

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

[]

SCHEER: [RECORDER MALFUNCTION] I call to order the forty-ninth day of the One Hundred Sixth Legislature, First Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

ASSISTANT CLERK: There is a quorum present, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you. Are there any corrections for the Journal?

ASSISTANT CLERK: No corrections this morning.

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

ASSISTANT CLERK: There are, Mr. President. New A bill, LB137A, introduced by Senator Blood. (Read LB137A by title for the first time.) Amendments to be printed, Senator Kolowski to LB619, and Senator Hunt to LB169. You committee on Transportation reports LB693 as placed on General File. That's all I have this morning.

SCHEER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LR45, LR46, LR47, and LR48. Moving on to the first item, LB169, Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, LB169, introduced by Senator Hunt, is a bill to amend Section 68-1017 to change provisions relating to eligibility for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits as prescribed, repeal the original sections. The bill was introduced on January 11, referred to the Health and Human Services Committee, placed on General File with committee amendments attached. Those amendments, along with various other amendments that have been considered previously, they are still pending. In addition to that, I have further amendments.

SCHEER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Hunt, would you please refresh us on LB169?

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Going into almost six hours of debate on this bill, I won't overexplain what this bill is. But we have several amendments up on the bill, and I just want to resummmary what AM922 does, which is the compromise amendment that I eventually came to with Senator Arch and Senator Geist. To summarize what AM922 does, under this amendment,

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

people convicted of possession or use would be eligible for SNAP benefits if they're serving a term of parole, probation, or post-release supervision. Just to remind everybody, because questions are continually coming up about parole, probation, and post-release, drug treatment is a part of the terms of probation, parole, and post-release. So that's important for us to remember. A person under this amendment would be ineligible for SNAP, would not be able to get it, if they have three or more felony convictions for possession or use, or if they have been convicted of a felony for distribution. So this is a much more conservative compromise than the bill I originally brought, and it was important for me to find that compromise so we could find enough votes to make this veto-proof if we needed to. And with that, I'll wrap up. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Howard, do you need to refresh us on AM710, the committee amendment?

HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. AM710 to LB169 states that a person with a drug felony may only be eligible for SNAP benefits if he or she have completed his or her sentence, including any term of parole, probation, or post-release supervision; or he or she is serving a term of parole, probation, or post-release supervision for such felony. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Howard. Mr. Clerk, for an amendment.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, the first amendment to the committee amendments I have is FA25. But Senator Hunt, I have a note to withdraw this amendment.

SCHEER: Without objection, withdrawn.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Senator Hunt would then move to amend the committee amendments with AM922.

SCHEER: Senator Hunt, if you would like to open on AM922. She waives opening. Going to the floor discussion, Senator Chambers, you're recognized.

CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, I haven't followed well the amendments being offered, but I have followed what has been said on this bill. I have found a lot of the comments to be very offensive, very patronizing; and especially those of Senator Lowe and Senator Groene. I handed out an article this morning about these people who have been flooded out. It was written and printed by the World-Herald, and since it tells you on the article who wrote it, I'm not going to take time with that. But it says this: Rivers flood. Under certain circumstances, such as heavy

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

rainfall or snowy melt, a river will rise from its bed and, for a time, flow over its flood plain, the area adjacent to its channel that the river can be expected to occupy under certain circumstances. The Missouri River and Elkhorn River have been doing this for as long as records exist, and certainly before records were kept. Then it gives a listing of the floods that have occurred, starting in 1875 up through and including 2010, and discusses what's happening now. The final paragraph says: Superlatives aside, living with rivers has always been a risky proposition. Most of them will overflow occasionally, as a matter of course. The more people and property reside within their reaches, the more costly the overflows will be. The Elkhorn's flood history reminds us that history touches us, that today's damages are a legacy of yesterday's choices. As climate scientists predict that a warming planet will intensify both drought and flooding, we would do well to remember that our choices create tomorrow's legacy. And I put something at the bottom of this, and a paragraph labeled hypocrisy. Different strokes for different folks. The same arguments against LB169 can be made against federal aid, which is taxpayers' money, to flood victims based on the legal principle of assumption of risk, where the injured party takes on the risk of loss, injury, or damage. The town's businesses and victims should have sunk roots somewhere else. They are, quote, victims, unquote, of voluntary actions and deliberate choices. Why should others pay and include farmers' price supports. For Senator Lowe, let these people who got flooded out just go somewhere else and get a job. For these farmers who can't make it and accept handouts in the form of price supports for farmers, let them get off the farm and go to the city and get a job. There are plenty of jobs for farmers, and I am very incensed at what I've heard. Senator La Grone is becoming a tool in the hands of a lot of the older senators here. He just got selected, so he does a lot of the dirty work. He'll turn on his light, give time to people. He said that even though money to provide food stamps is from the federal government, taxpayers pay it. Well, the aid that they're seeking for Nebraska, over a billion dollars, comes from federal money which is taxpayers' money provided by working people. The hypocrite will go for that aid, for these flooded-out people. I see tragedies that befall people in one way. People need help. The Legislature is in a position to provide it. The hypocrites here pick and choose--

SCHEER: One minute.

CHAMBERS: If they're white farmers, give them price supports. Subsidize insurance for them. They think that's all right. Then when it comes to providing food, they suddenly become nitpickers; penny-wise, pound-foolish; and horrendously hypocritical. I copied a verse from the "Bible" and put it in the upper right-hand corner of this. It's from the Book of Luke, sixth chapter, 31st verse. I could quote this by heart, as could everybody, but I'm going to read it. "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." If you needed food, would you want it? Certainly you would. You all are nitpicking because of ideological nonsense.

SCHEER: Time.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

CHAMBERS: You're marking yourselves--

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CHAMBERS: And you are marking-- what did you say?

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CHAMBERS: You said time?

SCHEER: Yes, sir.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Slama, you're recognized.

SLAMA: Thank you, Mr. President. I think we've had a chance to have a good discussion throughout this debate about some of the challenges our state faces when it comes to drug use. And something that I think hasn't been referenced enough is meth use in some of our rural parts of the state, and I would like to cite a couple of articles today that ran in the Omaha World-Herald in October, 2017. The first one is by Martha Stoddard and Natalia Alamdari: As nation faces opioid epidemic, in Nebraska and Iowa, meth is still the No. 1 threat. "Methamphetamine has dropped out of the public spotlight since the time, more than a decade ago, when it was labeled 'America's most dangerous drug.' But the highly-addictive stimulant is as least as common now as it ever was in Nebraska, far outpacing the opioids plaguing many other states. Consider: The U.S. Attorney's Office for Nebraska prosecuted nearly five times as many meth-related cases last year as in 2007, and meth accounted for nearly 93 percent of drug prosecutions last year. The Omaha Police Department made 668 meth-related arrests last year, more than twice the number five years earlier. The rate of Nebraskans seeking meth treatment was higher in 2015 than in any year back to 2000. Only alcohol sent more people into treatment. Meth factors into more Nebraska child welfare cases than any other drug. Parents of nearly one in three Nebraska foster children use meth. 'Right now, meth is very abundant,' said Brenda Daley, coordinator for the Midwest High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, or HIDTA, a regional drug-control effort. 'It's supply and demand, and there is a lot of supply.' The area's last surge in meth use occurred in the early 2000s. At that time, meth was the target of concern across the nation. The drug's popularity brought it with a proliferation of explosive and hazardous home meth-making laboratories. 'At one point, it was probably on everyone's mind,' said Detective Greg Chase of the Southwest Iowa Narcotics Enforcement Task Force and Council Bluffs Police

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

Department. Nebraska and Iowa saw a dip in use after they and the federal government passed laws restricting sales of pseudoephedrine, a decongestant and key meth-making ingredient. The laws require pseudoephedrine to be kept behind pharmacy counters. Buyers have to show identification and are logged in a statewide database. The mom-and-pop meth labs virtually disappeared after the restrictions took effect. In 2005, the Nebraska State Patrol busted 252 meth labs and Iowa law enforcement seized 760 labs. Last year--so this would be 2016--Nebraska authorities found only three labs, while Iowa authorities found 85. We're almost to the point where meth labs have been eliminated, said Sergeant Dave Bianchi of the Omaha Police Department's narcotics unit. 'It's almost gone the way of unicorns. Extremely rare.' The decline in use that followed the demise of home labs was short-lived, though. International drug cartels soon stepped in to fill the gap in production, pumping high volumes of highly-potent meth into Nebraska and other states, from large-scale laboratories in Mexico. As a result, law enforcement officials throughout the Midwest continue to rank meth as the top drug threat to the region, according to a survey by the Midwest HIDTA. That differs from the eastern United States where heroin and prescription opioids have replaced meth and cocaine as top concerns in recent years. Opioid use also is increasing in Nebraska and Iowa, along with the numbers of overdose deaths, Daley said. But meth remains the most common--

SCHEER: One minute.

SLAMA: --hardcore drug--" Thank you, Mr. President. "--with the greatest impact in the two states. 'It's been our No. 1 threat since 2005,' said Lieutenant Jason Scott of the Nebraska State Patrol. 'It's always there.' Nebraska law enforcement points to meth as the drug that contributes most to violent and property crimes in the state, the survey found. Users tend to be young, white adults who can be from any corner of the state. In fact, child-removal statistics suggest that meth is more common in rural parts of the state than in urban Omaha." I plan to finish out this article with the remainders of my turns to speak this morning, because we need to draw light to this issue, and this bill seems to be the perfect place to do it. This is something that needs to have light drawn upon it on this floor. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Slama. (Doctor of the day introduced.) Returning to those waiting in the queue, Senator La Grone, Lathrop, Lowe, and others. Senator La Grone, you're recognized.

La GRONE: Thank you, Mr. President. Since we already started talking about what we spend taxpayer dollars on, I thought it would be appropriate to look at that more in depth. So I'm just going to go ahead and look at the preliminary budget here. The preliminary budget is the first of several stages in the budget process. It provides a starting point for discussion of the various budget actions suggested at this point in time. Subsequent to the hearings, the Appropriations

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

Committee will formulate its formal recommendation to the Legislature, at which time floor debate and amendment will take place, followed by governor vetoes and legislative overrides, if any. Then it moves into the General Fund financial status. At sine die 2018, the projected financial status of FY '20-21 biennium was \$94.5 million above the minimum reserve. At that point, FY '19-20 was the out year in the five-year financial status. And there was no projection for FY '22-23 biennium. At the July, 2018, meeting of the Tax Rate Review Committee, or TRR, the General Fund financial status changed very little. FY '17-18 revenues were \$38.4 million above the sine die forecast and a total of \$62 million above the certified forecast. By statute, actual receipts in excess of the certified forecast are then transferred to the Cash Reserve Fund. The financial status deteriorated significantly in November, 2018, when the TRR committee again met. The variance from the minimum reserve went from a positive \$93.8 million to a shortfall of \$95.1 million due to revenue forecasts. Original forecasts from FY '20 and FY '21 were a combined \$336.5 million below the previously used preliminary LFO revenue estimates. In FY '18-19, the forecast increased by \$69.3 million, but that amount would be in excess of the certified forecast, and, by law, is shown as being transferred to the Cash Reserve Fund. There is some offset with the overall lower spending projections, those projected appropriations levels used the latest estimates for TEEOSA school aid information from the agency budget request. The Appropriations Committee preliminary budget, as set forth here, reduces that \$95 million shortfall to a balanced budget slightly above the minimum reserve. The \$95 million swing was accomplished mostly through the appropriation levels below the November tax rate review committee meeting estimate, including TEEOSA school aid, \$38 million of which \$26 million reflects inclusion of LB588; and DHHS provider rates, \$30.9 million. A \$48.5 million increase in revenues due to cash fund transfers was offset by a \$51 million per year increase in transfer outs of property tax credits. Now we're going to General Fund revenues, where we actually, you know, when we're talking about money coming in from taxpayers. Revenue estimates for FY2018-19, '19-20, and '20-21 are the October 18 forecast from the Nebraska Economic Forecast Advisory Board, or NEFAB. Rate and base-adjusted revenue growth implied by the forecast from FY '20-21 biennium averaged 3.1 percent; 3.3 percent in FY '19-20; and 2.8 percent in FY '20-21. When including the 5.5 percent growth in the FY '18-19 forecast, there is an average growth of 3.9 percent over the three years that affect the financial status of the upcoming biennium. Know that these revenue forecasts include the impact of the Wayfair ruling related to remote sellers. A more complete explanation is found on Page 11 of the preliminary budget report. For the following biennium, revenue growth is calculated at 5 percent per year, using the historical average methodology.

SCHEER: One minute.

La GRONE: A target growth is the historical average of 4.7 percent, but adjusted down to 4.4 percent to exclude growth that is now negated by indexing of the income tax brackets. Because the revenue growth in the NEFAB forecast is below average, the revenue growth needed to yield

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

a 4.4 percent five-year average as 5 percent in both FY '20-21 and '21-22 and FY '22-23. At this point, these calculated amounts are very close to the unofficial estimates prepared by the Legislative Fiscal Office, or LFO, using IHS economics, but significantly lower than the Nebraska Department of Revenue, NDR, and the LFO estimate using Moody's. And we are moving into more specific data, and so I'm sure I will have an opportunity to get into that data at a later time at the mike. How much time do I have left, Mr. President?

SCHEER: Five seconds.

La GRONE: Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator La Grone. Senator Lathrop, you're recognized.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. Good morning. I am struck by this conversation, how this bill has turned from the first three hours it had on the floor to where it is today, the comments that people are making. And I'm going to make an observation, if I might, and that is that we are here to make policy. At the end of the day, this isn't about the next election cycle and what's going to look good on a mailer, but we're here to make policy. And sometimes, making policy requires that we be a little more nuanced than what I'm hearing on the floor today. We have an honest-to-God crisis in our Department of Corrections. An honest-to-God crisis in our Department of Corrections. And the people that stand up and say drug addicts don't deserve SNAP are missing an opportunity to have a conversation about a crisis facing this state. We have people who are-- our Department of Corrections hit 163 percent of capacity. We are now in the midst of a lawsuit by the American Civil Liberties Union over the conditions of the Department of Corrections. And now we have a small piece that's before you for your policy consideration, and we've taken it off into campaign stuff. We've taken it off into campaign stuff, and we've missed an opportunity to have a conversation about policy. And I'm going to tell you I have spent the entire legislative session, three days a week, listening to bills in Judiciary Committee. And if you don't think we have a crisis over in the Department of Corrections that's going to affect our budget, what we're ultimately going to spend, and whether you're going to have any money for anybody's property tax relief, you're missing the point. And it's time that you have a broader perspective on policy and a more nuanced approach to policy-making. What we find when somebody is released from prison, they are either on parole, they go through the parole program; or they're on reentry that's taken care of through probation. These people, in order to give them an opportunity to succeed, because if they don't, they'll be right back in our prisons, and 163 will be 170 percent of capacity. These people need help. You may not like what they did before they got there, but they've just completed their time. They've done their time, and now they are out in society. We are finding housing for them, we are giving them programming, we are taking them through drug rehabilitation so that they might succeed and not reoffend. We have an opportunity

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

with-- in a partnership with the federal government to provide them with food. It's one thing they don't have to worry about. And if you think they're getting out of prison and going back and using drugs and using SNAP and just living a carefree life, you're missing it. Because if they're doing that, they're taking drug tests to see that they're clean, or they're back in prison. We're talking about the people who are determined to succeed at this, they are determined to succeed and we have an opportunity to help. Now, I've heard about how they could work at McDonald's. And if they worked at McDonald's, they might be able to pick up a free lunch. You need to understand most of these people are doing programming when they get out. So you leave prison--

SCHEER: One minute.

LATHROP: --and you get, whether you're on the parole or in the reentry program, you have a list of things to do. And many of these people are involved in drug treatment programs. Their life is consumed with trying to stay out of trouble and trying to check the boxes on the list that they were given when they left. This is a small way to help in the process of trying to get these people through that perilous time when they are at greatest risk to reoffend, and I'm telling you, I'm telling you this is an opportunity to partner with the federal government, allow these people a benefit that's going to assist them in not reoffending, so that they don't become our expense and our problem in a Department of Corrections that's at a new high, 163 percent of capacity. I implore you--

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

LATHROP: I implore you to take a more nuanced approach.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

LATHROP: Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. Senator Lowe, you're recognized.

LOWE: Thank you, Mr. President. Drug addicts deserve SNAP? Really? How does this help? If we give them SNAP, free food, will they not still be drug addicts? Because you give them food does not make them not a drug addict. They still have a problem. And I understand that. We need to give them work. There is work out there now. Many contractors will hire you. If you are working, you have a chance to come clean. By getting SNAP, there is no chance. It's another handout. The hand up we need is to get these people busy, get them productive in their life, and

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

get them moving forward. Senator Chambers brought up that the farmers and ranchers will now be needing all sorts of assistance. Yes, they will, because they've lost their livelihood. Not because of a choice they made, but by mother nature, and by poor planning on our part of not making these levees stronger sooner. And, yes, Senator Chambers, they will be coming to the cities and the towns to work, because they have a debt to pay, many of them to the bank. They've lost their livelihood. They will come to towns to work, to put in 8 hours, 10 hours a day or more, and then go back home and clean up their homes and their lot, their fields, their pastures. They've lost their livelihood. Their cattle are gone, their pigs are gone, their livestock are gone. Millions wiped out in a week. They will come to our cities, they will work for us. They need money so that they can survive. They need a temporary help, and I agree to that. They need a hand up. They're not ones that will take a handout. They will work hard. I appreciate your point of view. But they're a strong lot. Actions and behavior causes consequences: A, B, C. Your actions and your behaviors cause consequences. You committed a crime and you've done your time. Get clean, go to work. Part of this time of you being away on behalf of the government should be a time that you were able to get mostly clean. You can go back to work. There's nothing stopping you, there is work out there. There is plenty of work. We have a 4 percent unemployment or less in Nebraska. It's amazing. This is the best state in the country to live in. We love to work. I have friends who have been addicts. And they came clean, not because of handouts, not because of SNAP programs, not because of other programs, but because they dedicated their life to their families and to themselves, not their habits. Their habits eat them up alive. Let's let them--

SCHEER: One minute.

LOWE: --kick these bad habits. Thank you, Mr. President. Let's let them kick these habits by giving them the opportunity to work, and let's not suppress them anymore with government benefits. Because that is what we're doing. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Lowe. Mr. Clerk, for a motion.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, a priority motion. Senator Chambers would move to recommit LB169 to committee.

SCHEER: Senator Chambers, you're welcome to open on you amendment.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. I will withdraw this motion, but I can't stand it. Let these farmers get a different way to make a living, stop farming where they're going to be flooded out. Their livestock and crop will cost \$900 million that they're going to put a hand out to the government for. Realize that farming doesn't work and go get a job and stop taking the handouts. And stop extrapolating from what you do as an individual and apply it to everybody in

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

this society. And the same goes for Senator Halloran. I heard him talk about somebody used-- got some food with a food stamp card and then somebody with her peeled off a big roll and bought some lottery tickets. That's the most stupid, asinine kind of thing we can say in a discussion like this. They don't have to worry about it, so it's easy for them. Well, if you're going to make 33 votes, get ready for a rough session. And I'd like to see you all try to shut me up. You whine about what people say about you on social media. Do they put stuff under your door? Do they call and curse out your staff with racist threats? And I'm here every day. I don't go begging and whining and saying, these people do this, because I know what white Nebraskans are about. And you know what I gave Cindy to say when these racist cowards call? "Go, my child, and sin no more. Less a worse thing come upon you. I'm going to pray for you, because it's obvious you're standing in the need of prayer. God bless, and have a blessed day." And that pulls their venomous fangs. I get letters. I don't know who these people are. They write false return addresses. Like one came from South Carolina, supposedly, and it was post marked in Des Moines, Iowa. Well, the computer makes it possible to check on names and addresses. There's not even an address like the one they put. Somebody from the state of Washington wrote a Washington, D.C., address in which to send their racist, vile profanity. They can do that. This is America. You all talk about free speech. Well, let them have their free speech and show what they are. It doesn't do me any harm. I can take it. If these cowardly white racists have somebody like me that they can focus on, maybe the cowards won't beat their wife today. Maybe the cowards will not abuse their children today. I'm not weak like you all, whining and crying all the time. I've seen businessmen sentenced for stealing, income tax evasion, and all these things. So that casts a pall on Senator Halloran in the same way he's trying to say something negative about everybody on food stamps, because he saw somebody pull some money off a roll of bills. You all haven't lived the life I had, and you couldn't do it. You'd be out of your mind. You would have jumped off a building, and you would have run and hidden under a bed. You're strong when you've got bombs. You're strong when you got tanks. You're strong when you got a lot of company along with you. That's what you have on this floor, and that's what you have had ever since I've been here. But I don't run, I don't hide, I don't sacrifice my principles and beliefs to get along with you all. What am I getting along with? I listen to you. You have set the tone for this session. And I'm going to say something from John Henry. The man who invented the steam drill thought it was mighty fine. John Henry drove his 15 feet, but the steam drill only made nine. John Henry said to the captain, look at yonder what I see, hold and choked, you've drilled and broke, you can't drive steel like me. Let's see how the rest of this session goes. Thirty-three votes is what you want? You want every bill to go to three hours on General File? You don't have people on this floor who can speak for themselves. What's happening out with the Native Americans right now? Terrible conditions. Where is their voice?! Who speaks for the poor, the powerless, the hungry? Your Jesus told you to feed the hungry, and here Senator Lowe is judging people. He doesn't even know any of these people, and says they can get a job, they can get work. Those of us on the Judiciary Committee, those of us on the Business and Labor Committee know how difficult it is for people with a record to even get an interview for a job,

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

and he's saying there's plenty of work out there. That is ignorance. But it's not invincible ignorance. If he was a philosopher, he would know that invincible ignorance is the kind that will not yield to facts, information. "Vincible" ignorance can be overcome with facts and information. But as I think about it, the ignorance here is invincible ignorance. Facts mean nothing. These white people look at how things are for them in this state and they want to extrapolate from that and say it's the same for everybody. Why do you think I stand on this floor and fight as hard as I do? Why do you think I come down here during the summer, day after weary day, when you all are home doing whatever it is white people do when they're not working but still getting paid? Senator Lowe doesn't turn his check down when we're out of session and they give him that monthly check. He accepts it for work not done. We are paid each month for what we have done that month. Why don't you turn down that money that I got you all for expenses during the session? That's a handout from the taxpayers, but you accept it for yourself. And we are going to have some rocky roads the rest of this session. I heard somebody whining on the floor about what's happening on social media. If it bothers you that much, leave it alone, don't read it. Let it go. You show yourself to be weak-minded and weak. Can't take what you read that some fools put out there? Well, Solomon said: Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest you be like unto him. But he knows there are other circumstances where things are different when you're dealing with a different kind of a fool. And the Solomon who said, answer a fool not according to his folly, said in the same book of proverbs: Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he break thy head. You have to do like Paul told Timothy: Study to show thy self approved, a workman who needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. You have to be able to analyze and evaluate. Let your mind, Senator Lowe, be like a prism. Then when a beam of light is passed through a prism, on the other side it's broken up into its component colors. So if you have an intellect that works, you take a problem, and you pass it through the magnificent prism of your intellect, and you break it down into those constituent parts. And by understanding each individual part, then their relationship to each other, you first analyze, then you synthesize, and when you get that first point that you were unaware of, you now have understanding. That's why one of those biblical writers said, get knowledge, get wisdom, but with all thy getting, get an understanding. And as long as there are poor people, as long as there are voiceless people, as long as there are oppressed people, I'm going to be what I am, I'm going to say what I've got to say, and I'm going to stay here. And we are going to fight like scorpions in a bottle. And I don't need help, Senator Lowe. I don't need a bunch of company with me. This is what I have assumed as my responsibility, when I gave the affirmation that I would do this job to the best of my ability. Well, since my ability is--

SCHEER: One minute.

CHAMBERS: --so far exceeds others, apparently, I have a greater responsibility. You see, my friend, the "Bible" says: Where much is known, much is required. If you don't know much, you can't do much. You're doing as much as you know. And Paul, or one of them, said: How shall

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

they know, if they're not taught? How can they be taught without a teacher? How can one teach unless he or she be sent? These are things that I understand, that I ruminate on, that I think about, that help me survive in an intellectual wasteland, which is what this Legislature is. The pettiness, the trifling, the meanspiritedness, the stinginess, the unkindness. Well, you need somebody who is your even change, and that person is me. I'm going to be here.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CHAMBERS: And I'm going to be on my feet doing what I should do. I withdraw that motion, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Without objection, so noted. Returning to the queues, waiting to discuss: Senator Halloran, Hunt, Chambers, and others. Senator Halloran, you're recognized.

HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, colleagues, Nebraskans. If only I could be as nuanced as Senator Chambers. Sometimes five minutes seems like an eternity. I won't consume the five minutes, because I believe in brevity. It's the soul of wit. For those that are watching on TV, I handed out to my colleagues a handout which shows before and after pictures of people who have become addicted to meth. I consider them victims of meth dealers, drug dealers, felons. I consider them people who have their lives ruined forever. The pictures are pretty graphic. I didn't do them in color, it would be even more graphic. But their lives are ruined, their family's lives are ruined. And the question is, getting back to the policy proposal at hand, the question is, do we give drug dealers three tries to rehabilitate themselves? Do we give them three tries to not come back to our communities and sell these drugs, sell meth? Senator Slama gave some statistics on what a disaster meth is. These photos graphically show-- they're not very nuanced, sorry about that. They're not very nuanced. they're photos of people whose lives have been physically ruined, emotionally ruined, mentally ruined, and you can only picture the families that are behind that ruined life. So the question is, is should we grant a third opportunity for a felon who was convicted of being a full-time drug dealer, meth-lab? Should we allow them to have three times, three chances if they offend once, well, we'll let them have a second opportunity, right? And if they fail a second time, this proposal suggests they should have a third opportunity. Colleagues, I'm not willing to allow a felon drug dealer to have a third opportunity to ruin people's lives. Senator Chambers, I have empathy and sympathy for people like these, pictured on this handout, but I don't have empathy or sympathy for drug dealers that cause this kind of tragedy in lives. So third try, the third try is not someone making a mistake by giving their friend some illegal substance. They may be caught, they may be convicted, they may be in prison for a short while, and they may be released. Then they go through drug therapy, and hopefully they will be cured of their addiction, or at least subdue their addiction enough they can get back to a normal life. But what this is saying, what this bill is saying is: Fool me once, shame

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

on you. Fool me twice, shame on me. Fool me three times, shame on this body for proposing this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Halloran. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to come back a little bit and just revisit what AM922 does. This is language that was brought to me by Senator Arch in a meeting that we had with other allies in the body, after a lot of conversations about what we had to do to get this to a place that everybody could support. Under AM922, people with drug distribution convictions, that means drug dealers, that means meth dealers as well, would not be eligible for SNAP ever, until someone else brings this up in the body again and tries to do some more work to bring the right to apply for SNAP to more formerly-incarcerated people. But that is not what this amendment does. Senator Halloran should know that felon drug dealers won't be eligible for SNAP under this amendment. So his points that he just made are heard, but they're not relevant to this amendment. So if we don't pass this bill, fewer people with drug problems, fewer people who have challenges with addiction, are going to receive treatment and counseling. This bill, with this amendment, will help more people receive counseling. It will not keep people out from receiving counseling. And from conversations I've had on the side, I know that a lot of you are against SNAP because you don't think just anybody should be able to get SNAP. And if you don't think that, don't stand on the mike and say you oppose this because drug dealers are worse than rapists. Don't say that it's because you think people might sell their food stamps and they think that there's a lot of SNAP fraud. Because that's a willful misconception that you choose to hold, because everybody knows how difficult that is to do in practice and how heavily prosecuted SNAP fraud is. Don't say that you oppose this because people with drug convictions related to meth don't deserve a second chance. Meth? Don't even talk about deserve. They don't deserve it. Because if you oppose SNAP, just say that you think no one should get SNAP and go. Don't invent all these reasons and be disingenuous to me. The way some opponents to this bill would have it, we would get rid of SNAP for everybody and we would get rid of Medicaid for everybody and we'd get rid of Social Security for everybody. But you don't want to get rid of your salary here or your per diem as a government employee because you think you're a good person and you think that you deserve it. So don't talk about "deserve." None of us in here have the job of saying who deserves what. People who are formally incarcerated for drug conviction who are eligible to receive SNAP, which is federally funded, which many other states have restored the right for them to do, will reduce recidivism, will help communities stay safe, and will help get these people the treatment they need and we know that. And that's why there is so much support for this bill until the shenanigans started happening about my Twitter or whatever the issue is. If you support this bill, vote for the bill because you have the courage and you believe this is the right thing to do for thousands of Nebraskans in the future forever until it changes. If you don't have the courage to do that, tell your constituents that, don't tell me,

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

because you're hurting them. And with that, I'll yield the rest of my time to Senator Patty Pansing Brooks.

SCHEER: Senator Pansing Brooks, 1:50.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Hunt. I wanted to just add on to what Senator Chambers had said about feeding the poor and how that guides our faith, many of us. The Bible has over 2,000 verses on feeding the poor, 2,000. So where, you know, where, where-- we need to put our money where our mouth is. And colleagues here are talking about free food. I'll tell you about free food. How about the inmates that are getting breakfast, lunch, and dinner at the tune of \$31,271 a year? Where is the outrage regarding the taxpayer money spent in the prisons that's being used to reincarcerate--

SCHEER: One minute.

PANSING BROOKS: --reincarcerate and spend money on the self-sustaining taxpayers? We could, we're just paying more and more to reincarcerate. There's a lack of programming, we're having flat sentences. And so when you're surprised that someone ends up back in jail, when we're not doing programming, and we're not helping to make people better and stronger taxpayers when they get out because, of course, 96 percent do get out, then we're just on the vicious cycle, acting as if we're making a difference when we're not. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Hunt and Senator Pansing Brooks. Senator Chambers, you're recognized.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, on the subject of free food, how about the free food that the senators accept from the lobbyists? How about that? How about these dinners, where Senators get free food? And they are feeding at that trough then have the nerve to come here and say: Don't allow people to have food stamps because they committed crimes. I'm better than you all are. I'm not a Christian, wouldn't want anybody to make the mistake and accuse me of that. But when it comes to conduct, I'm a better Christian than all of you, because I practice those things your Jesus talks about. He and I would have gotten along. He would have said, "Chambers, they call you a nonbeliever. They call you an atheist, an agnostic, and all these other hateful terms. I just wish they would do as well as you do in carrying out what I, Jesus, have said that people ought to do." But Jesus is not the only one who said those things. Jesus took a whip and drove people out of the temple. Jesus was not a nonviolent person. Jesus was not a pussyfooter. Jesus spoke what you all call truth to power. He constantly called out the priests and the pharisees and the other hypocrites. The religious community was the one he condemned, and you all pray here every morning. Hypocrites all. I

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

tried to get workers' comp for farm workers who get injured, and the farmers fought that off. And if they get injured, they can't get workers' comp. That's how little they think of people, always thinking about number one. I'm going to send you all some comments and articles of what I did during the farm crisis when farmers in Nebraska were turning to me because they couldn't turn to white senators in the Legislature or the Governor. How I traveled to other states to help farmers who were distressed and losing their farms at farm sales, farm sales because they were foreclosed on by bankers. And we have bankers in here who understand why that has to happen, Senator Stinner, Senator Clements. And some bankers, it tends to make them very hardhearted because they don't have to worry about where their next meal comes from. They can squeeze it and draw it out of the poorest individual. Oh, they weren't poor when they got the loan, they had something. But the banker could see that this is going to go south, so the loan is given, where with that long-range vision, the banker knew that this farmer is not going to be able to pay it. Then put more collateral in. Pretty soon, everything he or she owns is used to collateralize the loan that never should have been given in the first place. Then foreclosure comes, and do you think banks want to be in the used implement business? No. When they have these sales, who comes and buys farmer A's machinery? Farmer B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and they knew that when I went and talked to them around the country. And I use the term cannibalize. Farmers are the ones who cannibalize the unfortunate one and are glad that it wasn't him or her. But their time is coming. Then when they are in the position of having to see everything they had sold off, and they look at the people who are their friends, that they thought were their friends, then they understand. I would like to ask Senator Halloran a question, since he's back.

SCHEER: Senator Halloran, would you please yield?

HALLORAN: Yes, I'd be pleased to.

CHAMBRES: Senator Halloran, did I hear you correctly when you said "Brevity is the soul of wit?"

HALLORAN: Yes.

CHAMBERS: Do you know who said that?

HALLORAN: Shakespeare.

CHAMBERS: Yes. And have you read Shakespeare's work?

HALLORAN: Some of it.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

CHAMBERS: It's very opposite of brief, isn't it? So the one who said "Brevity is the soul of wit," wrote some of the longest plays that had ever written. So he was prolific. That's all I have to ask you. Sometimes when people quote, they ought to have a little more knowledge about the one whom they're quoting, so that they can tell the rest of the story. But they don't get the rest of the story. They think in slogans. They speak in cliches. And that's why things are said on this floor by me, and I'm not going to apologize for. You won't hear it anywhere else. The lobbyists ridicule you after you've eaten their food. Why don't you take a pledge not to eat anymore free food from these lobbyists. Stop sponging at these lunches that you go to. And if you just have to go, pay for your lunch. Pay for it. But that's not what you are. You will take--

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CHAMBERS: Did you say time?

SCHEER: Yes, I did, Senator.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitor introduced.) Returning to the queue. Those waiting to speak: Senator Blood, Slama, Bostelman, and others. Senator Blood, you're recognized.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Yesterday, Senator Moser said that he can always tell by my face what I'm thinking. So if you've watched me during this debate over the last few days or have actually stood down and seen my face, you knew that eventually I was going to have to stand. Senator Lowe, I would ask that you yield to a question. Senator Lowe?

SCHEER: Senator Lowe, would you please yield?

LOWE: Yes, I will.

BLOOD: For clarification, did you say that addicts do not deserve SNAP because it's a handout? Did I hear that correctly?

LOWE: I said addicts--

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

BLOOD: I wrote it down when you said it. All right? I have a question for you. Did you vote LB41 out of committee?

LOWE: What was LB41?

BLOOD: LB41 is where we give a handout to gambling addicts. Half a million dollars to what's approximately 1 percent of the population that has that type of addiction. Gamblers can be addicted, is that correct?

LOWE: That is correct.

BLOOD: And when somebody is addicted, that makes them an addict. Is that correct?

LOWE: That's correct.

BLOOD: Can you justify why we're going to give them a handout over people who are addicted to drugs?

LOWE: Because it is a temporary situation.

BLOOD: Which one is the temporary situation? Once an addict, always an addict. Which is the temporary situation?

LOWE: We don't give the temporary-- we don't give the gamblers money.

BLOOD: No. What we do is we pay for some very expensive mental health counseling that far outweighs the amount that we would give anybody in a SNAP benefit. And what we did with LB41 was give them even more money for it, when they've not proven to us that they've done a good job of handling the money that is existing right now. Thank you, Senator Lowe. That's the only question I had for you. So my concern is that we're prolonging speech to obstruct progress. Senator Hunt has done her job, which was to get people to support her bill. For the people that are against this bill, I respect the fact you are fighting so hard to not let it go through. But here's a suggestion. How about you go around and have people change their votes? How about you do the work instead of wasting time on this floor. We are the Unicameral, we are unique. We kick ass and take names in this body when we do our jobs. Right now, we're acting like the federal government who can't get anything done. I agree with what Senator Lathrop has to say and Senator Pansing Brooks, and they said it for me and did the heavy lifting, so now I can sit here

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

and get angry. I can't believe the stuff that comes out of people's mouths. Did you know that today is Catholic day at the Capitol? And you know what they would say about this and what we're taught? It's about rehabilitation, restoration, responsibility-- giving people the tools to succeed because both the victims and the offenders are children of God. When I hear silliness about people being able to go to a food pantry and get food, it is not a grocery store. They are not taking a grocery cart there. It is limited how much they can use that. Go ahead and get a job? Well, who hires felons? Last year the same people that are standing up against this bill fought against the Ban the Box bill. You can't have it both ways. Decide what the heck you're going to do. Take one side or the other. Don't change the dialogue so it benefits you. Addicts are addicts, be they drug addicts, be they gambling addicts. How can you have empathy for one and not the other? It makes no sense. Senator Groene, who I listen to over and over again, and again, I respect everybody's opinion on this floor, but he talked about how pedophiles can't live in school zones, but you know what? Drug dealers can. Sure, they can. And guess what happens when they get busted in a school zone? It increases their punishment, as it should be.

SCHEER: One minute.

BLOOD: Thank you, sir. I have no issue with people having opinions, I have no issue with filibusters. In the past, I've participated in a few. But let people do their jobs. We've got important bills, Senator Lowe, like LB153, to help our veterans. And for our flood victims, LB177 that Senator Lindstrom has. Can we please get to work? Can you figure this out and quit wasting my time? I would be very appreciative. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Blood and Senator Lowe. Senator Slama, you are recognized.

SLAMA: Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Senator Slama, I'm sorry. There was a priority motion. Mr. Clerk, for a motion.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, a priority motion. Senator Chambers would move to bracket the bill until April 15.

SCHEER: Senator Chambers, you're welcome to open on your bracket motion.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, April 15 is tax day. Government said, pay me now or pay me later. If you pay me later, you're going to have to pay me something extra. Experience, they say, is the best teacher, and some will have no other. What I am doing here is showing that I know how to get hold of the mike whenever I want to. At

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

whatever position I am in what you all call the queue, speaking French on me now. You all learned a French word while I was out those four years because of term limits. And I came back here and had to have somebody translate for me what the Chair was saying when the word queue was uttered. I'm going to have my say, not only on this bill, but other bills. I play by the rules of those who set the rules. No matter how unfair those rules are, those are the rules, if I get into the game, that I am going to play by. If I see that everybody is cheating at the card table, I know that we're not gambling. We're cheating and we're going to see who the smartest cheater is. So I am going to beat you at cheating, if that's what the rule of the game is. You all are taking a bill like this that deals with the interest of people who have no constituency here. So you will jump all over it and take all of this time. I would like to ask Senator Lowe a question that is somewhat off the subject, but it's going to be like Perry Mason says: I'm going to tie it all together before I'm through.

SCHEER: Senator Lowe, would you please yield?

CHAMBERS: Senator Lowe, let's say that we were--

LOWE: Yes.

SCHEER: Excuse me, Senator Chambers, he hasn't responded. Senator Lowe, would you please yield?

LOWE: Yes, of course I will.

CHAMBERS: Senator Lowe, if this were one of those so-called tax, property tax bills, do you think I could find a way to dominate the first three hours of the discussion by myself? Do you think I could do that?

LOWE: Senator Chambers, you could do that in the first sentence of a tax bill.

CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the-- that's all I want to ask Senator Lowe. You all are setting the rule today. I want you to know that. You are setting for me the standard, you are my betters, b-e-t-t-e-r-s. You're white, I'm black. And when you look at a dark cake, you call it a devil's food cake because black is bad like me. A cake white like you is called angel food cake. If you want to keep somebody from joining an organization, you blackball them, not white ball them. White is right; black, get back. That's the way you've had it. There were black people who could not even raise their voice without dying because of that. There were black men who raised their voice, such as Malcolm X, who was killed; Martin Luther King, who was killed; Medgar

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

Evers, who was killed; Emmett Till, a preteen who was murdered by a white woman's lie that he whistled at her or said something inappropriate. And she said just a few months ago that she lied, that he hadn't done that. But what these white men did, they took him into this barn. Brave, white men. They beat him, they crushed his skull, they gouged out his eyes, then they took a wheel from one of these mills, tied him to it, and dropped him in the river, and when he finally was fished out, his body was bloated. Look on your gadget for Emmett Till, and there will be a picture of what these brave white men did to him. So I know what white people are capable of, yet I have no fear. I'm not going to run. I'm not going to hide. Where the battle is the hottest and the thickest, that is where I'm going to be, because those are the people who need somebody like me. They don't need a milquetoast, pussyfooter, somebody who's going to apologize. They need somebody who will fight as hard and ferociously against mistreatment. As hard and ferocious as that mistreatment is, and I'm that man. See how I can jump ahead of the queue on this bill? I don't believe-- let me say it like this. I don't want to believe that people who saw the need for this bill can be worked by the Governor's people out in the hall, in the corridor, and be turned against providing food for the hungry. Do you know that there are winos who are on the streets in the neighborhood where I live? And do you know that even though the money may be spent for liquor, if one come to say, hey, Chambers, give me \$5, I need a sandwich. I'm not a judge. I've got it to give, and I give it. What he does with it is between him and whomever or whatever he thinks about. I don't have to go through the moral agony of judging the worthiness of other people to be helped. I will not ask anybody for help, but let's say that I would. I would hate to be in a position where I needed help, would ask for it, and couldn't get it. If I anticipate that somebody needs help, I will give it. I don't want them to be demeaned, degraded, and have their human dignity sacrificed and compromised by having to beg. That's why I couldn't be a Christian. I'd have to lower my moral standards too much. I'd have to become hateful, I'd have to become hardhearted, I'd have to become judgmental. I'd have to tell Jesus, go do something to yourself when it comes to all those commands he laid when he was here. When that Jesus talked, he wasn't giving good advice, Senator Lowe. He was giving directives. He was telling you what you must do if you call yourself a follower of Jesus. He didn't call anybody a Christian. The disciples were not the ones who labeled themselves Christians. The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, and it was a term of derision. You all don't even know where your name came from. And I, who don't believe all that stuff you talk, will read about it, because Jesus had some worthwhile things to say. So did Confucius. So did many of the great minds that have passed through this earth. And some of them were evil people. You know who had a profound intellect? Hitler. See, you get blinded by the wrong that a person does and will throw away everything. Read Mein Kampf, read his understanding of the power of language, how you use propaganda to win the hearts and minds of people. And Hitler was a practitioner, and he did it like nobody had done it before. You want to say what the Nazi's did constituted war crimes. Well, in Yemen, the Saudis, who are backed by the United States of America giving them weapons, bombed so near a hospital that they killed seven people, four of them children. America committing war crimes, then you in your country, the first ones who conduct it, a war

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

crimes trial at Nuremberg in Germany. Not only put people on trial for what they did during the war, but convicted them, not only convicted them, but executed them. And there was one particularly brutal execution where a sergeant who was a guard in one of the prisons said that he knew how to hang a man because he had seen black men hanged where he came from, so they let him hang this Nazi. The knot slipped, it didn't work like it should have, and it took 12 minutes to carry out this execution by a person who represented the most enlightened Christian country on the face of the earth.

SCHEER: One minute.

CHAMBERS: Why don't you put into practice your Christianity one time? Senator Lowe, why don't you let that Jesus just this once, if never again, soften your hardened heart? Your seared conscious, let it be tenderized. And this once do something that will benefit people who cannot help themselves, who may be as unworthy of your help and Senator Halloran's help as you are all of Jesus' forgiveness. He said, I will allow them. He is not allowing anybody to do anything. He talks about giving them three chances. You know how many times Jesus said you should forgive your brother? Seven times 70. But you don't believe that, Jesus was crazy. He was a lunatic, and he did what they should have done to him because he's a troublemaker, and they hanged him on a cross. And the only one who tried to help him while he was carrying that cross was a big black man named Simon the Cyrenian.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Returning to the queue: Senators Slama, Bostelman, Howard, and others. Senator Slama.

SLAMA: Thank you, Mr. President. So we've gotten pretty deep into the weeds into the philosophical discussion around this bill, but I would like to get back into the meat of what this bill does, how many people it would impact. So if Senator Hunt is on the floor, I would ask if she could yield to a question. Would Senator Hunt yield to a question?

SCHEER: Senator Hunt, would you please yield?

SENATOR HUNT: Yes.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

SLAMA: Great, thank you. So I was hoping you could clarify to me how many new individuals, who are not part of an existing SNAP household already, would be covered by SNAP with this amendment. Do you have the numbers on that?

HUNT: With this amendment, I can't say for sure. I can say that in 2015, Nebraska denied benefits to about 700 applicants because of drug felony convictions.

SLAMA: Great.

HUNT: So I can't give you exact numbers on how this amendment would change that number. But, you know, at first glance, that figure might not seem significant, but that only encompasses the number of individuals who applied and were denied.

SLAMA: Great. Thank you. That's all I needed. So yes, as Senator Hunt was referencing, page two of the fiscal note. So according to the fiscal note, their numbers are slightly different in that there were 658 SNAP participants denied coverage last year because of their drug felonies. However, 75 percent of those ineligible members are part of an existing SNAP household. If we zoom out and look at the new individuals which are not part of an existing SNAP household, we're looking at only 25 percent of those denied coverage. Also referencing page two of the fiscal note, the Department of Health and Human Services estimates an increase of at least 15 percent to account for those individuals who have never applied for benefits, but may under this new provision, which results in an additional 264 potential applicants. OK, 264 potential participants, that's, again, not an insignificant number. So the processing time on applications is two hours per application. Of these 264 potential applicants, it is believed that 15 percent, 15 percent or 40 will now be eligible for benefits. And this is under the original bill. With AM922, we further limit that 40. So we're looking at cut and dry impact here of fewer than 40 people in new applicants to this bill. Less than 40 people. And also in reference to the discussion we have had in taking this discussion for as long as we have, I'd respect those who have brought up that point and I also respect the rules of this body. Again, I and my colleagues are just operating within the rules of this body. Going back to the article I had referenced earlier, Omaha World-Herald, October, 2017: As nation faces opioid epidemic, in Nebraska and Iowa, meth is still the No. 1 threat. We're about halfway through that article and I will pick up where I left off. "If you were to drive west on I-80, every town is going to have a meth problem." said Darin Thimmesch, an agent in the Drug Enforcement Administration's Omaha office. The drug comes north from Mexico via the nation's interstates, hidden in private and commercial vehicles. Sometimes the drugs travel by mail. Situated at the intersection of Interstates 80 and 29, Omaha has become a trafficking hub, several in law enforcement said. Drugs and money flow in and out of the city to be transported throughout the Midwest. Last year, the Nebraska state patrol seized 71 pounds of meth--

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

SCHEER: One minute.

SLAMA: --on the state's highways." Thank you, Mr. President. "In February 2016, a record breaking bust resulted in the arrests of 64 people across Nebraska and into Colorado. The yearlong investigation was orchestrated among 30 agencies, targeting mostly dealers at the end of distribution networks. Meth collected from the busts came from four states-- Arizona, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Utah but could be traced to Mexico. Mexican cartels control most of the trafficking with the Sinaloa cartel dominant in the region. Those caught smuggling face stiff penalties, up to life imprisonment, under state and federal laws, depending on the circumstances. But rather than cases slowing down, authorities have seen them increase in recent years and drug availability grow." I will continue with this article on my third turn at the mike. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Slama and Senator Howard. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Bostelman, you're recognized.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And good morning, colleagues. Yesterday, I wanted to get on the mike and speak a little bit about the SNAP benefits and that and, unfortunately, I can't find my source again that I was going to talk about. So I want to come back, and come back to the amendment specifically. And I do have a couple of questions I think I will have answered here in a little bit. But I want to make sure those at home understand a little bit more about what we're talking about. And in the amendment, it talks about specifically what's added is: except as otherwise provided in subsection c of this subsection, a person convicted of a felony involving the possession or use of a controlled substance shall only be eligible for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits if such person has completed her or his sentence for such felony, including any term of parole, probation, or post-release supervision or is serving a term of parole, probation, or post-release supervision for such felony. What it removed was in subsection c: a person with one or two felony convictions. And this is what's being removed: for the possession or use of a controlled substance shall only be eligible to receive supplemental nutritional assistance program benefits under this subsection if he or she is participating in his or her-- in or has completed a state licensed or nationally accredited substance abuse treatment program since the date of conviction. The determination of such participation or completion shall be made by the treatment provider administering the program. And this, I have a question of this. I wonder if Senator Hunt would yield to a question.

SCHEER: Senator Hunt, would you please yield?

HUNT: Yes.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Senator Hunt. My question comes into on the probation side of the substance abuse program or their probation period. If an individual during that period is taking a program or whichever and tests positive in one of their tests, what affect does that have on that individual? Do you know?

HUNT: Yes, Senator Bostelman. If they test positive for drugs during the time when they are on probation, they would be in violation of that probation and they would no longer be eligible for SNAP.

BOSTELMAN: I asked that question to a probation officer and I had a different answer. And that's why, I am kind of-- that's why I'm a little conflicted on this in the sense that they said that even if they did test positive, that they would continue on their parole. So perhaps someone else through that program, the initial test would not necessarily automatically remove them from the program and/or would they necessarily report it to DHHS that they failed that test. So I'm a little conflicted here as to how that's going to be carried out and if someone else can correct me or help me on that, I would appreciate that. The other thing that I wanted to talk about specifically is the SNAP benefits. Again, I couldn't find my source I had yesterday. So basically, who is eligible? Am I eligible for SNAP? It says your household must meet certain requirements to be eligible for SNAP and receive benefits. If your state agency determines that you are eligible to receive SNAP benefits, you will receive benefits back to the date you submitted your application. And one thing I wanted to look at, who is-- what is the threshold for dollar amounts on this? And underneath the program--

SCHEER: One minute.

BOSTELMAN: --it talks here: household size; SNAP income eligible limits, October 1, 2018-September 30, 2019. If there is one member in the household, the gross income, monthly income would be \$1,316, the net would be \$1,012. And then it moves all the way down to say you have four members in the household, that's \$2,720 as a gross or \$2092 as a net income. And if you go to eight members in the household, it's \$4,592 gross income and the net income would be \$3,552. And each individual member after that, it's \$468 or \$360. So the SNAP income, although it doesn't apply to Nebraska, it is higher in both Alaska and Hawaii. And I just wanted to make sure I understood a couple things. One was, you know, what was income level thresholds that we're talking about those who are eligible? The other one was, I still--

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

BOSTELMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Bostelman, Senator Hunt. (Visitors introduced.) Returning to the queue, Senator Howard, you are recognized.

HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. President. And welcome to my St. Cecilia's fourth-graders who are here. I wanted to talk for a minute, I wanted to talk for a minute about substance abuse and addiction because I don't just have friends who were addicts or who were addicted, I actually have someone in my family who I lost. Which is a little bit relevant. It's funny the kids are here from St. Cecilia's. My sister actually lived like four blocks away from St. Cecilia's. We used to take walks with her dog, she had a dog named Woody, and he constantly ran away from her. But she was sick, right? She had had a series of car accidents and they recommended a spinal fusion. I've told this story before on the floor, and I will tell it again. She was sick. Because when she met oxycontin and when she met hydrocodone, it was like something changed in her brain and she wasn't going to get better. She wasn't going to get better without help. And so when we talk about addiction, one of the reasons why we have such a bigger problem with meth than we do with opioids is because with meth, we treat it like a crime. With opioids, we treat it like an illness. It's become socially acceptable for us to say, hey, you're sick. A doctor gave you that thing and you took it the way that they told you to, and you became addicted. You're sick. But with meth, you are a criminal. You have committed a crime. And so it is significantly harder for individuals who have those types of addictions, when you're considering the spectrum of addictions, to recover. I mean, meth is one of those things where, I mean, truthfully, Senator Slama brings up a great point because in her area we have more children who have been pulled out of their homes because of methamphetamines than in anywhere else in the state. But when we talk about addiction, when we talked about, talk about the people who are sick, it is not just opioids because they are socially acceptable to think that somebody is sick there, it's every type of addiction. When Senator Halloran says that these people are victims, they are victims of an illness. But when we say that someone has cancer, we don't say you are cancer. But when somebody has substance abuse disorder, we say you are an addict. And we sort of feed that idea that it's not that they are sick, but it's that they're criminals and they don't deserve anything or any help from us because they are criminals. I mean, when you think of AM922, that completely removes the distributor. So it's just people with possession and use charges. And the facts that we need to actually take an approach where they are ill, because I never talk about Carrie like she was a criminal, I talk about her like she was sick. I think if people are sick and there is something we can do to help them that doesn't cost us anything, doesn't cost our state anything, why wouldn't we help them? On opioids, we have been a leader in treating an illness and looking at how we fix it as an illness. But when it comes to food, when it comes to people who have done time for possession and use, we have said, no, you know what, we're going to make this burden really, really high. We're going to make it really difficult, actually. For those of you who want them to get treatment, this is actually one of the wisest paths you could take. The language that is currently in statute is that you have to take, go through a substance abuse treatment program. That's not even the language we use for these treatment programs anymore.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

SCHEER: One minute.

HOWARD: So it is antiquated language that should be updated anyway. But now, when you're on probation and parole, it means that their services can be tailored and nuanced, and that means that they'll have considerably more oversight. And I do believe that the Department of Health and Human Services and Probation and Parole speak to each other quite often because their services overlay with each other. But I would urge the adoption of AM922 just out of courtesy. Your colleagues have worked on this agreement, even if you don't agree with the bill, and so you want to show them the courtesy of that vote, acknowledging the work that they have put in on this bill. And with that, I would yield the balance of my time to Senator Chambers.

SCHEER: Senator Chambers, 15 seconds.

CHAMBERS: Mr. President, when I was speaking, I was so intoxicated by the exuberance of my own verbosity that I neglected to say I want to withdraw that motion, which I now do.

SCHEER: Without objection, so ordered. Thank you, Senator Chambers and Senator Howard. Items?

ASSISTANT CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB390, LB320, LB603, LB713, LB316, LB218, LB59, and LB514 all to Select File, some with E&R amendments. New A bill, LB334A by Senator Stinner. (Read LB334A by title for the first time.) And reports from the Education Committee on various gubernatorial appointments. That's all I have at this time.

SCHEER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Returning to the queue: Senator Morfeld, Lathrop, Cavanaugh, Lowe, and others. Senator Morfeld, you're recognized.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise in support of the Hunt amendment and in support of the underlying bill as well. I introduced this bill about two years ago and a strikingly similar thing happened during this debate as did last debate. First, it comes out of Health and Human Services Committee with many of the committee members, if not all, in support, and then suddenly the Governor's Policy Research Office comes down and lists a parade of horrors. And suddenly, everybody who is principled voted it out, knew that it was good policy suddenly got scared and started making up reasons for why they are opposed. That is exactly what's happening in this floor debate. Now, there are some folks saying, well, I'm going to oppose it because of comments that Senator Chambers made or somebody else made or whatever, that kind of nonsense. Colleagues, look at the bill at face value. Put aside the

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

introducer of a bill. It's going to be a long eight years down here for many of you if you let somebody's personal, if you let-- how do I say this? If you let how you feel about certain people and their views get in the way of how you perceive the actual policy before you, you should look at each bill and analyze that bill and go, is that good policy? If it is good policy, then you should support that bill. There are plenty of things that I disagree with Senator Halloran on. There's plenty of things I disagree with Senator Erdman and Senator Groene on. Shocker, I know, right? But I look at each of their bills at face value. And I've voted for plenty of bills that have come out of Halloran's office, that have come out of Erdman's office, and come out of Senator Groene's office because they were good bills and good policy. There's going to be a lot of noise outside of this body coming from the Governor's Office and from other people all across the state. And there's going to be a bunch of people that want you to oppose a bill simply because of the introducer or simply because they said something a year ago, that has nothing to do with this bill, that upsets them. But I will tell you as a more seasoned legislator now, which is hard to believe after just five years in this body, that you should look at each piece of legislation at face value. And particularly to say that you are not going to vote for somebody's bill because of something that somebody who isn't even the introducer said? Grow up. Go take that up with that individual that said that on the floor, particularly if that's not the introducer. And if you are just looking for a reason to oppose a bill because of some of your friends don't like the fact that you were going to support it, then just go and tell the introducer that. Don't make up a reason, don't blame it on somebody else's comments that wasn't even the introducer on the floor. We're better than that. If we are going to be truly thoughtful lawmakers, we need to look at the value and the merits of each bill, not necessarily the introducer. And I know that is tough sometimes, I've struggled with that sometimes. It's such an interesting dynamic sometimes when I see the Policy Research Office and the Governor's Office come in and oppose a bill because it has a fiscal note, but then where there's an actual bill like this one, that saves money in the long-term and even in the short-term, they're opposed to it.

SCHEER: One minute.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President. It's not ironic, it's just hypocrisy in many cases. And the bottom line is, is that this bill with the amendment no longer provides benefits for drug dealers. So all those arguments, the handouts he sent out, let's stay focused on what the introducer is doing in the amendment before us, no longer provides those types of benefits. In terms of issues with social media, there's all kinds of statements that are made, not just on social media, but at fundraisers that have been disparaging to me and disparaging to my colleagues. But you know what, I look at the policy at its face value and I also look at the individual. And I'll tell you, Senator Erdman can attest to this again, I don't say anything on social media that I don't say on the floor directly to his face or anybody else's face. So I will continue to represent my district and my constituents as I see fit on this floor and on social media. But I will continue to work with people--

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

MORFELD: --and to collaborate with people.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

MORFELD: Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Morfeld. (Visitors introduced.) Returning to the queue, Senator Lathrop, you are recognized.

LATHROP: Thank you, Mr. President and colleagues. I stand once again to support AM922. Senator Lowe made a comment, and I want to talk about it for a second. The comment was that these people don't deserve the benefit. And I'm going to tell you, this isn't about whether they deserve it or not. They don't. They didn't work for this. This isn't something that they got coming because they served our country or whatever people might do to generally deserve a benefit from their government. It's not. But no one can argue with that principle or that argument. But that's not the only standard or the only test for whether this is a good idea or a bad idea. And I talked about this the other day, and I met with the county attorneys, many of them from rural districts. Right? And I asked them, you know, we have problems with the prisons being too overcrowded and we were having a conversation about that. These county attorneys from your towns told me that 80 percent of the crime or the felonies that are committed in your areas are related to meth. Meth is like the scourge of small towns in Nebraska. It's not unique to big cities. It's probably more prevalent per capita in some smaller communities than it is in Omaha or in Lincoln. But these are the people. For whatever reason, they try this stuff and they're hooked on it. And then when they run out of money, they start selling it. And by the way, we're not talking about the people that are in that phase of their addiction, right? This is about the people who have done their time, not the people that are out selling this stuff or using this stuff. These are the people who have done their time. And it's about whether or not we're going to try to help them during the period of time that they are at higher risk to recidivate. And it is probably a really small number. Now I want to talk about something else. When this bill was up for its first three hours, the vote count looked like 38 people. Right? Like 38 of you said yes, this is a good idea. And today, it's about politics. Today, it's, I don't want to vote for this because this could turn into a mailer that goes into my district. So now people are peeling off of it and giving all kinds of excuses or reasons for peeling off of it. And here goes an opportunity to do something that would be good policy when it comes to trying to attack the problems of recidivism in this state. Now, that shouldn't be a reason for us to change our votes. The reasons you are giving shouldn't be a reason to change your vote. If you're mad at Senator Chambers for some things that he said about farmers, that's not a reason to change your vote or you'll be changing your vote all session

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

long. And people are going to say things, and by the way, I completely agree with Senator Geist's comments yesterday about social media. I think it's a freshman mistake. Hopefully there is a lesson learned in this process of using social media and making it personal after a vote doesn't go your way. That, too, is not a reason to not vote for this. It's time that we decide whether we're going to make policy or be engaged in politics here. And it's time that we leave the politics at the door.

SCHEER: One minute.

LATHROP: Because we can't govern-- did you say time?

SCHEER: One minute, Senator.

LATHROP: It's time that we leave the politics at the door and come in here and make good policy, because we are getting further and further behind. And you don't want politics in the decisions we have to make on revenue or on property tax. And you-- it's just no way to behave in a deliberative body because we're going to divide this place in two and get nothing done. Nothing done. All because somebody said this might be an ugly mailer, get on board, get on, get off, get on. It doesn't make sense. We're not making policy. This state spent two years with nothing getting done. With this place being divided, with filibusters being the rule of thumb. They want us to work together to make good policy and get things done. Don't use this as an occasion to start something you don't want to participate in.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

LATHROP: Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Lathrop. (Visitors introduced.) Returning to the queue: Senators Cavanaugh, Lowe, Wishart, and Pansing Brooks. Senator Cavanaugh, you are recognized.

CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of Senator Hunt's bill, LB169 and its amendments. I am on the committee that voted this out of committee unanimously after deliberate work on AM710. And I appreciate Senator Hunt's hard work on making sure that this is a strong public policy. My background, which seems appropriate today, since it's "I love NU day," to mention is I have a master's degree in public administration from the University of Nebraska at Omaha. And we just heard Senator Lathrop speaking about strong public policy. One of the reasons that I sought this office is because I believe that public policy should be based in what is going to be best for the citizens and implemented properly and is sound public policy.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

And this piece of legislation is to date one of the most thoughtful pieces of legislation that I think we have seen. It has been deliberated on the floor, it has been reworked on floor. It has been collaborative. And even when it had an overwhelming amount of support, Senator Hunt still continued to work with those that had concerns to address them. And I think that's really important to note. I did want to speak to some of the things that Senator Lowe has spoken about, and I wonder if Senator Lowe would yield for a question.

SCHEER: Senator Lowe, would you please yield?

LOWE: Yes, I will.

CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Senator Lowe. So you spoke about your son, and I didn't hear the whole story. But he lived off \$100 for a month?

LOWE: For a month.

CAVANAUGH: Okay. And was that covering his lodging?

LOWE: That was just his food.

CAVANAUGH: Just his food. So I did the math on what-- thank you, Senator Lowe. I did the math on what a person who is incarcerated could potentially make in a month while incarcerated. The maximum, maximum, they could make-- and this is, I mean, if they get the highest-paying job in prison, is \$94.40 a month before taxes. And when they leave, this is what they've been earning monthly. And it is fair to assume that those that are incarcerated probably have children, so hopefully they have been sending some of their income to those children. Those that are incarcerated probably have other responsibilities that they have to pay for. And so when they leave prison, it's not very likely that they have that \$94.40 saved up. Especially if they are a woman and they have to purchase tampons while they're in prison. There are things that you have to purchase when you're in prison, and they're expensive. So these are people who are working while they're incarcerated. And we're not paying them for that work. We're not paying them a livable wage. So if we were paying them a livable wage, they would actually potentially have savings when they came out of incarceration, but they don't. And we're looking to give them 90 days of food. That's what we're talking about, is 90 days of food. And there's just-- if we want them to be successful, and we've heard these comments from several people, if we want this group of people--

SCHEER: One minute.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

CAVANAUGH: Thank you. --no matter what they have done in their lives, to be successful and not go back into our extraordinarily overcrowded prison system, we need to give them the best footing. And that is a hand up. Giving people a good footing, a good start: 90 days. They only have 90 days to prove themselves to us that they deserve this chance. Ninety days is what we're talking about, and it's food. It's not-- it's not a car, it's not transportation, it's not healthcare. It is the most basic necessity for human beings. It is food. And we have the Catholic Conference here. We're in the middle of Lent, for those of us that observe Lent, and it is just-- it weighs heavily on my heart that this is the conversation that we're having.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Lowe, you are recognized.

LOWE: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Chambers and I were speaking down here on the floor off mike for a little bit. And, you know, Senator Chambers and everybody else, all the other senators on the floor, we're all talking about the same people. Same people, we just have two different philosophies on accomplishing the same goal. We want to help these people. That's our goal, is to help these people and make them productive again. One way is to give them everything. The other way is to allow them to work for their accomplishments and for their earnings. One way, you gain dignity and pride and hope. The other way, well, that's about what you gain, is about nothing. It was made mention that if you don't vote for this, you don't believe in SNAP. I believe in SNAP. I believe it has a purpose. It is not this purpose. If we do this for felons, do we do this for college graduates then, that don't have a job lined up? Don't they need help? Don't they need to be fed? Once the university is no longer have their food program out in front of them? You know, those of us who are talking against LB69, we do do charity. I do, when I run across somebody, I do help them out. Whether I walk into a McDonald's and hand them a hamburger or whether I put a \$5 bill in their hat. But I am not going to ask Senator Briese or Senator Gragert or Senator Albrecht and tell them that they have to give money to these people. Charity belongs in a church, not in the government. It works best in the church, not in a government. We're talking about helping people. We're talking about helping drug addicts. 1-877-978-3216: Drug abuse hotline. It's there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and it is manned. That's 1-877-978-3216. If we're serious about helping these people, let's help them kick the habit, let's help them get a job, and let's help them on their way into productive life. I would like to yield my time, Mr. President, to Senator Groene.

SCHEER: Senator Groene, you have 1:40.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

GROENE: Thank you. I wanted to make sure, go back to the beginning here. I kind of started this, if you want to call it this extended debate. It was always on policy, it was never on punishment. I had to explain to my colleagues that I was involved in this two years ago or three, and we then decided this was policy. This was not an exception that we were mean and punishing one group of felons. I explained how we do it to drunk drivers, can't have the privilege. Food stamps is a privilege not a right, by the way. And I think a lot of votes were changed when they understood and got some institutional knowledge about why, why--

SCHEER: One minute.

GROENE: --this exception is there. This is not about punishment or fliers. We do help these folks like we do all felons through probation, and probation emphasizes home. These people don't exist in a vacuum. They get out of jail and everybody has family. Everybody does. A few may not, but now we're narrowing it down to one crime, all felons get food stamps. It's just drug dealers. The evidence is there. They sell when they're addicted or they don't need it, a drug dealer-- SNAP. And this ideal that somehow you mix and match statistics and say food stamps helps people recidivism, that's all felons. But when you separate out drug dealers and drug addicts, the numbers change.

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

GROENE: Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Lowe and Senator Groene. Senator Wishart, you are recognized.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of AM922 and the underlying bill. Originally, I wasn't planning on speaking on this bill. It seemed very straightforward to me. If we're going to have SNAP programs and they're going to go to help people who are in need, it seems to me that a population of people who are dealing and trying to overcome drug addiction would be the exact type of population that we were looking at supporting through this public program. I also wanted to speak a little bit to some of the conversation I've heard around drug addicts, and I want to speak to it from, one, the perspective of somebody who has gone through the foster care parent training program and learned extensively about what it is to be a kid who was born with meth addiction. So when I hear from senators who are talking about this type of person and this type of addict, as if they just woke up one day and decided to be addicted, the face of people that I am thinking about are the kids who were born with addiction. And their first hours and days in this world were coming off of that addiction. And the long-term consequences that they will experience in their life because they were born addicted to meth. And I don't think these are people that we would say made that choice, obviously. And these are the people that

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

I'm thinking about, who have ended up in our juvenile justice, in our corrections system, sometimes multiple times, and are coming out of it and are struggling and we're helping them get on their feet. The other perspective I wanted to bring to this conversation, again, around who we're really talking about when we're talking about the people who would benefit from this, who we're talking about when we're talking about addicts. Because again, it is not like somebody woke up one day and decided to go become an addict. When my husband was working as a police officer, you know, he would come home and talk about some of the people he had encountered, and I would always ask him, especially the young ones, where they were getting into trouble and living a life that was so terrifying at such a young age. And I'd ask him, you know, you wonder what in their life had led them to get to that point. And in doing some research and looking into, for example, gang activity, there are kids at 8, 9, 10, 11 years old that are being pulled into gangs, into the gang pipeline. And these are the very kids that end up with a rap sheet before they turn 18 so extensive it will haunt them for the rest of their lives. So I would ask all of you, you know, we see this handout of these people's faces who have obviously battled extensively with drug addiction, which, by the way, this handout feels very exploitative. We see this handout, and I would ask all of you to think, what in that person's life, what has led them to get to that place? And so obviously this is the very type of person that we are talking about when we're talking about a public health program--

SCHEER: One minute.

WISHART: --to provide food for people who are in need. So thank you, and I really encourage you to all step back and really dig deep. It seems like some of you need to dig deeper than others. Dig really deep into your conscience and recognize that this is a good bill for us to move forward. Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Wishart. (Visitors introduced.) Returning to the queue, Senator Pansing Brooks you are recognized.

PANSING BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, gosh, I am hearing all sorts of things about mailers and boy, we've got to start worrying about how we're going to vote because somebody is going to send out a mailer on us. And then people are mad because a freshman senator said something that, you know, maybe she should have couched those words a little bit more carefully, but you know what? That freshman senator also worked on an amendment in good faith with people. She had 38 votes on this. And now all of a sudden, everybody is peeling off and everybody is saying, oh no, you know, she said something mean. I've read it, it wasn't that mean. But the other thing is, are we worried about mailers, colleagues, because, wow. I can't wait for your futures, if that's what we're voting on, is mailers. I'll tell you what, these mailers will say that these people cared about keeping our communities safe. These people cared about

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

making sure that when people got out of prison their families had food so they didn't have to recidivate. I can't wait for these mailers, these are going to be awesome mailers. So sitting there and giving these excuses. I want to thank Senator Geist, because her first day on this bill, she felt exactly as I did. She stood up and said really important words about how we both served as chairs of the special investigative committees, and seen the trouble that is going on in our prisons. How we have an overcrowding system, how we have to work together to make our communities safer by not releasing people, number one, who haven't had the programming they need. So we need to work on programming. And number two, that have no hope for their future. So, again, we can spend the money on the SNAP to help them get a foot up or we can continue to pay the \$32,000 a year and continue to increase the building of prisons, because if they build it-- if we build it, they will come. So again, we're in a vicious cycle and with little to no programming, little to no help. Our prisons are our largest mental health institutions trying to deal with addiction without enough programming. So with that, I hope that you aren't really thinking about your mailers. That is what I'm truly hoping, that that's not what's driving us here. And I will give the rest of my time to Senator Hunt.

SCHEER: Senator Hunt, 2:15.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks. Let's just wrap up where we are on this bill. LB169 and the amendments from the Health and Human Services Committee, my amendment that I worked on with stakeholders in the body here, it will address our prison overcrowding by ensuring that formerly incarcerated people don't recidivate. And it will result in long-term savings that will help our families, our communities, our children who need to rely on the benefits of this food. It will help our work force. We've seen a national trend to move away from lifetime bans and more toward policies that ensure food security, instability for formerly incarcerated people. And you can see all over the country, including in parts of Nebraska, how making sure they have the safety net keeps them out of our prison system, saves taxpayers money, helps our communities. Currently, 43 states have opted out or modified their food stamp access bans. Eighteen states have completely eliminated it, which is what I was initially trying to do, including our neighboring states of Iowa, Kansas, and South Dakota. And we need to join these states and adopt a commonsense, compassionate approach. I know that there's support for this in the body no matter how you feel about me personally. Let's work that out later.

SCHEER: One minute.

HUNT: There's support for this policy and that's what we're here to do. AM922 is a compromise amendment that excludes people with distribution convictions from SNAP. That's drug dealers. And that sounds like what we needed in the body to get to a place of almost full consensus. So I

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

urge a green vote on AM922; I urge a green vote on AM710; and a green vote on my underlying bill, LB169, my priority bill this year. And please follow me on twitter. Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Pansing Brooks and Senator Hunt. Mr. Clerk, do you have a motion on the desk?

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hunt would move to invoke cloture on LB169, pursuant to Rule 7, Section 10.

SCHEER: It's the ruling of the Chair that there has been full and fair debate afforded to LB169. Senator Hunt, for what purpose do you rise?

HUNT: Call of the house.

SCHEER: There has been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor please vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Please record.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 27 ayes, 3 nays to go under call, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The house is under call. The senators please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Groene, would you turn your light on, please? Senator Morfeld, would you turn your light on, please? Thank you. Senators Lindstrom, Hilkemann, Bostelman, McCollister, Pansing Brooks, Brewer, Linehan, please return to the floor. The house is under call. Senator Lindstrom, would you check in, please? Thank you. Senator Linehan, the house is under call, would you please return to the floor? Senator Hunt, we are unable to find Senator Linehan at this time. Would you like to wait or would you proceed with the vote? We will wait, then. Thank you. Senator Linehan, the house is under call. Please return to the floor and record your presence. The house is under call. Senator Linehan, the house is under call. We are awaiting your return. Please return to the floor. The house is under call. We are all here and accounted for. Senator Hunt, how would you like to proceed? There's been a request for a roll call in regular order. Mr. Clerk. This motion for cloture does require 33 positive votes.

ASSISTANT CLERK: (Roll call vote taken.) Vote is 28 ayes, 16 nays, Mr. President.

SCHEER: The motion is not successful. I raise the call. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, next bill, LB87 by Senator Wayne. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 10; referred to the Urban Affairs Committee. That committee placed the bill on General File with no committee amendments.

SCHEER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Wayne, you're welcome to open on LB87.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Legislature. One of the lesser known components of the 2017 federal tax overhaul is the Opportunity Zone program, which is designed to promote invest and drive economic growth in low income and economically disadvantaged communities. Under federal law, each state could nominate a number of census tracts to be designated as opportunity zones. Governor Ricketts nominated 44 census tracts in Nebraska as opportunity zones last year and a series of maps showing those eligible census tracts were distributed to your desks earlier today. LB87 is designed to further encourage investment in these areas by requiring the Department of Economic Development to provide preference for projects and businesses located in or in part within the opportunity zones under various grant initiative programs it currently have. These current programs are the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, Business Innovation Act, Job Training Cash Fund, and Site and Development Fund. Because the department is already required to develop allocation plans for how they distribute these grants, the details on how the preference would be worked out is up to the department. Currently, the department provides a preference for projects located in enterprise zones. So in all likelihood, the preference would be given to opportunity zones would mirror those ones already provided to the enterprise zones. I want to thank the Speaker for designating the LB87 as a Speaker priority. LB87 faced no opposition testimony at the hearing and was advanced by Urban Affairs on a 7-0 vote. I would ask for your green support on LB87 to Select File. I would note that I do have to hop on a actual judicial hearing back in Omaha. I'm doing it telephonically, so if you have questions, you'll have to stall for about 15 to 20 minutes before I can answer those. Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator Hansen, you're recognized.

M. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and good morning, colleagues. I'd like to thank Senator Wayne for introducing this bill and for his efforts on this topic. In front of Urban Affairs last year, Urban Affairs Committee heard an interim study of mine looking at the ability of affordable housing and affordable housing options. And I think that's a wide priority across the state and this is a good vehicle to encourage some extra promotion there. And so with that, I rise in support of LB87. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to ask some of my colleagues to yield for questions. Senator Albrecht, would you yield for a question?

SCHEER: Senator Albrecht, would please yield?

ALBRECHT: Yes.

CAVANAUGH: Senator Albrecht, do you believe that people deserve food?

ALBRECHT: Deserve?

CAVANAUGH: Yes.

ALBRECHT: Deserve food? Everyone should eat, yes.

CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Senator Bostelman, would you yield for a question? He's not in here. Senator Brewer, would you yield for a question?

SCHEER: Senator Brewer, would you please yield?

BREWER: Yes.

CAVANAUGH: Do you believe that people deserve food?

BREWER: Yes.

CAVANAUGH: Is there any reason that a person does not deserve food?

BREWER: No.

CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Senator Lowe is not here. Senator Moser, would you yield for a question?

SCHEER: Senator Moser, would you please yield?

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

MOSER: Yes.

CAVANAUGH: Senator Moser, do you believe that people deserve food?

MOSER: I would say--

CAVANAUGH: Do you believe that people deserve food?

MOSER: I would ask for the context in which you're asking the question.

CAVANAUGH: Just basic human necessity. Do you deserve food?

MOSER: I think everyone needs to eat.

CAVANAUGH: OK. And is there any reason that you can see that people should be deprived that necessity?

MOSER: I think people should work for their food. Is that the question you're looking for?

CAVANAUGH: I asked if you-- no, I'm asking if there's any reason that people should be deprived.

MOSER: Is this germane to what we're talking about in this bill? Or is this an exercise to go through a bunch of rigamarole--

CAVANAUGH: If you don't want to-- okay, thank you. Thank you, Senator Moser. I support Senator Wayne's bill and I support people having access to food. Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh and others. Senator Chambers, you're recognized.

CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Wayne needs some time. He talked to me about it. And if there's one thing I know how to do is how to take time. But seldom am I requested to do so, except when speakers at critical points in the session need to keep the body in session and they don't want to recess or do anything like that, then I will fill in the empty time. There are a lot of things that I have done for this body, in this place which I ought not to have done if I acted on the basis of how I and other black people get treated in this

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

society and in this Legislature. I know the direction that Senator Cavanaugh was going and so does Senator Moser. A guilty conscience needs no accuser. He knows what was in store and he shouldn't have had any problem answering the question. But he's looking beyond that to what he thinks the next question might be. That shows-- and now I'm leaving Senator Moser to speak in general terms. It shows what we're dealing with on the floor of this Legislature. Any vote that I take, people can ask me about it and I will respond. I will tell what vote I made, why I made it, and why I didn't do something different. When I'm going to take time, I will take time. If I'm gutless and somebody from the Governor's office called me out there and said, punk, you better do what I tell you to do, and then I punk out and do it, I don't want anybody to ask me questions about that. And if I'm one who persuaded somebody to adopt or contrive an amendment which would take away my concerns on the bill and they agree to that and then I'm not voting, that's gutless. These new people are going to learn that what they do is creating a footprint and there's at least one person who takes note of it. I noticed others who were not voting. Somebody had written-- now, it's supposed to be fictional account of some rings of hell. And I think the hottest one was for those who wouldn't take a position, I think. Now, I can stand to be corrected. And if I'm corrected, I will accept correction and thank whoever improved my education. But I think the point that I'm making is well understood. When you're gutless in this place, you mark yourself. When you persuade somebody to help draft an amendment that is going to take away your opposition, then you wind up not voting, you mark yourself. I don't trust people on this floor. I have been here 44 years. I learned from Jesus. He didn't trust those people he was with. He knew that one of them was a traitor. He knew that one was going to deny him. Then he knew that the rest of the cowards were going to forsake him when he needed them most. But he was trying to make them better than what they were. He knew that there was something in them, which if it could be reached, might put them on a firmer footing than they stood. You all do all this praying every morning and the prayers that you pray could be answered by us if we would do the right thing. Who on this floor would say that somebody is not entitled to food? There are a number of you who feel that way. A number of you are vindictive and you're vindictive toward those who cannot defend themselves and who have no voice. When these business persons who gouge and cheat--

SCHEER: One minute.

CHAMBERS: --come here through their chamber of commerce and dictate to you, you don't stand up to them like you do poor people, like you'll do voiceless people. You're very tough, you're very brave if somebody is standing in front of you and he or she has hands tied behind his or her back, feet shackled together, a gag across the mouth, a blindfold, then you will punch that person like a punching bag. But somebody who has arms free knows how to ball up a fist and will give back as good as he gets, that's the one you walk light around. You find excuses not to confront that one. And my job is to speak for those who don't have a voice. And I wish that these

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

Catholics who profess to be Catholics would put in practice those things they claim they believe. As hard as it is to believe--

SCHEER: Time, Senator.

CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitors introduced.) Returning to the queue, waiting in the queue: Senator Moser, Albrecht, Hansen and others. Senator Moser, you're recognized.

MOSER: Good morning once again, colleagues. Well, it appears we're not, despite the vote, we're still not done discussing LB169, so I will respond to the last comments by Senator Cavanaugh and deserving food. I have compassion for my fellow man. But my compassion for my fellow man is a personal decision. I voted against LB169 the first time. I voted against closure [SIC] here, and I would vote against it if we were going to vote on the actual issue. The personal decision to be generous is a personal decision, but tax money is not freely donated. Tax money comes from citizens against their will and expanding the SNAP program, even in a small way and even for a purpose for which many supported it, is another way of spending money that was taken from people against their will by taxation and giving it to somebody for a charitable purpose. I think nonprofits and individuals should support people in need. I don't think that we need to expand it. We've already got adaptations in the statute to throttle back runaway capitalism to help the downtrodden and the poor. I think there has to be a line where we draw it and we don't go beyond that. The reasons for slippage in the vote count for the last bill, I think, are because some of that support was kind of weakly given. And as the discussion went along, I don't think it took too much for some of that support to evaporate. So in order to move something through the Legislature, we need to be able to work together. We need to have a good plan, we need to treat each other with respect and not ask gotcha questions, whether we're doing it here or whether we're doing it online somewhere. So with that, I'll move on to LB87 and listen to the debate on that and see if I can learn something there. Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Moser. (Visitor introduced.) Moving back to floor discussion, Senator Albrecht, you're recognized.

ALBRECHT: Thank you, Speaker Scheer. I rise and waiting to hear more on LB87 knowing Senator Wayne would like some time. But I was in the queue when we took the cloture vote and wasn't able to stand up, so I would like to say my peace at this point on LB169. I did, in fact, tell Senator Hunt on Thursday night when we had the new amendment that I would be looking that over and visiting more with her about it and listening more. I was unable to be here yesterday, but, you know, in looking over some of the information on LB169, there were-- there was an

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

opponent in the committee on February 7 and it was Matthew Wallen, the Director of Division of Child and Family Services for the Department of Health and Human Services for the state of Nebraska. And he said within his statement to the committee that under current law, individuals are ineligible for SNAP if they receive a conviction of a drug distribution or drug sales or if they have fewer than three convictions for possession or use and have not completed treatment after conviction. And not completing treatment-- again, the integrity of our programs is at hand here. If this bill did not go through, we have other areas to look at because I do believe that we need to be good stewards of our tax dollars. He said within his bill that in the last two years, DHHS, Department of Health and Human Services, has denied or closed an average of 658 SNAP participants related to drug felonies. Internal data shows that 75 percent of those ineligible members are already a part of a household receiving SNAP. So while LB169 would allow more drug felons to qualify for SNAP, many would be added to households who are currently receiving benefits, thus increasing monthly allotments that are already being used. So, you know, I would certainly hope that someone who has committed the felony and has served their time would be wrapping their arms around their family at that moment because if that family has \$500 worth of food stamps-- or the SNAP program, they only receive \$420. Well, again, if our programs are what they need to be, I would think that we would be able to take care of that and not have to extend it to-- further. The Department of Health and Human Services believes currently that the Nebraska law takes the right balance of helping those with drug addictions that receive treatments. They are being tough on drug trafficking and protecting hard-working Nebraskan tax dollars, so that's why I stood against the bill. You know, I believe that when we-- when we get together on this floor, we have to do what's for the greater good of our state. And I do believe that LB169 may have helped some, and I do know-- I work at food pantries in my area, and we-- the food is there. I can't imagine that anyone in our state would go without if they just know the resources that are out there. And I'm quite certain when being released from prison, they should know some of the places they can go to get food. And I do-- I don't believe that this floor is the place that if you're upset with a vote that you want to take on those that voted in the negative. It's not good for the camaraderie. It's not good for--

SCHEER: One minute.

ALBRECHT: --for what we're doing here on the floor. We're supposed to be a Unicameral that's nonpartisan and everybody is supposed to try to figure out how to work a deal together and get along. But I just don't appreciate-- I thought it was an inappropriate question of the Senator Cavanaugh to ask me if I think people deserve food. Of course, everyone deserves food. It's just a matter of where you are going to get that food and how you need to get it. Thank you.

SCHEER: Thank you, Senator Albrecht. Mr. Clerk for a motion.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, priority motion, Senator Chambers would move to bracket the bill until April 15.

SCHEER: Senator Chambers, you're welcome to open.

CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Wayne had asked me to help take some time. And when I get my engine revved, I cannot just shut it down all of a sudden. He is here now, but I explained to him that I have some things that I had intended to say while he was in his telephone conference and I'm going to say them. Senator Moser is just like Senator La Grone. They stand up here and say, I'm this and I'm that, but I don't believe I have the right to give other people's tax money and so forth. I wanted to ask him, does he think we ought to give tax money to those people who were flooded out? That's tax money. They should have built somewhere else. So if it comes before the Legislature, I'm going to follow their lead. But there will be 33 votes. All you have to do is give me some time. If a question is to be put to you and you're asked do you yield? Nobody owns you. All you have to do is say, no, I won't answer any questions. But to whine like some of them do about collegiality-- you all are not collegial toward me, you never have been. And if I would behave in the way toward you all that you do toward me, openly and underhandedly, I wouldn't help some of you with your legislation. I've done that some this session already-- already. And I don't ask anybody to help me. You all are petty. You're accustomed to a quid pro quo. Then you get upset when you don't give the quid, but you want the pro quo. That's silly. It's childish. And Senator Moser is going to stand up because he's got to say something, which he wouldn't say when he was asked a question, then he's like Pilate. And I will never forgive Pilate for this. Not for presiding over the killing of Jesus. There have been bad judges and a lot of innocent people executed. Here's what I will never forgive Pilate for. He was talking to Jesus and they were discussing things like people do in a set of circumstances where a man is in the last hours of his life and another man is in a position to say, you shall live or you shall die. And Pilate had occasion to ask Jesus, what is truth? And he didn't stay for an answer. He walked out. And he met with the multitude. That's what happens here. People will say something, then they walk out. But I'm accustomed to it. My opportunity will come to do what I want to do. I see Senator Moser is back. I would like to ask Senator Moser, as he moseys to his desk, would he respond to a question or two?

WILLIAMS: Senator Moser, will you yield?

MOSER: Yes, I will.

CHAMBERS: Senator Moser, I have one question to ask you. But I have to give some context. You're aware of the flooding that occurred in Nebraska?

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

MOSER: Yes.

CHAMBERS: And you're aware that the Governor asked the federal government for some assistance to the tune of about \$1,400,000,000. You're aware of that?

MOSER: I'm aware that they requested assistance. I don't know the exact amount.

CHAMBERS: OK, the amount. OK.

MOSER: I'll take your word for it that that's correct.

CHAMBERS: OK. And my word is my bond; my word is good. Do you-- but I could be mistaken when we're talking about facts, so you took a wise man's position. Did you hear that the amount that may be lost when they total it up in crops and livestock, we're not talking about buildings and so forth, could reach \$900 million? Had you heard that figure?

MOSER: The number I recall was over a billion.

CHAMBERS: OK, so you know it's a lot of money.

MOSER: Oh, yes.

CHAMBERS: Do you think that those people should be given any federal money which comes from the taxpayers? Now, you can help them if you want to, you might buy some cleaning equipment and go get a shovel and do things like that. Do you have the right to vote to give other people's money to those people just because you would help them personally?

MOSER: I think we have the right to vote money for any purpose that the Legislature feels is for a worthy cause.

CHAMBERS: No, I'm not asking about the Legislature. I'm asking about you. Because you didn't feel the need to vote for the other bill and you said why you wouldn't vote. So I'm not going to put you through that because the record is there. But do you have a different attitude when it comes to these people, your people, who were flooded out and want some aid? If something should come before the Legislature, you'd vote against that just like you voted against LB169. Is that true?

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

MOSER: I don't believe you could make that connection.

CHAMBERS: That's not an answer to the question. Would you vote against a bill like that?

MOSER: To give money to flood victims?

CHAMBERS: Yes. Would you vote against it?

MOSER: Probably not. It depends some on the details, though.

CHAMBERS: Why do you--

MOSER: I'm not going to-- before there's even a bill offered say I'm going to vote for something yes or no. I'm not going to box myself in like that because it depends on the details.

CHAMBERS: OK, thank you. Thank you. [Laugh] Have y'all ever heard of Wiley Coyote? Smooth, slick; but I know what he will do. He doesn't know, but I'm a mind reader. I wish Senator Briese was here and I would ask him to take a wager with me. I will tell you how Senator Moser will vote if a bill like that comes before us. He will vote yes. And the rest of you will vote yes. Because they are your people and your kind of people. And if one of your kind happened to run afoul of the law, you would try to give help there. I know you. And you'd change your vote because the Governor's people called you out there and put the whip on your back. And you couldn't stand up to it and you have shown him what you are; and I knew what you were before. And I'm not one of those people you can make a ugly face at me and I'm not going to say what I got to say. Or you can stand up and say, we're not being nice to each other and I think we ought to be nice to each other. Take that to the grade school playground. We are grown men, grown women. This is where lives can be lost. If you vote for the death penalty, you're voting on something that gives the state the right to take somebody's life. And you're going to tell me that I got to be collegial with you? You'd better be collegial with me. I don't have a bill-- and I prioritize my bill to abolish the death penalty. That bill will not change me in terms of what I am as a person. Something can overrule that if in order to get a vote I'd have to change what my values are. My job on this floor is different from you all. Your job is to kiss up to people. It's to grin at people. It's to not be voting on measures, then when your bill comes out of the Revenue Committee, and I take all the time, and then if it gets to a vote, I vote no, I'm not going to sit there and say, I'm not going to vote; I'll be not voting. Or if you ask me how you vote on this, if I'm not going to vote for it, I'll tell you. If I tell you I'm not ready to tell you that because I don't even know what the bill is, that's where I sound like Senator Moser. But he had a different reason for saying that than my reason would be. So, when these bills come out here,

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

and we're going to start all day sessions next week, I believe, we are going to see what kind of man am I. Am I a windbag like a lot of you all? Would I do like Senator Halloran when I got everything in my head and shadow an employee, where the employee is working and bully somebody like that and I can fire them? I'm not like Senator Halloran. Am I like Senator Groene, who will take out after people and not take out after others? No. I am me. And Popeye and I are as one. I am what I am and that's all that I am and that's all that I will be. And we're going to see how much you like it when the seeds that you planted today bear a bitter fruit. I read to you something from that article that I handed out today, and it said that history touches us.

WILLIAMS: One minute.

CHAMBERS: The decisions and choices that we made in the past determine things that happen today. Well, at 11:53 a.m. on the forty-ninth day of the Legislature, you all made a fateful decision. F-a-t-e-f-u-l. Will I tell you everything I'm going to do and when I'm going to do it? Heavens no. Heavens no. You will just have to wait in suspense and wonder what am I going to do and when am I going to do it. And I'd like a bunch of you to get together and try to bully me or intimidate me or frighten me out of doing what I say I'm going to do. I don't care if you're a banker like Senator Clements. Now, he can do something to a farmer who's got a loan. He cannot do anything with me. You couldn't pour him on me. That's the way you all need to be talked to when you're so bullying and can be so cruel and mean to those who are hungry.

WILLIAMS: Time. Senator.

CHAMBERS: I want to withdraw that motion.

WILLIAMS: The motion is withdrawn. Back to debate. Senator Bolz, you're recognized.

BOLZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the debate on the previous bill. I appreciate the ongoing discussion about the needs of low-income folks in our community. And that is why I rise to talk about LB87, because I do care about those issues and I do care about the debate on this floor. I want us to focus on LB87 and what we are doing with this bill. And, colleagues, I don't-- I don't want to come across as sermonizing, but as someone who served on this floor for seven years now, we have to maintain the quality of debate on this floor. We have to debate the bills that are in front of us. We're a Unicameral. If we don't do our due diligence, if we don't talk about these bills, if we don't make sure the public understands what we're doing, we are not doing our job as a one house. So I want to redirect our conversation to LB87, which connects directly to the issues that we have been talking about this morning, which is creating jobs and opportunity for people in low-income communities. How do we make things better for the people in Nebraska who need it? And I support this bill, but I do have a question of Senator

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

Wayne if he would yield to a question related to the substance of this bill, because it is so important and it is important to the lives of people who struggle. So Senator Wayne, I support the idea of giving a preference in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the Building and Site Development Fund for opportunity zones, but I do have a question as it relates to the Job Training Cash Fund. Can we have a bit of a dialogue about that?

WILLIAMS: Senator Wayne, would you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

BOLZ: Well first, Senator Wayne, thank you for bringing this bill. I think it's a good idea. I think you're doing something constructive and helpful. I really appreciate that. The question I have as it relates to the Job Training Cash Fund is, the other pieces of this bill are site specific; they are property bound. The Job Training Cash Fund could theoretically be serving a project that serves the community and employs people who are in a low-income community without specifically being in that site of an opportunity zone. And I just wonder if your committee had any debate or dialogue about that and what your thoughts were about the differences between the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, the Building and Site Development Fund, and the Customized Job Training Program?

WAYNE: We didn't have a specific debate about that. The goal was at the federal level, private sector introducing-- or introducing so much money into this area through the opportunity zones. We looked at current hub zones, current business development-- enterprise zones, I couldn't get the word right, enterprise zones and we took that same priority language and mirrored it to the opportunity zone. So the enterprise zones already have that language. We just mirrored it to the opportunity zones.

BOLZ: Um-hum. And I think my only hesitation about the Customized Job Training program is that jobs may be going-- it is possible that through the Customized Job Training program we should incentivize jobs for a community that are-- that are serving the people who live in an opportunity zone, but the jobs themselves may not be in that opportunity zone. So, we can talk further about that off the mike. I'm not trying to parse apart what is already very good work. But I do think that these sorts of things are worth conversations and thoughtful serious debate. The other thing I want to say here, is I want to bring the attention of the body to the fact that we are running out of money in the Customized Job Training program and neither the Department of Economic Development nor anyone from the stakeholder community came in to discuss the importance of the Customized Job Training program to the Appropriations Committee. So that resource may not be there into the future, despite the fact that we're hearing--

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

WILLIAMS: One minute.

BOLZ: --a lot about work force development and work force development needs. And so, I think there's an opportunity here for us to keep talking about which tools in our toolbox really have an impact on work force and work force development. It's important that we talk about big-picture strategies and the next steps for tax incentives. But it's also important that we shepherd and manage the resources that we have available and the tools in our toolbox now and I hope that that's discussion within the Appropriations Committee. Thank you for the dialogue, Senator Wayne. Thank you, colleagues.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Bolz and Senator Wayne. Senator Groene, you're recognized.

GROENE: Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of LB87. Senator Wayne was quoted in the paper this morning, the Lincoln Journal Star, we do try to help less fortunate areas for economic development. That's why him and I have always been on the same side how TIF should be used. And what I like about, it blends well because there's already a dictate for us rural folks in 58-708 about the affordable housing to allocate not less than 30 percent of such funds to each congressional district. More legislation should be-- that line should be put into it and you would get a lot more bipartisan action and urban/rural here if that's the way programs were set up so that there was equal dispersion. But, Senator Wayne, would you take a question?

WILLIAMS: Senator Wayne, would you yield?

WAYNE: Yes.

GROENE: So has-- the federal government has established where these enterprise zones are, right? Maybe I'm using the wrong word here, the opportunity zones.

WAYNE: So the federal government asked the governors of each state to determine, I mean, Governor Ricketts, in 2018, picked 44 census tracks in Nebraska to give to the federal government.

GROENE: To give-- and it's-- it follows the lines of census tracks?

WAYNE: Yes, it follows the lines of census tracks.

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

GROENE: Now, you know where I could go with that, but I won't. Anyway, no, good program. We need to make sure we define things well because there are always those who are opportunists and would try to bring a project to a local government and say, well, you know, we won't build unless you help us out and then that temptation is to bend the rules and pretty soon no economic activity has happened in the poorer parts of North Platte, Omaha, but, no, it's a good bill. It needs to be added. There isn't that much money to go around. I know the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, I believe Senator Williams actually added some money to it two years ago because it was-- I think we added, I don't think we took it away. We took away? All right. [Laugh] Well, maybe we need this now so we make sure we spend it for what it's supposed to be used for. Because like I said, somebody might come in and raid it. But, no, this is a good bill. And I've supported Senator Wayne when he brings good ones. And I'm not supporting Senator Wayne. You know, it's like Senator Lathrop said earlier. You look at the bill, folks. You look at the bill and if it's a good bill, and if you can work with the person who proposed it and make it better, that's how the system works here. And I would also like to inform the freshmen here, you will seldom see a senator that's been here at least one term go around with a vote card and ahead of schedule and ask somebody to support a bill or to give him 33 votes, because they know how the system works. We don't want to put a freshman senator or somebody in a bind that they gave a promise of a vote before the debate was heard, because when LB169, there's a perfect example again. For collegiality, I'll never do it. After we go through extended debate of two to three hours, I may go around and ask you to support a bill. But you'll never see me do it ahead of time. It's not always a filibuster in this body. There's an awful lot of times we had extended debate, as we did yesterday, as we did this morning. It only becomes a filibuster when 1 minute or 10 minutes prior to six hours if somebody pulls everybody out of the queue, it's not a filibuster. It was extended debate. It's only a filibuster if it goes the full six hours. We are here to debate issues; Senator Chambers is very good at it. Bring out the truth-- and LB169 was a beautiful example.

WILLIAMS: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Groene and Senator Wayne. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Wayne, you're recognized to close on the advancement of LB87.

WAYNE: Thank you, colleagues, for listening and having a conversation on this debate. Thank you, Mr. President. This is a simple bill. We are trying to match what's going on federally, locally, to make sure we can get as much resources and opportunities to these areas that need it the most. And with that, I would ask for your green vote. Thank you.

WILLIAMS: Thank you, Senator Wayne. The question is the advancement of LB87 to E&R Initial. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Have all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 32 ayes, 0 nays on the motion to advance the bill.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
March 27, 2019

WILLIAMS: The bill advances. Mr. Clerk, for items.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, your Committee on Agriculture reports LB304 to General File with committee amendments. Appropriations reports LB694 to General File with amendments. Communication from the Governor: (Read re LB141, LB318, LB339, LB340, LB354, LB354A, LB399, LB443, and LB463.) Amendments to be printed: Senator Erdman to LB483; Senator Dorn to LB472; Senator Brewer to LB374; Senator Wayne to LB595, LB179, LB37, LB462, LB184, LB700, LB592, LB147, LB675, LB428, LB593, and LB606.

And finally, Mr. President, priority motion: Senator DeBoer would move to adjourn until Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 9:00 a.m.

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