

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

DORN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the twenty-ninth day of the One Hundred Ninth legislative [SIC] First Session. Our chaplain for today is Pastor Jim Haack of Beautiful Savior Lutheran Church, La Vista, Nebraska, Senator John Arch's district.

JIM HAACK: Please join me in prayer. Almighty God, Heavenly Father, by you all things are created and sustained, and by you we live and move and have our being. In love, you made us, yet by our sin, we have rebelled against you in thought, word and deed. In grace, you have provided forgiveness through the atoning work of your son, Jesus Christ, and in your goodness, O Lord, you provide governing authorities to bring order, safety, and freedom to human society. Grant, therefore, your blessings of wisdom, humility, courage, and servant-heartedness to the members of this legislative body, that the people of Nebraska may flourish under good governance that allows them to thrive. We ask this in the name of Jesus. Amen.

DORN: I recog-- I recognize Senator Tanya Storer for our Pledge of Allegiance.

STORER: Good morning, colleagues. Please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DORN: Thank you. I call to order the twenty-ninth day of the One Hundred Ninth Legislative [SIC] First Session. Senators, please record your presence.

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, please record.

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

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

CLERK: I have no corrections this morning, sir.

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

CLERK: There are, Mr. President. Your Committee on Urban Affairs, chaired by Senator McKinney reports LB90 General File. Additionally, notice of committee hearing from the Appropriations Committee, and an

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

amendment to be printed from Senator Conrad to LB345. That's all I have at this time.

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

CLERK: Mr. President, first item on the agenda: General File, LB265, introduced by Senator Sorrentino. It's a bill for an act relating to labor; amends several sections of Chapter 48 and 81; eliminates certain funds and changes certain references to funds; changes provisions relating to state unemployment insurance tax rate and the Workforce Development Program Cash Fund; eliminates the work-- Nebraska Worker Training Board; harmonizes provisions; provides an operative date; repeals the original section; outright repeals section 48-622.03; and declares an emergency. Bill was read for the first time on January 15 of this year and referred to the Business and Labor Committee. When the Legislature left the bill yesterday, Mr. President, Senator Sorrentino had opened on the bill. There are other amendments on the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Sorrentino, you are recognized for a two-minute refresher.

SORRENTINO: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. As mentioned, I did open on LB265 yesterday, so I'll provide just a very short refresher. So, I bring to you again LB265, brought to me at the request of the Nebraska Department of Labor. The purpose of this bill is to provide a simplified and consolidated funding mechanism for Nebraska's Workforce Development programs through the Workforce Development Program Cash Fund. LB265 combines the funds currently held in separate accounts, and importantly, consolidates the funding mechanism for those accounts. This aligns with the governor's and the Legislature vision for creating efficiencies across state government. And that concludes my opening. Thank you.

ARCH: Mr. Clerk, for an amendment.

CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Conrad, I have AM261.

ARCH: Senator Conrad, to open.

CONRAD: Thank you. Mr. President. I-- in consultation with Senator Sorrentino and other interested parties, I'd like to withdraw that amendment at this time.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Conrad, I have AM259.

ARCH: You are recognized to open on AM259.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Under the same consideration and understanding, I'd like to withdraw this amendment at this time.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: Senator Conrad, I have AM262.

ARCH: Senator Conrad, you're recognized to open on AM262.

CONRAD: Thank you. Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I would like to withdraw this amendment at this time.

ARCH: So ordered.

CLERK: Senator Conrad, finally, I have AM265.

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

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, members. Good morning. I had the opportunity to learn more about this legislation, looking at the committee statement and watching the committee hearing on this measure. I appreciate and understand what Senator Sorrentino is trying to do in alignment with bringing greater efficiency to some of our different workforce training funds and grants and programs that are in existence. I think his overall goal is laudable and something that we can work on together, but-- there are a few additional issues that are present in the legislation, though, that I do think are going to require additional negotiation and deliberation and discussion. And I'm very hopeful after preliminary discussions with Senator Sorrentino, Speaker Arch, members from the governor's office, members from-- representing the business community, members representing unions and employee organizations, that we can continue the, the conversation on certain aspects in this legislation that will need additional discussion and negotiation, particularly as it relates to the workforce training boards that have been in place for about 29 years, that have worked well to bring together public-private partnerships with representatives from community colleges, Department of Education, Department of Economic Development, business interests

and worker interests, to ensure community feedback and engagement, and to ensure that these public funds are directed towards worthy workforce training programs that are out there that seek to address our workforce challenges in helping Nebraskans avail themselves to the skills requisite to have good jobs available. So, the legislation, as introduced and advanced by the Business and Labor Committee, did call for an elimination of this process and these boards. At the committee level, there was a variety of different solutions and ideas presented by both business interests and employee representatives to either continue the Workforce Training Board in its current composition which has grant approval authority, or to shift that to an advisory kind of, kind of dynamic, at the very least. And I think there was at least a third option put forward to perhaps transfer some of the duties from the existing boards to another board that would be able to accomplish many of the same goals. So, that being said, I think that those kinds of negotiations are probably most likely going to bear the most fruit outside of floor debate, where it's pretty challenging to bring all of the parties together to figure out exactly what the best path forward is. So, based in good faith, in discussions with Senator Sorrentino and all of the interested parties, we will continue to do that dialogue discussion and negotiation from General to Select File, and that's why I withdrew the amendments that would have given a variety of those different policy choices to the body at this time. So, the remaining measure that is filed today and for your consideration is something that I'm hoping Senator Sorrentino might weigh in on, but there have been attempts to diminish or reduce benefits to unemployed workers and workers who are in the midst of job search-- sometimes through no fault of their own-- in Nebraska and in our sister states through both administrative and legislative means. Those efforts have been stopped in Nebraska in regards to legislative proposals in recent years, but there is definitely a significant amount of anxiety that, since this section does open up the area of law related to those important benefits; we just want to clarify that it is the legislative intent that there will be no dimin-- "dimunition" of benefits under this section, and I think all parties agree that the intent language proposed in AM265 is agreeable to all parties at this time. So, I would ask for your favorable consideration, and I'm happy to answer questions.

ARCH: Seeing no one in the queue, you are recognized to close on AM265.

CONRAD: OK. Well, I, I think if people do have questions about the amendment, please do let me know, please do let Senator Sorrentino

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2025

Rough Draft

know. But it is my hope that we can have broad, wide consensus on this amendment to establish a clear legislative intent. Thank you, Mr. President. I'd ask for your green vote.

ARCH: Colleagues, the question before the body is the adoption of AM265. All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 36 ayes, no nays on adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

ARCH: AM265 is adopted. Senator Sorrentino, you're recognized to close on LB265-- excuse me, there-- Senator Conrad, you are recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to briefly, again, thank Senator Sorrentino for his good faith negotiations and consideration, and thank the body for their consideration and successful adoption of that amendment as well. And the last point that I just wanted to insert into the record quickly so that we can move on with our agenda is, again, while Senator Sorrentino has put forward a very laudable goal which I and others, I think, heartily support, to streamline government and to remove red tape, we do want to ensure that programs and structures that are in fact working as intended have an opportunity to move forward. I know as a member of the Government Committee in the last biennium, one of Governor Pillen's priorities was to eliminate obsolete or antiquated boards and commissions. I share his goal in bringing forward that legislation, and was very supportive in moving that through the committee, and then, ultimately, we just ran out of time in the last biennium to adopt that measure. Speaker Arch has picked up the torch, so-to-speak, on that measure this year, and I know recently had a very successful hearing at the Government Committee as well. To Speaker Arch's credit and to Governor Pillen's credit, they initially started by casting the net fairly widely in regards to boards and commissions, and then they allowed the people, the second house, to come into the committee level and say, hey, slow down a minute. This board and commission, this program is actually very valuable, and here is why. And then, taking to heart that feedback, they worked to further refine the bill and narrow the bill to keep in place boards and commissions that were still serving important functions while working to also streamline government and eliminate obsolete boards and commissions. So, that companion bill that's moving through Government and Senator Sorrentino's bill, which now will be advanced to Select File today, LB265, both contain relevant aspects in regards to the Worker Training Board. And so, I, I

do feel like we can definitely find a path forward based upon the past and current practice. When members of the public step forward and say "this is not antiquated, this is not obsolete, this is working," we take that feedback from the second house to heart. And this is a program that has served our state well. Again, having business interests at the table, government representatives and employee representatives, we have put out matching grant funds that have greatly benefited our state in workforce development and training. There's so much common ground here in terms of not only streamlining government but strengthening workforce, and I'm eager to continue the discussions from General to Select File. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Sorrentino, you're welcome to close on LB265.

SORRENTINO: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Conrad. I'll be brief. LB265, as originally introduced, carries forward the governor's vision of a streamlined approach to workforce development through the Commissioner of Labor and the Nebraska Department of Revenue. LB265's removal of the work-- Worker Training Board as an advisory entity was just an effort to create efficiencies in the-- utilizing, utilizing the workforce development; we'll be glad to work on that at the Select File level. That would conclude my close, Mr. President.

ARCH: Colleagues, the question before the body is the advancement of LB265 to E&R Initial. All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 30-- 37 ayes, no nays, Mr. President, on advancement of the bill.

ARCH: LB265 does advance. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, General File, LB297 introduced by Senator Ibach. It's a bill for an act relating to employment security law; amends Section 48-649.03; changes provisions relating to combined tax rate; repeals the original section; declares an emergency. Bill was read for the first time on January 15 of this year and referred to the Business and Labor Committee; that committee place the bill on General File. There's currently nothing pending on the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Ibach, you are recognized to open on LB297.

IBACH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, today I'm happy to present LB297 for your consideration. LB297 seeks to reduce Nebraska's

unemployment combined tax. For background, this tax is paid by employers and funds the payment of unemployment benefits. Most of the combined tax collected goes directly to the UI Trust Fund. This trust fund can only be used for the payment of unemployment benefits. Nebraska has one of the healthiest UI trust funds in the country. The current balance of the UI Trust Fund far exceeds the amount necessary to fund the payment of benefits during a recession or even a pandemic, which we just experienced. Current balances are approximately \$544 million. In 2024, the Nebraska Department of Labor paid out approximately \$95 million in UI benefits. So, that's \$544 (million) current balance; last year, paid out \$95 million. LB297 adjusts the combined tax rate calculations used to set tax rates for unemployment insurance taxes to immediately lower the 2025 tax rate and reduce the calculations for planned collection of the UI combined tax for future goals, with the goal of reducing the overall UI Trust Fund balance. LB297 lessens the tax burden on employers while still maintaining a sufficient unemployment trust fund balance to pay unemployment benefits. The Department of Labor follows a statutory formula to calculate an employer's combined tax rate each year. LB297 amends the current statutory formula by removing the total amount of reimbursable employee-- employer annual wages from the calculation of the state's total wages. This change in the statutory formula will reduce the planned income to the fund and drive down the overall UI Trust Fund balance. Should the balance ever become too low-- and this is important-- the formula will drive the balance back up with additional statutory changes. LB297 seeks immediate tax relief by mandating that, for tax year 2024, the only tax year-- or, excuse me, tax year 2025, the only tax year 2025, the average combined tax rate will be fixed at 0.48 instead of the current calculated 0.88 rate. This will reduce taxes for Nebraska employers and immediately slow the overcollection of tax reserve funds that has been occurring under the current statutory rate-- tax rate calculation. I would like to point out that while the fiscal note for LB297 indicates a loss of \$22 million for the coming year, these are dollars that go to the UI Trust Fund; there are no General Fund-- there's no General Fund impact. These dollars don't go to the General Fund, they go to the UI Trust Fund. And as a result of this bill, LB297 received no opposition testimony at the hearing, and was advanced to General File on a 6-to-0 vote. I thank you for your time. I ask for your green light on LB297. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator-- seeing no one in the queue, Senator Ibach, you are recognized to close. Senator Ibach waives close. Colleagues, the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

question before the body is the adoption of LB297 advanced to E&R Initial. All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 37 ayes, no nays on advancement of the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: LB297 advances to E&R Initial. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, next item. LB34, introduced by Senator Hunt. It's bill for an act relating to time; amends Sections 49-1301, -1302, 81-30-- 1323 and 81-1328 and Section 32-908; provides for year-round daylight savings time as prescribed; harmonize provisions; and repeals the original section. Bill was read for the first time on January 9 of this year and referred to the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee; that committee placed the bill on General File. There's currently nothing pending on the bill, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Hunt, you're recognized open on LB34.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I am presenting LB34, which is a bill to implement year-round daylight savings time in Nebraska. I was a co-sponsor of this bill when Senator Briese introduced it a couple of times, when Senator Conrad introduced it, and I'm happy to continue their good work on the issue. I also thank Speaker Arch for scheduling this bill and Senator Murman's bill to implement year-round standard time right after this one, and I think the best thing for us to do is sort of have a discussion about both perspectives, talk about the differences, talk about what our preferences are, and then we can move forward and, you know, we can either adopt my bill, or we can do nothing would be my preference. Just kidding. Maybe we end up doing what Senator Murman wants to do, but-- I can explain sort of basically what daylight savings time would be. I distributed a chart-- there's two charts going around. The one I, I sent out, it shows what time sunset would be in the winter under daylight savings time. Daylight savings time-- the one that I prefer, what LB34 is-- is the one where this-- you have more daylight after work. So, you know, in the fall, when you set your clocks back and then all of a sudden it's really dark at night, and you're leaving work and you're walking to your car in the dark, this does away with that. You have more daylight after work; you can go to your kids' games, you can go play golf, you can go to restaurants and shops. And it's a better thing for the economy, it's a better thing for things like seasonal depression and just kind of the winter blues that you get when you don't have any sunlight, and that's why I prefer daylight

savings time. LB34 would change the official time in Nebraska to remain on daylight savings time year-round, where you have more sunlight in the evening. However, this change would be contingent on a federal law or policy change and the adoption of single year-round stand-- daylight savings time by three adjacent states. Currently, Colorado and Wyoming have enacted laws supporting permanent daylight savings time, although Congress must act for those laws to go into effect. There's all kinds of studies out there that show evidence of harmful impacts of the time change in general. They show, in the period following the time change, there's increases in seizures, there's increases in heart attacks and strokes, car accidents, workplace injuries, lost workdays, decreased worker productivity and economic output, and so on. Largely, the research points to the act of changing the clocks twice a year as what causes the problem more so than one approach or the other. So, you know, you can find-- if you can find 100 studies showing that daylight savings time is the best way to go, honestly, you can find 100 studies saying that standard time is the best way to go. So, colleagues, you really just have to decide what your preference is. Do you want it to be darker in the evening, or do you want it to be having more daylight and more sunlight after work? That will be the question that we are talking about. People with epilepsy and other conditions that cause seizures see a rise in incidents the week after the change. Heart attacks go up as well. A study by the University of Michigan, the University of Colorado, and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs found a 24 inc-- 24% increase in heart attacks the Monday following the time change, and there are other studies showing the same thing. One study in Finland in 2016 found an increase in strokes, up 25% the week after the time change. Another study by the University of Colorado showed an increase in car accidents. The University of Oregon found an increase in workplace injuries. There's also a 67% increase in lost workdays. So, there really is a cost to this. Between medical care and lost workdays, sick days, heart attacks, that's not nothing. So, I think a strong argument can be made against changing our clocks twice a year. My preference is permanent daylight savings time so we have more light after work, because this will result in an economic activity increase; more people will be out and about, and an extra hour of daylight during the winter months can yield extra consumer activity, extra spending, and enhance economic activity in our state that's good for Nebraska. A lot of us, in the winter, we have trouble tearing ourselves off the couch to get out of the house during those winter months, and if consumers were more prone to get back out into our community, spend, support businesses, support restaurants and shops,

it's good for jobs, it's good for our state revenue, and great to increase foot traffic in those evening hours when it's dark out normally. One really interesting study to me was done by JPMorganChase in November 2016, and they assessed the economic impact of daylight savings time. They did it by comparing the spending 30 days before and after daylight savings time compared to spending in Phoenix, and in Phoenix-- they don't change their clocks in Arizona, so that's-- that was sort of their control for this experiment. They found an average credit card spending increase of 2% for the month after daylight savings time, and they found, after standard time, spending decreased by 3.5%. So, this study shows when you have more daylight, consumer spending increases 2%; when it gets dark and there's no daylight after work, it goes down 3.5%. That's a major economic impact. So, we're talking about income, jobs, revenue, and that's, that's not nothing, colleagues. To wrap up, you know, I don't think I need to take the full time. It's pretty straightforward. I see Senator Murman is in the queue next, so he can talk about his perspective, why he prefers standard time. To me, a lot of this is kind of "are you an early bird or a night owl?" That's a big thing, too. Do you want a lot more sunlight in the morning, or do you want more daylight after work? And that is-- I, I prefer after work because I'm kind of a night owl, and I, I run a business and I do see our sales decrease in the winter months correlated to the daylight. People don't really go out and shop when it's dark out. You know, when-- I got home last night from here about 7:45 or 8. Same with yesterday, we start to have longer days and longer committee hearings. And I think about, last night, if this was summer and I got home at 7:45, it would still be light out, and maybe I would go, you know, grab some dinner with friends; maybe I would go get a drink at a bar in my neighborhood; maybe I would head over to my shop and, and do some work over there after I get back from the Legislature. But in the winter months, when you get home at 7, 6:30, 5:30 and it's dark, you just feel like you have to start getting ready for bed. You feel like, let me get dinner going and let me start getting ready for bed, because that's just sort of, like, the mood that happens when it's so dark outside. So, I was just thinking last night, I wish it was a little brighter outside, and if we pass LB34, that's what we'll have, so. Happy to answer any questions, happy to clarify. I know it's kind of confusing, which is which. LB34, more daylight after work. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Advan-- advancing to the queue. Senator Murman, you're recognized to speak.

MURMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to rise in respectful opposition to LB34. I'll start by saying I agree with Senator Hunt's overall goal of ending the practice of changing your clocks back and forth. She did a good job of giving the reasons that that is not healthy to change your clock, your clocks back and forth in the spring and fall. The goal of, of not doing that tends to have broad support across Nebraska. That being said, there are really two options on the table. Senator Hunt's LB34, which adopts permanent savings time [SIC], and my LB302, which is up next, which adopts permanent standard time. As it-- the debate goes on, I'm happy to speak about the superior benefits that permanent standard time brings. And by the way, you do have a letter in your emails from the Nebraska Medical Association that goes into detail about those benefits. But before we do that, it's important to talk about the timeline of these bills. In order to enact permanent savings time [SIC], congressional action is needed to be taken. In other words, if we pass LB34, Senator Hunt's bill this session, nothing happens unless Congress passes, passes a law. But will Congress act? Maybe, but I wouldn't hold my breath. In order to enact permanent savings time [SIC], which is my bill that's next on the agenda, a state can simply stop observing savings time. This is why, right now, Arizona and Hawaii have already taken the bold step to enact permanent standard time. If the overall goal is to stop changing clocks back and forth-- and I do believe that's this bill's goal-- then we should stop and think about how we actually get there and accomplish that goal. LB34 doesn't have a strong pathway to that goal. On the other hand, LB302, which is next up, and permanent standard time does have that pathway to that goal. Why? Because states already are doing it. Right now, Arizona and Hawaii have the peace of mind knowing they will never have to change their clocks again. If we want Nebraskans to have that same peace of mind, LB34 isn't the way to go, but permanent standard time is. And-- just, by the way, with permanent standard time, that was done back in the late '60s, early '70s during the Nixon administration, and it was only in effect for eight months because once people go through permanent daylight savings time year-round, when the kids have to get up and go to school in the dark, in the wintertime when it's a lot colder, and of course, everybody has to go to, to work in the dark when it's a lot colder in the wintertime, people quickly lose interest in permanent daylight savings time. And at that time, like I said, it only lasted eight months and the country went back to changing clocks rather than permanent daylight savings time year-round. But I'm going to be strongly suggesting that we vote for permanent standard time when we get the chance on the next bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

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

FREDRICKSON: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. Good morning, Nebraskans. I rise today-- I, I genuinely don't know how I'm going to vote on this bill or on Senator Murman's bill, and I'm, I'm kind of interested to hear more about the debate and hear the different perspectives out there. I actually have a couple of questions for Senator Hunt, if she might be willing to yield.

ARCH: Senator Hunt, will you yield?

HUNT: Yes.

FREDRICKSON: All right. Well, thank you, Senator Hunt. Thank you-- first of all, thank you for, for bringing this bill. I know you're-- you-- you've done a lot of work on this issue, and you've, for a long time, been pretty vocal in the daylight savings time community. I, I appreciated hearing from Senator Murman as well, and, and his perspective. What-- this is like a bit of-- more of a logistical question. If both of these bills advance, what, what exactly happens?

HUNT: You know, both bills can't advance. Both bills can advance, you know, to the point of Final Reading, but we can only pass one. Senator Erdman was texting me; jokingly, he said, "why don't you split the difference and do half an hour?" And-- so, yeah, we can't obviously set the clock both an hour back and an hour forwards, so it's going to be one or the other.

FREDRICKSON: That's-- I appreciate that clarification. Thank you for, for answering questions. It's funny, because this has actually sparked-- I've, I've had a number of conversations with the colleagues on the floor about this very issue already, so I think that there's genuine, you know, split opinions on this. And I'm interested to hearing more about this. I will say I agree with what Senator Hunt said, and I think what Senator Murman said as well. I think if we are going to advance either of these bills, we do need to, as a legislative body, kind of come to some sort of agreement on which one we are going to do. So, this is going to be a real test of who are the night owls and who are the early birds in here. So, looking forward to the debate, and I will continue to listen. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Spivey would like to announce some guests from the Midlands African Chamber, Inc., from Omaha, Nebraska. They are located in the north balcony. Please rise and be recognized by your

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

JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm generally in favor of this bill, and I appreciate Senator Hunt for bringing it. My biggest concern with, with both bills is that we need to make sure that all four states that surround us are in, in-- playing ball, and particularly Colorado. Now, this gets me off into outside of my district, but I can tell you when you get to North Platte and you're driving down the interstate and you get to about Paxton, you're-- you have the time zone change. OK? That makes a big difference. And I would tell you, up in my-- the northern part of my district, Mullen is in the Mountain Time Zone. So-- but I'm-- but as you look at going across to Colorado, and if we allow for the state of Nebraska to change and we don't also have Colorado in sync with us, you're going to drive through-- and, and I just got a note from Senator Hunt that says Colorado passed that bill. Great. That's good to know. The concern comes from the fact that you've got kids going to school, you've got meetings, you've got people that live on the Colorado side of the border that are participating in events in Nebraska. And so, it's one thing to go through the Mountain Time Zone and roll your clock back an hour when you hit the Mountain time zone, but then if you hit Colorado and you have to change it again, it gets really messed up. I'm just telling you, when I first moved to North Platte, and you start looking at meetings that are scheduled to the west, they're denoting whether it's Mountain Time or Central Time, OK? You just get used to that after a while. And so, unless Colorado plays with Nebraska, we've got a problem. But you're going to have the same thing if you drive down to Kansas or you drive up to South Dakota. OK? If we're not changing along with them and they're changing with us. So, that would be an important thing for me. I've asked constituents to weigh in on it; they really haven't given me an opinion one way or the other. My personal preference is I like daylight savings time, I like having more light at the end of the day. The very things that Senator Hunt articulated, I would agree with. We just got to make sure that Colorado's on board with us-- and, and she's saying they are, and why would I question your, your, your, message? So, I believe you. So, I will be supportive of that bill. So thank you, Mr. President.

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

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, I'm not sure which bill I like yet. I do think the one consensus thing at the hearing was people don't like the time change. And-- but they-- of course, the

reason we have the time change is because we want to be light later in both the summer and the winter, I think, or vice versa. We want it to-- we want more daylight hours, I guess. And I appreciate the maps both circulated by Senator Murman from the Save Standard Time, which-- they have a website. That's great. I would check it out, savestandardtime.com. And Senator Hunt's graphic, I can't remember where it's from, but they are both very interesting graphs. And the one thing I would point out Senator Jacobson was just talking about is that it's the further east in a time zone you get, the more of an impact these things have. And of course, then further north you get, which is why Arizona and Hawaii don't do time changes because they're less impacted by the seasons and the shift in the sun, and things like that. So, we seem to be kind of in a sweet spot where we have one, two time zones, and two are far enough north that we're adversely affected by this. So, I don't know. I might vote for both of these bills at the moment to-- so we can keep talking about it as it goes on to select. One of the things I did want to talk about is a little bit of the history of daylight saving time, and I just went and looked up on the thesaurus.com-- which is a good one-- and it talks about how it was first introduced in New Zealand and then adopted in England, and it was basically adopted in the United States during the, the Great War, World War I, as a way to save fuel during the war for the war effort. But the reason I looked it up on thesaurus.com is I thought it would be a great time for a, a lesson on-- it's daylight saving time. I know everybody wants to say "savings," but it's "saving," because it is pl-- it is singular. So, it's not plural and it's not possessive. And thesaurus.com has a great explanation of why people do this. So, it's daylight saving time is technically correct. The practice of daylight-- saving daylight; still, daylight savings time with plural "savings" is so commonly used that it is become an accepted variant of daylight saving time. As some pointed out, perhaps this is because the phrases that use the plural "savings" when talking about money, such as savings account at a bank or savings rate taken out of your paycheck for a rainy day, or perhaps the regular loose-- use of the acronym daylight saving time-- DST-- has caused some of us to forget what it stood for. Daylight savings time is fine when you're chatting with your friends in an informal setting. We're all friends here. When it comes to formally talking about this, however, it should be used in singular, "daylight saving." So, I just thought I'd point that out. And, and it goes on to say that you might be talking to a grumpy person who would point this out, which I guess is what I am, is a type of grumpy person who will point out that it's "saving," not "savings." But it also makes this great point that DST is something people don't

understand. And when we had this hearing, I think I asked either Senator Hunt or Senator Murman, "what time is it now?" And I honestly forgot. I don't know if we are currently in daylight saving time or if we're in standard time. And so, this is-- it's just a-- we're in standard time, Senator Hunt tells me. So, this is a hard topic, because everybody does want to avoid the time change because, as Senator Hunt correctly pointed out, it causes all of these health and safety issues. But we have the time change for the reason that Senator Murman wants it to be standard time all the time, and so does this group, and we have daylight saving time for the reason that Senator Hunt wants daylight saving time all the time, is because of when the daylight hits. So, I'm still thinking about which one I think we really should do. Oh, I have other things I was going to talk about about the hearing, because it was a really interesting hearing. So, I might push my light and talk again. But I appreciate both Senator Hunt and Senator Murman bringing the bill, but at the moment, I'll probably vote for both of them because I want to keep the bills alive and moving so we can continue to think this through as a group. But this is, you know-- determining what time it is is a huge responsibility. And it's the type of power that I'm not sure any of us ran for office thinking we would possess. So, I just think we should really-- should sort of sit with it for a while and think. When we make a decision, we are saying what time it's going to be, which is a, a, a huge responsibility. So, I'm going to vote green at the moment on both these bills, but I'm going to keep thinking on it. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I share Senator John Cavanaugh's concern that none of us were elected to decide what is and what isn't time. That certainly is not something that I ran on. But I think this is a really interesting debate. I really enjoy this conversation that we've had the last couple of years. It's one of the few times we get to debate issues that I think are not partisan. I was just talking with Senator Hunt about how much I enjoy being able to get into these issues with colleagues who I sometimes do or don't agree with, and you find weird divisions on this issue. I, personally, am still undecided. For those who follow along with "As the Legislature Turns," you might remember that the last time we debated this, I was actually very much in favor of permanent daylight saving time, primarily because I wanted it to be lighter later. I tend to do more things in the evenings when the sun stays up until 8:00, 9:00, and I enjoy that. But last year, when I was on the

mic, my dad actually was watching, and he sent me a number of texts and a number of email articles. My dad is a-- studies sleep medicine. He has his Ph.D. in sleep medicine, essentially. And he was very disappointed in me for supporting permanent daylight saving time because he said, although it's not a popular opinion, he supports permanent standard time. So, I think it's important to listen to your parents from time to time. And so, I texted him here before I, I got on the mic and I said, "today's the perennial debate on the permanent daylight saving time versus permanent standard time. Any particular message that you want me to share on the mic?" And he once again shared that his choice, while not popular, is the one supported by Sleep Research Society and the American Academy of Sleep Medicine: use standard time year-round. So, I don't know if that's necessarily going to change my vote. I think Senator John Cavanaugh has an interesting thought to vote green on both of these and continue to have the conversation. But I do think that he's correct. There, there is a lot of sleep medicine and a lot of science that does support the unpopular and unpleasant notion that permanent standard time is better. So, if my dad's watching right now, I appreciate your expertise, I appreciate your advice. Not entirely sure how I'm going to vote on this, but I do appreciate this debate, and I, I do encourage people to get in the queue and talk about this one. I think it's a good opportunity to share your opinion and have a legitimate conversation back and forth on an issue where, frankly, I think a lot of us are not decided. With that, I'll yield my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Hunt, you are recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Jacobson had a great point for both the western and the eastern borders of Nebraska. You know, in western Nebraska, if-- in a hypothetical, if there was, like, a two-hour difference between the borders of Colorado, that would make no sense. Fear not, colleagues. When we pass LB34, that will not be the case because Colorado has passed a bill to implement year-round daylight savings time. And Iowa, on the eastern border of Nebraska, is currently considering a bill similar to LB34. Iowa has not passed permanent standard time, which is like Senator Murman's bill, and Colorado has passed a bill like LB34, so if we want to have parity with our neighbors, LB34 is the bill to support. As far as federal action, I wanted to talk about what needs to happen in Congress, what is happening in Congress. In 2022, the U.S. Senate passed the Sunshine Protection Act, which is like LB34. It would implement year-round daylight savings time, but it was not voted on by the House, so it did not advance out of Congress. But that's the bill that they've

considered. There have been continued calls for congressional action on this topic, and President Trump and some of his prominent Cabinet members and advisers such as Elon Musk, Vivek Ramaswamy-- I don't know how much Ramaswamy is in the mix anymore with President Trump, but both of them have advised permanent daylight savings time, and they've talked about it. If you look at their posts and things they've shared on social media, that's something that the feds are definitely talking about. Over the past five years, 20 states have joined this movement, and it's a strong signal for Congress to act. LB34 also allows for an order of authorization by the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, so that could be a possibility as well. If and when something happens at the federal level, colleagues-- I know many of you are in conversations, but this is an important point. If something happens on the federal level, Colorado and Wyoming will change their clocks, and we don't want Nebraska to be left behind. Passing the bill now just allows us to be ready if federal action takes place, if those other conditions fall into place where three states around us have passed this bill. Iowa is considering it now, so that could certainly be a position that we find ourselves in. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Storer, you're recognized.

STORER: Thank you, Chairwoman. I put out some-- and I feel like-- A) I just want to say this is, this is really kind of fun. This is one of those issues that is not partisan, it's not really urban/rural, and there is some really amazing discussion going on on the floor, I will let folks know at home. That being said, I, I really did reach out to my constituents on this. Clearly, a wide variety of responses. The clear message, as Senator Cavanaugh said he heard loud and clear in hearing as well, was the one thing people can agree on is they don't want to change the time anymore. Whichever direction we go, they don't want to go back and forth. So that, I think, is-- there's general consensus on one way or the other. But I'm going to stand-- I'm going to stand not necessarily in opposition; it's hard for me to say opposition to, to Senator Hunt's bill, because I appreciate the fact that we have-- we're having this discussion. I appreciate Senator Hunt and Senator Murman for, for both bringing this up and, and letting us kind of have a meaningful debate on it. But I'm going to stand firm on the fact that we are an ag state. I represent-- agriculture is the number one industry in my district, 11 counties, north central Nebraska. I live it. We were having that discussion here. You know, when you go to-- when you go to put up hay in the morning, you can't-- you have to wait until the sun comes up. There's dew, dew on the ground until the sun burns it off. And, and under permanent daylight

savings time, your day would start much later and have to go much longer in the evening. So, we also had the debate on what does that do to family time. If you are-- if you are more of a 9-5, it may give you more family time; if you're in agriculture, it gives you less family time because you're, you're using those daylight hours to be out in the field or doing your work. So, I have to-- I have to support and advocate for the number one industry of my district, and quite frankly, the, the number one industry driving the engine of this state, which is agriculture. So, I, I would urge my colleagues to be thoughtful about that, and what those days look like for folks in the, in the world of agriculture under both of these scenarios. In addition to that, you know, lots of discussion on, you know, Colorado and bordering states. When I explain to people I'm probably less sympathetic to that because I live in Cherry County, which is split by the time line. For my entire life, I've lived in Mountain Time Zone and done business or went to school or had meetings in Central Time Zone, so I have made that adjustment my whole life. The world doesn't come to an end. It is possible to, to make those adjustments. And, and the last thing I want to throw out-- you know, I know it's been brought up about kids getting to-- getting on the bus, going to school. Again, my district is pretty rural. We have kids on the bus for well over an hour in many cases, and it's already a challenge in those, in those winter months, but, you know, I just think we have to be, be aware of what life looks like for our kiddos in terms of getting on the bus, returning home from school and, and trying to provide the most natural setting and, and hours of daylight during those hours for them as well. So, I will be-- I will be voting no on Senator Hunt's bill and voting yes on Senator Murman's bill, but I thoroughly appreciate the good dialogue, the good discussion, and the good debate. Thank you.

DeBOER: Senator Spivey, you're recognized.

SPIVEY: Thank you, Madam President, and good morning, colleagues and folks watching online. This is a, a great conversation, and I'm excited to be able to have it. I honestly did not even think about some of the points that were brought up before Senator Hunt brought her bill, and then reading what Senator Murman is also doing. So, I appreciate the intentionality and the conversation to build my context and understanding of, of why this issue is important and why we, as a body, are considering it. I do want to divert a little bit and, and take a moment to revisit my-- some of my guests that are here, the Midlands African Chamber, and give just a little bit more information about this amazing organization that is doing work across our state.

So, the Midlands African Chamber, or known as MAC to some, was founded in 2020, and their mission is to empower and connect and champion African and African-American communities in Nebraska and across the Midwest, and they are really focused on economic development and community vitality. They are supporting business owners in accessing capital; they have a pitch event called Pitch Black, which allows folks to pitch their business and get investment to be successful. They are providing technical assistance support to businesses that maybe don't understand, like, "how do I manage my finances?" and "I don't like QuickBooks, but I need to use it. And so what does that look like?" or "I have to file taxes, and this is the impact that has on me as a business owner." And so, they are assuring that we can have a really strong, diverse and vibrant business community that are supporting our business leaders that are across the diaspora. And they also have a foundation, which I think is really unique. So, outside of supporting just economic development, they are thinking about how they are reinvesting back into community again, so people can access this good life that we always talk about here in Nebraska. And so, I just wanted to uplift this amazing organization. I am so glad that they are in Lincoln today, advocating, talking to senators, using their voice, and appreciate the work that they are doing, not just in Omaha and in my district, but across Nebraska. So, thank you again for being here, and thank you colleagues for recognizing them. I yield the rest of my time, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Spivey. Senator Raybould has an announcement.

RAYBOULD: Thank you, Madam President. This-- I, I am thankful for the opportunity to have this moment to address you on something that is, is very important. In 2022, the members of the 107th Legislature declared February 20th as an annual day of remembrance in recognition of the survivors of the Indian Industrial Boarding School at Genoa. I have shared with each of you a copy of LR280, LR280 from 2022, and I encourage you to take a moment to read it and be reminded of the atrocities and trauma endured by the survivors, their families, and their communities. The color orange symbolizes solidarity with indigenous peoples affected by Indian boarding schools. On February 27, our State Capitol building will be illuminated in orange. When you witness it, please take a moment to reflect on the lessons of the past and celebrate the courage, strength, and resiliency of those who were impacted at the Indian Industrial Boarding School at Genoa. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Raybould. Senator Kauth, you're recognized.

KAUTH: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to this bill, and in favor of LB302 instead, making standard time permanent. I just want to say, George, your dad is right, and you absolutely should listen to him. I, I, I, too, like having some extra time at the end of the day, not that we ever see anything at the end of the day; we usually leave here much too late. But not everyone works first shift hours. We have a lot of people who do second and third shift who would love to see some sunlight. They would love to use that time, and if they're able to use that more in the morning, I think it's important that we support that. I know a lot of people in this room are golfers, and that's been one of the things I've heard, is that golfers want to be able to golf later in the evening. And yes, it is an economic driver, but again, not everyone's a golfer. I come from a, a group of runners. I'm running in the morning in the pitch black, a little scary. We'd love to see a little bit more light in the mornings. And swimmers and people who do get up and get out and do things early in the morning would love to have that sunlight. The biggest reason, though, is this, this is about our circadian rhythms actually changing how our body reacts to the sun. I prefer to say with a permanent standard time so that we are working within our natural biological rhythms. These groups, the American Academy of Sleep Medicine, American Medical Association, British Sleep Society, Canadian Sleep Research Consortium, Canadian Sleep Society, the Canadian Society for Chronobiology-- the Canadians have done a lot of study on this, apparently-- European Sleep Research, the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, the National Sleep Foundation, Sleep Research Society, Society for Research on Biological Rhythms. All of those groups have come out and said it is far more important for your body to be aligned with the circadian rhythms of the permanent standard time, daylight-- versus Daylight Savings Time. And when we talk about our society right now, we-- I think we have not had one day in this Legislature where the topic of mental health or physical health has not come up. When we're talking about mental health, sleep deprivation is a big part of that. When we're talking about obesity, heart disease, all of these things are severely impacted by sleep deprivation. And so, this is something that you have all of these sleep researchers saying and screaming "this is important." You have a sleep researcher texting his son saying, "listen, it makes a difference to the human body." I want to read some of the, the position statements from the Ama-- American Academy of Sleep Medicine: the United States should eliminate seasonal time changes in favor of permanent standard time, which aligns best

with human circadian biology. Evidence supports the distinct benefits of standard time for health and safety, while also underscoring the potential harms that result from seasonal time changes to and from daylight savings time. And I think everyone on this floor has agreed it's the flip-flopping back and forth that makes us all a little bonkers, but also not being in alignment with how the sun is moving affects your body. By causing the human body clock to be misaligned with the natural environment, daylight savings time increases the risks to our physical health, mental well-being, and public safety. Permanent standard time is the optimal choice for health and safety. And now, from the American Medical Association: committing to standard time has health benefits and allows us to end the biannual tug-of-war between our biological and alarm clocks. Eliminating time changes in March and November would be welcome. Research shows permanent daylight savings time overlooks potential health risks that can be avoided by establishing permanent standard time instead. The British Sleep Society: there's an ongoing debate in the United Kingdom and in other countries about whether twice-yearly changes into and out of daylight savings time should be abolished. Opinions are divided, as we see here on this floor. The British Sleep Society concludes from the available scientific evidence that circadian and sleep health are affected negatively by enforced changes of clock time, especially in a forward direction, and positively by the availability of natural daylight during the morning. Our recommendation is the United Kingdom should abolish the twice-yearly clock change and reinstate standard time throughout the year. The Canadian Sleep Society: optimal sleep and optimal alignment of the human circadian clock with daytime activities is achieved with standard time. Not only does Daylight Savings Time induce sleep deprivation at its inception in the spring, but it enforces later darkness--

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

KAUTH: Thank you, Mr. [SIC] President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Kauth. Senator Clouse would like to recognize 35 folks from Leadership Nebraska seated in the north balcony. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Hansen, you're recognized.

HANSEN: Thank you, Madam President. I, I appreciate everybody weighing in on this subject. I know it's one we've heard many times before, and we get an extensive amount of emails from this every year. I had one

constituent actually recommend, hey, we should just add an extra day to the-- an extra hour to the day, and we don't worry about any of this. And I think that was a very logical solution, but something I don't think we need to consider, but I thought that was kind of funny. I'm a-- I appreciate what Senator Kauth was just kind of describing about the health benefits when it comes to standard time. I am in favor of eliminating the daylight savings time one way or the other, however, I am in more favor of the standard time approach, not just from the health benefits that were described earlier, but also I think it's just a little bit more of a logical approach, considering what a lot of our surrounding states are possibly considering. And so, I was hoping that Senator Murman would yield to a question. Madam President. Would Senator Murman yield to a question, please?

DeBOER: Senator Murman, will you yield?

MURMAN: Yes.

HANSEN: So, I, I was hoping you can just maybe expound on that a little bit, about what our surrounding states are considering legislatively, when it comes to daylight savings times. Are, are, are some considering more standard time, or are some considering more of the daylight savings time?

MURMAN: Yes, actually, I believe all of our surrounding states do have a bill to eliminate daylight savings time. North Dakota has actually passed-- one of the houses in North Dakota has passed elimination of daylight savings time. Kansas and South Dakota do have a, a bill to do the same. They're at various stages in those states, and, and in the surrounding states.

HANSEN: OK. Thank you. So, I, I think just from those two main arguments, where I'm coming from, I appreciate both Senator Hunt and Senator Murman bringing both these bills. I think it's an important conversation to have. However, I think just logically speaking, considering what all of our surrounding states are, are looking at. And then also, the health benefits are the reason why I would rather choose the standard time. Plus, I think when I look at the emails and correspondence from my constituents in District 16, standard time seems like the most popular approach. And I was hoping Senator Murman could actually just maybe discuss one more thing, and that was-- I-- from my understanding, I think there's a federal law or a federal act that says that if we want to change the daylight savings time,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

Congress has to approve it. And so, I will yield the rest of my time to Senator Murman to explain that maybe a little bit.

DeBOER: Senator Murman, you yielded 2 minutes, 33 seconds.

MURMAN: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Yes, actually, for LB34, Senator Hunt's bill, to go into effect, Congress would have to act. So, states can pass this, but it wouldn't go into effect until there is an act of Congress that would allow permanent daylight savings time. And actually, the next bill, my, my bill coming up for elimination of standard time [SIC]-- my bill does say that four surrounding states would have to approve the elimination of daylight savings time, and then this bill would go into effect on the following January 1. So, we have addressed the issue with surrounding states with the bill that's coming up. I would like to address also a, a few of the issues that have been brought up. I'm a farmer, too, so, I think farmers, as probably most everyone else, is split at least close to 50/50 as to which way they would like to go, permanent standard time or permanent daylight savings time. But the important thing-- you know, everyone look-- looks at daylight savings time and says, oh, on the-- in the summer, it's nice to have that extra hour in the evening for whatever you would like to do in the evening, but once you go through permanent daylight savings time through the winter, which by the way, I think we've only done once or maybe twice in our whole history-- I think once during World War I, and, and maybe once in the late '60s or early '70s, as I mentioned before-- people decide pretty quickly they don't like permanent daylight savings time in the winter because going to work or going to school, the sun doesn't come up until about 9:00 in a lot of the state in the middle of the winter, so you're a lot colder and darker. So, more dangerous to do it that time-- in that time. But I do-- I'm coming up later in the queue, so I'll talk a little more about the health benefits of permanent standard time. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senators Hansen and Murman. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement.

CLERK: Thank you, Madam President. Notice that the Banking Committee-- Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee will have an executive session in Room 2022 at 10:00 this morning. Banking-- excuse me, 10:30. Banking, Commerce and Insurance, exec session, 2022 at 10:30.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Murman, you're recognized.

MURMAN: Thank you, Madam President. I did mention I could expand a little bit more on farmers, I guess. As Senator Storer mentioned earlier, if you're putting up hay or anything like that, or even harvesting, you can get an earlier start if, if you're not on daylight savings time because you have that earlier sunlight. So, you can start closer to the time of day when most people would be going to work. And, and if you get a full day in, you know, possibly you can quit a little earlier in the evening to join your family for whatever the activities are coming up, sports activities, or whatever that is. On the health iss-- health benefits of permanent standard time, our bodies are on what's called a "circadium" [SIC] rhythm, but in simpler words, it's the body's natural clock. Our bodies know when to sleep and when to awake, and it-- our bodies align quite well with the natural sun under permanent standard time. When our body's circadian rhythm and the sun are misaligned as they are in daylight savings time, the body doesn't handle it very well. But you don't have to take my word for it; there's a doctor that's done a lot of work on this, Dr. Alaina Tiani, and she's a clinical health psychologist specializing in behavior sleep medicine at the Cleveland's [SIC] Clinic Sleep Disorders Center. And Senator Duncan has brought sleep up earlier, but I can expand a little bit more on that, too. She describes permanent standard time as undeniably the best option for our health. She writes: having more of that light exposure at those earlier times is essentially better for our body's rhythms than with daylight savings and having evening light exposure. Melatonin-- the sleep hormone-- starts the process for sleep when the body is exposed to darkness, and is suppressed with sunlight exposure. Therefore, having more-- having morning light exposure means Nebraskans working or going to school around 8 or 9 and then leaving at 5 are better-aligned during these working hours. But if one's doctor's opinion isn't enough, let's take a look at what the American Academy of Sleep Medicine has to say. Jennifer Martin, the president of the Academy of Sleep Medicine, writes: daylight savings time disrupts the body's natural circadian rhythms and impacts sleep. Standard time provides a better opportunity to get the right duration of high-quality, restful sleep on a regular basis, which improves our cognitive mood, cardiovascular health, and overall well-being. So, another thing I'd like to bring up is your kids. During daylight savings time, when it's still light late into the evening, it's harder to put kids to bed because-- just for this reasons that I brought up about your "circadium" [SIC] rhythm, that works, of course, for our kids, too. So, it's easier to get them up in the morning when at least the sun is starting to come up and there's a little bit of light

coming in, and it's easier to put them to bed at night when it's starting to get dark. And I think adults-- our bodies work the same way. Just unfortunately, especially if you're a farmer, you might have to start in the dark. As I was a dairy farmer, I started in the dark and quit in the dark just about every day, but I always appreciated it when I didn't have to go very long in the dark in the morning before the sun came up and things started moving around. [INAUDIBLE] the traffic started moving around and the other livestock started moving around, and everything else. So, it felt more like it's, it's a, a good time to be working. So, the important thing is not have to change the clock. And if we're not going to change the clock, I think we'll hate it being permanent daylight savings time. We'll hate it in the winter. And if we don't have to clock and-- don't have to change the clock and stay with standard time year-round, it's healthier and safer and more aligned with our natural clock, and that is the way to go. And also--

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

MURMAN: --as I said-- thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Murman. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President, and I appreciate everything Senator Murman was just saying. He made some really good points. As a parent of children who I have to get to sleep at night in the summer and they ask why do they have to go to bed when the sun's still up in those June and July days, it would be, I guess, relief in that consequence. But that also made me think about-- we had folks who came and testified on these bills about golfing and, I think, Little League baseball or youth sports, but nobody came and testified in favor of Senator Murman's bill in-- for fireworks, which just made me think when-- on the Fourth of July, I like to light off fireworks with my kids, and we have to wait until, you know, it gets dark enough to light off the fireworks. And if we passed Senator Murman's bill, I think we'd be able to light them off an hour earlier, which would actually be a feature for me. So, I just-- I punched my light. I was talking earlier, and, and I genuinely am torn on this, because I do-- I like it to be light when I, you know, wake up in the morning. Like this morning, I think sunrise was a little after seven. I was already up at that point, but it was nice that, like, while I was making breakfast for the kids and things like that, that the sun started to come through the windows, and it was just-- makes the morning more

pleasant when the-- there's light out earlier. So, I like that. But I think it was Senator Hunt's point, I also like it to be light out after work so I can do, you know, some recreation. And one of the things that the testifier in favor of Senator Murman's bill-- and I forget the man's name, but he was a local person but here representing stand-- what is it? Preserve Standard Time? Save Standard Time, I think is what it was called. Save Standard Time. And his-- he had a great handout with a lot of stuff, and one of the things he said was when you have standard time, you have less time for the man. And I thought that was great, because that means there's more time for you, less time for, you know, what a-- we all consider "the man." So, I thought that was a good point in favor of Senator Murman's bill. But that's-- I think, maybe, in the-- I don't know. What other, other times of the year. Again, I still try to have a little trouble remembering which one's which. So, I thought that was interesting. But the other point I wanted to raise was Senator Hansen had kind of an innovative idea about adding another hour, and then you don't need time changes. But one of the things that did come up in the hearing was about time zones, and, like, maybe we can move some of our counties into different time zones. Maybe we could move the Mountain Time Zone all the way to the Missouri River or something like that, and that would get the whole state in the Mountain Time Zone. I don't know if that helps out. Or we move it to the west, and make the entire state in the Central Time Zone, and then we'd have less of a consideration about-- or maybe it would factor into which one we decide. But to make that time zone change, we have to petition the US Department of Transportation was what we were told, the Secretary of Transportation. And my guess is-- I didn't ask this, but time zones were-- we-- I think we all know-- invented by the railroads. And so, I guess the Department of Transportation then became the jurisdiction for determining which time zone you're in. So, that's why we would have to petition the Department of Transportation if we wanted to move time zones. But I'm just saying, like, if we're having a conversation about which time zone we should be in, what time it should be, maybe we should put everything on the table and determine whether the whole state should be in one time zone or another, and we should pursue that as we're pursuing these other things, just for a more holistic approach. Senator Jacobson pointed out how it can be inconvenient to go from North Platte to Mullen-- which is a beautiful drive-- and changing times and being confusing about that. Maybe we should just pursue, at the same time, getting the entire state on either Central Time or Mountain Time. And then, I guess if we changed, then we would be on Central Standard sometimes and Mountain Standard other times

or-- I'm-- or Central Daylight sometimes and Mountain Daylight other times, I guess. But anyway, so I just wanted to put that out there. So again, I'm still currently planning to vote for both of these bills until we get a little bit further down the road. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator John Cavanaugh. Senator Holdcroft, you're recognized.

HOLDCROFT: Thank you, Madam President. You know, I've heard a lot about, apparently, the problem of changing your clock twice a year, once every six months. You know, in the Navy, when we transit the Pacific, we change our clocks about once every three days. So, the Pacific is 4,500 nautical miles. So, take the United States, you know, once, twice, one-and-a-half times across the United States, and we, we transit at about a 12-knot speed of advance, which is about 15 miles an hour. So, imagine going across the United States and then half again at 15 miles an hour, and that's kind of what we do. Now, the reason that, that is because we have this thing called an aircraft carrier with us, and it likes to fly, and it has to generate at least 30 knots of wind across the, across the flight deck to launch and recover aircraft. And sometimes, the wind's coming from behind you, so sometimes, the aircraft carrier just turns around and goes the other direction and we have to chase it down, and then it turns around and comes back. And overall-- the, the overall speed of advance is about 15 miles an hour. But even so, you, you cover in about-- every three days, you go across to another time zone, and you've got to change the clocks. So, the Navy does it pretty smart, actually. When we're going west and you gain an hour, we do that time change at 1500, 3:00 in the afternoon. That way, you get another hour of work out of, out of the cruise. When we come east and you lose an hour, we do that at, at 1:00 in the morning when you advance your-- to 2:00, and you lose an hour of sleep. But overall, it's a gain for, for the, the United States in service. So, I'm going to vote no on both of these. I think we're fine the way we are, and we-- and we can change our clocks twice a year without too much trouble. But with my remaining time, I would like to give out some more good news about the Department of Health and "huvid"-- Human Services. They've now released the Nebraska Vital Statistics Top Causes of Death Dashboard-- Death Dashboard. The Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services recently released the Nebraska Vital Statistics Top Causes of Death Dashboard. Vital Statistics data are fundamental to public health assessment and planning processes correlating with the overall health of the population. The data helps the DHHS and the public track the overall

population's health and wellness. Knowing the top causes of death supports the development of effective public health prevention efforts to increase public awareness, watch for and address new trends, support medical research, and work to improve our medical community, researchers and health departments; to help foster healthier Nebraskans and families, and stronger, more informed communities. So, I went out and I checked out this Nebraska Vital Statistics Leading Causes of Death is pretty-- kind of pretty slick. If you leave it-- everything is the same, the number one death-- cause of death in, in Nebraska is heart disease by far; cancer is number two, and then it drops way off to chronic lower respiratory disease, and then accidents, stroke, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, essential hypertension and hypertensive real [SIC] disease, Parkinson's disease. And so, that's-- so, you can go out to this site, you can change the timeframe, you can change the age, you can change the location, you can change the race and ethnicity and get an idea of what is the number one-- or the, the, the causes of death in Nebraska. So that, again, good news from-- good news from the Department of Health and Human Services. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Holdcroft. Senator Rountree, you're recognized.

ROUNTREE: Thank you, Madam President. Colleagues, I just rise today just to say I've appreciated all of the conversation regarding the two bills that are before us, why each one of those have some tremendous benefits. I was just looking back and thinking, in my own life, as far as our daylight saving time, having grown up on a farm, I can say that we rose with the sun and we went home sometimes after the sun set. So, it didn't really matter a lot about the clock. I know during the great energy crisis we had back in the '70s-- I remember that, so a lot of this was instituted so we could conserve and save energy, preserve energy, and it remained with us. As I said, great benefits of both. It'd be nice to see both of our bills continue to be debated if they both go forward; continue to hash it out, and see which one is going to come to the forefront. As far as in Mountain Standard Time, I've lived in all of the time zones here in our United States, having been in the military and traveled. Currently, I have my granddaughter and son-in-law and daughter lives in Colorado Springs, and so, that's over in the Mountain Time. So, anytime that we're looking at doing FaceTimes or calls with them, you've got to be aware of that time. And then, my family lives in North Carolina over in the Eastern Time Zone, so we're kind of set here in this time, and so, being aware of all of those. But that's everybody in our United States, so, I'll continue to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

listen to the debate that we have. It's been lively. All good points that are made. And hopefully, we'll get one of those hammered out. And I yield the rest of my time back. Thank you, ma'am.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Rountree. Senator Lonowski, you're recognized.

LONOWSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Longtime listener, first time caller. Today is National Hoodie Hoo Day. It recognizes one month until spring. So, to all of you, happy Hoodie Hoo. I have five children. When they were young, some of them wanted ice cream and some of them wanted cookies. So, we didn't decide ice cream or cookies; we decided cookie dough ice cream. That's also important for what we're talking about here today. The Hill has reported on a proposal to split the difference between standard time and daylight savings time by a 30-minute change. The proposal would smooth out the light balance and reduce the negative impact on circadian rhythms. The proposal would involve moving clocks forward by 30 minutes in the spring and leaving them there. Over time, the 30-minute difference would feel negligible. Other countries would follow suit. The background for this, the Sunshine Protection Act of 2021, passed the Senate in 2022 to make daylight savings time permanent. However, the bill stalled in the House. Sleep experts point to the health benefits of standard times. The National Association of Broadcasters has raised concerns about the impact on AM radio stations in daylight savings time, and that would end. States-- they can exempt themselves from daylight savings time by observing permanent standard time, year round. Hawaii and Arizona-- except for Navajo Nation-- currently observe standard time all year. In closing, I urge Senator Hunt and Senator Murman to get together and amend both. One bill would be a half hour earlier, or one bill would be a half hour later. Thank you, Madam President. I--

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Lonowski. Senator Guereca, you're recognized. Senator Guereca? Senator Dungan, you're recognized. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you. Madam President. I'm-- several people have come up to me asking what other states do, and it would have been smart to distribute a sheet saying what all the other states do so you don't have to listen so intently to hear this, and I have done that. So, I have copies over here, but as you know, I have to sign something for distribution. So, that's being printed and copied right now, and then you will receive that. If you want to look at it before you get it, I've got a pile of them right over here. But I can tell you-- OK, I

think Senator Murman misspoke. Colorado and Wyoming have passed permanent daylight savings time legislation like LB34. Colorado and Wyoming have passed bills like LB34. Iowa has a bill pending like LB34. Kansas has a pending bill to exempt the state from daylight savings time unless there's an act of Congress. Missouri has pending bills like both, just like we do in Nebraska, and South Dakota has a pending bill to exempt the state from daylight savings time. So, the only two states that have passed legislation are Colorado and Wyoming, and they passed bills like LB34. Iowa, on the east side, is considering a bill like LB34 and-- I see that sheet getting distributed now, so maybe that will clear some things up for people. One thing I'll say about the studies-- thank you-- as I said in my opening, you know, if you find 100 studies saying daylight savings time is better, you find 100 saying standard time is better. It seems like, from the research, what, what all researchers agree on is that the time change is what the problem is. In, in the fall, when you set your clock back and it's darker at night, people have, you know, issues changing with the clock. In the, in the spring, when they set it forward, sometimes they find it harder to wake up in the morning and people are more likely to call in sick, people are more likely to take time off. And that's totally understandable; we all go through that. So, I think, you know, my position obviously is that LB34 is better, it's better to have more daylight in the evening. But most importantly for commerce, for our economy, for truckers and delivery drivers to be going across state lines and having consistency in what the time zones are, LB34 is the best thing for Nebraska because of the states around us that are either considering or have already passed similar legislation. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Dorn, you're recognized.

DORN: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thanks for the conversation this morning. I'll give just a little bit of history for me of this discussion on daylight savings time and such. When I was first elected six years ago, my wife had a conversation with me and said, I don't care what you do up there in the Legislature, I don't care what bills you pass, pass something about changing or not changing the clocks. Well, we pretty generally had one bill or two bills every year. I think last year was about the first time we came close enough to have votes on something. I think Senator Erdman brought one-- and I forget who else brought the other one-- and we actually had votes on, on them; neither one could get enough votes to pass. That is part of the discussion. That's part of what we have here with, I call it, the daylight savings time. Yes, it is-- when it was

implemented, it was because of-- we could-- economically, we were going to get more done; it would use electricit-- less electricity and all of these things. Those kind of were proven over time not to be 100% as accurate as what they told us. I listened to Senator Murman and some of the, I call it, now the things they're putting out that our health would be better with this or that. We still have the same amount of daylight. We're not changing daylight hours; we're changing-- trying to change when we set our clocks. I listened to Senator "Lindowski" [SIC] and I very much go-- when he said let's move it to the half hour, let's not change the clocks. For me, for our family, it's more of a-- as you get up in age a little bit, that clock change for that hour, oh, it's great to have that extra hour one time of the year; it's not so much fun to lose that hour, I call it, in the other time of the year, spring or fall. I forget which one we do. But it's just that we change this and then we have to adapt, and our body has to adapt again or whatever. Senator Murman, I wish he would get up and talk about-- he was a long-time farmer, he milked cows for years. I'm pretty sure those cows, they stayed on the same sunlight schedule, not time schedule, as when they gave the most milk or whatever. And if you just change those, you changed everything. So, I will be supporting the daylight savings time. That's one thing that I voted for last year. I just really thank all the conversation-- and sometimes we need bills like this, where we get to have a little bit lighter side to some bills, because we, we will-- as we go forward, we will have some really deep discussions. But thank you for everybody, for contributing. Thank you for all the conversation. I yield my time.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Dorn. Senator Conrad, you're recognized.

CONRAD: Thank, thank you, Mr. [SIC] President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in the chorus of appreciation for having perhaps a more lighthearted and multifaceted and very interesting and incredibly non-divisive debate. I think that's really important to our work, and definitely reflective in the legislation in that both Senator Hunt and Senator Murman have brought forward, which I'm a proud co-sponsor of both measures. You might remember our longtime colleague then-state-Senator Tom Briese had been a champion for this issue for many years, which I know Senator Hunt and myself and others supported as well. When he was selected to become the Nebraska State Treasurer, I had the opportunity and honor to pick up that legislation from his legislative agenda and then bring it to the legislative floor in the last biennium, I think, which was one of the first times in, in recent history that we've had a chance to, to have full legislative debate on that. And it was such a fun bill to work on not only with the external

stakeholders but with my colleagues, and it really helped to deepen an already strong professional relationship that I had with people like Senator-- my friend Senator Erdman. And I was crystal clear in my approach moving forward. I didn't have a strong preference in terms of how we reformed the current antiquated system; I see pros and cons in each of the options and alternatives that are available to states to move forward in this direction, as evidenced by Senator Hunt and Senator Murman's approach. I just seek to, to end the disruptive practice of twice-a-year time changes. I definitely have read all of the research in regards to the economic impact, the health impact, the conservation impacts that go along with each of the options and alternatives. I just also know from being a parent of young children how disruptive the time change can be for their-- well, then, nap schedules; they've grown out of that stage-- but family harmony and bedtime and wake up and just getting everybody kind of on the same page in a little bit more consistent and less disruptive way. So, it's really that experience as a, a parent and a working parent that really increased my passion and engagement on this issue. And I've heard from many parent groups in my neighborhoods and across the state that, that they're kind of struggling with those same situations as well. The last piece that I wanted to lift up in this regard-- and I'll be supporting Senator Hunt and Senator Murman's measures, and then we'll kind of see where the body shakes out on those on General File and perhaps moving forward-- is I wanted to draw the body's attention to perhaps a related third option that is pending before the Legislature this year. So, in light of the fact that we had a bill limitation, and based on the last biennial debate where we weren't able to find consensus on how to effectuate the change, I saw through media reports this fall that President Trump and others on the federal level were going to continue to work on this on the federal side of things, which I think brings a great deal of uniformity to this issue, which is clearly a national issue as well. And so, I've introduced a legislative resolution-- a substantive legislative resolution that will have a committee hearing and be debated later this year, hopefully-- that would call upon our federal representatives to end the antiquated practice and to bring uniformity to this issue on the federal level. I-- if you look at the recent history, this is an issue that has garnered wide bipartisan support on the federal level. If you look at the polling on this, you see well north of 70% of Americans are dissatisfied with the status quo in regards to this practice, and I'm hopeful that through these bills on the floor today and/or the LR and federal action, that we'll be able to come toge-- together to find

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

a more modern approach to how we organize our time together. Thank you, Ms.-- Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Arch, you're recognized.

ARCH: Thank you, Madam President. When, when these bills were both introduced and both moved out of committee unanimously-- both of them-- I, I, I talked to Senator Hunt and Senator Murman and said, let's schedule these together, let's talk about them at the same time. We put Senator Hunt's bill up first, but this has kind of been the, the vehicle that we can discuss this, this matter. But I, I have a question and I will ask this question to both Senator Hunt and Senator Murman, if you'd would be willing. First of all, Senator Hunt, would you yield to a question?

DeBOER: Senator Hunt, will you yield?

HUNT: Yes.

ARCH: So, in, in your bringing this bill, what, what do you see as the benefit to having this discussion, having the state of Nebraska take a position on this issue, and, and its interface with the federal government? So, the federal government-- help me understand, what does the federal government need to do before this could be enacted in the state of Nebraska?

HUNT: So, the federal government has to pass permissive legislation saying that the states can go to permanent daylight savings time. In 2022, the Senate passed that; it did not get voted on by the House. President Trump and Elon Musk have signaled their support for bills like LB34, for permanent daylight savings time, and Colorado and Wyoming have already passed it. And so, I-- I think the benefit of us having this conversation and adopting LB34 is to support the economy in commerce and make sure that we're in line with our, our partners and our neighbors in states around us who have already passed legislation to change the time.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Hunt. And I would ask the same question of, of Senator Murman that-- what, what exactly is the, is the benefit of passing one of these at-- as it relates to the federal government?

DeBOER: Senator Murman, will you yield?

MURMAN: Yes. Well, I think Senator Hunt described it well. For LB34 to go into-- to infect [SIC], it would take an act of Congress. So, we

can do that, we can pass the bill now, but it would take an act of Congress for it to go into effect. My bill would not take an act of Congress, but my bill does say that four surrounding states would have to eliminate daylight savings time, in other words, adopt permanent standard time before my bill would go into effect. And as far as the President goes, I have seen infor-- or, I've definitely heard that President Trump wants to eliminate standard time and go to full-time-- [INAUDIBLE] eliminate daylight savings time and go to permanent standard time, and I have not seen any information that he's changed his mind on that. I'm not saying Senator Hunt is wrong, but I just haven't seen that information. As far as I know, President Trump, after being elected, said that he wanted to eliminate daylight savings time and go on to permanent standard time.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Murman. I would just remind the body that when, when these now come-- and it looks like we'll be coming to a vote soon on LB34-- when these come to a vote, we'll be obviously considering them separately, and so we'll vote on LB34, and then we will have the introduction of Senator Murman's bill immediately following that. So, just keep that in mind as you, as you cast your votes. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Arch. Senator DeKay, you're recognized.

DeKAY: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to do the same thing that Speaker Arch did. I would have-- ask if Senator Hunt and Senator Murman would each yield to the same question for me. Senator Hunt?

DeBOER: Senator Hunt, will you yield?

HUNT: Yes.

DeKAY: We talked a little bit about pending legislation in surrounding states. Do you think if we take a position on that, this would dictate what other states would do going forward?

HUNT: I don't think we can dictate what other states do, but I think that other states will be influenced by what their neighbors have decided. I mean, we're clearly influenced, because we're curious about the fact that Wyoming and Colorado have passed bills like LB34, that other states around us are considering similar bills. And that should weigh on the decision we make today.

DeKAY: And you are right, I should have used the word influence rather than dictate.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

HUNT: Sure.

DeKAY: And I will ask the same thing with Senator Murman.

DeBOER: Senator Murman, will you yield?

MURMAN: Yes. Well, thank you, Senator DeKay. Yes, of course, as, as I said, my bill would not go into infect [SIC] unless four states would adopt permanent standard time. But North Dakota-- at least one house in North Dakota has passed the bill to eliminate daylight savings time and go to permanent standard time. All of our surrounding states have bills to do that; they're just in various stages of, of being passed or not, so-- but the important thing is that my bill would require four surrounding states to do it. Senator Hunt's bill would, would require an act of Congress.

DeKAY: Thank you. I yield back the rest of my time.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senators DeKay, Hunt, and Murman. Senator Dungan, you're recognized.

DUNGAN: Thank you. Madam President, I just want to punch in one more time here before we get to a vote, because I unfortunately was in an exec session previously when we got to my time, and so it was skipped-over. And so, I just wanted to apologize for missing that. I think this has been a really productive debate. People oftentimes ask me out in the world whether or not other senators listen when we're having these debates, and I know that there's a lot of hustle and bustle going on, and a lot of people are doing other important work underneath the balconies, but I think debates like this are really, really important to remind us that we should listen to each other, and that when we get up on the mic, we're actually not just talking to hear ourselves talk, and although sometimes it's important for the public to hear what we have to say, we're doing this to talk to each other. And I try very hard when we're in the body to listen to what other people are saying, and so I think this is a really good example of an issue where a lot of folks come in, don't necessarily have their mind made up, or they've received information from both sides of the issue, and this is our chance as colleagues to actually get up on the mic and have a conversation with each other about why we should or shouldn't do something. I really appreciate both Senator Hunt and Senator Murman bringing these bills, and I, I want to say thank you again to the Speaker for scheduling them back-to-back. I think that kind of helps us logistically have this conversation. I do think it

would be very funny if both of these made it to Final Reading and it had to be the Speaker's decision as to which was scheduled first on the agenda, and then that became the law. So, let's all vote green all the way to Final Reading and make it really uncomfortable for Speaker Arch. Thank you, Mr. President-- Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Dungan. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Hunt, you are recognized to close.

HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Once again, I think we've gone through it. LB34 is a bill to allow Nebraska to enact permanent daylight savings time. That's the time when you have more daylight after work, like in the summer. After work, you can go out for drinks with your friends, you can go to dinner, you can go golfing, and you can stay out later; you can go to your kid's soccer games, and you'll have more daylight to do things like that. As far as federal action, the U.S. Senate passed the Sunshine Protection Act in 2022. It was not voted on by the House, but it has been introduced again this year with bipartisan support. So, there is pending federal legislation that would allow LB34 to be enacted. It has bipartisan support, just as LB34 does. And once again, to go over our surrounding states, Iowa currently has a pending bill like this one; Colorado and Wyoming have already passed bills like this one, and if one more state around us passes a bill like LB34 allowing permanent daylight savings time, ours will go into effect if Congress takes action on that Sunshine Protection Act that has been introduced. I'll also reiterate that North Dakota is not a neighboring state of Nebraska. Senator Murman mentioned several times that North Dakota has passed standard time, but that is not a neighboring state. So, interesting, but less relevant to our conversation. So, I'd urge your support on LB34. We can take this to Select File and continue the conversation. And finally, I'll just say this is one of my favorite bills that we do, because I actually think it might be the only actual nonpartisan issue that we discuss. Anything else we do, there is some aspect of taxes or social issues or something that someone has an issue with, but everyone can agree on LB34. Everyone knows this is a good idea. So, I was talking to some friends over here, and we were kind of joking that maybe we should have both bills fail so we can keep having this good feeling every year, and keep the tradition of talking about daylight savings time and how we hate changing the clocks. And I'll also say, finally, this is probably the bill that I get the most positive constituent feedback on every year. From the very first year when I co-sponsored it with Senator Briese to this year, we get overwhelming constituent support for stopping the madness. We don't want to change

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2025

Rough Draft

the clocks anymore. So, we'll see what we end up doing today. But thank you for your support, thanks for the conversation today. Nice to have some fellow feeling for an hour or so, and I'd like a call of the house so we can make sure everyone can come and vote. Thank you.

DeBOER: There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, "shall the house go under call?" All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 1 nay to place the house under call.

DeBOER: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return to the chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senators Guereca, Juarez, Andersen, Dover, and von Gillern, the house is under call. Please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senators Guereca and Dover, the house is under call. Please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senator Hunt, we are missing Senator Guereca. Are we OK to proceed?

HUNT: We can proceed. Thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Colleagues, the question before the body is the advancement of LB34 to E&R Initial. All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vote nay. Have you all voted who care to? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 29 ayes, 13 nays, Madam President, on the motion to advance the bill.

DeBOER: The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk, for the next item. I raised the call. Items for the record.

CLERK: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam President, your committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB21, LB187, LB197 to-- as correctly engrossed and placed on Final Reading. Additionally, your Committee on Government, Military and Veterans Affairs reports LB183 to General File with committee amendments. Notice of hearing from the Nebraska Retirement Systems Committee, as well as the Revenue Committee and the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee. Motion to be printed for a rule suspension from Senator Brandt, an amendment to be printed from Senator DeKay to LB7 and Senator Sanders to LB321. That's all I have at this time. Madam President, returning to the agenda. General

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Floor Debate February 20, 2025

Rough Draft

File, LB302 introduced by Senator Murman. It's a bill for an act relating to time; to amend Section 49-1301, (49-13)02, 81-1323 and 81-1328 and Section 32-908; eliminates daylight savings time; harmonizes provisions; and repeals the original section. The bill was read for first time on January 15 of this year and referred to the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee; that committee placed the bill on General File. I have nothing pending on the bill, Madam President.

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

MURMAN: Thank you, Madam President. This bill is very simple. If it were passed, Nebraska would eliminate the old tried and failed practice of changing our clocks back and forth. For some history, the United States first adopted daylight savings time during World War I as a way to conserve energy. But a 2011 study from MIT found that daylight savings time may actually slightly increase energy use. So, if it's not working for its intended, intended purpose, we ought to cons-- reconsider, and why have it? Ending this practice has the potential for improved outcomes for public health, safety, and the economy. In terms of health, let's look at what the American Medical Association has to say. In 2022, they released a statement supporting the end of daylight savings time and enacting permanent standard time, writing: data show that sudden change from standard time to daylight savings time in March is associated with significant public health and safety risks, including increased risk of adverse cardiovascular events, mood disorders, and motor vehicle crashes. Some studies suggest that the body clock does not adjust to daylight savings time, even after a few months; this is also supported by the American Academy of Sleep Medicine. This is also a positive change for public safety. A 2020 study out of the University of Colorado Boulder examining over 730,000 motor vehicle accidents from 1996 to 2017 found an elevated rate of about 6% in the workweek following the spring transition to daylight savings time. Finally, there are significant benefits to the economy. One study found that following the time change, there was an increase in workplace injuries resulting in more days of work lost, while another found an uptick in drowsy employees scrolling the internet for non-work-related activities. But the most compelling argument to me is that very shortly after I had introduced this legislation, I received emails in support from Nebraska farmers writing about how they would appreciate the extra morning sun to get an earlier start. While in order to adopt the permanent savings [SIC] time, a state can simply opt out of daylight savings time, such as

Arizona, which has already done so. This has the benefit that, under this legislation, we could "implete"-- immediately put an end to the process of changing clocks back and forth. But in order to adopt, adopt permanent daylight time, we would have to wait for the potentially slow process of other states acting, or even worse, waiting for Congress to act. This is at the heart of the debate between LB34 and LB302. LB34 requires the Congress to Act, LB302 does not. If your number-one goal is to end the practice of changing clocks back and forth, LB302 is the way to go. To conclude, I've passed out a few maps displaying the time of the latest sunrises throughout the state and the number of days with a post-a.m. sunrise for both permanent standard time and permanent daylight savings time. It seems-- based on the committee hearing and the debate on the floor last year-- that there is generally wide support of "ending"-- ending clock-changing, but LB302 is the most likely way to get us there. And then, I'd like to at least comment on a few of the things that we've brought up already. The, the worst thing of course everybody hates is changing the clock back and forth, but the permanent standard time does show health benefits, and it's definitely the permanent standard time that does show the health benefit; it's not just changing the clock, and there's a lot of research that shows that. And, and, and as I mentioned earlier, the latest research shows that there is an energy savings, actually, even for staying on standard time, and originally-- back, I can remember-- I, I think it was late '60s, early '70s when we did go on permanent daylight savings time for a very short time, I think about eight months until the winter hit, that the reason for doing it was to save energy. But that-- that's actually been shown that that doesn't happen. I see there's several in the queue, so I'll wait to make further comments until later down the queue. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Murman. Senator Arch would like to recognize 20 members of the American Council of Engineering Companies of Nebraska. Please-- who are seated in the north balcony, please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Kauth, you're recognized.

KAUTH: Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to point out a few things. So, Senator Hunt had passed out something about the daylight savings time legislation in surrounding areas, and as I was mapping this out-- Kansas, it says they have a bill to exempt their state from daylight savings time. So, that would be our entire southern border would be abutting up against someone who is on standard time. And South Dakota is also exempting their state from daylight savings time. So our

entire northern border would be butting up against someone-- a state that has permanent standard time. Colorado is daylight savings time, and Wyoming is as well. Missouri has three different bills, so whatever-- whichever way the rest of the states go, they're fine. And Iowa's is pending. But I think if our, if our northern border and our southern border are permanent standard time, then us being in the middle of that could cause some trouble. And I know Senator Jacobson and I were talking, and he said if Colorado is daylight savings time and we move to permanent standard time, does that essentially erase the time zone change on that border? So, that's food for thought. I need to do a little more research on that. But I want to get back to some of the health effects. So, again, when we're talking about how we handle things in this state, pretty much everything that we talk about touches on mental health, talks about health effects in general, how our health is progressing as a state. Sleep deprivation is something that has gotten more and more entrenched in our society. We have people who can't put down their screens, we are constantly working. The, the thought that we would have so many more hours at the end of the day when we could fit so much more in is going to continue to lead to more sleep deprivation. As all of the organizations-- the, the sleep study organizations are attesting to, it is so much better to use the sun as a natural rhythm. But the effects of sleep deprivation can be extremely severe, so I want to talk about-- you have a 36% higher increased risk in colorectal cancer. It impacts your immunity. Three times increased risk for Type 2 diabetes, 48% increased risk of developing heart disease, increased risk of high blood pressure, three times more likely to catch a cold. When you look at safety, there are 6,000 more fatal crashes. Those crashes are caused by drowsy driving every year. 1 in 25 adults have fallen asleep at the wheel in the past month. When you look at obesity, it increases your cravings for sweet, salty and savory food. And I think we can all attest-- we have candy jars all over the place. When we get tired-- and late at night, you'll find this-- everybody starts pecking a little bit more and grabbing whatever's around to try to keep ourselves awake. You actually feel hungrier when you are sleep-deprived, so you have a 50% higher risk of obesity if you get less than five hours of sleep a night. You have lower levels of appetite control. The hormone leptin is decreased. You have a 33% increase in dementia risk. Sleep dep-- sleep deprivation can age your brain 3 to 5 years. You have greater risk for depression, irritability, anxiety, forgetfulness, and fuzzy thinking. So, I think when we look at all of this, it may sound like a little bit to say you've got that one hour, things are going to get a little bit darker earlier at night, you're going to start winding down. But that one

hour can make a significant difference in our health. And again, as legislators, this is not just about what's convenient or what allows more people to go golfing or what kind of economic benefits it is. This is also about our health benefits. Our health impacts the bottom line of the state. We spend a lot of money trying to make sure people are healthy or taking care of people who are not, and trying to make sure that we're doing the right thing. If even a little bit of benefit can come from having better sleep and encouraging people to shut down, go to bed a little earlier, stay asleep a little bit longer, I think we'll be doing very, very good things for our state, for our economics, and making things simpler. So, thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Kauth. Senator Hansen, you're recognized.

HANSEN: Thank you, Madam President. Again, I'm just going to reiterate a little bit of what I said earlier about my support for LB302 and standard time as opposed to daylight savings time, just like a lot of the health benefits that were mentioned earlier. Also being aligned with what of our-- a lot of our surrounding states are maybe looking at doing as well. I like the idea as a whole of just changing it either to daylight savings time or standard time, but I just happen to be more in favor of standard time. So, I'm just glad to see we're having a good discussion, actually moving the ball forward here a little bit, and maybe we'll kind of get something moving. So, I was going to keep it short and sweet, and so with that, I would encourage my colleagues to vote yes on LB302. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hansen. Senator John Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. Well, so again, I rise in support of LB302, just like I was supportive of LB34, because I do like the idea of not having the time change. And I did make some of my points about LB302 on LB34, but you know, for clarity of the record, maybe, we had a guy come and testify on LB302 who said that supporting LB302 was meaning that you took-- had less time for "the man," and I thought that was a great suggestion. He said you'd have more time for yourself, less time for the man, and I know this body is really interested in preserving people's rights as it pertains to their position relative to the man. And so, that's one of the reasons I-- I'm supportive of this bill. I do like it being light out later, but I also like it being light in the morning, so that's kind of where I'm torn. I did make my point about fireworks; I don't know why firework industry didn't come testify in favor of this bill, because Fourth of

July-- if we pass this bill, it'll be dark out an hour earlier on the Fourth of July, which is great for fireworks shows, especially if you got kids. I don't have to keep them up so late to light off all my fireworks that I buy. But anyway, one of the things I wanted to-- actually punched in about was this-- Senator Dover, I think, walked by and said that he liked no time change. And I think most everybody said that they like one bill or the other, or they like both, and you know, like, that's where I'm at, is I can't decide. But Senator Dover reminded me of, you know, the-- Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory, and they've had referendums for years and years about whether they should become a state or whether they should become an independent nation or whether they should stay a territory, and they have these referendums, and they never really resolve the question because they have a large number of people who want to become a state and a large number of people want to become [SIC] a territory, and a small number of people who want to remain a-- or, a large number who want to become independent, and then a small number who want to remain a territory. But they continue to remain a territory because they can't really get enough of one way or the other. And so, the status quo gets preserved by the small group who don't pick one of the two sides, I guess. And that reminded me of that. It was-- Senator Dover has so far been the only person that I've heard say that they like-- they want to keep the time change. And I get that argument, that keeping the time change means that you get the best of both worlds. But you have the pain of all of the health effects that Senator Kauth was just talking about, that Senator Hunt talked about, that a lot of people have hit on of the-- Senator Dungan's dad, I think, talked about, through the avatar of Senator Dungan, of course. But, the-- yeah, that they have this, this pain of the time change and it causes all these problems, but the thing you get in return for that pain is, of course, late-- light out later in the summer and light out later in the winter, I think. Or light out earlier in the winter or whatever. But anyway-- see, again, I have some real trouble remembering which direction things go. But you get the best of both worlds, but you have the pain of the time change. So, I get it. I see why certain folks are-- I see why people like both sides. I see why people like no side, and so, I'm continuing to be in support of both until I can decide where I'm going to end up being on this. So, I appreciate Senator Murman bringing this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator John Cavanaugh. Senator Storer, you're recognized.

STORER: Thank you, Madam President. Chair? I'm going to get it right. President. Yeah, I'm just going to rise again and, and reiterate some of the points that I made before. I think it's just important to keep bringing us back to center, about the reality of how this is going to affect many of the industries in our state. And quite frankly, all of those that have to do their work outside, which-- agriculture is front and center in that, in that group. And so, having-- you know, when you, when you look at the, the maps that were handed out, which I very much appreciate, but the reality of thinking about 9:00 sunrise at, at certain periods of time, it just-- that is depressing. Not only, not only depressing, but the-- but trying to be practical for farmers and ranchers, and w-- maybe it's linemen, it's anyone who's doing their work outside, not having any daylight until 9:00 in the morning for a good, good chunk of the year just doesn't seem very practical. And so, I do want people-- you know, I appreciate the, the comments and the desire that we would have more daylight after work hours to be able to enjoy outdoor activities. But I do feel very strongly that we have to prioritize the work day before we prioritize the play part of our day. It's our work day that keeps our state humming along. It's our work day that's important to the livelihoods of all the families in the state of Nebraska, and, and being respectful of sort of the foundational economy of our state, which is agriculture. I've been getting some texts and emails while I sat here on this issue, so I'm glad that, that there are folks tuned in and paying attention to this issue this morning. But reiterating again the realities of what it looks like to even ship cattle out. I had one constituent say, you know, hey, if we're going to ship cattle to town, to got to get them there early, have, have the inspector come out, and it's not daylight until 8:00 or 9:00 in the morning, that just-- that doesn't work. So, maybe you have to ship them the night before, which is going to take weight off of them, which costs our ranchers money. So, there are real economic-- there are real economic consequences tied to this. So, with that, I will be voting in support of LB302 and again, ask my colleagues to really be open-minded and mindful of the financial consequences to the citizens of the state of Nebraska when they push either their red or green button. Thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Storer. Senator Dungan, you're recognized.

DUNGAN: Thank you, Madam President. Colleagues, I do rise in favor of LB302 And yes, I did also vote for the last bill as well. I, I think that there's legitimate arguments being made on both sides. And as Senator John Cavanaugh alluded to, my dad, who was watching, did again urge me to support the daylight-- or, I'm sorry, the standard time

being adopted. This all got me thinking, though. I wanted to go back and look at some of the history of how we even got to where we are. There's a misconception, I think, or a misnomer that the reason we have daylight saving time is-- has to do with farmers. But it looks like from a very short research I've done, that farmers were not the ones who originally implemented or suggested this idea. The New York Times does a deep dive into this in kind of a fun article, and they talk about how a lot of times Benjamin Franklin is actually often credited as the first to suggest this idea of daylight saving time after he realized he was wasting his Parisian mornings by staying in bed. He proposed that the French fire cannons at sunrise to wake people up and reduce candle consumption at night. It sounds like over the next hundred years, there was a continued conversation about standardizing time, and this arose out of sort of the industrial revolution and the further mechanization of things around the country, but primarily train travel. Trains going from one city to the next would have difficulty delivering people on time because the time would be different in each city they stopped in. Clocks in each town were set to local sun time, so it could be noon in New York, 12:05 in Philadelphia, and 12:15 in Boston. So, that makes it really difficult when you're trying to keep things in line. So, my understanding is that in the 1840s, British railroads adopted standard times to reduce that confusion, which then led to American counterparts essentially trying to do the same thing. So, it sounds like a coalition of businessmen and scientists decided on the time zones in 1883, adopting the four-- Eastern, Central, Mountain, and Pacific Time Zones-- but that, as most things are, was not universally well-received. It sounds like there was something of an outcry amongst a lot of evangelical Christians who specifically said time came from God and railroads were not meant to mess with it, which I think is an interesting little tidbit there. From then, it sounds like there were additional proposals made over a period of time about daylight saving time. Early 1900s, an English builder named William Willett urged the British lawmakers to shift the clocks to reap economic benefits. Parliament rejected that proposal in 1909, but then later embraced it in 1916, ultimately leading to the United States adopting taking over the time zones in 1918, and it was in March of 1918 that the country lost its first hour of sleep. So, I just think that's an interesting analysis. It's actually not that long ago. The fact that this is a new concept from the early 1900s surprised me; I think in my mind, it had gone back a little bit later. But Senator Murman also mentioned that there was a period in time in which America actually did go to permanent daylight saving time for a very short period of time, and I think that

was in 1974. I found a New York Times article, actually, from 1974 talking about them going back to the way things had been. It says that in the midst of last year's fuel crisis-- 1973-- Congress passed the Emergency Daylight Saving Time Energy Conservation Act and set the nation on year-round daylight saving time as a two-year experiment. The experiment, however, ran afoul of public opinion. Parents became concerned about traffic accidents involving their children who were going to school in the pre-dawn darkness on winter mornings. It goes on to say the Department of Transportation was then charged with studying the experiment and reporting to Congress. The study done by the Department of Transportation in the 1974 indicated an energy savings of 0.4% to 1.5%, but had no clear picture emerging on traffic accidents. One of the Senate aides comments here that some of the hypothetical models showed some slight tendencies toward an increased traffic problem, but there was nothing to really back it up. Ultimately, the Senate did vote on a voice vote, it sounds like, to end the experiment early. So, I just think it's interesting to have a little bit of that history. This debate is actually one we've been having for quite some time, and I don't think it's one that necessarily we need to figure out today, but I do think continuing both LB302 and Senator Hunt's prior bill to the next round of debate permits us to continue to have this conversation, to reach out to constituents, and to do a little soul-searching over whether or not we do, in fact, want to turn back time. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Dungan. Senator Jacobson, you're recognized.

JACOBSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, I missed quite a bit of the debate here, so I apologize if I'm repeating anything, but I did want to get on the record that, as I made it clear before, I voted for Senator Hunt's bill. Largely, I was concerned about the fact that Colorado and Wyoming have already passed permanent daylight savings time, although I would say that if we were to-- if they stay permanent daylight savings time and Nebraska would go to permanent standard time, that would actually fix a problem for us, because now, when you go from the Central Time Zone, you're going to-- you're, you're, you're going to run into a situation where when you get to Colorado, they're going to be the same time as we are. But the issue still comes back to the time zone change and that gap between Paxton and the Colorado border and the Wyoming border when you're seeing that time change again. So, I am still concerned about that inconsistency. However, I also am sensitive to the fact that if, if the other states, Kansas in particular, and-- and if you look at South Dakota and Iowa,

but I'm more concerned about Iowa and Colorado and Wyoming, because that's, that's where Interstate 80 and I-76 are going, going through. I'm also concerned that you're going to see-- I don't want to speak for Senator Hardin, but I'm guessing when you're out in Scottsbluff and Gering, you're going to have a lot of cross-border activity, and so when the state next to you has a different time zone, a different time, plus being-- they would both be in the same time zone, but they would-- their clocks would be different. So, I'm, I'm fully in support of getting to one or the other and not changing our clocks, but I'd really like to see us in step with that time zone change that occurs when you get out in the western part of the state, and not having that anomaly where you go to the state to the west and you've got a significant change in, in the, the time zone and a change in the-- and whether we're observing standard time or daylight savings time. So, I-- I'm probably going to vote for both bills to get to Select File, try to sort out where we're at in terms of what the other states are doing. That-- you could certainly see going to standard time if you could do it, and then go to daylight savings times later, if indeed that's what is, is brought by the federal government. But that seems to be what they may be leaning towards. Personally, I think from a farming standpoint, I remember when there was a, a-- an-- a-- farmers that would like to be on daylight savings time because if they've got kids in high school and they're coming home and helping with harvest or planting or those kinds of things, you are going to get more hours of daylight. I, I appreciate also, however, if you're on year-round daylight savings time that it gets-- it's, it's dark-- it's dark for quite a while after you're up and about in the morning. So, I-- there, there are a lot of issues that are out there. That's why this seems to be a perennial bill that keeps coming back. But we get further complicated with our time zone change in the western part of the state. So, those that are wondering "why are you voting for both bills?" It's because I want to get them both to Select and then make a decision before we get to Final. Thank you.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Jacobson. Senator Hardin would like to recognize a group of 20 from the Nebraska Nurses Association located in the north balcony. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Guereca, you're recognized.

GUERECA: Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon, Nebraska. So I-- I'll be voting for LB302 and Senator Hunt's bills while I think we should advance both and continue this debate. But I think my personal preference would be to move to permanent daylight savings time, and there's a couple of compelling arguments, but I'll save the doozy for

the end. You know, obviously, I'm-- I represent downtown Omaha; a lot of restaurants and establishments that I think would do very well with having more daylight so folks, when they get off work, can come downtown, enjoy a dinner with their family, enjoy a drink on a patio and just have daylight. It'll help mental health. It's been proven to combat seasonal affection [SIC] disorder. There's actually energy savings. Now, we, we have an energy crisis in this state; if we have more daylight, we're actually consuming less energy. So, there's an economic argument to be made there. Actually, fewer traffic accidents. It's shown that with light in the evening that there's actually a reduction of traffic accidents. And again, the-- talking about the economic benefits that certainly my district and actually every single district in the state, and we want to revive our main, our main streets, revive our downtowns, having that daylight will encourage folks to go out, buy local, consume local. There's actually a notable reduction in crime when we're in daylight savings time. When there is daylight, folks are less likely to commit crime. But I think the most important issue-- and this is one that kind of did it for me-- is that I don't want Nebraska's football players practicing in the dark. I want to make sure they have daylight so our Cornhuskers down the line-- and we're rebuilding our team, I want to make sure that our boys are able to practice in the daylight to help us bring back a national championship to this state. So, those are just a couple of reasons why, personally, I support moving to a permanent daylight savings time, but I will be vote-- I will want to advance both bills to make sure we continue this debate. And certainly, I think getting rid of the change, which plenty of studies show actually hurts folks. And with that, I'd reeled the-- yield the remainder of my time. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Guereca. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of daylight savings time, and I agree with having one time zone. I would like to take a moment to address a controversy between myself and Senator John Cavanaugh. He brought up that he likes standard time because it allows for more hours of fireworks. I hate fireworks. There was a bill many years ago that Senator Slama brought forward about expanding what fireworks can be in the state of Nebraska. I had to confess to her years later that it hurt me to not vote for her bill because I didn't want her to think I was doing it out of spite. I genuinely hate fireworks. I know that makes me a killjoy, possibly unpatriotic, but I hate fireworks, and therefore, I

cannot in good conscience support a bill that would enable extra hours of fireworks. John Cavanaugh should be more responsible than that. That said, I appreciate this bills. I appreciate Senator Hunt's bill. I didn't get here early enough to vote for Senator Hunt's bill, so I'll probably abstain from voting on this bill just so that they have-- you know, I'm not pushing the lever one way or the other. See how this all plays out. But I am fundamentally, firmly anti-fireworks and anti-John Cavanaugh's stance on fireworks. Also-- Senator John Cavanaugh, thank you. Yes. Not my father. Senator John Cavanaugh. I don't think my father likes fireworks that much either, to be honest. I know my mother doesn't, and if she's watching, she would be on this senator's side, not that senator's side on this issue. This is causing great strife in my family. But we will get through it, as we do with everything else. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh. Senator Hunt, you're recognized.

HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to rise quickly. I appreciate the conversation today. When Senator Murman introduced LB302, he came over here and he had a stack of bills, and he was telling me about a couple of them for Education Committee. And we were talking about this bill, too, and I actually cosigned it. I co-sponsored it because, at the time, my view was I just want to stop changing the clocks, whichever way is fine. I talked to the press about that. And since that time, colleagues, I have completely changed my mind. I don't like LB302, I don't like dark winters; it's too depressing. We can't keep going through this. So, I will be a no vote on LB302. I would highly prefer to advance my bill as we did-- so, thank you for your votes on that-- or just keep it the same because, you know, at least the status quo, at least how it is right now, when we have these dark, depressing winters, we can at least look forward to these late nights in summer where we have sunshine and can sit on the patio. If we take that away, I don't know what I'm going to do. So, I really-- going to be a no vote on LB302. And it's been a fun day, but ready to get back to work. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Lippincott, you're recognized.

LIPPINCOTT: Thank you. I voted for Senator Hunt's bill, and I also plan on voting for Dave Murman's bill. We all remember Paul Harvey and his (The) Rest of the Story program, and I'd like to read a Rest of the Story program from him, where he talked about the origin of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

daylight saving time. The old man was visiting the home of a friend one evening. This friend had just purchased a new lamp, and he was showing it off. "What do you think of it?" he asked his guest. The lamp was very bright one, so much so that the old gentleman wondered aloud how much energy it consumed. The rhetorical question sparked the discussion, and the discussion almost grew into an argument. The old man's point was that the lamp, bright as it was, could not possibly produce enough light to justify its operating cost. The "biseckled" old fellow stayed at his friend's house, beating at the topic to death until almost 4:00 in the morning, at which time, he went to-- home, and went to bed. Now, it's 6 a.m. the same morning, and the old man had only slept two hours. There was a noise coming from the street outside his window. Nothing serious, just loud. Loud enough to wake the elderly gentleman, causing him to sit up instantly upright in bed. At first, he's thinking, "What in the world was that?" But now, halfway between conscience [SIC] and unconscious, he becomes aware of something at once inconsequential and wonderful. The entire room is filled with light. Of course, you're saying to yourself it's daylight. But now, remember the old-- conversation the old man had with his friend the night before. The discussion had been about illumination and energy consumption. So that is why this fellow-- this American visiting Paris-- is suddenly struck with the fact that he had gone to bed at sundown last evening and then got up at dawn to visit his friend. No lighting energy would have been wasted at all. Intrigued by this conclusion, the American visitor jumped out of bed, ran to his desk, began calculating similar energy costs in citywide terms, and the figures were staggering. He is utterly convinced of a way to cut those costs on a grand scale. Use the hours of daylight for activities requiring light, and the hours of darkness for sleeping. By now, you have guessed that this was the origin of daylight saving time. In fact, this American in Paris published an article about it in the Paris Journal. He included some very tough suggestions for the enforcement of new system. For example, he proposed a tax on anything which would block sunlight from coming through a window. He proposed a purchase restriction on any devices used for artificial illumination, a roadway travel ban after sunset. He didn't think anyone ought to be allowed to travel after sunset, and he proposed a loud public alarm to herald sunrise. I suspect that it was the proposed public alarm that did it, because-- despite the very many who read the article-- no one could be found aside from the author who was in favor of daylight saving time. So, the idea was set aside for many years. In fact, daylight saving time was not really put into practice until the 20th century. Though it was first conceived in 1784 by a 78-year-old

American in Paris, concerned over the energy cost of candles and whale oil. So, this weekend, as you worry about your house reclaiming the hour you just gave the father time last spring, at least now you know who to thank or blame: it was a frugal fellow named Benjamin Franklin. And now you know the rest of the story.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Lippincott. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Murman, you're recognized to close on your bill.

MURMAN: Thank you, mad-- thank you, Madam President. And thank Senator Lippincott for bringing us back into the good old days. Paul Harvey had a lot of good, wise views expressed on the radio by him. I'd like to thank all of the senators for the great discussion this morning. As was mentioned, this is a very nonpartisan bill, and I appreciate all the discussion from all sides of the aisle. It's something that we can actually discuss and not be so much influenced by party especially, but by outside influences. I think we can all agree that the change is the worst part of the way we're doing things right now. The change is not healthy, and it's not something that almost any of us, I don't think, like to do, is change the clocks twice a year. So, the question is, if we're not going to change, which way should we go? And one-- a person I would like to thank, one senator I would like to thank is Senator Storer, for talking about the importance for agriculture for not having to change and actually staying with permanent standard time. I've got a lot of experience with that also, being a dairy farmer. The cows-- whenever we would change the clocks twice a year, that would really hurt milk production for a long period of time. It wasn't just one day, it was actually for weeks after that we could tell that there was a definite reduction in milk production. And when I was young, when I was milking the cows by myself most of the time, I would try and do that gradually, make the change kind of gradual. But even then, I could tell the cows were affected by the change. Then, and later on, when I had more hired help, it was difficult to make it gradual. The employees would want to-- you know, it's most important to keep the employees happy, because if the employees aren't happy, I'm back to milking the cows myself all the time, so, so, so the cows maybe weren't as happy, but the employees were happy just to change like everybody else does, make a drastic change with the clock. And that way actually made things worse, as far as milk production goes. And like I said, it last for weeks. It wasn't just the change, so that's just a-- kind of an indication of health, health-wise, what it does to all creatures, I guess; mammals, including humans, because the, the cows, we do everything we can to keep them not only healthy but happy. So, by changing the clock-- that, that did not keep them

happy and healthy as, as, as well as just, just a very, very regimented routine twice a day, every 12 hours. So, thanks to Senator Storer for talking about the importance of agriculture, and staying on permanent time is a good thing for many farmers at least. And then, I would like to thank Senator Dungan also for-- I think he, he definitely mentioned the health benefits of permanent time, and also he did talk about energy-- I think he mentioned energy savings. As was mentioned by some, the original reason for going on daylight savings time was to save energy. I think back during World War I, at least during halfway modern times, World War I, and then World War II-- or, excuse me, World War I and then in the late '60s, early '70s, to save energy. But the latest research has shown that, actually, permanent standard time actually has a slight benefit in energy production. But I would like to close just reading a couple things from the Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine. There's a very good editorial there that talks about a lot of benefits for permanent standard time, and there's just a couple of things that I know-- don't think have been--

DeBOER: Time, Senator.

MURMAN: Oh, sorry. Haven't been mentioned yet today, but I'll have to let that go. Thank you. And [MALFUNCTION] call of the house.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Murman. There's been a request to place the house under the call. Question is, "shall the house go under call?" All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 24 ayes, no nays to call the house, Madam President.

DeBOER: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel, please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Strommen, Senator Ibach, Senator Jacobson, please check in. The question before the body is the advancement of LB302 to E&R Initial. All those in favor, vote aye; all those opposed, vet-- vote nay. Have you all voted who care to? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 9 nays on advancement of the bill, Madam President.

DeBOER: The bill is advanced. Raise the call. Next item.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate February 20, 2025
Rough Draft

CLERK: Madam President, some items for the record. Your committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB10, LB42, LB229 as correctly engrossed and placed on Final Reading. Your Committee on Health and Human Services chaired by Senator Hardin reports LB104 to General File. Notice of committee hearings from the Agriculture Committee. Motion to be printed from Senator Hardin. Senator Sanders, name withdrawn from LB193 and LB660. Finally, Madam President, a priority motion. Senator Clements would move to adjourn the body until Friday, February 21 at 9:00 a.m.

DeBOER: Colleagues, you've heard the motion. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say nay. We are adjourned.