:** Senator Hardin, you're recognized for a two-minute refresh.

**HARDIN:** Thank you, Mr. President. LB538 addresses a growing and deeply troubling concern in schools and universities across the country: the rise of anti-Semitism and the urgent need to ensure that all students, regardless of their background, feel safe, respected, and protected in their pursuit of education. I'm appreciative of everyone who stepped up to work to help make the bill stronger, more robust, better. We have a forthcoming amendment from Senator Conrad which I think really helps make the handshake happen on that. And so I've had some people ask some questions this morning about the two hours of training for K-12, and it is the sense of both Senator Conrad and myself-- and I've reached up the ladder for more clarification on this, which I hope to have for you in next few minutes pertaining to that two hours. My belief, and Senator Conrad's as well, is that that will be enfolded into existing training that's already there in regards to Title VI and in general anything that's in the way of antidiscrimination training with an emphasis now as well on anti-Semitism, recognizing it and so forth. So we're looking forward to what's coming up in the next few minutes. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hardin. Senator Murman, you're recognized for a one-minute refresh on the committee amendment.

**MURMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. The definition for-- the-- actually, the discrimination definition does not change anything. It

is essentially the definition that is used in agencies currently. And the definition of anti-Semitism is also commonly used. So that is what the amendment says out of the Education Committee. Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Murman. And Senator McKinney, you're recognized for a one-minute refresh on your amendment.

**McKINNEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. My amendment just adds anti-blackness and anti-Indigenous into this bill. As I stated yesterday, hate crimes have been on the rise for a while now, especially dealing with black people and Indigenous people. And I think if we're going to recognize one thing, I think we should recognize multiples. And that's why I brought my amendment, because hate speech and hate and all those things do not just occur in one community, and I just want to make sure that the education that we teach in this state clearly recognizes that. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator. And you were in the queue, so you are recognized to speak.

**McKINNEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. And, you know, honestly speaking, I was thinking about this and many people asked me, like, what would I do today. And honestly, I just want-- we could just get to a vote on this. I want to see where everybody is at. I think it's very simple. Are we going to recognize anti-blackness and anti-Indigenous or not? I don't think we need to have a long, drawn-out floor debate about this. I don't even think it should be a debate. You know, as I stated, you know, reported hate crimes in the U.S. rose from about 5,843 in 2015 to 11,679 in 2024 with anti-black bias among the most frequently reported racial motivations. It shows a spike in this bias motivated towards black people. And I think, you know, there's a lot of reasons for that. You think about 2015 and what happened the year after and so on and so forth, it's no surprise. So I just want us as a body to recognize that because-- I think it was my first year or second year there was another piece of legislation to teach education in our schools about particular groups and then there was amendment on this floor that at, at-- initially, it made it to Final Reading where the teaching of black history will-- would, would have been a thing. But then it was amended out of a bill because of fear of a veto, which I still am annoyed by to this day. And I'm just hoping today we can do the right thing as a body and ensure that anti-blackness and anti-Indigenous speech and a-- anti-Indigenous, you know, things are taught in educational systems and our schools. I don't want to have a

long debate about this. We could definitely get to a vote as soon as possible because I just feel like it's cut and dry and it's very simple. Either we teach these things or we don't. And I don't think we can just single out one sector of our communities and say this should be taught but when there's bias and hate in, in, in these other parts of our community that we don't want to do that. I just don't agree with it at all. So thank you.

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

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of AM1866. However, if AM16-- AM1866 gets adopted, I still will only support the underlying bill if Senator Conrad's amendment also gets adopted. However, if AM1866 does not get adopted, I'm not likely to be supporting the bill as it moves forward, but I'm certainly not going to stand in its way. I think that what Senator McKinney is trying to do is extremely important and that we have an opportunity with LB538 to-- if we're going to address isms in this state and in our culture, we should be more comprehensive in that approach. And this is a great opportunity for us to do that and to look at how we are-- essentially, this sort of divisive, negative political speech has infiltrated our society and anti-Semitism, racism, all of those things are, are really coming to a head. And having legislation that only focse-- focuses on one piece of it I think does us a disservice as a society. So I appreciate the intention of LB538, but without AM1866 I think that it falls short significantly. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**RAYBOULD:** Good morning, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues and fellow Nebraskans watching on TV. I think we all agree that bias and hate has no place in our state of Nebraska. And I commend Senator Hardin for bringing this forward. I guess as I continue my concerns about unfunded mandates, I just would like to ask a couple of questions of Senator Hardin, if he would permit them.

**KELLY:** Senator Hardin, would you yield to questions?

**HARDIN:** Yes. Yes. Thanks.

**RAYBOULD:** Thank you, Senator Hardin. I, I noticed in the fiscal note that it does list a, a specialist to be hired fro-- for the Nebraska Department of Education to be able to process concerns and complaints. Can you talk a little bit about the-- how, how are complaints currently processed in the Nebraska Department of Education? Does it depend on each individual school district? Or how do they currently process these type of concerns?

**HARDIN:** My understanding is that there is some uniqueness in terms of how that handles school district to school district. I think big picture with the-- it's about \$256,000 that is listed on the fiscal note. Senator Conrad is bringing an amendment shortly. It will be AM1381 [SIC: AM1861], and our belief is that's going to absorb that fiscal note.

**RAYBOULD:** And then could you explain a little bit how those complaints are currently handled?

**HARDIN:** My understanding is that they tend to take a long time and it's individualized to many times the size of the school district and their resources and so forth in terms of how long it takes to kind of filter up through the system. Eventually, it could land in front of the-- at K-12, right, through the state school board-- or, the state board level of education. And it should, at the universities, land in front of the regents. Many times, that's a long way around the barn to get that done, and that's part of the frustrations, especially with the Jewish community. And that's really the emphasis of LB538, has been the challenge that these things have not been given the attention they need when they need it. And so the timeliness is very important, and that's one of the frustrations and why this bill is happening. It's not that they haven't acknowledged it at all. It's literally been an ignoring on the part of the adults in the room, and that's what's caused the frustration and the need for LB538 across the country.

**RAYBOULD:** Thank you. Yeah, I, I certainly concur that it's abhorrent. Any acts of anti-Semitism, racism, et cetera are, are totally intolerable and unacceptable in our state. But has the Department of Education been tracking them? We, we know nationwide anti-Semitic attacks are clearly on the increase, but do we have any statistics that you could put forward from-- between General and Select so that we could actually understand what's going on in our state of Nebraska and how best to combat that? Is-- does the Nebraska Department of Education track these cases?

**HARDIN:** Honestly, I don't know if the Department of Education is tracking the cases. We do know that, publicly, we had one event that took place in 2024 on the UNL campus. The real difficulty here, Senator Ra-- Raybould, hasn't been so much the kinds of things that have happened in the Ivy League. It's been more of the fact that students, both at the high school and the college level in Nebraska, UNO, UNL, as well as high school students and-- especially we're talking the larger communities. Lincoln, Omaha have been reporting that the challenges that teachers, principals, people in authority, professors, and others will witness anti-Semitic activity going on, spin on their heel and say nothing. And they would not do that if it was any other discriminatory class. But it's been that lack of attention that causes LB538, particularly in Nebraska, and I would say across much of the middle of the country. And so, yes, we all watch the headline-grabbing news on the coasts especially. But here in Nebraska, that's what it has been a frustration of, is these students reporting that there's been a willful--

**KELLY:** That's time, senators. Thank you, Senators Hardin and Raybould. Senator Conrad, you're recognized to speak.

**CONRAD:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. And happy Friday, Nebraska. I'm glad I had a chance to be in the queue after the exchange between my friend, Senator Hardin, and my friend, Senator Raybould. I do just want to provide a little bit more information about the current process in regards to complaints of discrimination and how those are handled currently. So dependent upon the nature of the complaint or the allegation of discrimination, a person would have a host of different avenues currently available to them to pursue those claims, perhaps through the Attorney General's Office, perhaps the Nebraska Equal Opportunity Commission, perhaps through the Postsecondary Coordinating Commission at the individual institution-- institutional level for each institution of higher education. And then usually the typical process that comes to bear in regards to claims of discrimination in the educational field really focus on two primary avenues in addition to those agencies I menti-- mentioned, and then recourse in the courts. There is a process to bring individualized complaints at the K-12 level through the Nebraska Department of Education, and there is an opportunity to bring individual and systemic complaints to the forefront. Those usually take the course of utilizing a complaint within the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education on the federal level. That's the, the current avenue that most people who are suffering the impacts of discrimination will take to address these issues in, in the, the

educational context. And I know funding for OCR on the federal level I believe has increased in recent years to try and address some of the, the increase in claims that we've seen under both Title IX and under Title VI. So I do think that these processes and avenues are already in place. I don't know if there's necessarily an annual reporting at the state level on that front. And to Senator Raybould's good question, I think one of the key components in Senator Hardin's measure is that it will require an annual report for these matters to the Legislature and other stakeholders so that we can establish a baseline of data to have a good understanding about where there may be problematic issues happening in education in regards to discrimination. So the other point being in relation to the fiscal note is each of these institutions of higher education and other related state entities that I mentioned that-- mentioned that, that handle discrimination claims have processes in place, have staff in place to deal with these complaints of discrimination and have conducted those investigations appropriately for many years. Of course, it's well-established that we have long-standing prohibitions in the realm of civil rights that focus on preventing discrimination on bases of gender and race and disability that are, are already out there. And there are education and awareness components at each institutional entity that focuses on education, K-12 schools, higher ed. We have these systems in place when there are complaints for-- that might go to OCR or might go to, like I said, Title IX or other civil rights that are already protected under federal and state law. So there has been an increasing trend across higher education in recent years to lift up and identify coordinators specific to working on raising awareness around Title VI, much like we have done for Title IX. And I think that this is in line with that, that trend that we're seeing. I might just punch in again because my time's limited, but I wanted to respond specifically to Senator McKinney's amendment that he's filed as well, but also wanted to share that information with Senator Raybould, and, and we can get some more to be responsive to her question about how these discrimination complaints are presently handled and then how we can establish a baseline of better data collection. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Conrad. And you're next in the queue.

**CONRAD:** Thank you, Mr. President. And I wanted to rise in support of Senator McKinney's amendment and to again contextualize and ground the point that he's making in the present measure before us. At the heart of Senator Hardin's legislation is an effort to strengthen awareness and engagement around antidiscrimination that is presently found in

Title VI. And he is focused on making sure that there is clarity in terms of how Title VI plays out when it comes to religion and when it comes to anti-Semitism. But Title VI itself, on its face, already discriminates-- prohibits discrimination based on race, color, and national origin in federally funded programs. So educational institutions, which are the heart-- at the heart of Senator Hardin's measure, are already liable under Title VI when they treat students differently based on race or national origin-- think of these as generally called disparate treatment claims-- or when they fail to respond appropriately to pervasive racial or national origin harassment that is pervasive and severe and perhaps considered so objectively offensive that it would deprive students of an educational benefit or opportunity. So this is kind of akin to the hostile work environment claim that we're familiar with to think about it as creating essentially, like, a hostile education environment kind of claim. So I think Senator McKinney's points are well-taken. I think it's specifically grounded in the text of Title VI, which is at the heart of Senator Hardin's measure. And I think when it comes to the fiscal impacts of this, it's important to remember we're not starting from scratch. K-12 institutions and institutions of higher education already have staff in place to handle instances of discrimination and investigate that. They already conduct community education and awareness and engagement about how to identify discrimination, how to prevent it, and how to let community members know about avenues of recourse. They also conduct trainings at the higher education level and at the local school board level on key aspects of discrimination. So I would like to believe-- and I think we can work with the schools and other senators if we need to have technical amendments that will come before us on Select five-- File to further clarify that and to make sure the fiscal note is appropriate. We want to ask-- give the flexibility to the educational institutions to figure out how to incorporate this new training and this new-- not new, but a clearer path for investigation for claims under Title VI. If they choose to have a separate, standalone in-service day on anti-Semitism and religious discrimination and the Holocaust and otherwise, they can do that. If they choose to make sure to incorporate these ideas in their existing nondiscrimination trainings and materials, they can do that. So I think we all are headed towards the same goal, but we want to make sure we get the technical components right to make sure we don't drive up costs for the impacted entities and to make sure that we have a strong approach in terms of, of how the, the educational institutions are carrying this out in context of existing federal and state law. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**HARDIN:** Another aspect of this is that Title VI is a federal program, and the fact is that students, whether they're high school, college students frankly see the process as too cumbersome. We talk about that frequently about a lot of topics in this room. Many times we will intentionally pass bills at the state level even though something already exists in federal level. Why? Because it's a straight line or a straighter line at the state level and something can actually happen. The federal level, they have to compete with a lot of voices in order to get the attention of the feds, and so frankly a lot of students have looked at it. And that's one of the reasons that we need LB538. It's to collect data so that students will think that their issues will be addressed. Right now, they don't report things because they look at it and go, no one's going to listen to us anyway. And so it's the type of thing that's going to lay the track for that train of more information, more data to, to run on. And that's why there's a report that has to be filled out. So-- anyway, it starts at the school level. And we'll actually have some real numbers to report and not just kids coming in to places like my office and, you know, local Jewish organizations where they're reporting these things and, you know, the schools are saying, gee, we're not hearing it and the students are saying, gee, you're not listening to us. So thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hardin. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator McKinney, you're recognized to close on AM1866.

**McKINNEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. In my close, I'll just say that I just think it's the right thing to do for us to require the teaching of anti-blackness and anti-Indigenous in our schools and our educational systems. And with that, we could take it to a vote. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator McKinney. Senators, the question is the adoption of AM1866. 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 be placed under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 36 ayes, 0 nays to place the house under call.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

**KELLY:** The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All 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. Senators Strommen, Rountree, Armendariz, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senator Rountree, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused members are present. Members, the question is the adoption of AM1866. A vote was underway, and 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 not voting. Senator Bostar voting yes. 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 not voting. 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 voting yes. Senator Quick voting yes. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Riepe not voting. Senator Rountree voting yes. Senators Sanders not voting. Senator Sorrentino voting no. Senator Spivey voting yes. Senator Storer not voting. Senator Storm voting no. Senator Strommen voting no. Senator von Gillern not voting. Senator Wordekemper not voting. Vote is 15 ayes, 25 nays, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** AM1866 is not adopted. Seeing no one else in the queue. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to reconsider the vote just taken.

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

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I, I don't think you need to go too far, because if you do, I'll just do a call of the house. Would Senator Strommen yield to a question?

**KELLY:** Senator Strommen, would you yield to a question?

**STROMMEN:** Yes.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you, Senator Strommen. What did the amendment we just voted on do?

**STROMMEN:** It added in other classes of individuals.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** And what was your reason for not supporting that?

**STROMMEN:** I felt that if Senator McKinney wanted to add other classes, he could bring a bill for that, just like Senator Hardin brought a bill for this.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** OK. Thank you.

**STROMMEN:** You're welcome.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Senator Hardin, would you yield to a question?

**KELLY:** Senator Hardin, would you yield?

**HARDIN:** Yes.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Senator Hardin, this is your bill. And Senator McKinney brought that amendment, and I didn't hear you actually speak to the amendment directly. Is there a reason that you didn't express whether it was a-- you considered it a hostile amendment or not?

**HARDIN:** I think this is a very worthy idea-- so worthy that, in fact, it needs to be a bill of its own.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Oh, OK.

**HARDIN:** Not something that comes on to another bill as an amendment that's not been considered or addressed in, in advance.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** So--

**HARDIN:** This is something-- I, I completely agree with Senator McKinney in what he said earlier about challenges that are going on with the numbers that he presented. But that's not what the issue of LB538 is about. In fact, the very issue of LB538 is about the fact that the Jewish community has been vastly ignored.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** OK.

**HARDIN:** And so-- anyway, I'm looking at it and just saying that's what we need.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you. Thank you. I just was more-- my question was about why, as it being your bill and you voted against it and people tend to take the lead of the introducer on a bill whether they vote for or against an amendment, and it was never mentioned-- actually, you didn't speak to the amendment whatsoever in your comments while the amendment was pending. And so it just seems more from a public perspec-- perspective and my own perspective that the vote on that amendment was purely about the introducer and not the content. When we don't talk to the content of an amendment, it's hard to think that it's anything other than who introduced the amendment. So I'm disappointed that if people thought it was so worthy of being a standalone bill that they wouldn't have gotten on the microphone and explained that was the reason for voting against it. Instead, there was zero engagement in just voting against it, which is un-- unfortunate thing, especially when we look at the political climate right now. There is no argument, I think, from anyone in this body that there is an extraordinary rise in anti-Semitism violence in our country and really aclo-- across the globe. And I-- my biggest concern with legislation like LB538 is the role that it plays in escalating that and not the role that it would play in addressing the underlying cause. But if the intention is to address the underlying cause of anti-Semitism, I don't know why we wouldn't expand that to other anti-racist-- or, racist ideologies and try to do better by all people. When we lift all them up, we can do better. So I-- I'm giving everybody another opportunity to vote on the amendment that Senator McKinney brought. As I said before, without that amendment, I will most definitely be voting against LB538. And also without the forthcoming Senator Conrad amendment, I will be vehemently opposing it. But I will be voting for Senator Conrad's amendment. I will be voting to reconsider this amendment. And I hope that my colleagues will be paying attention and take the opportunity to do better. That's-- Senator McKinney has presented us with an opportunity to strengthen this legislation and to help more people with this legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**McKINNEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. For the second time since my time in the Legislature, this body has chosen not to teach about anti-blackness, black history, and those type of things. So honestly, I brought the amendment, but your vote was not a surprise. I understand where I'm at. I just, you know, wanted to see where I am at to just confirm it. Honestly speaking, you know, to say one group is ignored and the other is not, but clearly this body has a appetite to do away with the teachings of actual American history which involves black people, the enslavement of black individuals from the continent of Africa, you know, how this country was formed as far as colonizing this country and taking land from Native Americans. There's a appetite for legislation to do away with that teaching. We got pictures on the walls downstairs of "infactual" history about America and how it came to be. But we don't want to ensure that actual history is taught, anti-blackness is taught in our schools and, you know, discrimination towards us, me, a black man. So it's, it's OK, you know. I don't need the-- you should bring a bill and I'll vote it. It's worthy of-- it's, it's not. If it-- if one is good, the other is good. It-- we don't need another bill. We don't need to wait till 2027. So it is what it is, but I understand where I'm at. And thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator McKinney. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on the motion to reconsider. And waive. There's been a request for roll call, reverse order. The question is the motion to reconsider. Mr. Clerk.

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

not voting. Senator Ballard voting no. Senator Armendariz voting no. Senator Arch. Senator Andersen voting no. Vote is 15 ayes, 23 nays to reconsider, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** The motion is not adopted.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next item: Senator Conrad would move to amend with AM1861.

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

**CONRAD:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. While I'm definitely disappointed in the vote on Senator McKinney's amendment and Senator Cavanaugh's reconsideration, I do want to move forward with the introduction of this amendment that is before you. I believe it's AM1861 in its present iteration. We just recently had to redraft from last year to update some of the dates, et cetera. But I want to echo the general understanding that my friend, Senator Hardin, noted earlier in the debate on this measure. I think that there is widespread agreement in terms of doing all that we can in a nonpartisan way to address discrimination in institutions of education, whether that's K-12 or on the higher education level. And much as we have seen an emphasis and evolution for engagement and reporting and investigation in relation to Title IX, we're now seeing that clear trend in relation to Title VI and providing some clarity as to what that may mean when it comes to religious discrimination and anti-Semitism. This is an issue that our sister states have worked through to varying degrees. This is an ongoing debate on the congressional level, and there is a host of existing and emerging case law trying to tease out exactly how the existing legal protections under both the U.S. Constitution Bill of Rights and various aspects of civil rights law apply when it comes to religious discrimination in institutions of higher education and how that may be covered or overlap with things like race, ethnicity, national origin, et cetera. In the course of this effort, we have to think carefully about not only the fiscal constraints that the schools have brought forward and work as hard as we can to nestle this work within existing antidiscrimination awareness education and investigation. I think we also have to think carefully about how we always balance these issues when it comes to religious rights and freedom, nondiscrimination in education, but also the First Amendment and free expression. And of course-- I think you all know my position on that. I'm kind of a First Amendment absolutist and will fight as hard as I can to protect speech for unpopular speakers and unpopular messages because I think that's

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

at the heart of the First Amendment. Popular speech does not need protection, right? And so, dependent upon the point in history, whoever the unpopular speaker or speech may be-- and I'm talking about peaceful, free expression here-- I think it's undeniable that dissent, the right to petition your government for change, the right to hold and express unpopular or popular opinions is quintessential to the values that we hold dear as Americans and Nebraskans where we value peaceful, free expression and robust exchange of ideas without undue government interference. So we're trying to balance a lot of complexities here is the point of that long-winded introduction. But I have a, a, a very clear commitment with Senator Hardin and with others to figure out how to get the technical aspects right. And I think the amendment that I filed-- which I understand he's supporting, he sees as a friendly amendment-- will provide us a better framework to work on this issue as it moves forward if we're able to have that space and opportunity from General to Select File. Again, we have had some good conversations with institutions of higher ed. We've heard feedback from colleagues about the impact to K-12. And so we're, we're going to take all of that together to continue working on the technical and fiscal aspects from General to Select. But I know that there are also smart and important questions that colleagues are raising in relation to some of the definitional components in, in this legislation that I would be happy to have more dialogue on, and I think, again, we can probably strengthen and clarify moving forward because it is a complex area of law. The definitions that we're referencing are significant. It might be more helpful to perhaps just provide clarity on what the definition is instead of a reference. There's a fair amount of policy, legal-- and legal scholarship out there about what definition to utilize in this regard that is worthy of debate and consideration as we make that policy choice. And then we want to ensure clarity for all of the stakeholders about what we mean and what we don't mean. And ensuring that we have a focus on nondiscrimination in religion also has to apply equally, right? We can't treat one religion in a different way than we treat other religions. And that's exactly how Title VI is working today, as applied to Jewish students, to Musli-- Muslim students, to Sikh students, et cetera. And we want to make sure there are robust protections-- because, of course, on the state level, we can't override the First Amendment for either free expression or free exercise of religion-- to ensure that those who have political criticisms of the state of Israel can bring those forward, just as they would for any other governmental entity in a, in a peaceful manner. And when you look at the, the definition that's referenced here and that's utilized by a host of governmental entities and some

of our sister states, I think if you look beyond just the initial definition, you can see that there's a clarity and understanding for equity, that criticism of Israel can be made on the same level as criticism of any other government as protected by the First Amendment. There are-- there is a laundry list of contemporary understandings and examples beneath the definition itself as well in addition to that equity component that members are asking really smart and good questions about how that would apply, when that would apply, if that would have a chilling impact on peaceful, free expression. And I, I really believe we can absolutely have more debate on it today. But I will work with those members, and I know Senator Hardin will as well, to figure out how to get that definition as clear and straightforward as possible instead of perhaps just referencing NGO's definition and a, a very, a very long laundry list of examples there. So I'm confident we can take that up in, in terms of the technical work that we'll do from General to Select. The bottom line being I think the policy goal at the heart of Senator Hardin's measure is good. We-- it is a complex area of law. There are fiscal components. My amendment I think seeks to harmonize Senator Hardin's ideas with existing civil rights laws and nondiscrimination laws. It's trying to push down the fiscal note to ensure that this nondiscrimination work happens in the context of existing nondiscrimination work, education, and investigation. But we may need to do a little bit more work from here to Select File to make sure that we get it right. I want to thank Senator Hardin for seeing this amendment as a friendly amendment, a constructive framework to help us move forward. And I think he said perhaps it's the embodiem-- embodime-- embodiment of a, a handshake deal, and I, I liked that phraseology. So I'm happy to answer questions. And appreciate your consideration of this good faith, friendly amendment framework to help us move forward. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**HARDIN:** Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of AM1861 and support Senator Conrad's amendment. And it really kind of returns the bill back closer to the original form. My goal has always been to ensure that those who practice the Jewish faith are protected in Nebraska schools, and AM1861 helps accomplish that goal. Just wanted to point out again that the IR-- IHRA definition has already been moved forward by 37 states, either in statute or is executive orders across the country. 47 countries across the globe also understand this. And what that definition is-- and I'll just read it for you real

quick. Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred towards Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community, institutions, and religious facilities. And so the purpose of the IHRA definition and the reason they had to set up a measuring stick was so that there could be a uniform measurement. What is anti-Semitism? And so that stands as that measuring stick. And so they give contemporary examples. And the contemporary examples are truly meant as this is what it looks like, feels like to be a Jewish person and to have that measuring stick either misused or broken or broken over their heads. And so they will give examples of things like calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion. When they experience that, that to them is anti-Semitism. When they say denying the Holocaust or the scope of the Holocaust, that to them is anti-Semitism. Accusing the Jews as a people or Israel as a state of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust, that to them is breaking the measuring stick. Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel or to alleged priorities of Jews worldwide than to the interests of their own nations, that to them shows anti-Semitism. Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination by claiming that the existence of the state of Israel is racist, that to them is anti-Semitism. Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation, that to them is anti-Semitism. And I could go on. But that's really what the IHRA definition is for, is to create that standard. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**HANSEN:** Thank you, Mr. President. I'll ask Senator Hardin a couple of questions here in a little bit, but I just want to express a little bit of the, the reason why I'm on the microphone. And everything I think Senator Hardin here is doing with his bill I think is laudable, and, and I appreciate where-- the direction of where he's trying to go with a lot of stuff. I just have some more questions about the implication of this bill if it is passed. Maybe not so much about the definition of anti-Semitism, even though I do have a couple questions of, of that, but it's more the-- and it-- as what Senator Hardin alluded to a little bit ago, is the contemporary examples that are mentioned in this bill, pertaining to the, the handout from 2016. And some of these are-- make an extreme amount of sense, of-- some of the things that just-- Senator Hardin just mentioned. The calling for,

aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews-- that makes complete sense to me. Again, the implication of maybe what some of these other ones following might have on free speech and the ability of Americans to say certain things-- even though myself and maybe a lot of my colleagues here have, have seen some pretty crazy and radical ideas online about the Jewish people, like the Holocaust. There are some people out there I know who might deny the Holocaust, which I think is absolutely asinine. But according to this bill, what happens to them if they say that online? Another one on here-- and I'll ask Senator Hardin here. May-- he can ex-- expound on these a little bit. Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel or to alleged priorities of Jews worldwide than to interests of their own nations. Some of these I'm trying to figure out what, what these mean. I just want to make sure we're not being too broad here. And then the implications on if somebody does say that. So if, if Senator Hardin could yield to a question, please.

**KELLY:** Senator Hardin, would you yield to a question?

**HARDIN:** Yes.

**HANSEN:** Senator Hardin, could you-- can you, like, just explain that a little bit to me, maybe what the implications are when it comes to free speech and people's ability to say certain things with these-- more the contemporary examples of anti-Semitism? That's kind of the rub for me I'm trying to figure out here.

**HARDIN:** Great question. Because ultimately, what this is coming down to is that wonderful world of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. And there's a reason that the First Amendment is first. It's because if we get-- don't get this right, nothing else that follows it matters either. And so free speech is the thing that we rally around. So how does a world work where we have free speech but we also experience things that are hateful? Can we say hateful things? Short answer, yes. Yes, we can. And so pragmatically speaking, I would say, Senator Hansen, when you take a look at the Supreme Court and how it views where does free speech begin and where does a line cross into hate speech, when is it problematic and when do we as a people need to stand up and say, you've gone too far? And evidently, that place is violence-- incited violence, actual violence. And so when reasonable people, as many law books will say, believe that it's not just a slur cast to the clouds. Any time we, we cast out those kinds of dispersions, those are things completely protected by free speech. I can say horrible things. So can you. So can everyone else listening.

And those horrible things that we say are free speech. But when the things we say turn into violence, that's where the Supreme Court gets very involved.

**HANSEN:** So if-- if I can-- I only have, like, a couple seconds left. So if, if somebody ends up saying one of these things on the contemporary examples of anti-Semitism and another person sees that online, commits an act of violence and said, and said, well, I saw what so-and-so said online and I agreed with them and so I did something about it, can the person who said that be held liable?

**HARDIN:** Well, the person who went out and did the violence would be held liable because we have lots of other laws to make that happen.

**HANSEN:** It's more the person who said that thing then.

**HARDIN:** Absolutely not.

**HANSEN:** I just wanted to clarify that. And so-- I appreciate, I appreciate the back-and-forth and answering the questions.

**HARDIN:** Sure. Thank you.

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

**JACOBSON:** Thank you, Mr. President. I'm a little conflicted on, on the bill itself and the amendments. Generally speaking, I think that I'm uncomfortable with the Legislature mandating to public schools what they should teach. We seem to be skipping a step here with Department of Ed. I also have concerns that we have third graders who can't read and we're talking about adding additional curriculum to the public schools that have nothing to do with helping reading skills, helping mathematics skills, and so on. The teachers I talked to and the administrators I talked to, I get very concerned about the fact that many of these things they already teach. And for the Legislature to mandate it seems wrong to me. I, I, I am-- I, I have significant concerns about anti-Semitism. And, and it repulses me when I hear people that are Holocaust deniers and so on. The same is through-- to-- true when it comes to race. OK? But I wonder at what point is it not the Legislature's responsibility to be mandating to public schools directly what they should have in their curriculum. And that's why I'm having trouble with this bill and the associated amendments, is I think they've got other priorities right now. And if they-- and if the Department of Ed sees that this is something that should be elevated,

then let's let them lead it and work with the schools with curriculums that would go with it. So at this point, I'm not a believer in the bill or the amendments, likely will vote no, but I've been a PNV at this point, which, if this gets to Final, I'm gonna have to e-- either come down as a "no" vote or a yes. But I, I do have concerns as to what this does and whether this is the appropriate place for these issues to be resolved. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**HUNT:** Thank you, Mr. President. I share Senator Jacobson's global concerns about legislating education policy through our Chamber here when we should be relying on teachers, superintendents, the Board of Education, school boards, you know, the elected people who know about schools. But as far as the bill that sits before us, anti-Semitism is real. It is increasing in the United States, and Jewish students must know that they are safe in schools, they're safe in their classrooms, they're protected from harassment and discrimination just like every other student. And our civil rights laws require that. And I fully support enforcing them vigorously. My question about LB538 is the definition. And I know that finding a definition of something like anti-Semitism is hard when there isn't really a legal definition, but this is something that can hopefully be addressed with an amendment. And I know that folks are going to continue to work on it on Select File. My problem with the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism is that it includes, quote, contemporary examples. And some of those examples are about criticism of the state of Israel. And these are political viewpoints about a nation state, not inherently statements about Jewish people, not inherently anti-Semitic statements. So I want to be clear through this bill that you can oppose the policies of Israel the same way that people oppose U.S. immigration policy, Russian military actions, Chinese human rights abuses, and that criticizing a government is not the same thing as attacking a religion or attacking an ethnic group or anything like that. If a student says Jewish people are evil, then that's anti-Semitism, and that's something that is discriminatory, and it needs to be called out and addressed seriously and immediately. But if a student says, I believe the Israeli government is committing human rights abuses, that is a political viewpoint about a government, about a country. And we encourage students to debate U.S. foreign policy, any foreign policy of any country in the world. And we do not treat those political opinions as racial discrimination. And I wanna make sure that with LB538 we're doing the same thing. By importing a definition that

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

includes criticism of the state of Israel as an example of anti-Semitism, I think that this bill blurs that line a little bit. And then the enforcement mechanism in the bill makes me worry about the First Amendment ramifications for students and teachers and the institutions that they're, you know, working under. Under this bill, schools have to report incidents of, quote, implicating anti-Semitism. And anti-Semitism is used using this-- or, it's defined using this political framework that includes criticism about Israel. So what I worry about is that, in practice, a student or a faculty member will wonder, if I criticize Israeli government policy in class, will that be reported as discrimination? If I organize a campus protest for Palestinian rights, could that trigger a Title VI complaint? And we see in schools all over the country in colleges like Columbia University that the Trump administration has come down hard on these students and these faculty members and these institutions for criticism of the state of Israel. So in context globally of what's happening in our country, I think that we should be skeptical and very careful with bills like LB538 to make sure that we're not criticizing-- that we're not conflating criticism of a government with discrimination against a religious or ethnic group. When people are unsure about if their political speech could be treated as unlawful discrimination, they pull back. And in education spaces, that's the opposite of what we want people to be doing. I just want to state clearly, you know, that Jewish identity is not the same thing as the policies of the Israeli state. Jewish communities are diverse. Jewish scholars and rabbis and students and activists have a wide range of views about the Israeli government. And when we write into law that a strong criticism of the Israel government may be evidence of anti-Semitism, we are also sidelining Jewish voices that dissent from those policies. I think-- and I've been clear forever-- that we have to confront anti-Semitism wherever it appears-- in slurs, harassment, exclusion, threats-- but we should not expand our discrimination laws in a way that risks turning political speech about a foreign government into a civil rights violation. We can protect Jewish students without policing political viewpoints. We can fight anti-Semitism without chilling campus debate. And we can uphold civil rights and the First Amendment with a way that also protects minority voices. And so for those reasons, I have questions about this bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**HARDIN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Just wanted to-- Senator Jacobson was bringing up a concern a little while ago about how this may affect curriculum and so forth. And it really does not create any new burdens for curriculum at all. This is really for the adults in the room. This is really for teachers. This is really for school boards. This is for regents. This is for others who basically have influence over recognizing this IHRA definition of anti-Semitism so that they can apply it when they see it. It's not about educating kids about it. It's really about educating the people who are the framework of the leadership of the educational machine. So just wanted to speak to that. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hardin. Senator Hughes, you are recognized to speak.

**HUGHES:** Thank you, Mr. President. I want to just speak on this a little bit, just with the concern of exactly what Senator Hardin is talking about. Realize this is not a training for the students, but it's a training for our teachers. And we-- we've talked multiple times already this session about unfunded mandates and putting more and more on teachers. You know, already our teachers come in typically early before a, a school starts to do-- they have all kinds of mandatory training. To add a two-hour one on this specific I feel like is quite burdensome when-- and thankfully, through our N-- Nebraska Department of Education, we are teaching teachers how to teach phonics again-- because we kind of got away with that-- and we need to spend a lot of time helping our teachers learn skills to be better teachers. Not that this isn't important, but I am wondering-- and, and that's maybe something that can be worked on through amendments or whatever if this kind of training and recognizing that kind of anti-Semitism behavior couldn't be tied into something that they're already taking on antidiscrimination versus a standalone training. And I think-- it's not a standalone training? He's shaking [INAUDIBLE]. That is what I wanted to hear. I was thinking, oh, my gosh. This is another list. Like, OK. Here's another two-hour thing. So I will get more clarification on it. I'm glad to hear that. Anyway, thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hughes. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Conrad, you're recognized to close on the amendment.

**CONRAD:** Thank you, Mr. President. And again, good morning, colleagues. I really want to thank Senator Hansen for his awesome questions and dialogue. I agree with my friend, my good friend, Senator Jacobson, in

raising important issues about the priority of this issue. This issue was prioritized early by my friend, Senator Sanders, and I think that early prioritization-- she can speak to why she'd select this as her personal priority bill. But it kind of "leapedfrogged" up onto the agenda a bit more quickly than I think Senator Hardin or myself or Senator Murman or Education Committee members perhaps anticipated. So we-- the-- and the excellent points that my friend, Senator Hunt, brought forward that have been echoed by many colleagues off the mic who want to ensure that we strike the right balance to always, always protect peaceful, free expression when it comes to bringing a critical point of view forward about the policies of any country. We, we, we-- the, the working definition which is referenced in Senator Hardin's bill and in my amendment-- which, again, Senator Hardin sees as a friendly amendment. So I urge your, your favorable consideration of that framework to help us keep working from General to Select, which we know we have a lot of work to do. But the definition itself, if you look beyond the first few lines, actually does implicate the fact that criticism of Israel should be viewed in an equitable manner as criticism of any country. So we do need to be really, really clear about that and maybe even codify that component. Different model bills that are out there that are raising this specific definition that was generated, some indicate that consideration should be given to the definition, some mandate the definition. There are questions about some of the long laundry lists that is attached to the definition in terms of the contemporary understandings that I think perhaps may be vague or unwieldy or hard to understand that colleagues have rightly brought forward concerns about chilling free speech. So I know that Senator Hardin, myself, and others will definitely work with all colleagues to figure out how to tighten this up, how to make it more workable. And I'll, I'll leave it to, to Senator Sanders and, and Hardin to talk about, you know, why they wanted to prioritize this issue at this point in time. The way I see it is they're trying to strengthen efforts to ensure that there's nondiscrimination in higher ed on the basis of religion. It's a carryover bill from last year. It popped up a little bit earlier on the agenda than we anticipated. I think we've had a good dialogue here, but there's complex issues at play, and, and we're going to need some more time to make sure there's no fiscal impact here and to make sure that the definitions utilized are clear for all stakeholders. So thanks, colleagues, for really, really good questions and debate on and off the mic. And I would appreciate your favorable consideration of this, this amended framework to help us keep, keep working on it from General to Select. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senators, the question is the adoption of AM1861. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 41 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** AM1861 is adopted. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Murman, you're recognized to close on AM1385.

**MURMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. A-- A-- AM1385 is the Education Committee amendment on LB538. The amendment uses the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition, which is widely recognized by various governments, educational institutions, and civil rights organizations already. AM1385 also makes clear that LB538 is not creating any new protected class or creating new discrimination laws but instead codifies that anti-Semitism-- anti-Semitism falls under the currently existing civil rights laws framework. Finally, the amendment outlines reasonable, nonmandatory steps education programs may take to support the goal of stopping anti-Semitism. I urge your green vote on AM1385. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Murman. Senators, the question is the adoption of AM1385. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 40 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the committee amendment, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** AM1385 is adopted. Senator Hardin, you're recognized to close on the bill.

**HARDIN:** Thank you, Mr. President. As mentioned before, 37 states have already acted on this. Nebraska did that in 2023 via an executive order from Governor Pillen. 16 states have made this law. 47 countries have done so. It's a nonbinding definition, but it is the one that Jews from across the world by consensus have said, OK, we can agree on what this definition is. And so it helps to clarify some things. And in the space of education, we are now using that measuring stick. And that's, that's what they want to have happen with LB538 in Nebraska. And so most of the remaining states across the country that have not already adopted it into statute, many of those states are facing this same discussion right now. And so I really appreciate everyone working on this together so we can try to make this as strong as it can be. The fiscal bill is about a quarter of a million dollars. We

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

believe that because we're really talking about infolding training into what already exists, our sense is that really there's not going to need to be a full-time lawyer hired in order to accomplish this. We're really talking about-- saying in the midst of the other Title VI information that is already covered, we're gonna be adding the anti-Semitism la-- language to that. And so we're really not talking about that part of it at all. And so I can tell you that the Governor is strongly in favor of this legislation. Our Secretary of State is in favor of it. In fact, this entire idea of the IHRA and its definition is already ensconced in federal law in the United States. And so we're simply aligning ourselves as a state with what is in federal law with that definition. So thank you, Mr. President. And I would appreciate your green vote.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hardin. The question is the advancement of LB538 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 42 ayes, 0 nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** LB538 is advanced to E&R Initial. Senator Spivey would like to recognize a guest under the north balcony: that's Ted Lampkin, Nebraska Commission of African American Affairs. Please stand and be recognized by the Nebraska Legislature. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next bill on the agenda: LB538A, introduced by Senator Hardin. It's a bill for an act relating to appropriations; appropriates funds to aid in the carrying out the provisions of LB538. Bill was read for the first time on May 19 of 2025 and placed directly on General File.

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

**HARDIN:** Thank you, Mr. President. My belief is, as is Senator Conrad's, that between now and Select we're going to do what we can to make this irrelevant or as irrelevant as possible. But I would appreciate your A vote-- your green vote on the A bill at this time. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hardin. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And waive closing. The question is the advancement of LB538A to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 27 ayes, 9 nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

**KELLY:** LB538 is advanced to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next item on the agenda: LB783, introduced by Senator Hallstrom. It's a bill for an act relating to liens; it adopts the Uniform Assignment for Benefit of Creditors Act; provides an exemption to the documentary stamp tax; provides severability; repeals the original section. The bill was read for the first time on January 7 of this year and referred to the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File with committee amendments, Mr. President.

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

**HALLSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. President, members. I rise today in support of LB783. It consists of the Uniform Assignment for Benefit of Creditors Act, which was promulgated by the uniform law commissioners in 2025. The act, simply put, provides for the use of an assignment for the benefit of creditors-- which I'll refer to as an ABC-- which is an efficient and flexible state law mechanism to wind up a distressed business. This act was, as I indicated, only promulgated in 2025. So Nebraska could be the first state out of the gate in adopting the uniform law. But the vast majority of states already have separate ABC, or Assignment for Benefit of Creditors, law in existence while Nebraska's-- has not had one since 1945. Although the use of ABC to liquidate the assets of a failing business is rooted in the common law, only a few states have additional and detailed laws outlining the specific procedures, and the ABC law or the uniform law would accomplish that purpose in Nebraska. The fact that we have inconsistencies among the states-- and particularly in Nebraska due to the absence of a specific ABC law-- impairs the ability of and the frequencies with which they may be used. LB783 addresses these problems by cementing the common law in statute and providing updates that modernize the law and give clarity to assignors, assignees, and creditors alike. In an ABC, a financially distressed business-- which is the assignor-- transfers ownership and control of its assets to an assignee who acts as a fiduciary and owes such duties as loyalty and impartiality to all creditors of the business. The assignee sells the business's assets with the goal of maximizing value and distributes the proceeds to pay creditor claims. LB783 creates an effective alternative to bankruptcy and receivership processes. An ABC is better than the alternatives in five significant ways. One, it is debtor initiated. Two, it does not require judicial supervision or bond. Three, it imposes fiduciary duties upon the assignee in favor of

creditors. Four, it aims to maximize the value of the business' assets for the benefit of all creditors. And five, it encourages cooperation among all partners by aligning their goals. The bill was advanced-- heard recently and advanced by the committee on a vote of 8-0. Those that testified in support were the Uniform Law Commission, Commission and the Nebraska Bankers Association and the Nebraska Independent Bankers Association. I would just note for a little more specificity, this is a complicated, nuanced, down-in-the-weeds type of uniform law, as many of them are, but it does provide benefits for both debtors and creditors alike. It is initiated by the debtor as opposed to being imposed much like a receivership would be, and it also is much more flexible and efficient than a bankruptcy, does not carry the, the scarlet letter or the stain of a bankruptcy discharge, and provides again benefits for both debtors and creditors. I would encourage your support and would be happy to address any questions that you may have. Thank you.

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

**JACOBSON:** Thank you, Mr. President. This bill did come to the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee. We did have good debate in it. Although it was limited debate from the public, I was a little surprised that there weren't any bankruptcy attorneys that came and spoke. And what, what-- we did hear from the uniform law commissioners. The dis-- the discussion we had in exec I thought was, was enlightening and I think-- keep in mind that this is a state solution, that bankruptcy is a federal code. And so I know I had some concerns about certain creditor rights in a Chapter 7 bankruptcy. For example, the preferential treatment potentially of creditors that we look at in Chapter 7 bankruptcy, there is an ability to claw back certain payments that were made as you are nearing your bankruptcy-- pretty much in anticipation of bankruptcy. The debtor does certain things that puts money out of reach of their creditors. And that's why sometimes a Chapter 7 is a better route to go. It's my understanding-- and Senator Hallstrom, you can correct me if I'm wrong-- that the federal bankruptcy court would take precedence over the ABC. And so therefore, if a creditor was concerned, they still have the ability to force an involuntary Chapter 7 bankruptcy and we would go through a Chapter 7 as opposed to the ABC. But the ABC really is a way to more cost-effectively handle a smaller, simple bankruptcy where there aren't any large creditors who would be disadvantaged by some mis-- mischievous acts by the, by the creditor. So that's why the bill came out 8-0. I will vote for the bill. I think this is-- probably would

streamline some things, but there are still protections for larger creditors if they feel like that they should go through a Chapter 7 bankruptcy. So I would yield to Senator Hallstrom if you want to respond to that, or if-- I'm fine. Go for it. But I would yield to him.

**KELLY:** 2 minutes, 45 seconds, Senator Hallstrom.

**HALLSTROM:** Thank you, Senator Jacobson, for your comments and for raising the issue. We did discuss in executive session those very issues. There is a 90-day automatic preference that can be clawed back if there is a bankruptcy filed. One of the things that the assignee or the trustee, if you will, under an ABC has at their disposal is to clearly overturn fraudulent-- avoid fraudulent transactions or fraudulent transfers. So that protection is there for creditors. And as Senator Jacobson suggested, if a creditor believes something wasn't fraudulent but it happened within 90 days, might have been treated as an automatic preference in the bankruptcy proceedings, that they certainly could impose an involuntary bankruptcy upon the, the debtor, and that would take precedence. And the debtor obviously has the right at, at any time to file a voluntary bankruptcy, would put-- which would put a stay on any type of legal proceedings or other-- anything further with regard to the ABC. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senators Hallstrom and Jacobson. Senator Dungan, you're recognized to speak.

**DUNGAN:** Thank you, Mr. President. And good morning, colleagues. I do rise in favor of LB783. And I just wanted to take a couple minutes to talk a little bit about the bill itself and kind of how we got here. Many folks in this Legislature have seen the Uniform Law Commission, or ULC, bills before. I know they've come through a couple of different committees, and I, I-- that's exactly what this is. So I just wanted to point out my appreciation for Mr. Larry Ruth, who came into the hearing. And this is not my first time seeing Mr. Ruth testify about a Uniform Law Commission bill, but it is always helpful to understand the history of kind of how we got to where we are with these Uniform Law Commission bills and who helped write them. One of the fun things about being on the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee is that you get to learn a whole breadth of information. And there's a lot of things we deal with in that committee. And I'll be honest, this was one of those issues that I was not as informed about prior to the hearing. And so if you look at the committee statement, we had a number of folks testify, Larry Ruth, and then also Donald

Swanson from the Uniform Law Commission who actually gave us some interesting history about where this entire history of this kind of law came from and how we used to have something on the books, but I think it was repealed in 1945 due to some federal legislation. And it was just kind of a fun hearing for him to talk about the fact that he actually went into our physical law library here in the Capitol and found the old law explaining what the repeal was for a similar law back in the '40s. So it's always kind of fun to go through the history of that, but I just wanted to get up and express my support for this. It is a commonsense bill that I think addresses some very specific and niche issues, but those issues, when they do come up, are important to those that they affect. So wanted to thank Senator Hallstrom for his leadership on this issue and, again, also the Uniform Law Commission for always coming in and helping us ensure that we are in compliance, or at least in alignment, with how other states are operating on these issues. It-- it's very helpful for that guidance. So with that, colleagues, I would encourage your green vote on LB783. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Dungan. See no one else in the queue. Senator Hallstrom, you're recognized to close.

**HALLSTROM:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Dungan stole some of my closing. I, I was going to thank Larry Ruth and Don Swanson-- who are part of the Nebraska delegation of our uniform law commissioners-- for their efforts not only on this bill but all of the uniform laws that we take into consideration here. The Jacksons in 1970 were very forward-looking with their song, "ABC." They said, A, B, C, it's easy as one, two, three, as simple as do-re-mi, A, B, C, one, two, three. So I would ask for your support for the ABC in LB783.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hallstrom. Senators, the question is the advancement of LB783 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 42 ayes, 0 nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** LB783 advances to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next item: General File, LB836, introduced by Senator Jacobson. It's a bill for an act relating to banking and finance; changes provisions relating to charges for the examination of financial institutions and the le-- levying of assessments, fees, and costs on certain financial entities; harmonize provisions; and repeals

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

the original section. Bill was read for the first time on January 8 of this year and referred to the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File with committee amendments, Mr. President.

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

**JACOBSON:** Thank you, Mr. President. Today, I'm asking for your green vote on LB836, a bill brought to me by the Nebraska Department of Banking and Finance to modernize our financial regulations. The financial world has changed. Our current statutes rely on an asset-based model, which works for traditional banks but fails to account for modern fintech companies that process billions in transactions with very few physical assets. LB836 shifts us to an activity-based model. Key provisions include, number one, fairer metrics. The bill moves assessments from nondepository ent-- entities like mortgage lenders from asset size tradit-- to transaction and loan volume. It cuts redundanc-- redundancy cuts. It eliminates hourly examination charges for routine visits, removing an extra layer of billing for our regulated institutions. Stronger enforcement. It allows the department to suspend registrations and en-- ensures that entities, not taxpayers, cover the cost of legal hearings for nonpayment. This is a cleanup and catchup bill. It ensures the department has the resources to keep Nebraska's financial sector safe and competitive without overburdening traditional banks. I en-- I urge your support. And thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Jacobson. As the Clerk stated, there is a committee amendment. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized to open.

**JACOBSON:** Thank you, Mr. President. And good morning again, colleagues. AM1780 is a protective amendment that ensures the fiscal integrity of our financial regulatory system. It amends Nebraska Revised Statutes 8-604 to remove language that currently allows the Legislature to transfer money from the Financial Institution Assessment Cash Fund to the General Fund. This amendment is about fairness and transparency. The funds in this con-- account are not generated-- are, are not general tax dollars. They are assessments paid by our financial institutions specifically to cover the costs of their own regulation and oversight. By removing the sweep provisions, we are ensuring that these industry-paid fees remain within the Department of Banking and Finance. This guarantees that the resources needed to keep Nebraska's financial sector safe and competitive are

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

not diverted for unrelated general spending. It is straightforward, commonsense adju-- adjustment that protects the intended purpose of these funds and provides stability for both the department and the institutions to regulate. I appreciate your support for AM1780. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senators, the question is the adoption of AM1780. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 42 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the committee amendment, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** AM1780 is adopted. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized to close on the bill. And waive. Senators, the question is the advancement of LB836 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 41 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on advancement of the bill.

**KELLY:** LB836 is advanced to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next item: LB741, introduced by the-- Senator McKinney. It's a bill for an act relating to government; changes the membership of the Racial Profiling Advisory Committee and the Nebraska Children's Commission; repeals the original section. Bill was read for the first time on January 7 of this year and referred to the Judiciary Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File.

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

**McKINNEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. LB741 is a bill that I brought on behalf of the Nebraska A-- Nebraska African American Affairs Commission to place a member of the commission on the Racial Profiling Advisory Committee and Nebraska's Children's Commission. For context, there is a member of the Na-- the, the Indian Affairs Committee and I believe the Latino Affairs Commission on these, these committees. And just wanted to ensure that a member from the Nebraska African American Affairs Committee also has a placement on both the Racial Profiling Advisory Committee and Nebraska Children's Commission. This bill came out of committee 8-0, no opponents, and there was one neutral testifier. And with that, I hope to receive your green vote. Thank you.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator McKinney. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close on the bills. And waive. Senators, the question is the advancement of LB741 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 38 ayes, 0 nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** LB741 is advanced to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next bill: LB751, introduced by Senator Spivey. It's a bill for an act relating to the Nebraska State Patrol; it requires a report on missing black women and children in Nebraska. Bill was read for the first time on January 7 of 2026 and referred to the Judiciary Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File, Mr. President.

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

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, Mr. President. And a good-- again, good morning, colleagues and Nebraskans watching and joining us this morning. I am really proud to be able to tell you about LB751. And the pages did hand out some information and data points at your desk for you if you want to read a little bit why I am opening. So LB751 is an opportunity for the state to better protect black women and children. The bill commissions a study to help increase state criminal justice protective and investigation resources for reporting and identifying missing black women and children in Nebraska. The main components of this bill include being able to convene meetings with state and local law enforcement partners, federal agencies, and urban community organizations to determine the scope of the problem, then identify barriers and create partnerships to increase reporting and investigation of missing black women and children, and then produce a report with recommendations-- specifically policy recommendations-- to improve the reporting and identification of missing black women and children in Nebraska. This bill does not take resources from the investigation of other missing Nebraskans. It does not impose a mandate on law enforcement agencies to prioritize missing black women and children in Nebraska over other missing populations. And it-- this is not saying that law enforcement is not already investigating. What it does is really seek better understanding. We are seeing "exorbant" numbers for black women and children across Nebraska that are reported missing. We don't know if they are considered runaways, and that definition has an opportunity to be cleaned up a bit. We are not sure

if it's, it's because of domestic violence or sex trafficking. And so this bill really says, let's look at the data. Let's see what's happening and how do we go upstream with policy to ensure that we are protecting black women and children that have disproportionate numbers based on the population size across Nebraska. Nationally, you will see that-- in 2022, there were 271,000 black girls and women who were reported missing. And over 36% were black despite black women and girls only making up 14% of the population. Those numbers and that disproportionate makeup are the same here. In Nebraska, the number of black missing and girls have been over 700 each year for the last five years, with the highest being a thousand-- over a thousand reported missing in 2023. And 885 of that 1,000 were missing black girls. So these are children that we are talking about. This bill, LB751, models what former Senator Brewer did around missing Indigenous women and girls. And so there was a bill introduced in 2019, a study that was produced that came from that that really looked at, again, what are the root causes, where are the opportunities for policy so that we can ensure that all Nebraskans-- especially women and children that are disproportionately represented in these numbers-- are taken care of. And so some of those findings that came out of that study included that the Native population's missing cases were not being reported on the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. So that was an accessible way to address what they were seeing so that, again, word can get out and that there was more support in the recovery of those that were deemed to be missing. It also showed that the majority of missing Native Americans were actually males under the age of 17. And so again, how is a population being impacted? What does that look like? And how can there be more intentional strategies? And so those were some of the findings and then the recommendations included whenever possible, including the race and tribe of the missing person in that missing persons report. There was an opportunity to create better standard operating procedures for a step-by-step process when handling missing persons report both on the tribal side and law enforcement side. And then there was work to establish a task force around the underlying issues that are associated with a person going missing, which included economic challenges, substance abuse, child abuse, neglect, poverty, and pervasive homelessness. The AG also from this report put a position in his office that works on these cases to persecute the, the folks that are behind the abduction and trafficking and the domestic violence that was causing some of these numbers as well. And so I believe that this is an opportunity for our state to step up and, and do this study to ensure that we are going upstream on this issue, because this does not have to be our reality. And before

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

I, I finish my close and ask for your green vote on this, I wanted to take a few moments to share some stories that were really prominent in the news that rocked Omaha and the Nebraska community. I will give a content warning that this could be hard for people that have navigated this type of trauma. And so please, if you're listening, take care of yourself, whether you're on the floor or at home. So I want to first talk about Amber Harris. Amber Harris was last seen stepping off her school bus 20 years ago on November 29, 2005, near Florence Boulevard and Pinkney Street in Omaha. That is Senator McKinney's district. Surveillance video from the bus was the last image ever captured of Amber. She was 12 years old. On November 29, 2005, Amber disappeared. She is the daughter of Michael and Melissa Harris and sister to Jeremy, Ashley, Justin, Jalesa, and Spencer. Detectives had almost no clues. They exhausted every lead, even investigating the family because everyone was desperate to find Amber and bring her home. Can I please have a gavel, Mr. President? These stories are important, and I hope folks can take two minutes to, to give homage and understanding to the issue that's in front of us. Then on February 14, 2006, her book bag was discovered in a trash can. DNA evidence linked the case to a suspect, 53-year-old Roy Ellis. Lead prosecutor, Douglas County Attorney Don Kleine, said that the DNA was very important breakthrough in this investigation. On May 11, 2006, Amber's body was found half buried in Hummel Park. That is in my district. The autopsy revealed that she died from blunt force trauma to the head. The investigation revealed that Amber had been sexually assaulted before she was brutally murdered. Roy Ellis Jr. was convicted of first-degree murder and sentenced to death. Next, I want to uplift Tyler Thomas. Tyler Thomas was a 19-year-old at the time of her disappearance, enrolled as a student at Peru State College in the fall of 2010. Tyler was reported missing in the early morning hours of December 3, 2010 by two students-- her friends-- at Peru State after she did not return to her dorm. Friends searched for her for several hours, and they were unable to find her. An extensive search conducted by civilian volunteers, law enforcement, trained dog handlers in the following days ensued but were unsuccessful in finding her body. To this day, her body and her remains have not been recovered. The investigation was conducted in partnership with the Nemaha County Sheriff's Office, Nebraska State Patrol, the FBI, the Nemaha County's Attorney's Office, as well as the Attorney General's Office across the state. In 2020, a jury found that Joshua Keadle was found guilty of second-degree murder and the death of Tyler Thomas. When questioned by police, Keadle admitted that he had been with Thomas hours before her disappearance, but he said he drove her to a boat ramp by the Missouri River and left her there

alive after the two argued. She was declared legally dead in 2020--2013. And she was 19 years old. And lastly, I want to lift up the story of Camisha Hollis. You each have a letter at your desk from her sister, who talks about the experience of the disappearance of her sister whose body has also never been found. Through LB751, I've had the opportunity to also connect with Camisha Hollis's full family, parts of her family, her mother, her sister, but most importantly her daughter. Her daughter, Ayana [PHONETIC], reached out to me and thanked me for bringing this bill. She thanked me for the work that could happen that she cannot necessarily get reprieve from the experience of losing her mother but no one else would have to have that experience. We're actually meeting in the next couple of weeks to talk about how we can continue this work. And so there are real humans and people behind these stories. I wanted to uplift a couple because I think it's important that we humanize this conversation. And I hope that you will vote yes on this after we wrap. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

**STORM:** Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, I want to say I appreciate what Senator Spivey's trying to do with this, but I wonder if she'd yield to some questions.

**KELLY:** Senator Spivey, would you yield to questions?

**SPIVEY:** Absolutely.

**STORM:** OK. Senator Spivey, did you reach out to the State Patrol before you drafted the bill and ask them--

**SPIVEY:** So not before I drafted, but I did reach out to the-- to State Patrol, yes.

**STORM:** Wha-- I didn't get that. What was that?

**SPIVEY:** I did not reach out before I drafted, but once the bill was drafted, I did reach out to State Patrol, yes.

**STORM:** OK. The question I have on this is, is there a fiscal note to pay for this study? Or what's the--

**SPIVEY:** Absolutely. So listed in the bill, it talks about the partners, that African American Commission will work with law

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

enforcement as well as community members. Based on my conversation from State Patrol, they would like to hire a consultant based on their experience with working with the Indigenous populations. And so that is about a \$23,000 fiscal note. The Commission on African American Affairs is absorbing that in their current appropriations. So while it has a fiscal note, there is no fiscal impact that cannot be absorbed in current allocated budget amounts.

**STORM:** OK. Because I did a little research on-- Senator Brewer did this in 2019, like you said.

**SPIVEY:** Mm-hmm.

**STORM:** And I believe that was paid for by a grant and went through-- UNO did the, did the study on that as well.

**SPIVEY:** Yep. And so I did reach out to UNO. As you know, the university is pretty strapped. They've had to make cuts. They are willing to partner, but we want to ensure that this study doesn't cause undue hardship to any of our partners that are participating. And that's why the commission is listed in the bill. And based on their mission and the work that is in front of them, they are able to absorb that in their current appropriation.

**STORM:** OK. Because the State Patrol just manages the data bank of missing people.

**SPIVEY:** Correct. And that's how I was able to pull the data over the five-year period.

**STORM:** Right.

**SPIVEY:** And so this study is really getting upstream as to why. Why are black women and girls having disproportionate numbers of going missing based on our population? And we're unable to answer that. And so this study would allow us to see-- and kind of some of the recommendations that I gave from the study with Indigenous women and girls-- is it because of sex trafficking? Is it really DV? What are the reasons so that we can better have policies situate and address those?

**STORM:** So did you reach out to, like, Omaha Police Department or-- because local-- the local jurisdiction's the ones-- investigates what's--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

**SPIVEY:** Well, it depends on the type of case. So, like, in some of the cases that I mentioned, there was a coordinated effort with the Attorney General's Office, with the county. So I think it depends on the case and what it warrants. And so the study would work with all of those partners to be able to gather insight just like the study that was commissioned for Indigenous populations.

**STORM:** OK. That's all I have. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senators Storm and Spivey. Senator Sorrentino, you're recognized to speak.

**SORRENTINO:** Thank you, Mr. President. Would Senator Spivey yield to a question, please?

**KELLY:** Senator Spivey, would you yield to a question?

**SPIVEY:** Absolutely.

**SORRENTINO:** Senator, thank you for bringing the bill. It's a good bill. And my question is not anything more than potentially expanding the bill. I think in the last-- the statistics in the state of Nebraska we now have Hispanics making up 13% of our population; African American, 5%; Asian, 3%; Native American, 2%; with the remainder being white. Do you know in your study if this disproportionate number of missing women and children would apply to any of these other minorities and perhaps this study should be expanded?

**SPIVEY:** So this-- the data that I have is specifically pulled from the State Patrol for black females. That's how they categorize it. And then they do adults and juveniles. And so just like with the Indigenous study, people have racial identification when they go missing. And so that's disaggregated. And so the Indigenous study just looked at folks that identified as Native American, Indigenous. And the data that I have around the disproportionate number is around black females, women and girls. And so I do think there is an opportunity if someone wants to bring a bill around the Latinx population. Absolutely. The study is composed of working with the African American Commission, and they have a specific scope. There is the Commission on Latino Affairs as well that could, you know, take on a study of this magnitude, but I would not want to commit the Latino Commission or their partners for specific communities because I have

not had that conversation. And I do think that there is an opportunity to look at that. Absolutely.

**SORRENTINO:** I may take that up with some of the senators who represent south Omaha. Thank you.

**SPIVEY:** Absolutely. Thank you, Senator.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Sorrentino and Spivey. Senator Bosn, you're recognized to speak.

**BOSN:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of LB751. Just want to point out a couple of things and thank Senator Spivey for bringing this bill. It's always very difficult when we get fiscal notes or when we get things that we're not aware of at the time of the hearing. But the fiscal note-- and I'd ask anyone who reads this differently to let me know-- NSP did not submit a response. And while I appreciate all the work that my friends at NSP do, when they don't come in in opposition and they don't deliver a fiscal note and then after the fact raise a concern without any explanation, it really makes it difficult for those of us on the committee who support these types of-- pieces of legislation. What Senator Spivey has here is very similar to what Senat-- former State Senator Tom Brewer, who sat right in front of me, brought several years ago for a population that was disproportionately represented in, in these tragic situations. And Senator Spivey has come and said, you know, it did result in some positive changes and investigations and collaboration in that particular case, and she's looking to do the same thing here. We had nothing but proponents. There is an individual who's listed as an opponent. He did not testify as it relates to this bill. I'd encourage anyone to go back and look at it. His opposition was not related to this bill specifically. So I read that to mean this had nothing but proponents. And for those reasons, I would ask for your green light. If there's work that needs to be done or information that's presented, we can reevaluate. But I am in support of LB751. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Bosn. Seeing no one else in the queue. Senator Spivey, you're recognized to close.

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, colleagues. Again, thank you for your questions and wanting to get in more insight. And thank you, Chair Bosn, for your work on Judiciary with me on this and the full committee for pushing this out. As I mentioned, this is an opportunity to really go upstream

on why black women and children-- specifically children-- are overrepresented and missing and what happens to them. What happens to them and-- and it has ripples through their-- through our families, through our communities. And I think that we can have tangible solutions and produce better policy to ensure that all Nebraskans are safe. And so I appreciate everyone's intention and time today. Hopefully the stories added some human components so you can understand who is impacted. And I ask for your green vote on LB7-- LB751. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Spivey. Senators, the question is the advancement of LB751 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 41 ayes, 0 nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** LB751 is advanced to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, next bill: General File, LB795, introduced by Senator DeKay. It's a bill for an act relating to the Uniform Controlled Substances Act; designates bromazolam as a controlled substance; corrects the spelling of certain substances; and repeals the original section. The bill was read for the first time on January 7 of this year and referred to the Judiciary Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File.

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

**DeKAY:** Thank you, Mr. President. LB795 proposes a couple changes to the Uniform Controlled Substances Act. First, the bill would add that bromazolam is a Scheduled I controlled "substant." Bromazolam is a designer drug that is in the same class of drug as Xanax, an existing regulated Schedule IV drug. However, bromazolam has never been approved for medical use. Bromazolam was first detected in the United States as a recreational drug supply in 2019 and is increasingly found in counterfeit pills often passed off as a legitimate prescription medications like Xanax, which raises the risk to unsuspecting users who might overdose. Additionally, bromazolam is also increasingly being found mixed-- excuse me-- mixed with fentanyl and other opiates. Unfortunately, opiate-reversal medications like nalcam [SIC] are ineffective against bromazolam's effect, making combined overdoses particularly lethal. Currently, six states have designated bromazolam as a Schedule I substance at the state level. They are Virginia, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, West Virginia, and most recently

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

Kentucky. Additionally, Drug Enforcement Agency has completed initial rulemaking to designate bromazepam as a Scheduled I substance at the federal level, a process that started in 2024. On January 14, 2026, bromazepam was temporarily designated as a Scheduled I substance for two years, with the option to extend for another year. While more permanent federal rulemaking takes place, these actions are in response to increased numbers of law enforcement seizures, overdoses, and deaths related to this drug that are happening across the country. For example, in terms of fatalities, between April 2021 and July of 2025, the DEA became aware of at least 240 overdose cases involving bromazepam nationwide, of which 189 of these cases were associated with a fatality. Finally, in addition to the piece on bromazepam, LB795 would make a number of technical corrections in the Uniform Controlled Substance Act. During the interim, it was determined by the Nebraska State Patrol that three substances listed in the act are spelled wrong. The bill drafters worked with the Nebraska State Patrol to confirm the correct spellings and ask that LB795 be a possible vehicle for those corrections to be made to the statute. The three substances are 2,5-DMA, number 2 would be bromophine, and number 3 would be psilocin. Ultimately, this bill aims to bring clarity to the state level now that bromazepam is illegal at the federal level. Thankfully, bromazepam has not had a significant presence in Nebraska, instead being concentrated in states along the coast or in or-- in or around the Rust Belt. This bill aligns with-- Nebraska law with federal law, which just recently changed. Additionally, this bill would fix a few spelling mistakes in the Uniform Controlled Substance Act. LB795 was heard by the Judiciary Committee on January 22 and was advanced to General File by a 7-1 vote. I would appreciate your support for LB795. Thank you.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator DeKay. Seeing no one else in the queue. You're recognized to close. And waive closing. Senators, the question is the advancement of LB795 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** 35 ayes, 1 nay on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** LB795 is advanced to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk for items.

**CLERK:** Thank you, Mr. President. Your Committee on Transportation and Telecommunications, chaired by Senator Moser, reports to LB70-- LB771 to General File. Your Committee on Education, chaired by Senator Murman, reports to LB748, LB924, and LB956 to General File. Amendments to be printed from Senator Meyer to LB1107. Your Committee on

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate January 30, 2026

Rough Draft

Enrollment and Review reports LB60, LB207, LB212, LB384, LB518 as correctly engrossed and placed on Final Reading. Committee report from the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee concerning the appointment of J. L. Spray to the Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission and from the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs concerning Douglas Hohbein to the-- as the State Fire Marshal. Notice of committee hearings from the Education Committee, Transportation Committee. New bill: LB1262, introduced by Senator Andersen at the request of the Governor. It's a bill for an act relating to postsecondary education; it adopts the Foreign Adversaries Out of Postsecondary Education Act; harmonizes provisions; provides an operative date; provides severability; and outright repeals Section 85-906; and declares an emergency. Additionally, amendment to be printed from Senator Holdcroft to LB1235. That's all I have at this time.

**KELLY:** Mr. Clerk, please proceed with the next item on the agenda.

**CLERK:** Mr. President: General File, LB669. Senator Hunt would move to indefinitely postpone the bill pursuant to Rule 6.

**KELLY:** Speaker Arch, you're recognized for an announcement.

**ARCH:** Thank you, Mr. President. As I noted in my January 12 memo, the general full and fair debate time threshold for cloture would be an 8-4-2 rule, but I stated for bills I deem controversial and emotionally charged I'd be following a 4-2-1 time threshold. And I would provide the body with notice in these situations. With respect to LB669 that is now on the board, Senator Storer's bill to change requirements for voluntary and informed consent and civil actions relating to abortion, I will be following a 4-2-1 time threshold for purposes of cloture. This decision was made after consultation with Senator Storer and opponents of the bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

**CLERK:** Mr. President: LB669, General File. Senator Hunt would move to indefinitely postpone the bill pursuant to Rule 6, Section 3(f).

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

**HUNT:** Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, Nebraskans. I can tell you a little bit about my intentions with ordering the motions and, and amendments that could potentially come up on LB669 with my time on this motion before Senator Storer introduces the bill. I understand

from stakeholders, proponents, and opponents that there are some negotiations in process with a potential amendment. This is a really great thing to have happen on a Friday. I love it, right? Like, when, when there's work to do and it's Friday because then we have some extra days to get that done. So my intention today is to use this motion to state some of my opposition to the bill as it stands today, understanding that Senator Storer is working with stakeholders on both sides of the issue to continue the effort to come to an agreement and that gratefully we don't have 15 minutes to do that as we sometimes do on this floor. But we have several days to do that, so that's a really good thing. LB669 is a bill that's being framed as a measure to protect victims of coercion and trafficking and violence and abuse. And those are very serious issues, of course. They deserve serious, evidence-based responses, and they deserve policies that are truly responsive to the experiences of survivors, that strengthen access to services, and that, also in the context of medical care, reflect medical best practices. And I know that Senator Storer agrees with that. I'm in disagreement at this time with the solutions that LB669 sets forth to accomplish that. And I can outline some of my opposition to that on the record here for Nebraskans who are watching as we continue to work on this bill. This bill singles out one group of patients, which is people who are seeking abortion care, and treats them as though they are uniquely incapable of making their own medical decisions. It builds a narrative that abortion itself is a site of coercion when the actual evidence shows something very different. You know, we see that women are often coerced into getting pregnant, into staying pregnant. There's things like birth control sabotage. There's forced pregnancy as a tool of abuse. And this is also a type of coercion that, if we're serious about helping victims, survivors, you know, allowing women to be in control of their own reproductive destiny and free from violence, we have to look at that side of it too. So what this bill focuses on is just those in Nebraska who seek abortion care. Kind of painting with a broad brush and setting an expectation culturally that a lot of these people have been coerced into getting the abortion, and that does not reflect what reality really is and what the data says as well. Coercion and intimate partner violence are real and devastating problems. And human trafficking is real, and we agree that survivors deserve compassionate, confidential screening from their health-- health care providers when they seek support for those things. But coercion around abortion is a very, very small piece of a much larger and more complex problem of domestic violence and reproductive coercion. Research shows that while a small percentage of pregnant people report pressure to

end a pregnancy, there is far, far more pressure-- you know, infinitely more pressure to not seek an abortion or to report birth control sabotage or forced pregnancy, these tools of abuse. And in other words, reproductive coercion most often shows up as someone being forced to become or stay pregnant, not forced to end a pregnancy. Yet LB669 focuses narrowly on abortion patients as if that coercion only flows in one direction. And my problem with that is that's misleading. It's incomplete. It doesn't reflect the facts, and it doesn't reflect medical consensus. And it also pulls attention away from the broader systems that we need to be talking about reforming to strengthen the policies that help survivors of domestic violence. If the Legislature is truly serious about policy grounded in survivor protection, we would be having a very different conversation today. And we would see a lot of policies that we've worked on over the last years had come to fruition. So my concern with the way LB669 is written is that-- you know, ostensibly, it's about protecting survivors from coercion, of domestic abuse from terminating a pregnancy that maybe they don't want to terminate. But in doing that, it continues to cast a stigma over abortion care when really that coercion goes both ways, and it's really important to name that if that's the goal of this bill. I think that other things we could be talking about include universal, trauma-informed screening for domestic violence and trafficking in all pregnancy-related health care, not just abortion. If we were serious about this, we wouldn't just be talking abortion providers. We'd be talking about all obstetricians, saying-- you know, we're going to have a screening for patients saying, were you coerced into keeping this pregnancy? Were you coerced into ending this pregnancy? Just taking a temperature of what the level is there for those patients. And what we heard in committee from health care providers and what health care providers who have reached out to our offices since this came out of committee has said is that these are things that they already do. Both abortion providers and obstetricians and other health care providers, they already have these screenings in place to make sure that their patients feel safe in the exam room and are experiencing safety in the world as well. In line with the medical standards of care and recommendations from major health care organizations like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Medical Association, providers already screen patients for coercion, domestic violence, and trafficking as part of confidential, trauma-informed care. Staff is trained to recognize red flags. They know how to have these conversations privately and safely. They know how to connect patients to resources. And this is something that's already happening

because it's already standard medical practice. Even proponents of this bill, you know, acknowledged that in the hearing. So what LB669 actually changes from what's currently the standard of care, what providers are already doing, is it adds arbitrary hurdles for health care providers, and it also inserts some problematic, ideological junk science language into statute. One big problem, number one: under this bill, patients would have to sign a written certification that they were asked these questions by their health care provider and given resources. And that might sound minor, but the problem is the signing of the paper. For someone who is being abused, coerced, trafficked, a written record like that can feel very dangerous, and it can make them much less likely to disclose these things than a conversation. Research shows and experience shows that survivors often fear documentation that could be found by a partner, that could be found by a trafficker, that, you know, could ever be subpoenaed in some way or used by an abuser. And if we truly want victims to speak up against their abusers, we should be removing barriers to confidential disclosures, not creating new ones and adding bureaucracy. And I, I think that that's a part of the negotiation for an amendment that's going on right now, so that really pleases me. LB669 also includes these really sweeping general statements, such as in Section 1(8), claiming that, quote, many pregnant women are coerced into abortion. And that claim is not backed by credible evidence or any research. And it reflects talking points from antichoice organizations, not the consensus of medical or public health experts. Embedding language like that, many pregnant women are coerced into obor-- into abortion, embedding language like that into statute politicizes what should be a careful, evidence-based discussion about survivor safety done by experts, not bipartisan politicians. Would it be better to say something like, many pregnant women are coerced into abortion and many women are coerced into pregnancy? That would put both sides of it on there, but I don't really think that we need to have a finding about that at all, in my opinion. This bill overall rests on a harmful assumption that people seeking vul-- abortion care are uniquely vulnerable, confused, incapable of making their own health care decisions without state-mandated intervention. And that's a stereotype, and it's not true at all. Research shows that while a small percentage of pregnant Nebraskans, pregnant people report pressure to end a pregnancy from a partner or an abuser, far more women report pressure to seek an abortion or to end a pregnancy-- or, to not seek an abortion, to have birth control sabotage-- to get pregnant, basically. Far more women report being coerced into that. And if the Legis-- if the Legislature wanted a policy grounded in

survivor protection, we would be having a very different conversation today. And I look forward to that conversation continuing over the weekend. And I'm happy to see where we end up on Monday. Thank you, Mr. President.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Storer, you're recognized to open on the bill.

**STORER:** Thank you, Mr. President. This is an important topic, certainly one that can generate emotion. So I am very encouraged by a, a really healthy dialogue amongst-- with-- amongst and between and within my, my colleagues. LB669 is a bill that updates our state's informed consent statutory framework for abortion for the purpose of better protecting women and strengthening Nebraska's efforts to combat domestic violence and human trafficking. The bill accomplishes this by adding new language requiring abortion providers to screen for coercion, abuse, and trafficking in a manner that protects the pregnant woman's privacy and safety. If the pregnant woman discloses that she is a victim of domestic violence or trafficking, the bill ensures that she is provided with the domestic violence and human trafficking hotline numbers and an opportunity to make a confidential phone call. It also provides that she is asked these questions and given space privately in, in the event that her trafficker or her abuser would be in the room with her, and we certainly wanted to make sure that was not the case. Nothing in LB-- really, LB669 simply removes language. It also removes language that was previously ruled as unconstitutional by the Nebraska Supreme Court and would require abortion providers, again, to screen for coercion, domestic violence, and sex trafficking in a safe and confidential manner. Research shows that abortion is often used as a tool by abusers and sex traffickers to control their victims, hide their abuse, and continue their exploitation. A 2014 study from the University of Loyola Chicago Law School surveyed over 100 domestic sex trafficking survivors and concluded that the prevalence of forced abortions is an, is an especially disturbing trend in sex trafficking. One of the survivors reported this, that, during that time, quote, I saw 10 to 20 men a day. Over the years, I had pimps and customers who hit me, punched me, kicked me, beat me, slashed me with a razor. I had forced, unprotected sex and got pregnant three times and had two abortions. Afterward, I was back out on the street again. I have so many scars all over my body and so many injuries and so many illnesses. I have hepatitis C and stomach and back pain and a lot of psychological issues. I tried to commit suicide several times. The study also found that more than half, 55.2% of the 67 respondents who answered, reported at least one

abortion, with 20 respondents reporting multiple abortions. One woman reporting having 17 abortions, some of which were forced upon her by her trafficker. And another said, quote, in most of my six abortions, I was under serious pressure from the pimps to abort the babies. The study found that survivors had significant contact with clinical treatment facilities, most commonly Planned Parenthood clinics, and more than a quarter of survivors that-- more than a quarter of survivors visited. The study further notes that, quote, since pimps and traffickers generally exercise nearly complete control of their victims, these points of contact with health care represent rare opportunities for victim identification and intervention and that those opportunities have largely been missed. In another 2023 study from the Charlotte Lozier Institute exploring the experiences of 1,000 women, 226 reported having had at least one abortion. Of those 226 women, 43% said that the abortion was, quote, accepted but inconsistent with their values and preferences. And 24% answered it was unwanted or coerced. 24%. These statistics are alarming and point to a serious problem. Today, we can take a practical-- very practical and tangible step to protect young women in Nebraska who are victims of exploitation and abuse. LB669 removes language that is no longer relevant or too broad and vague to be enforceable and simply adds language to strengthen informed consent, privacy, and safety protections. These simple changes could have lifesaving impacts and be the difference between someone's freedom or continued abuse. Whether you're pro-life or pro-choice, we can all agree that no woman in Nebraska should be pressured or forced into an abortion against her will. I also want to add-- I a-- I appreciate and I actually agree with Senator Hunt's concerns, that there are women who are also being abused or controlled through pregnancy. And we are working on an amendment-- and I think we might have it back-- to add that provision for screening to a obstetric appointment as well. The underlying goal here is to protect women and to give them a way out of an abusive situation or a situation where they're being controlled by a trafficker. If this saves one woman, it's worth it. One woman, because that one woman could be your daughter or your granddaughter. And the more I've learned about the world of both domestic violence and sex trafficking, the more heartbroken I become that there are women that we see maybe every day right in front of us that are living in a virtual prison. It is, it is not a stretch for people to understand that screening at an abortion clinic is a juncture where you are more likely to find women who are in a trafficked or abusive situation. Certainly, a pregnant woman is not valuable to her human-- to her trafficker. So it is-- there-- there's, there's no argument that

terminating those pregnancies that may arise are to the benefit of the trafficker. So by withholding that consent and that screening, we're not protecting women. We're protecting traffickers. Again, we are-- I am continuing to work on the amendment to add a provision to include this screening for women at their first or-- first scheduled obstetric appointment, because it is important. Those women are equally as important to make sure that we don't miss an opportunity to help someone get out of a domestic violence situation. There's also some discussion on the language that Senator Hunt raised concerns about, and I think we're, we're wor-- willing to work on modifying that as well. The goal at the end of the day here is that we don't miss an opportunity to help get people out of a hell they may be living. And for some, this may be their only chance. So I am very encouraged at the discussions that I've had with my colleagues on both sides of this issue. We are hoping that we can get to a point that we are, we are at least in, in more general agreement. I also want to be very clear that there were some concerns that we may be using-- we may intend to use this vehicle for other very specific pro-life bills. I have made a commitment. We want this bill to go through clean. LB669 is, is the bill that we want to see move through independently. It is important for a variety of reasons. But again, to help those women in abusive relationships or trafficked relationships. So with that, I, I look forward to those ongoing conversations. We're having-- we have some amendments that I think will be up yet today before we adjourn. But we'll be back on Monday. Thank you.

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

**LONOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not only do I rise in support of LB669, but I made it my priority bill. As a former teacher, I have seen kids that just disappeared from class. We assume they went to homeschooling. We assume maybe the parents moved without telling the school. Sometimes we don't really know. Sex trafficking is a significant and growing problem in Nebraska, especially along the I-80 corridor and in and around Omaha and Lincoln and even smaller towns in I-80. I am very disappointed in my colleague's use of the word "stakeholders." The women and young men even included in sex trafficking are definitely the major stakeholders here. We heard from Senator Spivey earlier as she explained that sometimes nearly a thousand young black women per year go missing in Nebraska. Surely many of those young women have been put into sex trafficking and are now part of our stakeholders here in Nebraska. I prioritized this bill because I know of situations of coercion. I know of young women that

have been forced into doing things they don't want to do. A recent Nebraska-focused an-- recent Nebraska-focused report estimates that nearly 984 people are sold for sex in this state each month, many of them sold multiple times in that period. They are controlled. They are coerced. They are forced into doing many things they don't want to do. This bill gives them a chance to speak privately with someone, to, to talk and let their feelings out, to maybe reveal who the sex trafficking people are that have forced them into this situation, give them freedom of, of the rights that they have. Nebraska's geography and I-80 make it a revolving door for trafficking with victims bought, sold, transported through truck stops, hotels, spas, and rest areas. We've seen it time and time again. Both big cities, Omaha, Grand Island, North Platte, cities along I-80, little towns, they've been-- become active locations. The interna-- the internet se-- network-- interstate network, I-80 and I-29 in the Omaha area, gives traffickers easy east-west, north-south movement and ready access to buyers at truck stops, rest stops, and road sides. These people have found easy targets in and along I-80, and they have found people that they make their victims. Many of these people aren't coerced initially. They're tricked, deceived, told some sort of lie that they're only getting a ride or that they're going out for a meal. This bill helps add one protection for them, one chance perhaps that they can get out of a sex trifficked-- trafficking situation and that they have a chance to talk with a provider and reveal what the situation really is. Again, I stand in support of LB669 and I support Senator Storer in this cause. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**KELLY:** Thank you, Senator Lonowski. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would like to recognize a guest under the north balcony: Ricky Fulton of Omaha. Please stand and be recognized by the Nebraska Legislature. Mr. Clerk for items.

**CLERK:** Mr. President, your Committee on Revenue, chaired by Senator Brad von Gillern, reports LB749 to General File. Additionally, amendments to be printed from Senator Storer to LB669, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh to LB669 as well; Senator Jacobson to LB717. Notice of committee hearing from the Health and Human Services Committee. Note that Referencing will meet in Room 1525 upon adjournment. Referencing, 1525 upon adjournment. Name adds: Senator Dungan name added to LB882. Additionally, amendments to be printed from Senator Conrad to LB1071; Senator Fredrickson, LB732. And priority motion: Senator Kauth would move to adjourn the body until Monday, February 2 at 10:00 a.m.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Floor Debate January 30, 2026  
Rough Draft

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