

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

ARCH: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the sixty-eighth day of the One Hundred Eighth Legislature, First session. Our chaplain for today is Pastor David Palomaki from Redeemer Lutheran Church in David City, Nebraska, Senator Bostelman's district. Please rise.

PASTOR PALOMAKI: Let us pray. Almighty and eternal God, we praise you for this new day and for your abundant mercy which renews us for service to you and to our neighbor. You have blessed our state with abundant resources in land and water, crops and livestock, business and industry, and most especially in its people. In good measure, you give to each of us talent and ability, purpose and drive, work, and vocation so that we may provide for our families and support life in community. We give you particular thanks that we have a form of government which enhances our common life with each branch carrying out its purpose. As we gather in this great hall today, we are mindful of the service of our elected senators and ask your blessing upon the members of this Unicameral and upon our Governor. Let the deliberations, discussions, and decisions of this Legislature be fruitful as they address matters of state. As this is a day in which we recognize administrative professionals, we also offer our thanks to you, oh Lord, for all those who labor in the offices of our Capitol, facilitating communication and carrying forth the necessary tasks of administration so that the work of governance is maintained and the people of this great state are well served. With due appreciation, we pause to consider how our rights and responsibilities crafted in our Constitution ultimately flow from the laws which you have woven into the creation. Grant that your living word may abide among us and work in us and through us for your glory and the good of our neighbor and the good of our state. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

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

LOWE: Please join with 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.

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

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

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

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

CLERK: I have no corrections this morning.

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

CLERK: There are, Mr. President. Amendments to be printed: Senator Sanders to LB583A and Senator-- and Senator Halloran to LB562. That's all I have at this time.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Vargas would like to recognize Dr. Theresa Hatcher of Omaha, who is serving as our family physician of the day. Please rise and be welcomed. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LR99, LR101, and LR102. Mr. Clerk, first item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File LB1-- excuse me, LB815, I have no E&Rs. Senator Clements has MO921, MO922, and MO923, all with notes he wishes to withdraw. In that case, Mr. President, first amendment, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend LB815 with AM1264.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. Just a moment. I have to look up what the AM that we are on does. It's AM1264. AM1264 strikes the \$588,000 and inserts \$600,000 for legislative pay. OK. Let's see here. This is from the NCSL 2022 legislator compensation. If you have, I'll, I'll take it. So the 2022 legislator compensation by state-- OK, thanks. Alabama, its base-- their base salary is \$53,956 and they do a mileage reimbursement of 58.5 cents per mile. Overnight stays is \$85 a day for two or more days with overnight stays \$100 a day. OK. And Alaska is their base salary is \$50,400. Their mileage is 58.5 cents per mile; for legislators whose permanent residence is not in Juneau, up to \$370 a day; for Juneau legislators, no per diem. Wow. Kind of a lot more money if you live outside of Juneau. I mean, if we did \$307 a day for a 90-day session, times-- that would be \$27,000. So that is a generous per diem. Arizona-- well, generous compared to that's more than what we make by over double. Arizona is \$24,000 for their base salary, and then their mileage is 58.5 cents a mile tied to the federal rate. The session per diem rate for state legislators residing in Maricopa County is \$35 a day for the first 120 days of regular and special sessions and \$10 a day for all following days. Oh. For legislators residing outside of Maricopa, 100 percent of the average of the highest six months of the annual federal per diem rate for Maricopa

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

County, including lodging as determined by the United States General Services Administration. The director of the Department of Administration shall determine this amount annually, currently \$220, \$220 a day for the first 120 days of regular and special sessions, and half that amount, currently \$110 a day for all following days. This is set in statute, but will change each year as the U.S. General Services Administration adjusts the federal rates. Arkansas has \$44,357 for their base salary and 58.5 cents per mile tied to the federal rate. For legislators residing within the 50 miles of the Capitol, it's \$59 a day. For legislators residing more than 50 miles from the Capitol, it's \$155 a day. California has \$119,702 for their base salary, and they have a mileage reimbursement of 58.5 cents per mile and \$211 a day for senators and \$214 a day for representatives for their per diem. Wow, that is generous. Oh, excuse me. OK. Colorado is \$40,242 and again, 58.5 cents per mile. For legislators residing within 50 miles of the Capitol, it's \$45 a day. For legislators living more than 50 miles from the Capitol, it is \$234 a day set by the legislature vouchered. Connecticut is \$28,000. It's 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate. No per diem is paid. Wow. Connecticut is rough. Delaware is \$48,237 for base salary. Interesting. It's 40 cents per mile. They're not tied to the federal rate. Legislators do not receive a per diem, but receive a stipend worth \$7,481 that is divided by 26 pays. That's \$287.73 a paycheck. Florida is \$29,697, also not tied to the federal rate, it's 44.5 cents per mile; \$152 a day for up to 50 days for senators and up to 60 days for representatives, vouchered. Georgia is \$17,341. It is \$59 a day and then, sorry, 59 cents a mile, also not tied to the federal rate, half a cent more than the federal rate. OK. And they are \$247 a day set by the Legislative Services Committee, unvouchered. Which does make me wonder what-- so our per diem, I assume, is set by the, the Legis Council. And I wonder when the last time it was adjusted. I think the per diem has been the same for my five years. So, yeah, curious when we had-- when does the adjustment happen for the per diem or does it not happen? That it used to be that with inflation, the amount that we get for per diem now was much greater mileage out of your money than the value of it today. But whatever. OK, that was Georgia. Hawaii, \$62,604, 58.5 cents per mile; for legislators who do not reside on Oahu, it is \$225 a day; for legislators living in Oahu, on Oahu during the mandatory five-day recess, only \$10 a day. Legislators who do not reside on Oahu also receive reimbursement for their travel costs to commute from their home island to Oahu. Idaho, \$18,875; 58.5 cents per mile; for legislators residing within 50 miles of the Capitol, it is \$71 a day; for legislators residing more than 50 miles from the Capitol, it is 139 miles [SIC] per day. OK, now there are some pop-ups blocking.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Yeah, that's great. I can't read the bill in Indiana. Let me refresh that since maybe that-- there we go-- nope. OK. Well, that is-- stop seeing this. OK.

ARCH: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. Well, there's ads blocking several states now. Illinois is \$70,645 base pay, 58.5 cents per mile and \$155 a day. Doesn't clarify if that's just like when they're in session, I assume when they're in session, but hard to tell because it just says \$155 a day. Indiana \$28,791. The rest of the information is blocked by this ad that I cannot get to disappear. Here, I clicked on it. Maybe that'll make it disappear. Nope. Still there, great. Iowa, \$25,000, again, can't read the information. Kansas, it says \$88.66

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: And you are next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Kansas has-- it's unclear what theirs is, again, because it's being blocked. Just going to refresh this again. This is not great. Still not working. NCSL, your website is not making it easy to read. Let's see here. Maybe if I email it to myself. No. OK. Well, I intended to go through all of this, but it is, like, literally just pop-up ads all over the place. So, gonna close out of that. Try it all over again. And let's see if we have a better chance this time. Nope. No. Just not going to do it. OK. Michigan, 71,000-- \$71,685, 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate, no per diem paid; legislators receive an expense allowance of \$10,800 a year per session and interim set by the Compensation Commission, vouchered. Minnesota \$46,500, 58.5 cents a mile, one round trip per week tied to federal rate. For senators, it's \$86 a day; for Representatives it's \$66 a day. Additional compensation for communication, living expenses and district travel may be possible. This different rate for senators versus representatives is interesting to me because they live in the same state and the cost of living is the same. So why is their per diem different? Mississippi, \$23,500, 58.5 cents per mile, \$155 a day tied to federal rate, unvouchered. Missouri, \$36,813, 49 cents per mile, \$124 a day tied to federal rate, unvouchered. Montana, ah, OK, I think this was what was happening in one of the other states, 140-- \$100.46 legislative day so they only get paid for the legislative day and then 58.6 cents per mile tied to federal rate. So that was probably a typo and supposed to be 58.5; \$126.12 a day for additional

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

expenses. Legislators also receive a primary \$3,000 stipend and a secondary amount between \$1,000 and \$4,000, depending on the square mileage of a legislator's district. Huh. Well, some of you would receive the full \$4,000 if we were doing things by square mileage of our district. Nebraska, it is a hundred, sorry, \$12,000 a day, not a day, \$12,000 base salary, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate; for legislators within 50 miles of the Capitol, it is \$59 a day; for legislators residing more than 50 miles from the Capitol, it's \$155 a day, which it doesn't say here, but perhaps we are tied to the federal rate because that \$155 is the federal rate. Nevada is \$164.69--

ARCH: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. --calendar day up to 60 days. Senators who are not up for reelection until 2022 receive 150-- \$159.89 calendar day, and it is 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate; 2021 data is \$151 a day, travel allowance of \$10,000 a session, an additional \$900 a session leadership allowance. Per Nevada Constitution, the Speaker and the Lieutenant Governor as President of the Senate each receive an additional allowance of \$2 per diem during the time of their actual attendance as presiding officers. Mr. Speaker, in Nevada, you could get two more dollars a day. Whoo-hoo, is it worth that?

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

ARCH: And you are recognized and this will be your last opportunity before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you would get \$4 a day for doing both roles at the same time. I mean, you could almost buy a sandwich. Committee chairs also receive an extra nine-- additional \$900 allowance. Why do the committee chairs get an extra \$900 and the Speaker just gets \$2 a day? Nevada, I really am intrigued by your per diem process. OK. Sorry. Just amusing myself here. New Hampshire is \$100 a day, 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate. Legislators can instead choose the state mileage reimbursement option, which is 38 cents a mile for the first 45 miles and 19 cents a mile thereafter. With this alternative method, the reimbursement is taxed as income, and legislators do not need to drive their personal vehicle. Huh. OK, let me read that again. So 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate, legislators can instead choose the state mileage reimbursement option, which is 38 cents a mile for the first 45 miles

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

and 19 cents a mile thereafter. With the alternative method, the reimbursement is taxed as income. Why would you do that? Be interested to know how many people in New Hampshire use the taxed option for their reimbursement and no per diem is paid. Wow. New Hampshire, you get paid \$100 for your base salary and then you get 58-- well, they are-- they are lower paid than us, like, significantly. Wow. OK. New Jersey, \$49,000, no mileage reimbursement, no per diem is paid. New Mexico, zero, 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate mileage, \$165 a day January and February, \$195--94 a day March tied to federal rate, vouchered, goes up to \$202 in FY '23-- on July 1 of 2022. Still not a great gig in New Mexico. New York, \$110,000, 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate; for nongovernmental travel, it is \$61 a day; for overnight stays, it's \$183 a day. There we go. North Carolina is \$13,951, 29 cents a mile, one round trip per week and then \$104 a day set by statute, unvouchered; for additional expenses, legislators receive \$559 a month. North Dakota, \$518 a month; \$526 a month starting January 1, 2022; \$537 a month starting July 1, 2022; 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate; \$186 a day, \$189 a day starting January 1, 2021, \$193 a day starting July 1-- starting January 1, 2021-- July 1 and then \$193 starting July 1, 2022. Ohio, \$68,674, 55 cents a mile for legislators living outside of Franklin County, no per diem is paid. Oklahoma, \$47,500 base pay, 58 cents-- 58.5 cents per mile--

ARCH: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. --tied to federal rate; \$168 a day, tied to federal rate, unvouchered. The per diem rate for Oklahoma legislators in the interim nonsession months, approximately June through January, is \$25 a day and limited to 20 days without prior permission for each respective House leader. This is governed by statute. Oregon, \$33,852 a day, 58.5 cents per mile tied to the federal rate, \$151 a day. Pennsylvania is \$95,432 a day, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate, \$178 a day for Representatives, \$181 a day--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Conrad, you are recognized to speak.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good morning, colleagues. I rise in support of the measure which is required to effectuate our constitutionally established rate of pay. I appreciate what Senator

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Cavanaugh has been doing to try and provide some additional education and put in context how our legislative compensation may compare to that of our sister states. I think it's, of course, well established that being the only Unicameral, the only nonpartisan institution in the state, we typically have one of the smallest legislatures, both in terms of numbers and then also, of course, in terms of budgetary expenditure. And I always think it's very interesting to compare notes on these kinds of matters regarding staff and compensation with our colleagues in our sister states. But I think that we can be proud that we do have a significant allocation for staff as individual senators, which is good. I think that we're all very well aware that in the workforce challenges that Nebraska is facing, including in state government, that it has been challenging to recruit and retain top talent to assist us and other members of the institution in carrying out the people's business. I really appreciate the work that Senator Linehan and others have done to try and address pay for staff to ensure that we can really have the best and brightest who are called to public service, assist us in our work as well. And then what we do know is that when it comes to compensation, we all come into this very clear-eyed, of course, about making \$1,000 a month. And I think we have a lot of challenges sometimes for those of us who are not retired or independently wealthy to try and balance commitment to service and \$12,000 a year with other endeavors to meet our families' bottom lines. But I do think that we need to be thoughtful about how we can ensure that more people have an opportunity to run and to serve in this body, because the more diverse perspectives that are represented helps us to achieve better policy. And that's one component that I think has been widely and well established is a barrier to service for many talented and public-spirited-minded Nebraskans. The other thing that I was thinking about as I was listening to Senator Cavanaugh's comments this morning and I'm not sure if I'll have enough time to finish perhaps my love letter to the Legislature this morning in my remaining time. And if not, I'll have an opportunity to punch in again to finish. But while, of course, it's interesting for comparison purposes to see how our sister states handle compensation and staff and per diems and things of that nature, there is, of course, what's clearly distinguishable from the operation of our sister states, and that's the fact that we're a nonpartisan Unicameral Legislature. And even this year in perhaps the most challenging and arduous of circumstances that this august institution has found itself within, we are still finding ways to find common ground, even on the toughest of issues, even in the most challenging of circumstances. Things that happen in this institution and it should not be taken lightly or for granted--

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

ARCH: One minute.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. --would not happen in our sister states, where each individual senator has a right to bring forward bills, to work across the aisle and across the political spectrum, to cosponsor bills, and to have those measures move forward regardless of the individual senator's party, because we run and we serve in a nonpartisan manner. So as you start to see the packages being put together, as you start to see the measures moving through the body, you can see a wide array, a diversity of perspective from senators across the state and political spectrum who are working together to manage the challenging circumstances that we find ourselves in this year. That, of course, is never going to grab a lot of headlines but is happening. And I wanted to reflect a bit more about how we still have been able to find common ground and consensus--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Senator Cavanaugh, seeing no one left in the queue, you're welcome to close. Excuse me. Senator Conrad, you are recognized.

CONRAD: Sorry. Thank you. I wasn't quick enough on putting my light on, but just wanted to continue my reflections in regards to what I saw happen in the Nebraska Legislature yesterday. So even though there have been very, very hard fought battles this year and very, very hard feelings exhibited amongst the members and other stakeholders with this body, we're still finding a way to stay in relationship and we're still finding a way to stay in dialogue to identify those key areas of common ground when they do present themselves. And I was very proud of all of the members of the Legislature who worked yesterday to try and figure out a way to address food insecurity for low-income working Nebraskans and to figure out a way to do that without impacting the General Fund bottom line, working diligently with the executive branch to absorb those costs and that credit where credit is due. That's a thoughtful example of how we can work together, even under challenging situations, to make a positive difference for more Nebraskans. And it really reflects, I think, as well, the message that I continue to share with student groups, civic groups, other folks that, you know, invite us all to come and visit about the status of the Legislature and what's happening. And I continually have the same refrain. Do not give up hope. Don't stop believing in the Nebraska nonpartisan, Unicameral Legislature. It is a precarious moment in our state's political history. It is perhaps feeling very dark and heavy for many

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

citizens who are watching what's happening here and are very dismayed about the direction and the tone of our politics. But we shouldn't give up hope because Nebraska is too important. And our work together is too important. And this Legislature is special and should be protected because it works. Even under the most stress and pressure, it still finds a way to work. And that doesn't happen as much in our sister states, and it definitely doesn't happen on the federal level. And one of the key components that ensures that we still find a way to work together is because we refuse to be mired in the partisan dysfunction that cripples our sister states and our federal government. So we need to take these examples to heart. Even when they're on smaller measures, even when it may not be the kind of bill that is grabbing all of the headlines this session, we're still finding a way to find common ground to do the people's business. And we need to really-- we need to really hold on to that because it helps us to find common ground on the next challenging issue. And it helps us to stay in relationship on the issues where we can't find common ground and to have a disagreement that is principled and allows us to represent our constituents to the best of our abilities. So my message to my colleagues today and to Nebraskans at large is don't give up. When you see the storm clouds gathering on our political horizon, when your heart and your head is hurt by the headlines emanating from the Nebraska Legislature this year, lean in harder with more love. Work harder to advocate and to organize. And please know that each act makes a positive--

ARCH: One minute.

CONRAD: --difference. Whether that's testifying in hearings, writing letters to senators, coming to the Capitol to petition your government, speaking out online, speaking out in your kitchen table or coffee shop, each and every one of those acts is important to ensuring that we have an engaged citizenry and a strong democracy. So the key antidote to apathy and acrimony is engagement and continuing to fight forward with love in your heart and not give up on Nebraska or our Nebraska Unicameral Legislature. Thank you, Mr. President.

ARCH: Seeing no one left in the queue, Senator Cavanaugh, you are welcome to close on AM1264.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Conrad, for a reminder of what it means to serve here. OK. I was reading about-- so this amendment, AM1264, strikes \$588,000 from the language of the underlying bill and inserts \$600,000. Oh, excuse me. For those of you that don't recall, the bill is appropriating the funds for our salary,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

our annual salaries, and what it includes in addition to the \$12,000 a year is the state reimbursement for Social Security and I think Medicaid. And so this is just an arbitrary change to the amount that we would be appropriating for that extra state reimbursement. Yeah. OK. So probably you shouldn't vote for the amendment because I think it would cause some sort of accounting error, but also go for it. Maybe it'll end up in an inadvertent increase in pay. I don't know how that would work because our pay is in statute, but let's give it a roll, shall we? I won't be voting for it, but you can. OK. So I was-- I'm just gonna go back to-- so Nebraska, after Nebraska was Nevada. That's where they have the \$2 per diem for actual attendance as presiding officers. It's a big, a big carrot to incentivize becoming the Speaker or the presiding officer, the \$2 per diem. New Hampshire has a \$100 base salary and no per diem. New Jersey has \$49,000 base salary and no per diem. New Mexico pays nothing, does have a per diem tied to the federal rate. New York is \$110,000 base salary, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate. For nongovernment night-- for nonovernight travel it's \$61 a day; for overnight stays, it's \$183 a day. North Carolina is \$13,951. It's \$29 a mile, one round trip per week, \$104 a day by statute, unvouchered. For additional expenses, legislators receive \$599 a month. North Dakota is \$518 a month. And starting on July 1, 2021, it's \$526 a month and starting on July 1, 2022, it is \$537 a month and it is 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate, \$186 a day, \$189 a day starting July 1, 2021, \$193 a day starting July 1, 2022. Ohio is \$68,674 and it is \$55 a mile for legislators living outside Franklin County. No per diem is paid. Oklahoma is \$47,500, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate, \$168 a day tied to federal rate, unvouchered. The per diem rate for Oklahoma legislators in the interim nonsession months, approximately June through January--

ARCH: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. --is \$25 a day and limited to 20 days without prior permission of each representative House-- House's leader, this is governed by statute. OK. Oregon is \$33,852 a day. It is 58.5 cents a mile tied to federal rate, \$151 a day. Pennsylvania is \$95,432 a day [SIC], 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate, \$178 a day for representatives, \$181 a day for senators. Rhode Island is \$16,835, \$56 a mile, no per diem is paid. South Carolina is 10,000--

ARCH: Time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Call of the house and a machine vote.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

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

ASSISTANT CLERK: 14 ayes, 2 nays to go under call, Mr. President.

ARCH: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senators Fredrickson, Walz, Bostar, McDonnell, and Senator John Cavanaugh, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator McDonnell, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. All unexcused members are now present. The request has been for a machine vote. All those in favor vote aye; opposed, nay. Have all those voted who wish to vote? Mr. Clerk, please record.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 0 ayes, 35 nays, Mr. President.

ARCH: AM1264 fails. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk, next item.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to reconsider the vote on AM1264.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I don't want people to, like, automatically just vote against my, my amendments. But if I'm not voting for it, I'm not-- I'm definitely not going to take it personally if you don't vote for it. So-- but I do have an amendment today pending on a bill that I would love for people to vote for, but we'll wait until we get to that bill, if we get to that bill. I think we'll get to that bill. No, maybe we won't. Yeah, we might not. We got some activity up in the balcony today. OK. So I was reading the reimbursement for senator-- legislators' pay in other states. And I see that we're having a changing of the guard up front, and Senator DeBoer is now presiding, so maybe she can get two extra dollars a day. If she were in Nevada, at least that would, I think, be a real enticement there. Although some days we have several presiding officers, so we would just be burning through dollars. We could probably spend up to \$20 giving the presiding officer two extra dollars that day. No, I don't think we've ever had ten different presiding officers. That would be a lot. I don't even know if we have ten different people in here who routinely preside. We've got the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker, Senator DeBoer. Senator Dorn, I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

know, has been up there. That's four. I'm looking around-- Senator Hansen, Senator Slama. I'm not sure who else sits up in that seat. Senator Slama. Oh, Senator, oh, McKinney has sat up there. That's right. Senator McKinney. Thanks for the phone a friend, Senator Moser. You know who hasn't, I don't think has sat up there, Senator Briese, have you ever presided over the Legislature? Because as Chair of the Exec Board, I think you have a claim to that if you want it. Senator Briese is a very thoughtful reader, and I always see him sitting up here at his desk reading over legislation as he's doing right now. So, yeah, I know that. I assumed that we had-- we had some, some children up in the balcony that are-- it's nice to-- it's always nice to hear children when they're up there, and, and let their, their voices be heard. I think I said something about that a couple of weeks ago, Christmas Eve mass that the priest would always say, Christmas Eve mass is really the children's mass and let the children be heard. So the children up in the balcony, I love hearing your voices. I didn't-- I didn't mean to imply otherwise. It's really nice. I only am sad that I can't see you because of where I sit. And you are in the balcony that I can't see. I can see the other balcony, but that balcony doesn't have anybody in it right now. So I oftentimes, if I look up, that's not the balcony that tends to have people in it as often, unless we have a lot of guests in a day. And I assume, oh, I almost forgot to get in the queue. I, I assume that we'll be standing up and recognizing the students up there shortly. But yeah, so I've got-- I was reading about the salaries. I got myself a little sidetracked talking about the, the per diem. Now, Senator Briese, if you did want to sit up and preside and you were in Nevada, you'd be getting two extra dollars that day so something to think about. We don't do it here, But, but we-- but if you were in Nevada, you'd be getting two extra dollars for presiding. I have never presided, actually, and I've never asked to preside. It's not that I wouldn't be interested in it. It's just not something that I've ever asked to do. I've sat up there when somebody is presiding and talked to them. I have not sat up there that much this year. I would sit up there and chat with the Lieutenant Governor when it was Mike Foley sometimes. But I guess now I'm always here, so not much time for socializing. OK. And I do have to comment, like last week, I, I think I'm pretty ingenious here-- my back was hurting from slumping over the podium. And so I went to the back where the printers are, and I grabbed a box top from the printer paper to put my podium on. And it has made a world of difference. My back feels so much better. I'm still, like, my posture. I'm always trying to work on my posture. So my posture was getting really bad because of the slumping. And so now I'm trying to work on my posture a little bit more, but I still slouch a little. So maybe if I started standing up

here with a book on my head to work on my posture, but would that be considered a prop? That probably would be considered a prop and people would think I was just being ridiculous if I just, like, stood up here with a book on top of my head just because I wanted to work on my posture. So I just have to keep reminding myself to stand up straight so that I don't have to have that book on my head. Posture is really important. It's really important because if you don't work on your posture, then you get hunched and your muscles get hunched and, you know, as you-- as we all age, good posture will help you physically as you age. So that's a tip, I guess. I don't have great posture. I'd like to have better posture. OK. I think the last state-- I don't know what last state was on. The top of my screen is Oregon so we'll start with Oregon. Oregon is \$33,852 base salary, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate. OK. And is \$151 a day. Pennsylvania is \$95,432. It is 58.5 cents per mile tied to the federal rate and \$171 a day for representatives, \$181 a day for senators. Again, it's a \$3 difference. Why do senators make \$3 more a day in Pennsylvania than representatives? What is the difference? It's, I mean, it's per day. That implies like if Senator-- the Senate session is longer or shorter, you're still getting paid per day. So why are you getting paid \$3 more per day? Who decides that in Pennsylvania? Does, does the House decide the pay? Does the Senate decide the pay? If the Senate decides to pay and they decide to pay the House \$3 less than they pay the Senate themselves, that just seems like some serious subtle shade being thrown. But if the House decides the pay and they pay themselves \$3 less, what does that say about their view of their own self-worth? Or do they each set their own pay and it just happens to be close in amount but not the same amount? And maybe that's the case. Maybe they both set their own per diem, but they don't compare in advance. So that's why there's a \$3 discrepancy. I would love somebody to unpack the Pennsylvania senator versus representative daily per diem and why it is \$3 differentiation. OK. How much time do I left?

DeBOER: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. OK, so that was Pennsylvania and their \$3 discrepancy in per diem. Next is Rhode Island, \$16,835, 56 cents a mile. No per diem is paid. South Carolina is \$10,400, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate; \$185.38 per day, tied to federal rate, with additional amount added to match average hotel rate in Columbia, South Carolina. All legislators in South Carolina House and Senate receive a monthly payment of \$1,000 that we label in-district expense. So they get our entire salary as an in-district expense, \$1,000 monthly. South Dakota, \$13,957. One trip is paid at 5 cents a mile--

DeBOER: Time, Senator. Senator Conrad, you're next in the queue.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President, and good morning, colleagues, and a warm welcome to the young voices and the people that are visiting our Capitol today. I know that we all enjoy having visitors from our district here. And it's always, I think, a special moment for all of us to welcome our Nebraska neighbors into their house, into the people's house that is this incredibly stunning Capitol that we have an opportunity to work within day to day. And in my ninth year of service and in many years of coming to testify on measures outside of my time as a senator, I probably couldn't count the number of times that I've walked into this building. But I do know that despite the countless number that the awe and the respect and the inherent beauty that I see and feel when I walk into this body remains every, every single day. One thing that I wanted to touch upon that is a correlation, I think, to some of the metrics Senator Cavanaugh is looking at in regards to how other legislators, legislatures handle pay or per diem or compensation and those kinds of issues in our sister states as we look at the required bill before us to set appropriations for our constitutionally established salaries, I wanted to also note that there's a host of low-cost or no-cost options that state legislators should look at that would also help to enhance diversity for our citizens, to make sure that more people can run and can serve, even if we don't make adjustments to the compensation that would be required by, by a vote of the people in amending our state constitution. But when you look at some of the research and data that has been put forward by people who are looking at ways to increase, increase the diversity of political candidates and elected officials, you can see that there are a host of other strategies outside of compensation that we can and should be looking at. That includes things like perhaps making childcare expenses covered under campaign funds or otherwise. I know that Senator Hunt and other senators have brought forward measures year after year after year to try and make this small change in state law that would not impact the taxpayers or the bottom line budget, but that could provide a little bit of extra breathing room for those members with young children who are serving to have a bit of assistance in covering childcare related to the terms of their service and their duties. So that's one thing that I wanted to lift up as a potential that we could look at outside of just compensation for, for senators to figure out other policies to complement our efforts to help more Nebraskans run and serve. You can also look at research from how our sister states handle some other internal policies to see if we are providing an inclusive and welcoming environment to more women, to more members with young

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

children. And you can do things like ensuring clear access to breastfeeding spaces. And I know that the Capitol has made small strides forward in terms of providing spaces to--

KELLY: One minute.

CONRAD: --for our citizenry to access breastfeeding spaces. And I know-- thank you, Mr. President-- some of that continues to evolve as we work through the HVAC project and otherwise. But that's another policy and practice that we can adopt to ensure more diverse representation and service. Also, when it comes to just access to on-site childcare or adjusting compensation or stipends or per diem to address that increasing pressure on working families and the ability to serve for many people with young children, I think that could make a positive difference as well. Other things that don't cost a lot of money, but that can make a difference in ensuring that people with young children in particular or other caregiving responsibilities can serve is things like setting a regular voting schedule or allowing remote participation for certain activities.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Senator Hughes has guests in the north balcony. They are fourth graders from Centennial Elementary in Utica. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Clements, you're recognized to speak.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to remind the body and the people watching what this bill is. LB815 is the bill to continue payment to state senators, the \$12,000 per year. And that is all that's in this bill. The-- and so I was pleased that Senator Cavanaugh recommended a vote to vote no on that first amendment. It was a amendment to increase our pay and by-- that would be unconstitutional. By constitution, only the people of Nebraska can vote to increase state senator pay. So this-- that's LB-- AM1264, and AM1265 and AM1269, each one of those would increase senator pay slightly, which we are not allowed to do. So I'll recommend votes against those. AM1270 that's on file would strike Section 3, which would strike the emergency clause, which means that the bill would not take effect until three months after adjournment. So senators would not be paid June, July and August. I suppose we could do that and not be paid. And AM1272 and AM1271 just change the effective date slightly from July 1 to July 4 or July 2. And so I oppose LB1264 [SIC AM1264] as being

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

unconstitutional and the other bills as well that are not advisable. But this LB815 I do support because it's just the first bill of the budget that establishes state senator salaries as the same as it has been for quite a while. And just wanted to do a little refresh to the senators here and people watching as to what this bill is. And I ask for your green vote when we finally get to LB815. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, Senator Clements, I would not want us to do something that is unconstitutional. So thank you for that. All of my amendments on LB815 should just go ahead and not vote for or vote for them, not really sure. Do what you like. Do what feels right. You can be present, not voting. I've talked about this before. It is incumbent to get 25 green votes for anything, minimum. Some things require more, but minimum 25 green votes to make anything happen that's on the board. So yesterday, I think we've gotten so used to, like, needing 33 votes that yesterday when we were on the Health and Human Services bill and there were amendments that were getting voted on, and we didn't do calls of the house on those amendments and people were getting anxious. And then it was, like, 27 votes. I was like, should I do a call of the house? No, you got your thing. Your thing is attached now. You needed 25. There's 27. So I noticed that that happened a couple of times, 25 votes. Cloture needs 33. I think if you try to do a pull motion on an IPPed bill in committee, that I think raises the threshold either to 30 or 33 votes. I'm not positive. I've always wanted to increase-- 30. It increases it to 30. I've always wanted to increase a pull motion not IPPed to 33. Because if you're pulling something from a committee, circumventing the committee process and bringing it to the floor, it's most likely it's going to be filibustered. So it probably should meet that threshold of 33 and save us all 8 hours. Like, if it doesn't have 33 votes to be pulled out of committee, then we're going to go 8 hours on it and it's not going to have 33 votes. That's, you know, that was my feeling at a different time. Now I'm like, have at it. Take more time, go bananas. I think I have one more time in the queue. So that's why I've introduced that rule to increase the threshold for pull motions to 33, whether it's IPPed or not. I think, you know, there's a whole process and a timeline on pull motions. I think it has to be something like you can't file a motion to pull a bill out of committee until it's 20 days after the hearing. If no action is taken by the committee, I think you have to wait 20 days for the committee to take action. And if they have not taken any action after 20 days, then you can file a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

pull motion. So that's why you would want an early hearing on a controversial bill, because if you can't get it out of committee and you want to pull it out of committee and you have your committee hearing date is, let's say the 40th day, the 50th day, then you have to wait 20 days. You have to wait till the 70th day. I mean, that's if we're in a long session. So then if you wait till the 70th day and then you file a pull motion and then it gets to the floor and then it has to go through three rounds of debate, also, it has to be scheduled. So, you know, and at that point in the-- in the session, everybody is lobbying for their things to be scheduled so.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: So that's why a committee hear-- an early committee hearing date is a valued prized possession, not just for just getting it done, having it done, getting it out of committee early. You also want it that way in case it doesn't get out of committee early. So I'm looking at our priorities. Speaking of priority bills, I'm looking at our priority bills. Look at the agenda and actually I'm just going to go through the old agendas and see. I'm trying to remember what, oh, OK. So we had Senator Dorn's bill yesterday. That was a senator priority.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. You're next in the queue. And that's your last time before your closing.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK, so I'm just looking through old agendas to see-- we've got committee priority, committee priority, committee priority. Senator Dorn, I think you're the first senator's priority bill that has been scheduled for quite some time. Senator priority bills on April 14 so that was last week. One of them is Senator Dorn. The other one is Senator McDonnell's CHIP bill. And so that-- Senator Linehan's priority and Senator Albrecht's priority, which we're having again this week. And just looking through, looking through-- Day 58. No. Those are committee priorities, committee priority, Senator Lin-- same, that's Senator Linehan's priority. Senator Briese's priority bill was on April 3 and Senator Sanders' priority bill was scheduled, but maybe we didn't get to it on April 3 as well. And I don't think it's been-- it hasn't been put back on the schedule. So that was Senator Briese's bill. I'm looking to see where that bill is now. I think it's probably on Select File. It is on

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Select File. Oh, Senator Sanders' bill is also on Select File. OK. There we go. We have three Select File senators' bills. OK. And General File, that's the same bill. Same bill. Let's see here, General File committee, no. OK, I'm back to Day 50, March 24. And I haven't seen any other senator bills. No, Senator Kauth's bill. OK. And that is now I'm on Day 46 and no other senator priority bills. So it looks like, well, Senator Brewer's bill. So it looks like senators' personal priorities, with the exception of Senator Kauth, Senator Albrecht, Senator Linehan, Senator Brewer are getting pushed aside. It's-- I, I just bring that up because people have been asking me about the session and how the session is going and why we're focusing on the things that we're focusing on. I assume that many of you have somehow gotten your bills attached to something else. So maybe that's why no--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --no individual senators' priorities are getting scheduled, except for the most controversial ones are getting scheduled. So do with that information whatever you will. OK. I think I had one minute and then I have my closing, and I'm gonna get back to the legislator pay. All right. South Dakota is a hundred and-- not a hundred-- \$13,957; one trip is paid at 5 cents a mile, and the remaining are paid at 42 cents a mile, one round trip per week. That is odd, 5 cents a mile-- OK, \$155 a day, legislative days only, unvouchered. The per diem rate is the amount fixed--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: There's no one in the queue and you're recognized to close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. South Dakota. The per diem rate is the amount fixed for per diem allowance that is authorized by the United States Internal Revenue Service per SDCL2-4-2. Tennessee, \$24,316, 47 cents a mile until November 2022. Then it will be adjusted to 58.5 cents per mile. For legislators residing within 50 miles of the Capitol, it is \$61 a day. For legislators residing more than 50 miles from the Capitol, it is \$295 a day, currently tied to federal rate, unvouchered. Beginning in November 2022, members will be granted the meals and incidental amount equal to the allowance granted federal employees for expenses in the Nashville area. For lodging, the higher of the annual average hotel rate for the previous calendar year in the Nashville Center Business District, as provided by the Nashville Convention and Visitors Corporation, or their successor organization

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

if obtainable, or the allowance granted federal employees for lodging expenses in the Nashville area. OK. Texas, \$7,200, reimbursed at 58.4 cents per mile, \$1.51 per mile for single, twin, and turbo engine airplanes set by General Appropriations bill. Legislators also receive reimbursement for transportation costs for one round trip home each week. Texas allows for gas mileage reimbursement for single, twin and engine turbo-- and turbo engine airplanes. I guess a lot of their legislators pilot in to session. So all right. I know we've got actually a fair number of aviators in this body. We could-- we could do that kind of reimbursement. I believe, well, I'm not going to list them all because I'll forget. I think we have at least four aviators in this body, possibly more than four. But I think we have at least four. I wish I was. A family of, of pilots on my mom's side. My grandfather was a pilot, and he trained pilots during World War II in Illinois and trained people to be pilots in World War II in Illinois. But he was a civilian. He wasn't in the military. And then two of my uncles have been airline pilots and in the Air Force. Well, one was in the Air Force. The other one I don't believe was in the Air Force, but my one uncle was in the Air Force. My cousin is a pilot. My other cousin, he's not a pilot-- he might have his pilot's license, but he is an airline mechanic. So he-- you may have flown on a plane that my cousin has repaired. He knows how to build an entire plane. That's part of the training when he went to college to become an airline-- he went to college to become an airline mechanic, specific university that taught that, and he learned how to build a plane and how to dismantle a plane as part of the training to--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --fix the plane. So I always thought that was kind of fascinating. Yeah. So anyways, I guess if they were in Texas and they were in the legislature, they could get reimbursed for their gas mileage. OK. I'm on Utah and their base pay is \$285 a legislative day, 56 cents a mile. No general per diem is paid. For Senate legislators seeing-- residing more than 100 miles from the Capitol can receive up to \$100 a day. For House legislators residing more than 40 miles from the Capitol can receive up to \$100 a day. Vermont is \$742.92 a week during session and 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate, \$75 a day for remote, \$127 a night for lodging, and \$69 a day for meals for in-person. OK. Virginia--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like a call of the house and a machine vote.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: 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: 7 ayes, 6 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All those 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 Armendariz and Speaker Arch, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. All unexcused senators are now present. Senators, the question is the motion to reconsider. There's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk. Machine vote. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 1 aye, 35 nays on the reconsideration of the amendment.

KELLY: Motion fails. Raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for the next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, some items, if I could. Legislative Bill-- your Committee on Education, chaired by Senator Murman, reports LB705 to General File with committee amendments. Additionally, your Committee on Health and Human Services, chaired by Senator Hansen, reports LB84 to General file with committee amendments. Amendments to be printed: Senator Erdman to LB341. New LR: Senator Jacobson and others, LR110. That will be laid over. Senator Jacobson, LR111, LR112, LR113 and LR114, all of which will also be laid over. Concerning LB815, Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend with AM1265.

KELLY: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, today is Administrative Professionals Day. So I looked it up. It's actually like the whole week is Administrative Professionals Week. And this is usually the last week of April and the last Wednesday of the last full week of April is Administrative Professionals Day. So thank you to all of our administrative professionals in this building, which is many, the staff in our own offices, the committee staff, the Clerk's Office, the Research Office, the Fiscal Office, the-- so LRO, Legislative Research Office, PRO, not our administrators, but the Governor's, and all of the administrators that work for the courts in the building as well. So thank you all very much because you literally keep the state moving forward, not metaphorically. You literally keep the state

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

moving forward and probably keep us all out of jail. So I was reading up on this. Administrative Professionals Day is a day observed yearly in a small number of countries. It's not a public holiday in any of them. It should be, because then you all would have the day off. In some countries it falls within Administrative Professionals Week, the last full week of April in the United States. The day recognizes the work of secretaries, administrative assistants, executive assistants, personal assistants, receptionists, client service representatives, and other administrative support professionals. Typically, administrative professionals are given cards, flowers, chocolate, and lunches. I'll just read that last part again. Typically, administrative professionals are given cards and flowers, chocolates and lunches. So just-- coffee-- and coffee. Anything else that I'm forgetting? Feel free to slip me notes. I can work in what other things are, are typically tokens of appreciation. Oh, his-- there's some history on it. During World War II, there was a shortage of skilled administrative personnel in the United States due to Depression era birthrate decline, booming-- and booming postwar business. The National Secretaries Association, founded in 1942, was formed to recognize the contributions of administrative personnel to the economy, support their personal development, and to help attract workers to the administrative field. Key figures who created the holiday were the President of the National Secretaries Association, Mary Barrett; President of Dictaphone Corporation, interesting, the Dictaphone Corporation, C. King Woodbridge; and public relations account executives at Young and Rubicam, Harry F. Claw-- Klemfuss, Klemfuss and Darren Ball. The National Secretaries Association was name-- name was changed-- Association's name was changed to Professional Secretaries International in 1981 and the International Association of Administrative Professionals, IAAP, in 1998. Administrative Professionals Day is a registered trademark with registration number 2475334, serial number 75/898930. The registrant is IAAP. That is a very thorough history, including the trademark registration number and the serial number. I wonder what administrative professional made sure that that information was available in the history. Probably the same person who trademarked it and they wanted that work to be acknowledged. So if you were the person who trademarked the International Professionals Administrative Professionals Day, just want you to know I acknowledge that you did that. Whoever you are, thank you for trademarking that and making sure that the registration number was publicly available with the history of the day. OK. The official period of celebration was first proclaimed by U.S. Secretary of Commerce Charles W. Sawyer as National Secretaries Week, which was held June 1 through 7 in 1952 with

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Wednesday, June 4, designated as National Secretaries Day. The first Secretaries Day was sponsored by the National Secretaries Association with support of corporate groups. In 1955, the observance day of the National Secretaries Week was moved to the last full week of April, with Wednesday now designated as Administrative Professionals Day. The name was changed to Professional Secretaries Week in 1981 and became Administrative Professionals Week in 2000 to encompass the expanding responsibilities and wide-ranging job titles of administrative support staff in modern economy. The week-long observation was created in order to space out the bookings at restaurants, country clubs, and other places where administrative professionals would be taken out to lunch. Now, that is a fascinating piece of history that the week-long observation was created to space out the bookings of taking your administrative professionals out to lunch at restaurants and country clubs. Clearly, a very well-organized administrative professional came up with the idea of making it a week instead of a day for that. If that was the motivation for being a week was to make it more practical in the administration of Administrative Professionals Day, you can bet an administrative professional came up with that idea to make it more efficient and, and not infringe upon the efficacy of the workplace. That's how amazing administrative professionals can be. They are thoughtful. They are forward-thinking. They are strategic. They keep things going. They think about things that need to happen that you don't think about. So if you have an administrative professional in your life, be grateful. OK. Oh, there's some criticism. Well, well, well, let's get a take on this. Some critics take an anticonsumerist stance and accuse the flower, card, and candy industries of inventing the holiday for convenient sales between Easter and Mother's Day, which is the second Sunday in May. It has also been argued that the traditional gifts of flowers and cards unintentionally marked the holiday and the administrative role as a gendered one since these are typically feminine gifts and that a special day to celebrate administrative professionals isolates them from the rest of their workplace peers. My office is split 50/50, so I would give both of my amazing staffers flowers if they like flowers. I've just been informed coffee is an appropriate token. I would probably give them both coffee. Maybe, maybe I will give them coffee if they want coffee today. I wouldn't dare to gender gift members of the Clerk's Office. So obviously the Clerk and Deputy Clerk would get flowers and then the others would get, I don't know, coffee, chocolate, cards, or if you like, flowers. I know Carol likes flowers because she oftentimes has a floral print dress that matches her floral water bottle. So, Carol, you would still get flowers from me even if it was being gendered-- unless you're

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

allergic to flowers, in which case. OK. All right. Not allergic to flowers. OK. So that was a criticism, anticonsumerism. And--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Oh-- thank you, Mr. President. Now, I am not one to be a big proponent of consumerism. It kind of is, you know, a frustrating, wasteful. But I believe that even if this is driven by consumerism, days and weeks, like Administrative Professionals Day or Administrative Professionals Week are important because they remind us to acknowledge the people in our lives that we are interacting with all of the time to take time to thank them. Now, you shouldn't need a day to do that or week to do that, but some of us do. I think it's helpful. And so, yeah, I think that's a great-- a great thing. Now I see on here Bosses Day. Now that-- that's probably a consumerism day that--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: --we should think about. Thank you.

KELLY: And you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. That is probably a day we could do without, Bosses Day. Thank you so much, boss, for making a profit off of my work and paying me less for it, probably not a day we need to have. Also, you shouldn't be buying your boss gifts. They should be buying you gifts, if appropriate, workplace appropriate gifts. But I am going to read about Bosses Day because now I'm interested. But I'm going to take a sip. OK. Bosses Day also written Boss's Day or Boss' Day. Now I'm reading these, so you don't know what I'm saying. Bosses Day, B-o-s-s-'-s Day or B-o-s-s-e-s Day or B-o-s-s-' Day. I would say one of the two possessives, because the plural doesn't make sense. It's the boss's possessive day. If you want to do and part-- this comes back to that Oxford comma type question. OK. We've got the apostrophe, B-o-s-s-'. Do you put another s after it or do you just leave it at the apostrophe? Which is grammatically correct? To be determined. I think we'll dig in on this one later. Any of you writing papers right now? Got your APA. Do you do APA style now? Yeah, no, some of you do, some of you don't. I can't remember what all the different style books are now. I think APA was what I learned. Well, I'm really curious about the apostrophe. What would you look up? Plural apostrophe? Apostrophe, yeah, plural apostrophe after s. If the plural word is formed by adding an s, for example, cats, place the apostrophe after the s. If the plural word is formed without adding an s, for example,

children, add apostrophe s. OK. So cats, it would be cats'. Children, it would be children's. Got that. Bosses Day, boss is singular. So singular-- so maybe singular apostrophe after s. Singular apostrophe after s. OK. Even if you have a singular noun that ends with a sibilant, letters s, z, sh, ch, or x, you add an apostrophe s to it. The box's surface is very glossy. You can't take up this seat. It's James's, James's. So what is the rule for apostrophe after s? So according to this and let me see, what am I referencing here? This is using apostrophe is clearly-- right clearly punctuation. And this is the University of Guelph in California guidelines. Well, maybe I should be looking up APA style guidelines on apostrophes-- style-- now I'm misspelling apostrophe. Jeez, I used two p's. It's one p. There we go. Apostrophe is kind of a fun word--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --don't use that much. Oh, thank you, Mr. President. OK. Add an apostrophe plus s to the singular form of the word, even if it ends in s. That's from Purdue. APA style, forming possessive with singular names. Cite-- how to cite an apostrophe in APA, OK. For example, should you use Adams' work or Adams's? Per APA style, the answer is that the possessive of a singular name is formed by adding an apostrophe and an s even when the name ends in s. OK. So going back to Bosses Day, it should be Boss's if you are going by the APA style guide. Of course, you know, we've got the great Oxford comma debate, so I'm wondering if I am teetering into--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator, and you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: This is your last time before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, did you know that if you were in Nevada, you could get two extra dollars a day for presiding over the Legislature? I know, right? Blows your mind. I was-- I was hypothesizing whether or not it was \$2 a day per person who presided, because so far it's been the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker and Senator DeBoer. We might be up to \$6 worth of per diem just burning through that, that per diem cash. I think-- I think the Speaker's pondering this as a potential legislative resolution to take to the Executive Board. Maybe we can get to \$2 a day. He's not really, sorry. I'm still-- Speaker, I'm still on the \$2 a day. OK. I actually, that reminds me, I never finished. I got distracted, importantly so, about Administrative Professionals Day and Administrative

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Professionals Week. But I was reading through the salaries of other state legislators. So I'm going to go back to that for a minute because I'm on t, Texas. I ended on Texas because they reimburse for mileage for airplanes, assuming they have a fair number of pilots. And I was pondering about that because we have several pilots here and perhaps they would want to pilot in to the Legislature. I have actually flown. He wasn't flying at the time. I have flown in a helicopter with Senator Brewer, but he was not flying the helicopter at the time. But if you were in Texas, if you were in Texas, Senator Brewer, they would reimburse you for airplane mileage. You could fly in, you could fly in to work. We might have to get a helipad but, but still. OK. Utah is \$285 a legislative day, 56 cents a mile. No general per diem is paid for Senate legislators residing more than 100 miles from the Capitol can receive up to \$100 a day. For House, legislators residing more than 40 miles from the Capitol can receive up to \$100 a day. So in Utah, they get the same per diem whether in the House and Senate. Vermont is four hun-- four, well, \$742.92 a week during session, very specific amount, 92 cents. It is 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate; \$75 a day for remote; \$127 a night for lodging; and \$69 a day for meals in person. Virginia is \$18,000 for senators and \$17,640 for delegates. It is 85.5 cents a mile and it is \$209 per diem per day. I don't know if it's per day when they're in session or not. Washington is \$57,876. Pardon me. OK. Sorry about that. Washington, \$57,876, 58.5 cents per mile tied to federal rate; \$185 a day; per diem is now tied to 89 percent of the federal per diem rate and will be reviewed for accuracy each November.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. This is my-- I have my close or this is my close?

KELLY: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: This is my close?

KELLY: No, you still have a close.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Lost track. OK. I should-- I should maybe, like, make little hash marks here so I could keep track better but-- 89 percent. West Virginia, \$20,000, 48.5 cents a mile, \$131 a day set by Compensation Commission, unvouchered. Wisconsin, we are getting to the end. Wisconsin is \$55,141, 51 cents per mile. Senators can claim one round trip per week. Representatives can claim two round trips to the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Capitol per week unless they stay overnight, and then they can only claim one round trip. For the senate--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Senator Conrad has guests in the north balcony, ninth graders from North Star High School in Lincoln. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized for your close on AM1265.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. AM1265, I think I was on Wyoming's pay. Wyoming is \$150 a day, 59 cents a mile, \$109 a day per diem. Oh, their base salary is \$150 a day. OK. And then they have their per diem is \$109 a day set by legislature, vouchered. Legislators also receive an additional \$300 a month half salary for one day of preparation for each day the legislator's engaged in work for the Management Council or any committee; half salary for each day the member travels to and from an interim activity for which he/she is entitled to receive a salary. OK. District of Columbia, council members earn \$152,813; chairmen's earn \$210,000; in-town mileage is not reimbursable. Out-of-town mileage is reimbursed if the member is on official business and the destination is farther than 50 miles one way from the District of Columbia. Members must present proof of actual mileage incurred, and it is reimbursable at rates established by the federal GSA schedule. Per diem is only authorized when members are on travel for official business. In those instances, per diem rates as established by the federal GSA are applied. American Samoa. The Senate President and Speaker of the House are paid a base salary of \$30,000. Senators and representatives are paid a base salary of \$25,000. No mileage reimbursement, federal rate for per diem. Guam is no information is available. Northern Mariana Islands, \$32,000 base salary, no mileage, and then per diem during session, Department of Finance calculate the rates based on the average rate per state established published by the United States U.S. General Services Administration for travel to the insular areas of the United States, the states of Hawaii and Alaska or the Island of Saipan,-- oh, I'm going to mispronounce these-- Tinian, Rota, and Guam. Per diem rates were calculated based on the average rate per state and territory as published by the U.S. Department of Defense Per Diem Travel and Transportation Allowance Committee, PDTATAC, per diem rates for, for, for travel to foreign countries, not including foreign countries defined as insular areas of the United States were based on the average rate per country published by the U.S. Department of State.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

OK, that's a lot of information. Puerto Rico, no information available. U.S. Virgin Islands, \$85,000, no mileage. Per diem for overnight travel within the U.S. Virgin Islands is \$75; per diem for overnight travel outside of the U.S. Virgin Islands is \$100. So one of the islands, Virgin Islands, is St. Thomas. And I went to St. Thomas University, and I always had to tell people, not that one. It was in Minnesota, very different climate, very different. Wouldn't have minded being in St.-- St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands. But instead I was in Minnesota and we had a lot of snow. How much time do I have left, Mr. President?

KELLY: 1:13.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So that brings us to the end of the 2022 legislative compensation as posted on NCSL, the National Council of State Legislatures. If you are new to the Legislature and you are not familiar with NCSL, I would encourage you to go to their website. They have lots of wonderful resources for state legislators, lots of data, research, information. They do stories on policies that have happened in other states. I remember when we first passed Medicaid expansion my freshman year, I relied on a lot of the information that they had to see how other states were implementing Medicaid expansion. So very, very helpful. See, I finally get to see students. There's finally students on my side. Normally, see, the students, when they're on that side, I can't see them. So I feel very special that I can see all of you. Yeah, I know. I can see you. Hi.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Call of the house.

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

CLERK: 7 ayes, 3 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Day has guests in the south balcony, fourth graders from Palisades Elementary in Omaha/Gretna Public School. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senators Raybould, DeKay, Hughes, Moser, John Cavanaugh,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused senators are present. The question is the adoption of AM1265. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 36 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the amendment.

KELLY: The amendment is not adopted. Raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment concerning LB815, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend with AM1269.

KELLY: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on AM1269.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. AM1269, let's see here. On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike \$632,982 and insert \$652,980. So almost a \$20,000 increase in the appropriation, but it's actually a \$19,998 increase, to be specific. I don't know why. OK. So that's what AM1269 does. And I finished going through all of the legislators' salaries, so I'm going to switch to a different legislator topic: women in state legislatures for 2023. Again, this is the National Conference of State Legislatures, NCSL, a great resource for lots of information. Approximately 2,451 women serve in the 50 state legislatures in 2023, making up 33 percent of all state legislators nationwide. This percentage is the highest we've seen in our nation's history. After the 2022 elections, women legislators reached a historical record representation. This represents a steady increase over the past four years, with a significant increase in 2018, when women represented 25 percent of legislative bodies. The map shows the percentage of women legislator by state, the percentage of women legislator-- legislators by state. Please click on the state to see the total percentage of representation by state. OK. So it is a color-graded, it's like peach hues color grade-- gradation. The darkest color is 51-plus percent and there are states that have over 51 percent. Let's see here. Nevada, let's see what percent they have. Nevada is 60 percent female. What? Get out. It must be that extra \$2 a day they give to their leadership positions. All right. Colorado, 53 percent. Cool. All right. Who else have we got here? Guam has 53 percent, as well. Nebraska, we're not doing too shabby, not doing too shabby. We're at 38.8 percent. We got room to grow, for sure. My freshman year, gosh, how many did we have? Was it 14 our first year? I think it was. It started with-- my first year was with Senator Slama, Senator DeBoer, Senator Hunt. I think-- was it 14? It was. OK. I don't know how many we have right now, but

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

[INAUDIBLE] that was historic. Do we have more than 14 now? We have 18? We just keep getting more historic. Look at us. Thank you, Senator Slama. Sorry. I'm like-- I'm kind of looking for facts from other people. I apologize, because they're actually trying to do something work-wise, so. Eighteen now, we had 14 when we started and that was a historic number when we started. So I feel we can get closer to 50 percent. We're at 38.8 percent. Not too shabby, but definitely room to grow. Now, there are some states that don't have very good representation. Wyoming's OK. Well, the-- 22 percent. They could, they could do better. Oklahoma's 20 percent. Arkansas is 23 percent. Louisiana is 18.1 percent. Come on, Louisiana. Mississippi is 16.7 percent. Alabama is 17 percent. Tennessee is 15 percent. West Virginia-- ooh. West Virginia may be the lowest. It is 11 percent. Yeah, I think West Virginia is the lowest. Oh, let's see here. Who else do I have down here? Those are-- American Samoa has 5 percent. OK. West Virginia, followed by America or American Samoa followed by West Virginia, have the lowest number of women in the-- their legislatures. OK. Then there's a whole graft. Great. Oh, shoot. That was the one I wanted to look at. Women-- sorry. I got to hit the back button. I went-- moved forward too soon. Female legislative leaders in 2022. OK. Ninety-two women serve as speaker of the house, president of the senate, speaker pro tem, senate president pro tem, majority leader or minority leader for the 2022 legislative session. This is the highest number of women serving in leadership to date. I wonder out of how many of those positions-- so 92 serve in those positions. How many of those positions are there? OK. That is-- note: the research is subject to human error and may reflect discrepancies due to legislative vacancies. Information is subject to change throughout the year due to resignations, appointments and special elections. OK. Women in Leadership, 2022. They have it by state. Alabama has none. OK. Alaska has the senate majority leader, speaker of the house, house minority leader. And so, they have-- the senate majority leader is Senator Shelly Hughes. The speaker of the house is Lois [SIC] Stut-- Stutes and the minority leader-- house minority leader is Cathy Tilton. Interesting. The speaker, the-- on the, on the house side, the speaker and the minority leader are both women. In Arizona, the senator, senate pro-tem senate president is Karen Fann and the senate minority leader is Rebecca Rios. So again, in Arizona, in the senate, both leadership positions for both parties are women. Arkansas: House Minority Leader, Representative Tippy McCullough. All right. I wonder if Tippy is short for something or if that's actually Representative McCullough's last-- first name. California: senate president pro tem is Toni Atkins. House assembly or sorry, not house, assembly majority leader is Assemblywoman Eloise Reyes and assembly minority leader is

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Assemblywoman Maria [SIC] Waldron. Colorado: senate president pro tem, Senator Kerry Donovan; house speaker pro tem, Representative Adrienne Benavidez; house majority leader, Representative Daneya Esgar. OK. Where is everybody else? What-- oh, that's a different-- got to scroll in there. OK. There we go. That was Colorado. OK. Connecticut: none. Delaware: Val-- Representative Valerie Longhurst is the house majority leader. Florida: senator-- senate majority leader is Debbie Mayfield and senate minority leader is Lauren Book. OK. Georgia has the senate minority leader is Gloria Butler. And the speaker pro tem is Representative Jan Jones. Hawaii: senate vice president is Michelle--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --Kidani. Thank you, Mr. President. House majority leader is Della Au Belatti. I remember. I went to NCSL's conference this year and it was in Hawaii and I toured the Capitol and I saw Representative Della Au Belatti-- Au Belatti's, Belatti's seat. And I took a picture of it because my oldest kid's name is Della. And Della is not a super common name. It's D-e-l-l-a, in case people can't-- I'm not enunciating. It's not Stella, it's Della. And my Della is named after my great-grandmother. And her name was actually Adalheit. You have to get that guttural Adalheit. She was a German immigrant and everybody called her Della. So when my Della was born, we were debating whether we would go with Adalheit or Della. And we went with Della, because we knew that that's what we were--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: And you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So moving on from Della. Is this my first time in the queue? And then I have one-- OK. Great.

KELLY: This, this is your first time, then another, then your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So that was Hawaii, women in leadership. Now, Idaho. We have the senate minority leader and the house minority leader. And the senate minority leader is Senator Michelle Stennett. And the house minority leader is Ilana Rubel. To my fellow female legislators out there, if I am mispronouncing your name, I greatly apologize. I'm not always great at my pronunciation. OK. Illinois, we have senate majority leader is Senator Kimberley Lightford. Indiana: none. Iowa: house minority leader is Jennifer-- Representative Jennifer Konfrst, Konfrst, Konfrst. Kansas: senate

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

minority leader is Senator Dinah Sykes. Kentucky: house minority floor leader is Joni Jenkins. Louisiana: senate president pro tem is Beth Mizell. Maine is senate minority-- senate majority leader Eloise Vitelli; house majority floor leader, Representative Michelle Dunphy; house minority floor leader, Representative Kathleen Dillingham. Maryland: senate president pro tem is Senator Melony Griffith. It's spelled diff-- it's not Mel-- it's not-- it's Melony, M-e-l-o-n-y Griffith, not the actress. Not the actress. And that's Melody, I believe. Melody. Melody. No, Melanie, It's Melanie. Am I losing my mind? Probably. But it's Melony Griffith, spelled differently. Not the same person. OK. Senate majority leader, Senator Nancy King-- this is Maryland-- speaker of the house, Delegate Adrienne Jones; speaker pro tem-- house speaker pro tem, Delegate Sheree Sample-Hughes. Massachusetts: senate president, Senator Karen Spilka; senate minority leader, Senator Cynthia Stone Creem; house speaker pro tem, Representative Kate Hogan; house majority leader, Representative Claire Cronin. Michigan: house speaker pro tem, Representative Pam Hornberger; house minority leader, Donna Lasinski. Minnesota: senate minority leader, Melisa Franzen; speaker of the house, Melissa Hortman; and in Minnesota after-- well, nevermind. Mississippi: none. Missouri: house minority floor leader, Representative Crystal Quade. Montana: senate minority leader, Senator Jill Cohenour; house majority leader, Sue Vinton; house minority leader, Kim Abbott. Nebraska: none. Interestingly, we have never had a female Speaker--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --in Nebraska. Just an observation. I don't know if we've ever had a woman run for Speaker in Nebraska. Nothing ventured, nothing gained, ladies. OK. Nevada: senate major-- min- majority floor leader, Nicole Cannizzaro; assembly majority floor leader, Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson; assembly minority floor leader, Assemblywoman Robin Titus. I-- actually, I want to go back to Nebraska. So in fairness to Nebraska, we only have the one position because we don't have two houses and we don't-- we do not caucus by political party. So we don't have a majority and a minority leader. So, so just wanted that for the record. We do have women in leadership-- thank you.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator. You're next in the queue and that's your last time before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. We do have women in leadership positions in the Legislature-- the Chair of the Revenue Committee, Senator Linehan, and the Chair of the Business and Labor Committee or

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

not Business and Labor-- I'm sorry-- Banking Committee-- Banking and Insurance, Senator Slama. The Chair of Committee on Committees is Senator Albrecht. Senator Geist was the Chair of Transportation. And actually, prior to this year, she was also the Chair of Performance Audit. Who else am I forgetting as chairs? Chair of the Planning Committee is my rowmate, Senator DeBoer, who looks lovely as spring today. Am I forgetting any other committees? Tribal Relations Committee, thank you, Senator Day. Yeah, Nebraska. Just because we only have one leadership position that they count in NCSL, we're doing pretty good. OK. New Hampshire has senate president pro tem, Senator Sharon Carson. Also colleagues, Senator Walz, last session, was the pres-- the Chair of Education. If I am forgetting, I apologize. OK. So New Hampshire, Senator Sharon Carson is the senate president pro tem in New Hampshire. Senate minority leader is Senator Donna Soucy, Soucy, Soucy; house speaker pro tem is Representative Kim Rice. In New Jersey, senate president pro tem is Senator Teresa Ruiz, Ruiz and senate majority leader is Senator Loretta Weinberg. New Mexico: Senate president pro tem, Senator Mimi Stewart. New York: senate president and majority leader is Senator Andrea Stewart-Cousins and assembly majority leader is Assemblywoman Crystal Peoples-Stokes. North Carolina has senate majority leader, Senator Kathy Harrington; house majority leader, Representative Sarah Stevens. North Dakota has senate minority leader, Joan Hock-- Heckaman. Ohio: house minority leader, Representative Emilia Sykes. Oklahoma, Oklahoma [INAUDIBLE] senate minority leader, Senator Kay Floyd and house minority leader, Emily Vir-- Representative Emily Virgin. Oregon: house-- speaker of the house, Representative Tina Kotek; house majority leader, Representative-- Rep. Barbara Smith, Smith Warner; house minority leader, Representative Vicki Breese-Iverson. Pennsylvania-- I don't know why I think Pennsylvania's just a fun word to say. Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania: senate minority leader, Senator Kim Ward; Pennsylvania house minority leader, Representative Joanna McClinton. Rhode Island: None. South Carolina: none. South Dakota: none. What's your excuse, you three states? You don't have just one leadership position. All right. Tennessee: house minority leader, Rep. Karen Camper. Texas: senate president pro tem--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --Sen-- thank you, Mr. President-- Senator Donna Campbell. Utah: senate minority leader, Senator Karen Mayne. Vermont: senate president pro tem, Senator Becca Balint; senate majority leader, Senator Alison Clarkson; house-- speaker of the house, Representative Jill Krowinski, Krowinski; house majority leader, Representative Emily Long; house minority leader, Representative

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Patricia McCoy. Virginia: senate president pro tem, senate-- Senator Louise Lucas; house-- speaker of the house, Delegate Eileen Filler-Corn; house majority leader, Delegate Charniele Herring.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator, Senator Halloran has guests in the north balcony, fourth graders from Axtell Elementary in Axtell, Nebraska. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on AM1269.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. Where was I? Virginia, I did Virginia. Washington-- I'm going to get through this whole list on this one amendment. Great. Washington's senator pro tem is Senator Karen Keiser. Speaker of the house is Representative Laurie Jenkins, speaker pro tem is Representative Tina Orwall. West Virginia. West Virginia. Hey, three other states. West Virginia has the lowest percentage of women elected to the legislature and they have two women in leadership positions. Those states-- those other states, get with it. Get with the program. OK. Senate president pro tem, Senator Donna Boley; house majority leader, Delegate Amy Summers. Wisconsin: senate minority leader, Senator Janet Bell-- Bewley; assembly minority leader, Representative Greta Neubauer. Wyoming: house minority leader-- house minority floor leader, Representative Cathy Connolly. District of Columbia: none. American Samoa: none. Guam: speaker of the unicameral-- that's right. Guam has a unicameral-- Speaker Therese Terlaje; vice speaker of the legislature is Vice Speaker Tina Muna Barnes; majority leader, Senator Telina Cruz Nelson; minority leader, Senator Telo T. Tatague. Northern Mariana Islands: none. Puerto Rico: senate vice president is Senator Marially Gonzalez. And U.S. Virgin Islands, to round it all out, president of the senate, Senator Donna Frett-Gregory. Way to go, Senator Frett-Gregory. OK. Total number of women in legislative leadership, 92. Total women in leadership in house chambers, 47. Total women in leadership in senate chambers, including unicameral legislatures, 45. Total Democrats, 67, total Republicans, 23, total third party or other, 2. So there we go. Women's caucuses, commissions and committees. Yes. Huh. Oh, this has-- this is interesting. This is an interesting listing, because it has the state, then it has the group, like, Alabama's Women's Commission. And then, it has social media and other notes. Interesting that it has social media-- I guess so you can go and look up the various caucuses and commissions. How much time do I have left, Mr. President?

KELLY: 1:43.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So I was just going to see what we have listed for our own state. I'm just going to jump on down

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

to it. League of Women Voters of Nebraska has their bylaws, their Facebook and their Twitter. OK. League of Women Voters Nebraska is a nonpartisan political organization that works to educate citizens on issues, as well as-- I don't know what else. I got cut off. OK.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Let's see here. They've got a little video with the Nebraska Legislature's upcoming second round of debate on LB626, set for Thursday, April 27. We encourage you to watch an interview. OK. Good resource. I use the League of Women Voters guide for voting, like, I use it myself for voting. I-- you know, I-- I'd like to consider myself an informed voter most of the time. But sometimes, there's just things on the ballot, like actual items, not even people, actual items on the ballot. Then I'm like, oh, I didn't know we were voting on this. And so, having the League of Women Voters guide is very helpful. You can get a sample ballot, so that you can look at what questions you're going to be answering if you go and vote in person. I like to vote in person. I like to get my little "I voted" sticker. But--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Is that my last time. OK. Call of the house.

KELLY: There has been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house be placed under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 8 ayes, 5 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: 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 Ibach has guests in the north balcony, fourth graders from Pershing Grade School in Lexington, Nebraska. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. All unexcused senators are now present. Members, the question is the adoption of AM1269. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 38 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of AM1269.

KELLY: The amendment is not adopted. Raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for items.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

CLERK: Mr. President, items quickly. Your Committee on Judiciary, chaired by Senator Wayne, reports LB50 to General File with committee amendments. Additionally, concerning LB815, the pending matter, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend with AM1270.

KELLY: Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on the amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I really feel good about this one. I think this is the one that's going to get attached. I'm still not going to vote for it, but I still feel good about it. OK. I have to say, because this is bringing me so much joy right now, Senator Hunt gave me a pen. And it is like, it is, bringing me so much joy. So I'm going to share it. You can't spell salad without s-a-d, sad. Thank you, Senator Hunt. I feel heard, because I talk about salad so much. And it, it, it has, it has brought me, like, an enormous amount of joy this morning, so thank you. I personally enjoy a good salad. I don't get to have a good salad very often. Yesterday, I was having a bag salad. It was sad. The salad I had yesterday was actually one of the best bag salads I've had. And I got it from Trader Joe's and I've never had it before, so I'm probably going to get it again. And it probably was, probably was-- it was-- what? It was loud? It was loud, yeah. Well, it's a bag and you got to mix everything up in the bag. If anyone has ever had a meeting with me over lunch on Zoom or in person, I am probably mixing a salad in a bag, because I pretty much eat a bag salad every day for lunch. But so, this particular loud, bag salad-- I should get like a big Tupperware bowl or something to shake them in. But this loud, bag salad was probably so good because it probably wasn't very healthy. Because it had like shaved parmesan, which was delicious and it was like a pesto vinaigrette. Yeah. So it was, it was packed with calories. It was delicious, though, probably because it was like, heavy with pesto, heavy with vinaigrette, oil and cheese. And-- oh, it had walnuts in it, too. So thank you for reminding me of my happy salad. It was really-- it made me really happy. Probably made you sad to watch. But yes, I do, I do enjoy a bag salad. I actually, am hoping that I have one left up in my office for today's lunch, because I didn't think to bring something today. So hopefully, I've got another delicious, delectable, loud bag salad. I was walking down the hallway yesterday, going to my favorite ice machine that I talk about regularly, in the vending machine room. But I was carrying-- and I don't, I don't know, absent professor-type thing, yesterday. I left my bag on the floor. I was carrying a laptop. I didn't need the laptop. I don't know why I had the laptop, but I was carrying a laptop. I was carrying a can of cold brew and my bag salad. And I had so many people stop me, like, I guess I looked like I was about to drop things, asking if they could help me. And I was like, I mean,

it's not heavy. It's just a bag of salad. It's just a bag of salad. It looks awkward sitting on top of my laptop, but it's just a bag of salad. It's just lettuce. Little did they know the delectableness that was inside of it, with that pesto vinaigrette and the shaved parmesan cheese. I don't know what the name of the salad was. But I know I got it from Trader Joe's, because I went to Trader Joe's, I don't know, a week ago or so. And I don't go there very often. I go there for very specific things. Specifically, I go there for their grape leaves, the dolmas, because my oldest kid loves them. So that's a treat that I get for them. But I was-- so I was going for that and a few other specific Trader Joe's items-- turkey sausage, the turkey summer sausage. I get that for my husband. He really likes that. So whenever I go to Trader Joe's, I always have to get that. And interestingly, they almost-- they always are almost out, like I always buy like, the last one. Or if there's two, I'll buy both of them, because they're always like-- maybe it's a gimmick. Like, they want you to buy the last two and then they put out two more. Like, every time somebody takes them, then they put two more out. Anywho, I had never bought bag salads at Trader Joe's. I didn't actually know that they had the bag salad things. I know that they have bags of salad mix, but I didn't know that they had, like, a specific bag salad kit. So I bought a couple of those. I'm really hope-- all of this is to say clearly, I'm hungry. I'm really hoping that I have another delicious bag salad waiting for me upstairs. My office is in the tower, the tower of the Capitol. So when I say upstairs, it's the tower. And sometimes, when we do a call of the house and we're waiting for a while, for people watching at home listening to the hold music, many of us have offices in the tower. There are only four elevators. Well, I guess there's a fifth elevator, but it's like, the accessible elevator for these, these two floors. But the four elevators-- and multiple of those go to the 14th floor. So when we have all these school kids coming in here visiting the Capitol, the elevators during the day are kind of crammed full of kids trying to get up to the gallery on, on the top of the Capitol. And so-- and then sometimes, different elevators just don't work. So when you're sitting-- when you're watching at home and you're watching us sit here during a call of the house, someone may be just legitimately waiting for an elevator. Because I feel like anytime I leave this, this room, the Chamber, most of my time is spent waiting for an elevator. And then, the elevators are tiny. So, you know, an elevator crammed with school kids, you can't fit on it, so you gotta wait for the next one. But my first year, when I had my son here with me and he was a couple months old-- and I didn't have him with me all the time. I had him here, like, when there were going to be snowstorms because I was breastfeeding. And I-- by my third kid, I had long given up

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

pumping. I was like, that is for the birds. I am not doing that. So then, when I came to the Legislature, I did have to start pumping again, because my son would not take formula, just wouldn't do it. So I started pumping again. But because I hadn't been pumping for the first several months, I didn't have an exorbitant supply of milk. And so, when we had-- so I couldn't be away overnight from him. So if I was going to be here during a snowstorm, he would have to come with me. And some people were like, oh my gosh, that's so great. You get to have your baby with you. And to all working parents out there, you know how much fun it is and productive to have your child at work with you. You get so much more done when you've got a little kid that needs you entirely to stay alive. It's super easy to get work done then. So, so anyways, I would bring him with me. All of this is to say the stroller didn't really fit in the elevator. I had to collapse it down to get it in and out of the elevator. And I would bring him onto the floor in the stroller, because I actually sat where Senator Day is. And I would have the stroller there, like, on the side and I would just rock it back and forth to get him to go to sleep. So, yeah. AM1270, that is what I am on. Am I still on my opening? Yes. How much time do I have left?

KELLY: Yes. And you have 1:30.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. I had not actually looked up what AM1270 did, so I apologize. I normally am better about getting on the mike. Oh, OK. AM1270 strikes Section-- strikes original Section 3. Well, what does that do? Maybe we--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Maybe we want to strike original Section 3. Strikes-- nope, nope, nope, nope, nope. Advanced to E&R, motion to reconsider-- where is the underlying bill that we moved? I apparently filed a lot of motions-- placed on General File. No, I didn't file, I didn't file any motions. I filed amendments. OK. AM-- nope, that's not it either. OK. Introduced copy, maybe. Maybe there were no amendments adopted. In Section 3, Section 3: since an emergency exists, this act takes effect when passed and approved according to law. Don't vote for this. Don't vote for AM1270. It strikes the emergency clause, which would--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: And you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Yeah. So striking the emergency clause since an emergency exists. If we were to strike, I mean, I guess vote for it. If we were to strike it, I think we wouldn't get paid for a couple of months, until it took effect, whenever that is. Isn't it like 90 days after session or something like that? So probably not a great idea to vote for AM1270. But, again, you do you, if that's how you want to roll. I would remind you that today is Administrative Professionals Day in Administrative Professionals Week. So it would be kind of unkind to create that level of administrative upheaval, if you voted for this amendment. So just, you know, but do if you want to. Totally vote for it, if you want to vote for it. I don't think it's going to get 25 votes. So if you feel strongly, go for it. OK. So I have two more amendments pending here after this. And we started at 9:15. So we go to 12:00 and that will be just shy of 3 hours. So we'll come back and we're-- it's 4 hours on this, so we'll have an hour and 15ish minutes when we return from lunch. I have two motions pending. That should probably take us through, on this bill, I think. We'll see. What I'm trying to do is because I had already filed these motions, I'm trying-- attempting to not overfile today. Sometimes, I am overprepared. So I file things proactively that I didn't need to, like yesterday. You might have seen, when we were going through things, on every single thing, there-- I had a note. The Clerk said, I have a note that Senator Cavanaugh wishes to withdraw. And the Lieutenant Governor said, so ordered. And they kept doing that back and forth, over and over again, because I was overprepared. So-- which isn't necessarily a bad thing, just, you know. So today, I am trying to see if I can do exactly the motions that I have put up and not fewer, like, maybe I did exactly the amount that I needed to do, to do this. So I'm on my first time on this time talking, on this motion and then I have my second time and my close. So I have 10 more minutes after this to talk on this specific motion. And then I have two more motions, which are 25 minutes each, so 50 minutes plus 10 minutes. So that's an hour. But I have an hour and 15-- hour and 25ish minutes left on this. So that does mean I'm going to need one more thing. And that will-- unless other people talk, which is possible or-- well, also the calls of the house or just voting. So, you know, I think the machine voting is a little bit faster. I could switch to roll call votes, but that's such a slog for everybody, so going to try and avoid doing that. But, yeah. So--

KELLY: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

M. CAVANAUGH: --we'll see. We'll see if I can get through-- if we can get through AM1272 and AM1271, and then, we just go to cloture on this. That will be some real perfect math and timing, which, my staff, thank you for. Any time I have an AM up there, that is definitely-- my staff has done the work. If I've handwritten something, they've probably also still done the work, but I've handwritten it so. But if it's an AM, my staff, drafters, clerks, like a bunch of people have done work to make that AM happen, no matter what the AM is, even if it's going to cause a kerfuffle in all of us getting paid. That took the effort of my staff, the Clerk's Office and the drafters.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Senator von Gillern has some guests in the north balcony, 85 fourth graders from West Dodge Station Elementary in Elkhorn. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Hunt, you are recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. It is wonderful to see so many kids in the building today. That's one of my favorite parts about this job is getting to talk to so many students and see so many young people and try to make sure that they understand that all of this is for you. And there's nobody here, in the Legislature or anybody who's elected in the entire country or in your city or in your state, who is above you. And our job here is to serve you and try to make the state a better place for you, as you live and grow. So I'm happy you're here. Today, you know, we're in some crunch time here. We're getting toward the last days of session. It's the 68th day. And I, I have some very earnest and heartfelt things that I want to say in the coming days. And I'm even thinking about talking to some of you, which is physically painful for me, personally. But it's really time for reasonable Republicans in this state to stand up against some of these policies, stand up for the health and well-being of all Nebraskans, against these bills that are discriminatory and counterproductive. They're undermining the state's ability to attract and retain talent. And they're encouraging harassment of Nebraskans, of our neighbors, of our kids, of our citizens and of your colleagues. Today, I was hand-delivered a packet from Frank Daley, who's the executive director at the Accountability and Disclosure Commission, because I'm being formally investigated, because of a complaint that I have a conflict of interest on LB574, because I have a trans child. So the argument, you know, made by this complainant is that I haven't even read this all yet. I just-- I just received it, but-- arguing that I have a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

potential conflict with respect to LB574 because of my minor child. This, colleagues, is not serious. This is harassment. This is using the legal system that we have in our state to stop corruption, to increase transparency, to hold government accountable and using it to harass a member of the Legislature, who you all know is trying to do the right thing, is trying to parent her child in a way that keeps that child alive, in a way that keeps that child successful in school and with friends and healthy and in a way that, potentially, that child would have a future in this state, as well. Potentially, in a way that that child would say, I saw the work that my mom did for eight years in the Legislature. I've seen the work my mom has done, as an entrepreneur and a leader in her neighborhood and community. And I'm proud to live in Nebraska. But because of the actions of this Legislature, I could call out every one of you I'm talking about, but you know who you are. And when I call you out, it hurts your feelings. And things are so fragile and so, you know, on the edge of everything, that I cannot do that. But this is harassment, because of a freshman senator who was appointed, who's got it in her head that she's got to get her way on this one thing. And none of you have the courage to peel off of that. The complaint reads-- and I'm distributing this to all of you, so that you can look at this complaint and see what you hath wrought. It says, on January 17, 2023, LB574 was introduced in the Unicameral and filed with the Clerk of the Legislature.

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. And I will talk about this for the rest of the day. If enacted into law, LB574 would prohibit any minor child from obtaining gender-altering medical services in Nebraska from a licensed healthcare practitioner. I would take issue with that language, first of all. On March 22, 2023, Senator Megan Hunt stated on the floor of the Unicameral that her minor child, who was born female, was transitioning genders. In order to fully transition, Senator Hunt's child would need medical services. I also did not say that. This is this person projecting, in the form of harassment to one of your colleagues. The medical services, according to Senator Hunt, would cost \$7,000 per month if there was no health insurance coverage. On March 22, 2023, on the floor of the Unicameral, Senator Hunt said that her minor child's health insurance was provided by Medicaid, which is administered by the Nebraska Department of--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

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

CLERK: Mr. President, notice of committee hearings from the Business and Labor Committee. Notice that the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee will hold an Executive Session today at 12:45, in Room 1510. And priority motion, Senator Conrad would move to recess the body until 1:00 p.m.

KELLY: Senators, you've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye; all those opposed, nay. We are in recess until one.

[RECESS]

KELLY: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber. The afternoon session is about to reconvene. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

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

KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We'll proceed to the first item. Well, do you have any items for the record?

CLERK: None at this time, Mr. President.

KELLY: We'll proceed to the first item on this afternoon's agenda. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Select File, LB815 when the Legislature left before-- prior to the recess pending was an amendment from Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, AM1270.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Is this my second time? Yep, it is. I can see.

KELLY: This is your last time before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK, so the bill that we are on, LB815, is our salaries, legislative pay. We're the legislators. OK, so this is an article from December 16, 2022, Flatwater Free Press by Sara Gentzler: The cost of low pay. The \$12,000 salary is warping the Nebraska Legislature. And there is a picture of Senator DeBoer, and it is freshman Chadd Brown and Nebraska State Senator Wendy DeBoer of Omaha talk before Hebrew Bible class taught by DeBoer Wednesday,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

December 14 at Hastings College. Photo by Laura Beahm from Flatwater Free Press. OK. Third-party ads that targeted State Senator Tony Vargas during his recent run for U.S. Congress featured incredulous voices, baffled over a seemingly selfish move: He wanted to double his own salary with taxpayer money. I'm using the incredulous voice. Is that incredulous? He wanted to double his own salary with taxpayer money. Is that incredulous? It's ballpark. OK. What the ads didn't say: Nebraska's 49 lawmakers have been paid \$12,000 a year since George H.W. Bush, or Herbert Walker Bush, was first elected President, leg warmers were en vogue, and Rick Astley's-- oh, my God, what, Rick Astley? Rick Astley's "Never Gonna Give You Up" blasted unironically from boom boxes. I'm looking around because I am really hoping that this Rick Astley reference-- Ans-- Ains-- Ans-- Ainsley? Help me. Astley? Astley. Why am I saying Ainsley? Those aren't even the letters. Astley. OK. I'm hoping that the Rick Astley-- thank you-- the Rick Astley reference of "Never Gonna Give You Up" will spur a rendition from Senator Wayne next time he's on the microphone. I don't believe he sang it yet this year. If their pay had merely kept pace with inflation since voters approved the most recent raise in 1988, senators today would make more than \$30,000. What? We would still have a very low income but, you know, groceries would be slightly easier. Some state politicians, including those paid far more as a Nebraska Governor or U.S. Senator, have argued over the decades that the \$12,000 price is right. But low pay warps the composition of the Nebraska Legislature. Other lawmakers and experts say, who can and can't serve in a body that annually describe-- decides how billions of taxpayer dollars are spent and writes laws that govern Nebraskans' lives? The average age is 57-- I wonder what the median age is-- the average age is 57-- what's the median age-- in the current Nebraska Legislature, which will be in place through January 2023. Most state senators are retired, semi-retired, or in a position to take significant time away from their primary jobs according--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --thank you-- according to current form-- and former state senators and financial disclosure forms. Ah. So that median age of 57 was the last Legislature. I'm curious what the median age is of this Legislature. OK. About half report owning property besides their home, farmland, rental properties, and second homes. Boosting pay could diversify Nebraska Legislature and result in state lawmakers more politically like the people they represent, say experts and studies of statehouses across the country. But, in Nebraska, that pay raise requires a vote of the people to change the state constitution. For 34 years, it's proved an impossible sell. OK. Nebraska State

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Senator Wendy DeBoer of Omaha talks about finals with student in her Hebrew Bible--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Hunt, you are recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. As part of a broader discussion about collegiality in this body, I wanted to share the text on the record of this complaint that's, that's been filed against me and share that I'm under formal investigation in Nebraska now for conflict of interest because of LB574, the bill to ban trans healthcare. I received this letter today hand delivered from Frank Daley, who's the executive director of the Accountability and Disclosure Commission, and the letter he brought states: Enclosed is a copy of a complaint filed against you and related documents. I'm hand delivering them to your office. If you have questions, you are welcome to contact our general counsel. So I'll read the complaint and I'll read the, the letter from the general counsel of the Accountability and Disclosure Commission. The complaint is from someone many of you know named David Begley in Nebraska. I even heard some groans in the crowd. OK, guys. In the Nebraska Accountability and Disclosure Commission in regard to Senator Megan Hunt, respondent, comes now David D. Begley, petitioner, and for his complaint against Senator Megan Hunt states and alleges as follows: I am a Nebraska attorney, resident, citizen, and voter. On January 17, 2023, LB574 was introduced in the Unicameral and filed with the Clerk of the Legislature. If enacted into law, LB574, the Let Them Grow Act, would prohibit any minor child from obtaining gender-altering medical services in Nebraska from a licensed healthcare practitioner. On March 22, 2023, Senator Megan Hunt stated on the floor of the Unicameral that her minor child who was born female was transitioning genders. In order to fully transition, Senator Hunt's child would need medical services. That's editorializing by the way, I did not say that. The medical services, according to Senator Hunt, would cost \$7,000 per month if there was no healthcare insurance coverage. On March 22, 2023, on the floor of the Unicameral, Senator Hunt said that her minor child's health insurance was provided by Medicaid, which is administered by the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services. Furthermore, that her minor child's application for gender-transition medical services had been rejected four times. Senator Hunt's minor child is a member of her immediate family, as defined in Nebraska Revised Statute 49-1425. At

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

all times relevant herein, Senator Hunt had a potential conflict with respect to LB574. On March 23, 2023, Senator Hunt debated and voted no on LB574. At no time prior to March 23, 2023, prior to that vote, did Senator Hunt deliver and file with the Speaker of the Legislature or the Commission the written statement required by Nebraska Revised Statute 49-1499 (a) and (b). That's conflict of interest. Currently, 25 states and the District of Columbia extend Medicaid coverage for sex-change or gender-transition medical services. And he is citing Medicaid coverage for gender-affirming care from the UCLA School of Law, the Williams Institute 2022. Nebraska does not extend Medicaid coverage for sex changes. Point 11: In my legal opinion, and per the case and statutory citations set out in the study prepared by the Williams Institute, Senator Hunt and her minor child have slightly--

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: --thank you, Mr. President-- Senator Hunt and her minor child have a slightly more than average chance of obtaining Nebraska Medicaid coverage for the child's gender-transition medical services via a lawsuit if LB574 does not become law. If LB574 does not become law, then Senator Hunt's immediate family member could receive a financial benefit with Medicaid paying for the medical services necessary to transition genders. Senator Hunt has the burden of proving that she is excepted from the provisions of our conflict of interest statute because LB574 would apply to, quote, a broad segment of the public. Wherefore, the petitioner prays that the Commission impose such penalty on the respondent as allowed by law. And that's sent in by David D. Begley, who is a well-known attorney in Omaha. And I'll continue speaking about this on my next time. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. I think it's a good opportunity to talk about the unique nature of this important and unique institution in regards to the legislator salary bill, which, again, to be clear, we're passing a constitutionally required measure to take care of the appropriations for our salaries as established in the, in the Nebraska Constitution that cannot be amended or changed without a vote of the people. So just wanted to, to be really clear about that piece. We have similar measures, I think, every biennial, if not every year, I'll have to go back and double-check for other constitutional officers as well. And you'll see that measure right after the legislators pay bill on our agenda today.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

But one thing that I want to bring up, in addition to the dollars and cents that Senator Cavanaugh has been talking about in regards to this measure and kind of contextualizing where we stand in comparison to our sister states, I was really struck by the comment that Senator Hunt started to share with us before the lunch break and then picked up again and shared some additional information with us this afternoon about how her and her family has been unfairly targeted and attacked due to her work in this body. And not to get too misty-eyed about years and days gone by, but one of the reasons that I returned to public life was because I believe in this institution. And I believe that it's important that we have strong voices to protect it. And I remember in my former term of service when there were some partisan mailings that went out attacking my friend Senator Lathrop. This was back in 2008 about his work to address some issues related to immigration. And it was a small set of, I think, door hangers maybe that went out in his neighborhood. And once the Legislature got wind of that, let me tell you who spoke up in support of Senator Lathrop that day: Senator Brad Ashford, Senator Tom Carlson, Senator Lowen Kruse, Senator Ernie Chambers, Senator Greg Adams, Senator Cap Dierks, Senator Annette Dubas, Senator Dwite Pedersen, Senator Pat Engel, Senator Ray Aguilar, Senator John Harms, Senator Joel Johnson, Senator Don Preister, Senator DiAnna Schimek, Senator Scott Lautenbaugh, and Senator Vickie McDonald. These were senators that I had a chance to know, learn from, and serve with, who hail from all across our state and all different points on the political spectrum. And they stepped forward to protect a colleague and the institution that were under attack by partisan political interests and they spoke clearly and eloquently and without hesitation. So here we find ourselves with a member and her family again under attack for her work in this body. And I'm hopeful that we'll see a chorus of voices from colleagues today step forward and denounce these frivolous and hateful attacks. My friend Senator Wayne brought forward similar points earlier this session when he asked those, even if they have a different political viewpoint, to denounce hateful attacks against members and their families. Of course, we all recognize and understand that people have a free speech right to be as hateful as they want to be in their speech. But we have a free speech right and an obligation to meet hateful speech with more speech and to set a tone as leaders in this state to say this will not be tolerated. It is divisive. It distracts us from the issues that are at hand. And let's debate the issues, let's have robust debates and disagreements about all of the issues pending before the Nebraska Legislature. But let's come together and draw a hard line when it comes to not only to attacking members, we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

all sign up for that, we're all clear-eyed about those pitfalls and human life--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President.

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

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President. When Senator Conrad was speaking just now, it triggered in me that, of course, I should stand up because what's happening here is someone has said that because our colleague has a tenuous connection to a bill that she somehow has to file a conflict of interest. So I wanted to get up and, and tell you all the things that I have tenuous connections to. That income tax bill we did the other day, I voted on that and I'm not yet in that higher tax bracket; but if we lower that middle tax bracket, that could affect me. So I guess I'm-- I failed to disclose that. Property taxes, I own property. We've done things on property taxes in here. I'm sorry to everyone, I failed to disclose that because I could have gained a financial-- I did, in fact, I filled out my taxes and got a nice return because of the 1107 tax credit. My brother teaches at a private school. I didn't vote for Senator Linehan's scholarship tax credit bill, but that could potentially affect my family. I did not announce that as a conflict of interest. I know there are people in here who have agricultural interests. They don't announce that they have a conflict when we do bills on that. My family has a-- has some land, but we don't farm it professionally so I don't know if that would count. But there are any number of bills in here involving tax credits, tax exemptions, property taxes, things like that that I could be affected by. So I just wanted to stand up and say that if we're all saying all the things that we're tangentially involved in that could potentially maybe lead us by action or inaction to gain financially then we probably all better be up here standing up telling about our conflicts of interests all the time. But isn't that the idea of this place? Isn't the idea of the Unicameral that we are citizen legislators? We've been hearing all day about how little pay we get and the idea is I've always been told about why we get so little pay is so that we're still involved in our communities is the idea. I don't know how we do that when we're down here all the time, but the idea is that we still go out and we're involved in our communities. And if that's the case, if we're supposed to be involved in things, if we're supposed to have knowledge based on our real-world experiences, it seems a little strange to me that we would then file complaints

against people for having real-world experiences that inform their decision-making in here. There's any number of things upon which I have real-world experience that I have voted on and I will continue to vote on. So I guess this is my announcement that every time we have a tax bill, I'm a taxpayer so I may be involved. That every time we have a bill that involves families, well, I have a family so I may be involved. Every time we have a bill on basically anything in here, I'm involved because I care about my state. I care about the people in my state and I'm involved with them just like Senator Hunt is.

KELLY: One minute.

DeBOER: So if Senator Hunt is going to get a conflict or a NADC filed against her then I should too. And I think this is a, this is a very strange thing that has happened. So I stand up for Senator Hunt for being a citizen legislator, for having real-world experience with the bills that are coming before us, and I think we all have those experiences. And I think if we-- if we think there's something wrong here, then there's something wrong with each and every one of us. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

J. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to echo the comments of Senator Conrad and Senator DeBoer, and this is kind of a apt bill to have this conversation on because talking about legislative pay and, Senator Hunt, you don't get paid enough to deal with this sort of stuff. And I hope you all take a chance to look at what Senator Hunt circulated. This is a deliberate and clear attempt to intimidate and harass and to have a chilling effect on the responsibilities and actions of senators in this body because, as Senator DeBoer just correctly pointed out, we all take votes all the time that have some sort of connection to our lives because we're Nebraskans and everything that the state of Nebraska does has some effect on Nebraskans. But the bigger issue here is that we're engaged in a broader conversation about issues that matter a great deal to some people. And we have people all over the place who are deliberate-- taking deliberate action to intimidate members of the Legislature and to intimidate other members by bringing in known hate groups to protest on the steps of the Legislature. I saw myself when this bill was up for a hearing that, that this individual that filed this complaint was here and taking pictures of children. And when he was doing that, this was at a press conference with cameras everywhere so as not to make a record of it, he was doing that in a deliberate

attempt to intimidate these children from expressing their opinions about what matters to them, trying to create fear, a climate of fear, trying to shame or cajole people into his type of thinking. And this is one further step in that same overall tactic to not have a conversation about the merits of an idea, to not have a conversation about what matters to Nebraskans, but to try to use the levers of power and, and position to intimidate and scare people. So that's what this is. It's a bold attempt to frighten Senator Hunt. And I know that she is up to the task because she's demonstrated it every day here and that she will continue to stand up for what's right despite this, this attempt to intimidate her. But I would ask and join with Senator Conrad's comments that our other colleagues stand in support, whether you agree with the issue at debate or not. This is about whether or not it's OK for someone to come along and attempt to intimidate one of the members of this body. And it's-- today, it's Senator Hunt, but tomorrow it could be anyone else. And if that is the path we go down and people start changing their votes because they're afraid that someone is going to file a frivolous complaint against them, then I don't know what we do here. So thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you. Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Dungan, you're next in the queue.

DUNGAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I rise in favor of LB815 but I also want to join in, in talking a little bit about this complaint that was brought against Senator Hunt and the fact that she's now under this formal investigation, frankly, is preposterous. I think that a lot has been said already about the bravery that certain people in here show. And, you know, one of the things that stood out to me, in particular, about this entire conversation regarding whether or not there is personal gain that she's getting from this, Senator Hunt never had to share her personal story and she never had to talk about her family. And, in fact, the very first time it came up on the floor for those who are paying attention remember, she actually expressed the fact that she didn't want to originally. And we talked a lot in this body about whether or not, you know, anecdotes are helpful or anecdotes are things that we should bring into the Legislature. But the reason that I believe she did it is to illuminate not just the actual problems with LB574 but to make sure that a number of people in this body knew that it affected somebody who was close to them. And the fact that that's now being weaponized, and the fact that that bravery and that honesty is being used not just against her, but to threaten everybody in this body to say this could happen to you, I think is something we should all be very fearful about. And I think that my colleagues have expressed that appropriately thus far. Another

thing that I think is worth noting about this is they actually do in this complaint cite a specific statute. And it's a statute that when you become a member of the Legislature they train you on in your orientation to talk about when you do or don't have to file these conflicts. And it specifically says in relevant part that: A member of the Legislature who would be required to take any action or make any decision in the discharge of his or her official duties that may cause financial benefit or detriment to him or her, a member of his or her immediate family, or a business with which he or she is associated, which is distinguishable from the effects of such action on the public generally or a broad segment of the public, shall take the following actions. The idea that Senator Hunt is benefiting in any way, shape, or form specifically from the conversation on LB574 ignores the very crux of the argument that this doesn't just affect her. It affects a large segment of the population. I have sat and talked to families. I have sat and talked to the children that we are talking about LB574 affecting. We're not talking about one or two people in the state. We're not talking about a handful of folks who maybe are going to be affected by what has been discussed this entire session. We're talking about a large segment of the population. We're talking about children who want to stay in Nebraska. We're talking about families who are afraid and are being told that something is wrong with their children. And we're talking about a large group of people who's affected by this legislation. And I think Senator DeBoer pointed out really, really well that there's a number of things that we all somewhat benefit from when we vote on these legislations. But the reason that we're not in violation of 49-1499 is because it doesn't just affect us and it doesn't just affect our members of our family without actually affecting a broad segment of the public. And so the entire predicate of this complaint is that somehow LB574 only affects the family of Senator Hunt and I think that is offensive because it means that people aren't paying attention. It means that what we, what we've been hearing here and what people have been talking about on this floor, people aren't listening because this is not just a couple of folks. It's a large, large group of people in Nebraska that are affected by this. And so I wanted to make sure that I touched on that point. I think it is on its face a ridiculous complaint. I'm not surprised given how it's written. But at the end of the day--

KELLY: One minute.

DUNGAN: --thank you, Mr. President-- I just, I want to rise in support of Senator Hunt and my colleagues who have said this is a dangerous precedent to set. And that if we start doing this and if we start seeing this here in our body, it's going to intimidate, it's going to

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

threaten members to feel like they can't vote on things that affect more than a few people in the population and I think that's a dangerous road to walk down. And so I would urge my colleagues to stand up and maybe make a comment about this or let us know what you think about this, because I do think this is an important thing. People are obviously open to bring complaints if they want, but that doesn't mean we can't respond and I think that we should all have a strong response against this. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Dungan. Senator Fredrickson, you are recognized to speak.

FREDRICKSON: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. Good afternoon, Nebraskans. I rise, of course, in support of LB815, probably not in support of AM1270. But I also want to just to sort of-- I was listening to what Senator Conrad was saying earlier, and I wanted to rise and also stand in solidarity with Senator, with Senator Hunt here. And, you know, I hope that folks take the opportunity to actually read through the letter from Frank Daley and the complaint that is out there against Senator Hunt. And I've kind of hinted at this in different speeches I've given this session but one thing that I personally kind of sometimes find, it's easy to forget that what we do in here really has an impact on our state and on specifically the culture of our state. And I, I imagine if you don't fully grasp that, it might be because you've had the privilege of not having to fully grasp that. You know, Senator Hunt and I have had multiple conversations about the impact of some of the bills that have been introduced this session on, on our families and, you know, whether it's hateful emails we received or, you know, in one case I had a photo posted of me holding my son online and, and inferring-- well, I'm not even going to say what was inferred, but really not great, or now, in this case, an actual investigation into Senator Hunt's family. And, you know, I've heard colleagues complain about mean emails they've gotten or, you know, I kind of want to say, folks, if you're, if you're worried about a mean email, I, I invite you to look at my inbox any day. I think it might make you feel a little bit better about yours, perhaps. But I, I, I stand in strong solidarity with Senator Hunt. She's a friend, she's an incredible colleague, and she makes me incredibly proud to be a member of the LGBTQ community. So thank you, Senator Hunt, for all you do. I appreciate you. And I also strongly condemn what we've seen here from this pending investigation. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Fredrickson. Senator Brandt, you're recognized to speak.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

BRANDT: Thank you, Mr. President. The people of this state elected 49 good people to represent you to the best of their ability. I would echo Senator DeBoer on conflicts. Yesterday, we discussed ethanol. I'm a corn grower. I'm a taxpayer. I pay all manner of taxes in the state. This complaint, and let me make this very clear, ever since I have been in this Chamber, family is off limits. So I hope all the people watching out there get the message. You can come after me, but stay away from my family. I know people are upset about the filibuster. I get that all the time from my constituents. I tell them it is the senator's right under the rules. And who knows when I, as a rural senator, will need those rules. I will stand with Senators Hunt and Cavanaugh for their right to speak out. I do not endorse this offensive complaint. It is so far out of bounds that it does not merit discussion. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Brandt. Senator Blood, you're recognized to speak.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, I, too, stand in full support of my peer, Senator Megan Hunt. And I have to say that I am not surprised at any of this. I am not surprised because we've become a state where our democracy has been hijacked, where if we can't harass somebody enough on social media we try and make it personal. We don't care how ridiculous the charges are. We want to make it personal and we want to make sure that we hurt that person in every way possible. Unfortunately, Senator Hunt is not the only victim when it comes to this type of behavior but it is certainly a blatant example. Many of us signed on to a letter this year in support of Senator Slama when she had a personal issue with an individual. In full solidarity, we didn't care what her party was, we didn't care about past transgressions, all the women in this body signed that letter of support, regardless of how she treated us before or after, because that's the right thing to do. I would like to see more people stand up in support of Senator Hunt to show that this behavior is unacceptable, that these false reports are unacceptable. We aren't seeing any reports on the many people in here who have family members that are lobbyists. I'm not seeing conflict of interest statements on those. We're looking the other way on that stuff, and that is an issue that needs to be of concern if people are benefiting personally if their family member is an actual lobbyist. But what we know is that how society is now, we've empowered these disruptive voices. We've allowed people to come into our Rotunda because it is the people's second house and we do little when we see our fellow senators being attacked. We pretend we don't see it and we keep on walking. I've seen that happen multiple times. We're scared to stand up against those

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

that are attacking our peers because maybe they're from a different party. Maybe they have a different ideology. Maybe we just don't like them. But that takes away the spirit of the camaraderie we have always had in this body until recently. It is unacceptable to Senator Hunt, and I want to personally say I am so sorry. It's just wrong and it is unacceptable and you deserve better, as does everybody in this body if anything like this happens to them. We worked hard, many of us, not all of us, to get into these seats. We did it by knocking on doors and talking to our constituents and earning the right to be here and be their voice. And you in other districts may or may not like the senators that don't represent your district, but they're here to do a job for their constituents and do what they believe is for the greater good of all. We could, as Senator DeBoer said today, pretty much stand up on every single bill in this body and say how it somehow relates and benefits us. But as taxpayers, not that that big \$12,000 a year gets a whole lot of taxes, we also had the right to benefit from the bills that we pass because we live in the state.

KELLY: One minute.

BLOOD: With that said, I want to remind especially our freshmen senators that this is an opportunity for you to set the pace for the rest of your four years. Let Nebraskans know what you stand for and what you stand against, because one day it will likely be you or someone that you care for or someone that you respect. And if we allow this to happen and pretend that it's OK, we're opening that door to that opportunity for these people to be unnecessarily hateful, cruel, and to trample all over our democracy. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak, and this is your third opportunity on the amendment.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I'm, I'm a little humbled and I'm kind of embarrassed by that so thank you very much for all of your kind words. I know that as Nebraskans we really value our traditions and our beliefs and we believe in limited government and individual liberty and personal responsibility and trusting our neighbors and our community members to make the decisions that are best for them. But we also believe in fairness and equal opportunity for everybody. And I'm here to tell you that the policies that are being prioritized by this Legislature, let's just say LB574, let's say one bill, this bill is causing the kind of brain drain and harassment and it's not fair and it's not helping our state. We all know that Nebraska is a wonderful place to live. We have great schools, we have great businesses, we have friendly people and a strong sense of community. But we're losing

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

some of our best and brightest people because of the discriminatory policies that you are all supporting. I-- it's frustrating because I don't want to hear all of you speak up in support of me. I don't want you to get in the queue. I don't want to hear you speak up for me. I want to see you vote in support of me. To the kids and families, it's not just kids, it's their brothers and cousins and aunts and uncles and grandparents and families and teachers and friends and all the people who care for the kids that are impacted by your discriminatory votes. It hurts them. It physically and mentally and emotionally hurts them. And when they're going through this pain, when they're deciding what their escape route is going to be from the state where they are not welcomed and to welcome them costs you nothing. It doesn't take anything from your conservative bona fides. It doesn't take away anything from, from you and your beliefs at all just to recognize the humanity of these people. None of those people care if you stood up and supported me or my son or any of the trans kids on this floor. They only care how you voted. Please don't say anything to me if you're going to vote for that bill. When you look at complaints like this that are designed to intimidate, designed to harass, could it be that the point isn't about financial benefit? The point isn't actually about conflict of interest or accountability or anything like that. The point isn't that I could gain financially if my kid has rights, the point is the harassment. The harassment is the point. And we are seeing this all over the country. A friend of mine, Zoey Zephyr, who's the first transgender lawmaker in the state of Montana, she made a comment a week or two ago or something on the floor of the legislature, and they have their own rules, I don't know how it works in Montana, but she said verbatim, 95 percent sure this is verbatim, about how when they passed this bill blocking healthcare for trans people in Montana, the blood will be on lawmakers' hands. This is a phrase that has probably been said in this Legislature before, too, you know, regarding different things relating to different issues. And because she said that, Representative Zephyr was not allowed to speak ever since, she has not been called on by the president, she gets in the queue just like we do, her name comes up in the queue and she's not called on and she sits there in her chair with her green light on to speak and no one presiding--

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: --in their legislature has called on her to speak. They have effectively silenced a member of their legislature. And you know what they're doing today? In the past days, there have been people filling up the galleries and filling up outside the steps of the Montana Legislature in support of her saying let Zoey speak. Let's let her

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

follow the same rules that all of us have to follow and let her speak. And today, the Montana Legislature is taking a vote to expel her. This is the road we're going down, colleagues, complaints against your colleagues. In other states, they're arresting parents of trans kids. In Montana, they're expelling a senator. You might not think this is a big deal, but this is what you're doing. Open your eyes. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Arch, you are recognized to speak.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. President. I want to speak to those who are listening on cameras today and those outside this room, because there, there has been something that has really been bothering me over the last several months, and that is what I, I would-- I would call that a license has been granted to those outside of this body based upon passion. In other words, if I feel strongly enough about some topic I can pretty much do and say whatever it is that I want to do or say, as long as my passion is strong enough. And that's not right. That's inappropriate. The ends do not always justify the means. And that can be weaponizing of social media, that can be, I say we've all received them, hateful emails. I, I don't just disagree with your vote. I mean, like, I won't even repeat some of the things that we have all received when we don't vote a particular way. That is wrong. That is just wrong. We have strived very hard this session, there has been much conflict, but we have strived very hard to protect this institution. And outside influence, and I don't mean somebody that, that wants to make sure they understand their perspect-- wants to make sure we understand their perspective on policy, but I mean the outside influence that has the name calling and the vitriol and the hateful speech doesn't help us protect this institution. And then especially when it comes to attacks against families, they don't get elected, they're not down here. We sign up for taking the hits. They don't. And it is very difficult on families. And I want people outside this body to understand that, that, that we aren't some politician as though we don't have families and we don't have lives and we don't have-- we don't have our own personal issues that we wrestle with on a daily basis. We are striving to protect this institution so that we can hand it off to the generations to come. It does not promote civility in the room. Do not weaponize, measure your words carefully. Be civil. Express your positions on policy, we want to know that. But just because you can doesn't mean you should. And we have said that over and over and over again in this body. So there's a lot of weapons out there. And I don't mean literally, but I mean, there's, there's a lot of opportunity to cause all of us a lot of grief. Measure very

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

carefully. You're not helping the institution if you use that lightly. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Speaker Arch. Senator Raybould, you are recognized to speak.

RAYBOULD: Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank Speaker Arch for his words. It is a challenge in this institution to be mindful of the deep responsibility that each and every one of us have to make sure that we represent our constituents, that we represent our state, and that we follow the laws, rules and regulations that guide and direct us. It's really hard on some of the issues that we've been tasked to deal with, particularly on some of our colleagues that it tremendously impacts like Senator Hunt. You know, today I spoke at the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, along with Senator Dungan, on a lot of issues that are impacting the Legislature. And one CEO of a large organization asked me and asked Senator Dungan, are your colleagues not aware of some of the legislation they are pushing forward and how harmful it can be to our state of Nebraska in our ability to attract new companies, workforce, to retain our valuable professionals and organizations and companies by some of the things that you're taking up and discussing? They were concerned that we are not aware that for every great tax cut that we give corporations or reducing individual tax cuts or doing transformative things like Governor Pillen is doing when it comes to shifting the costs back to the state for funding public education that is so valuable and important to each and every one of us. They feel like what the Legislature is doing is hurtful and hateful. Senator Dungan, to his credit, was far more diplomatic than I could ever possibly be. He said I believe in my colleagues, they are working so hard to build relationships with each other so that we can craft great policy that impacts the majority of Nebraskans and work hard in doing so. I was not so optimistic. I said some of the divisiveness that is going on is spilling out into our state where people feel that they have a license to be hurtful and hateful to those that might not look like them, that have that little bit of diversity and difference. And that's really sad. That's not the Nebraska I grew up in, born and raised. So I ask my colleagues, it's hurtful when we see things happen to another colleague. Senator Blood said it wasn't surprising and sadly I agree with her. I've been on enough campaigns to, to know that people inflict all kinds of unnecessary administrative headaches on candidates when they run statewide races. They take time and resources to address these frivolous, unnecessary type of accusations. And it's frustrating because that's not Nebraska nice. That's not how we were raised. That's, you know, I think your parents would say that's not how I

raised you to do things like that, to treat people with kindness and compassion, particularly those who are different than you, who don't look like you, who don't think like you.

KELLY: One minute.

RAYBOULD: Thank you, Mr. President. So I'm committed to doing everything I can to work with my colleagues to come up with good policy that helps all Nebraskans and gets us back on, on track to doing the things that we were elected to do to help with the workforce crisis, to help with affordable housing, to help out with childcare. Why would any company want to come to our state of Nebraska if we have such negativity towards people that are LGBTQIA+? We don't have the workforce even if we were a stellar state that is embracing and inclusive and welcoming. We have a blueprint that tells us how to be a more welcoming state and that focuses on inclusivity and diversity as an asset and a strength and something that we all should be proud of. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

CONRAD: Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, colleagues. Wanted to add my gratitude to Speaker Arch, Senator Brandt, and others who have added important reflections to the debate and dialogue this afternoon on the mike. And I know many colleagues are having conversations about these matters off the mike and amongst each other as well which is very, very important. And I want to just add a few concluding thoughts and my final time on the mike I, I think on this matter. But I think we have to be really clear-eyed about how we got here and what we're talking about. LB574 is ripping this institution apart. One bill is ripping this institution apart. One bill is ripping this institution apart. Why are we allowing that? Why would we-- why do we allow that when we see a level of acrimony and pain in this body and in our state that has serious problems from a legal policy and practical perspective? We need, we need to listen to that. We need to not double down and push forward at all costs. We've taken up very divisive, very challenging issues before that hasn't brought this type of damage to this institution. That is telling in its own right and we have to grapple with that and we have to acknowledge that. There have been other members who have been unfairly targeted by unfair media stories, awful things on social media and awful commentary on this mike as well. I've tried my best to address each of those when they've come forward, and I've perhaps fallen short in being as consistent and as voracious as I can be. But I want to ask my colleagues to use this

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

moment to reset. This measure is about our institution. Let's reset together. We have made mistakes. We have gone too far, but we have a chance at every moment of every day to step back from the abyss together in regards to this measure that's tearing us apart, in regards to the hateful, harmful politics that is washing across our democracy and across our beloved country and across our beloved state and communities. Whether it's expulsions or censures that are happening in other state legislators, whether it's the unprecedented nature of things that have happened in this body this year, let's use this moment to reset together and say enough is enough. We need to take up the people's business in regards to so many important issues and we need to heed these lessons that have been presented to us day after day after day that this measure is too divisive and should not be advanced. We have an opportunity each day and each moment to not harden our hearts, but to open them when new information is presented. More information has been presented each day about how divisive this measure is and how it hurts our relationships and our--

KELLY: One minute.

CONRAD: --institution. Let's learn from this painful example, let's reset our intentions together, let's rethink forging forward with this divisive measure that's hurting this body, and let's make sure that we honor the institution and the people's business to our highest and best ability for our remaining days of this session. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Conrad. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on AM1270.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. So when Senator Hunt first told me about this Accountability and Disclosure filing or not Accountability and Disclosure, I guess complaint, I have the Accountability and Disclosure letterhead in front of me, this complaint, I was obviously as everyone taken aback by it. I mean, it's frivolous. It's completely frivolous and it's malicious. It's an Internet troll who's taking their trolling offline and into the real world. The individual who filed this complaint is the same person who a rally out in the Rotunda was taking photographs of children. And when I approached him and said you should stop taking photographs of these children, he said, well, they're in a public space. And I said, yes, they are but you still shouldn't be taking pictures of other people's children. And I knew that he was an Internet troll and I was genuinely concerned that his lack of judgment was going to lead to him posting pictures of children attending a rally in opposition of LB574

and post them on social media, because clearly this is the level of judgment we're dealing with. So unfortunately, unfortunately, I am not in the slightest bit surprised that somebody that would take pictures of children would go the next step and file a claim of harassment against our colleague. People in this Chamber don't file conflicts of interest for things that they very clearly should be filing conflicts of interest for, things that where you have a vested, direct financial, significant financial benefit. And I don't just mean taxes, I take Senator DeBoer's, you know, comments, tax cuts impact everyone in some manner. Tax increases impact everyone in some manner, but there are some things, incentives, programs, there are lots of things that we do in this body that directly impact individual members. An example just caught my eye. Senator Ballard's family owns a vineyard. Senator Ballard abstained from voting on any bill that had to do with the liquor laws that directly benefited his family's business, not his business, it wasn't bakery related, but his family's business. That is what we are supposed to do. That is what we are supposed to do. And we don't have frivolous things filed against us when we don't. This is an assault. This is an assault on Senator Hunt and her family. And the only person who should be standing up here who should be decrying this is the person who introduced the bill at the center of this. But that person refuses to stand up and say, hey, folks, I'm just trying to save the children here. Don't attack my colleague and their kid. No, because this is an attack on our colleague and her kid and that's why the introducer of the bill doesn't get up and do that, because that is the intention of it. That is the intention of it.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: I appreciate the comments that have been made here. I appreciate the comments of individuals who I am not aligned with that have been made here about this institution because it is important and it is valuable. But I also am not going to lose sight of the fact that this is an assault and you are voting to take away your colleague's parental rights. And this, this document is just another slash of it. It is inappropriate. It is offensive. It is offensive. Call of the house. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator. There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house be placed under call? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 14 ayes, 3 nays to place the house under call.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Cavanaugh, we're missing Senator Wayne. How do you wish to proceed? Machine vote. Thank you, Senator. The question is the amendment, AM1270, the adoption of AM1270. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 34 nays [SIC], Mr. President, on adoption of AM1270.

KELLY: The amendment is not adopted. Raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Mr. President, concerning LB815, the next amendment, AM1272, offered by Senator Machaela Cavanaugh.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Sorry, I had my computer closed. AM1272, there is 11 minutes left on this, colleagues, so just an FYI that there's 11 minutes left on this so, this strikes, this strikes the enacting clause. Thank you to Margaret. AM1272 strikes the enacting clause. Again, not a great idea, but if you feel so inclined, then I guess vote for it. OK, so let's see here: Voting to raise your own pay status, state lawmakers in a bind. We are not voting to raise our own pay status because we can't. We can vote to put it to a vote of the people, but we cannot vote to increase our own pay. So when there's those booming commercials saying Senator So-and-so wanted to increase their own salary by 100 percent or 200 percent, then you know that's not entirely true. Well, yes, I would like to increase my salary by 200 percent. That would make it \$36,000 a year. That would be amazing. I think I still would make less than the city council in Omaha or around the same. Maybe I'd be on par, maybe it'd be on par with the city council. But, yeah, I totally would vote to increase my salary by 200 percent. Two hundred percent, I would vote 200 percent of the time, but we can't do that. We can only vote to put it to a vote of the people. So any attack ad saying that I voted to increase my salary would mean that they snuck into the voting booth with me and took a picture of my very private ballot, because that's the only way you would know if I voted to give myself an increase. Because I might vote to put it on the ballot and then vote against it, but voting to put it to a vote of the people is not voting to increase your salary. So in Nebraska, if you see an attack ad against anyone in the Legislature and it attacks them for wanting to-- voting to increase

their salary, either somebody got hold of their actual ballot, which I think is a federal crime, or they are misrepresenting that they voted to put it to a vote of the people. OK. Voting to raise your own pay status puts state lawmakers in a bind. This is Stateline article April 13, 2023. Oh, just this month. This is a six-minute read. Well, thank you Stateline for telling me how long of a read it is and I have about seven minutes left to go. New York Republican Assemblywoman Mary Beth Walsh debates a bill to prove a legislative pay raise during a special session at the State Capitol in Albany in December 2022. It's a photograph. Lawmakers across the country are weighing the options of salary increases. Why, yes, they are, because it is a job and we have families and bills like every other human does. So, yes, we are contemplating a pay increase. Persistently low salaries discourage everyday citizens from serving in state legislatures, state legislators who face an uphill battle to raise pay. Quote, could a single parent be a state rep? Absolutely not. If you are the sole wage earner in a family, you can't afford it, or even if you're the primary wage earner, Louisiana State Rep Joe Marino said in an interview with Stateline. Well, Joe Marino, Senator Hunt is doing it. I think she would agree that she'd like to be paid more, but she is a single parent. I just wanted to note, shout out to my single parents out there. The salary for a Louisiana state lawmaker is \$16,800 a year, unchanged since 1980. Wow. Yikes. Marino, an Independent, introduced a bill in March that would hike legislators' salaries to \$60,000 a year, \$4,600 less than what \$16,800 would be in today's dollars. Unless salaries are raised, he said, we'll have a legislature of wealthy or retired people. Yep, yep, or people who are willing to be very poor. Very poor. Yes. Yes, you will have wealthy or wealthy and retired people and not a good representation of the people. And those of us that are not wealthy and retired, it is a financial burden. It is a financial burden. I put money away every month to a NEST account, which I probably should file a, a conflict of interest on because I think we vote on a NEST bill at some point in time. So if one comes up, I'll do that. Don't want David Begley to come after me. So I put money away every month for my kids' NEST accounts, \$10 for each of them, \$30, \$30 a month, because that is what I can afford. That is what I put away every month for my children, because that is what I can afford. And even that is a very purposeful decision to do, because I think it's important to be investing in their educational future. But I make \$12,000 a year, I clear \$900 and I think \$81 a month. And of that \$981, or no, nope, \$991. Of that \$991, \$30 of it goes to my kids' college or postsecondary savings account; \$10 for each of them. It is hard. It is hard. It is a job and it is a job that should be treated as a job but we are where we are. OK. Unless salaries are

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

raised, he said, we'll have a legislature of only wealthy and retired people. State legislative salaries range widely. In New York, lawmakers gave themselves a 29 percent raise to \$142,000 annually as of January, making the legislature the highest paid in the country. At the other end of the spectrum, New Mexico legislators receive no salary. That is bananas, New Mexico. I am sorry, but you got to pay people for their work. Many states also pay a per diem rate during sessions, which may be taxable as income and mileage. New Mexico lawmakers receive per diem and mileage so they are not the lowest paid in the country, that distinction goes to New Hampshire which pays \$100 a year with no per diem. New Hampshire's nominal salary has been in the state's constitution since 1889, and New Mexico's unpaid legislature dates to the constitution adopted with statehood in 1912. What is the inflation on \$100 from 1889? That is-- I hope somebody tweets that at me. I would love to know 1889, what would \$100 be today versus in 1889? Yikes. Probably a fortune. Efforts this year in both legislatures--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --thank you, Mr. President-- in both legislatures to put the question of salaries to voters failed. OK. Resistance to higher state legislative salaries is purposeful and historic. New Hampshire and New Mexico are among states that prize a, quote, citizen legislature, end quote, people from different walks of life who meet the state at the State Capitol for a few weeks or months and go back to their regular jobs, rather than professional politicians who make a career out of legislating. I'm going to call real baloney Skittles on that. Who, who is a working person can leave their, just leave their job for a few weeks or months? No one. We don't even have paid leave here. You're going to get-- so you're leaving your job and not getting paid to leave your job to go do another job that's not paying you because you want to have citizen legislators. Yeah, I'm still a citizen.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, I am still a citizen and, and a legislator. And now I'm looking, I'm, like, oh, wait, I thought maybe we were going to cloture in one minute, two minutes, ten minutes? So, yes, it is baloney Skittles to say that you're not going

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

to pay your legislators who you require to leave their job if they have one to come and work for weeks or months at a time because you don't want them to be professional politicians? Do you want them to feed their families? Do you want them to apply for SNAP and TANF instead? I mean, yeah. OK. So smaller and more rural states tend to have part-time legislatures, pay legislators less and have smaller legislative staff, while the largest states usually have full-time legislators, pay the most and have large legislative staff according to the National Conference on State Legislatures. This is just a, a thought, neither here nor there really, but it's a thought that I have. When we say that smaller-- more rural states, I am intrigued by this concept, what states-- like, don't most states have agribusiness? Maybe not the really, like, land small states, like New Hampshire or Delaware or Vermont or Maine, maybe they-- but, no, Maine has, Maine has fruit. There's, there is an agribusiness out of Maine. I know Maine blueberries, I think, is a big one. So when we say, like, rural states, aren't most states have some type of agribusiness? California, huge agribusiness; Oregon, again, lots of vineyards and probably other things, I think maybe peaches. Georgia definitely has peaches. So I think we're about done so I'm going to yield the remainder of my time. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Mr. Clerk, you have a motion on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Arch would move to invoke cloture pursuant to Rule 7, Section 10.

KELLY: Senator Arch, for what purpose do you rise?

ARCH: Call of the house and roll call vote in regular order.

KELLY: 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: 20 ayes, 4 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. All senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. All unexcused members are now present. Members, the first vote is the motion to invoke cloture. There's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

CLERK: Senator Aguilar voting yes. Senator Albrecht voting yes. Senator Arch voting yes. Senator Armendariz voting yes. Senator Ballard voting yes. Senator Blood voting yes. Senator Bosn. Senator Bostar voting yes. Senator Bostelman voting yes. Senator Brandt voting yes. Senator Brewer. Senator Briese. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Clements. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator Day. Senator DeBoer voting yes. Senator DeKay voting yes. Senator Dorn voting yes. Senator Dover voting yes. Senator Dungan voting yes. Senator Erdman voting yes. Senator Fredrickson voting yes. Senator Halloran not voting. Senator Hansen voting yes. Senator Hardin voting yes. Senator Holdcroft voting yes. Senator Hughes voting yes. Senator Hunt voting yes. Senator Ibach voting yes. Senator Jacobson voting yes. Senator Kauth voting yes. Senator Linehan. Senator Lippincott voting yes. Senator Lowe voting yes. Senator McDonnell voting yes. Senator McKinney. Senator Moser voting yes. Senator Murman voting yes. Senator Raybould voting yes. Senator Riepe voting yes. Senator Sanders voting yes. Senator Slama voting yes. Senator Vargas. Senator von Gillern voting yes. Senator Walz voting yes. Senator Wayne. Senator Wishart voting yes. Vote is 39 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to invoke cloture.

KELLY: Cloture is invoked. Members, the next question is the adoption of AM1272. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 38 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of the amendment.

KELLY: Senator Ballard for a motion.

BALLARD: Mr. President, I move that LB815 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: The motion is to advance LB815 to engrossment, E&R Engrossment. All those in favor vote aye; all those-- say aye. All those opposed say no-- nay. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. It is advanced. Raise the call. Mr. Clerk, next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, some items quickly, communication from Senator Moser as Chairperson of the Telecommunications Committee informing the Legislature that the Transportation Committee has selected Senator DeKay as the Vice Chair. Additionally, amendment to be printed from Senator Riepe to LB131. In regards to the agenda, Mr. President, LB816, Select File. Senator Clements would withdraw motion 928 and 929. Senator Clements would offer motion 930, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: Senator Wishart, you're authorized to open on the motion.

WISHART: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Clements is down listening in on the Fiscal forecast and so he asks that I remind this body of the-- what LB816 does. So LB816 was introduced by the Speaker at the request of the Governor and it's part of the Governor's biennial budget recommendations. This bill provides for the funding of the salaries and benefits of certain state officers as required by the state constitution and laws of the state of Nebraska. This bill includes judges as well as elected constitutional officers, the Parole Board, and the Tax Commissioner. And this bill contains an emergency clause and it would become operative July 1, 2023. With that, I will withdraw that motion. Thank you.

KELLY: It's withdrawn.

CLERK: Mr. President, in regards to LB816, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would offer AM1273.

KELLY: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on the amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK, this is AM1273. Oh, we're taking, got to take-- I got it. I got it. I'm, I'm following-- I'm following the board. Got, got confused for a second. OK, AM1273 strikes the enacting clause. Now I noticed a couple of you pushed your green lights on that last one, I got-- not going to lie, I got slightly panicked, Senator Hansen, you were going to keep it green. I was, like, don't, no, no, vote red. Don't vote for my amendment. I do have an amendment on a bill later that I would love for you to vote for. This is not it. OK, so this is striking the enacting clause in, oh, well, that didn't work the way I had hoped. LB816 appropriates funds for salaries for constitutional officers. OK. I was going old school with the paper, and then I just threw papers everywhere. A little commentary of the Chamber, it is freezing in here today. And yesterday, in the afternoon it was a furnace. And so today I did something that I don't normally do, I don't have sleeves. And I-- my hand is, like, I have to keep shaking it, it is so cold. I am cold. I cannot moderate my temperature in this Chamber to save my life. I come in because it's cold outside, come in with a jacket, ready, going to be warm, going to be cozy, and then it's like a furnace in here and I, like, all right. So today I was, like, oh, it is going to be 70 degrees and it was so hot in there yesterday, I will, I will-- I'm not going to be hot today. Today, I am going to be even temperature. I'm going to moderate my temperature and now it is freezing. I am so cold,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

so, sorry, if you see me, like, trying to warm up my hands over the campfire. This light is not giving off heat which is fine, I don't want it to, like, burn me, but I wouldn't mind if it gave off a little bit of heat. Anyways, that was my commentary. OK, so back to the salaries for constitutional officers. Well, well, well, Mr. President, looks like we're talking about your salary. I might want to throw up an amendment for that two-day per diem-- \$2 per day per diem, model ourselves after Nevada. But I would make it \$5 so you could at least afford the salad bar downstairs. Seems reasonable. OK, so constitutional officers' salaries-- that last bill we all voted on and I don't think any of us filed conflict of interest so whatever that's worth. Let's see here, how the minority gets work done in supermajority chambers. Yeah, we already, we already know that. Oh, this is a nice one. Wait, got to get in the queue. OK, this is from NCSL State Legislatures News Special Report: Groups Help Lawmakers Pursue Civility and Bipartisanship, the Unicorns of Politics. A State Legislatures News Special Report, March 21, 2023: Ask 97-year-old Arlene Reichert for a surefire way to promote bipartisanship, and she'll cite a personal experience that led her to conclude that legislators should not sit separately by party across the proverbial aisle. Well, we don't do that. We sit however, our seating-- I was asked this question just this morning, how our seating is done. It is done like so many other things in this building, by seniority. If you have seniority, you get to pick where you sit before others do. If you do not, you have to wait until others pick where they sit and then you get filed in accordingly. My seniority has me two rows back from where I was for four years. I actually didn't ask to move for the first, the first time-- the first times I had an opportunity to move. I didn't ask to move because I sat by the same people for the entirety of my first four years. I had, right there was Senator Walz, right there was Senator Wishart, and then myself, and then right in front of me was Senator Matt Hansen for four years. And so I was, like, well, if you all aren't moving, we got a good groove going here, that's fine. But Senator Matt Hansen was term limited out, and I knew that Senator Walz and Senator Wishart were moving to that back area there. And I thought, you know what, I think I'd like to move a little bit further back. So I put in the request to move further back, hence two rows back. I am not entirely, I'm not 100 percent on board with it, though. I'm so used to sitting, like, off to the side over there. I see Senator Hardin sits over there a lot and I'm, like, got to, got to be real, Senator Hardin, I'm a little envious of you sitting over in that spot because that's what I used to think of as my spot. Of course, it wasn't my spot but I sat there a lot when, get this, when I wasn't talking. I used to sit over there a lot when I wasn't talking because

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

I used to not talk so much so I had a spot that wasn't my desk. The good old days, memories. OK, so back to the seating assignments. So legislators should not sit separated by party across the proverbial aisle. Reichert, one of the 100 delegates elected to rewrite Montana's Constitution in 1972, says she and her colleagues decided to sit in alphabetical order. When we gathered in Helena for our orientation, the first thing we decided is we were going to forget partisan politics. And that was a very important factor, says Reichert, the oldest of the ten delegates still living. By the time the constitution was written, we didn't even know the political party affiliations of our seatmates. Great. Not only did the collection of Montanans from all walks of life come to an unanimous agreement on the constitution six days ahead of schedule, they also became lifelong friends, Reichert said. Having Republicans and Democrats sit in alternating seats or sitting alphabetically or just a couple of the many-- are just a couple of the many ways states have tried to foster bipartisanship among lawmakers. I got to be honest, I'm glad we don't sit alphabetically and I think-- this, this is the time where I'm going to do it, I'm going to be bold, I'm going to speak for my brother. I think he appreciates that we don't sit alphabetically because I do not think he wants to sit next to me. So I, of course, stand for correction. He is welcome to correct the record if he wants, but I don't think that he would appreciate us sitting alphabetically unless it was something like his seat was there and then we started over the next row and I was here, maybe that would be enough distance. But as it is for people who are not inside the Chamber, so I sit, I don't know, is it stage right, stage left because I'm on the-- am I on the stage or are they the stage? Hard to say. I sit on the right-hand side all the way on the end of the right-hand side, and my brother sits on the left-hand side all the way on the end. So the only way we could really sit further apart is to sit on those ends, but at opposite front and back so we do not sit close to each other.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: And if it were alphabetical, I fear-- actually, the way I was just describing it, if we went all the way across in a row alphabetical and he was at the end of the row, we would be exactly where we are now. Maybe it would have worked out for us, Senator John Cavanaugh, maybe it would have. A gamble I'm not willing to take. I think the way we do it now is just fine. OK. At a time when evidence is of a deep divide shows up every day on social media and in the news, a growing number of national organizations are dedicated to promoting bipartisanship and civility. They offer legislators fresh ideas about working across the aisles; they say it takes a steady

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

effort to build and strengthen bipartisan work. But researchers also say that the effort improves passage rates for legislation and can build public trust. Across the Aisle: Exploring Bipartisanship. NCSL's--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator, and you are next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. NCSL's "Across the Aisle" podcast examines the steady effort many lawmakers are making to strengthen civility and bipartisan work. Quote, civility is not just good manners, it's really being able to get something done, says Beth Harwell, the Republican former speaker of the Tennessee House who joined the discussion. You can listen now. OK, back to the article: Laurel Harbridge-Yong, an associate political science professor at Northwestern University and a faculty fellow at the Institute for Policy Research, has studied bipartisanship for years at the federal and state levels. What we find is that there's strong positive relationship between legislators' records of bringing in bipartisan cosponsors on their legislation and having legislative success, she says. That's true even when a party has a so-called supermajority, enabling it to pass whatever it wants without minority support. We find that bipartisanship is valuable for both majority and minority members, Harbridge-Yong says. Bipartisanship Gets a Boost: In the past decade or so, national organizations have formed to develop best practices and train state legislators. The National Institute for Civil Discourse, formed in the wake of a shooting that wounded U.S. Representative Gabby Giffords of Arizona and killed six others, has a program called Next Generation, which runs civility workshops. Compromise is not a dirty word, and working with each other is actually a goal we should all strive for, says Republican former Tennessee House Speaker Beth Harwell, who manages the Next Generation program. She made a point of bringing the civility workshop to her chamber while she was in leadership. Quote, I found a lot of the skills that I learned in this program were very beneficial in helping members understand the role of a minority party, the importance of listening to their ideas and taking the thoughts that they gave and allowing them to be applied to the policy-- oh, gosh, I need to get in the queue. Apologies, just occurred to me. OK-- applied to the policies we are forming, Harwell says. Another key point from the program for the majority party was to treat others what way we would like to be treated. Well, that's the Golden Rule. Do unto others as you would have done unto yourself. Yeah, I think the Golden Rule is a good rule, the do unto others, do unto others; do no harm is another one. Those are good rules to live by. Sometimes when people criticize me or say unkind things, I think are you trying to hurt me? Because

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

let me just tell you, you cannot be as critical of me as I am of myself. Although, I would not lay the criticism on others that I lay upon myself. I-- so maybe I shouldn't do unto others, be kinder to others than you are, than you are to yourself. Treat yourself with as much kindness as you would treat others with. There we go. That'd be good. OK, lost my place. That's shocking. OK. The Next Generation program goes to a state only when invited by the leadership. To ensure there's strong support, the workshops start with participants getting to know one another beyond party and beyond the work in the Capitol. Quote, one of the first things we do is really develop an understanding of--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --each other, Harwell says. Thank you, Mr. President. It's surprising how much people have never really taken the time to get to know each other, even though they serve in the legislative body. When you understand someone else's experiences, you're more willing to treat them with respect. Thank you. Oh, my goodness gracious, Tanner just brought me my jacket. That is so sweet. See, and it's administrative professional's day, and you're still doing sweet things for me. Thank you. That was so thoughtful. I'm going to put it on because I am actually cold. Oh, it's got my buttons on it. I forgot, wasn't wearing buttons today. Oh, thank you, Tanner. Gosh, Tanner and Margaret are the best. OK. Leadership of the Delaware House of Representatives decided to hold the civility workshop to open this year's--

KELLY: That's your time,--

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: --Senator. And, Senator Hunt, you're next-- recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Yeah, Senator Ballard was here. Sometimes I go to other people's desks and talk to them and Senator Dungan's mike is way up here and Senator Fredrickson. There have been some senators where they've got to pull it, like, all the way up taut and straight and couldn't be me. This weekend, I got some news via Instagram stories, the way we all get our news, and I learned on there that one of my friends who I've known for a really long time is moving out of Nebraska. And I was kind of surprised by that because she's one of those girls who's, you know, progressive but proud Nebraskan, corn fed, born and raised type of gal and really kind of made, like,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Midwestern life a part of her identity. And I saw on her Instagram story, she posted a picture at the airport and she said something like, this is my last time at the airport as a resident of Nebraska and that's how I learned that she's moving. And I want to talk about something that I think is very important, which is the idea of politics driving Nebraskans out of their own homes and own communities. And this friend of mine, she's not leaving because of a lack of job opportunities or because of a personal issue or anything like that. She's leaving because of politics. Specifically, she's leaving because of the radical culture war issues that are being discussed by this Legislature this year in 2023 and she's not the only one. People are saying enough. That's it. They're saying what you won't say, what even moderates of this body, even people who are trying to get along, even people who are trying to find a way out of this, are not willing to say enough, it's been enough. And this is a problem that all of us should be really concerned about. When politics are driving people out of their communities, it means we're not doing something right. It means that we're failing the people who put their trust in us to make the state a better place and it means that we're hurting ourselves in the long run. I've heard some of you say, well, what about conservatives? We have to make the state a safe place for conservatives. I think you guys are OK. The fact that a trans person can get healthcare, whether they're 35 or 18 or the fact that a woman who is experiencing a miscarriage at 12 weeks can go to the doctor and that she can trust that doctor to provide the standard of care and help her, procedures that many of your wives have had by the way, that doesn't make the state less safe for you as a conservative. It's so absurd to say something like that, but you say it with your own mouths. Well, how are we going to make the state safe for conservatives? Bro, we want the state to be safe for everybody. Don't you? Don't you want that? We're hurting ourselves. We live in a democracy and that means that we have the right to vote for the people who are going to represent us in government and we trust these people to make decisions on our behalf, decisions that will make our lives better and our communities stronger. But when we make decisions that go against the will of the people we represent, when we prioritize our own political agenda over the well-being of our constituents, when we take votes that literally, physically, emotionally, mentally harm the people we represent--

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: --thank you, Mr. President-- when we do that, we're failing in our duty. We're failing this institution, we're failing each other, and we're failing the people of Nebraska. And the consequences of

these failures are real. When people leave their communities, they take with them their skills and their knowledge and their experience, their families in often cases, their passion and they leave behind these holes in our communities that are really difficult to fill. They take with them a piece of our state's future. If we want to create a bright future for Nebraska, we've got to make sure that we're doing everything we can to keep our best and our brightest here. And I know you know that because your kids are telling you, your wives are begging you, what these policies are is not popular. And you know this, let's work our way out. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Ibach has guests in the north balcony, fourth graders from Bryan Elementary in Lexington, Nebraska. Please stand and be recognized by your Nebraska Legislature. Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak, and this is your last time before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. I have been schooled by my nine-year-old; Golden Rule is out, Platinum Rule is in. The Platinum Rule is a variation of the Golden Rule that calls for a more thoughtful approach when dealing with others. As opposed to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you," as the Golden Rule states, the Platinum Rule asks you to "do unto others wherever possible as they would want to be done to them." That is a much better approach. That is much more thoughtful. It does not assume that everyone thinks and feels and engages the same way you do. It causes you to pause and take into consideration the person in front of you and their wants and needs. Yeah, makes sense. I received a text message from my husband informing me of this. The Golden Rule, out. Out. Platinum Rule is where it is at. There's a Diamond Rule. Diamond Rule, "treat others as you wish you-- as they wish you to treat them. I don't-- I'm not-- I think that one's going to take more for me to unpack, so I'm going to just come back to that another time after I can read it again. OK. I did just submit some amendments to this bill that, again, thank you to my staff, I am quite excited about it. I think that they are fantastic. And when we get to them, feel free to vote green. They don't create any sort of constitutional crisis. Oh, my goodness, I see we have a new page in our midst. Well, well, well. Even got the dress code memo. Senator Wayne has joined the pages up front. I don't know, I don't know if I'm disclosing a secret here or not, but one late night, my first year, Senator Wayne was sitting up front with the pages. And I asked what he did, and he told me he always does this. At least once a year, he sits with the pages and acts as a page for, for part of the day. So I don't know how, if you all do anything like you have any grunt work that you make the newest or the youngest page, but

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

he has done this before, so I guess he's not the, like, greenest of green pages. But be sure and give him some hard task for sure. For sure. If I-- if he-- if I happen to, like, punch the button and get Senator Wayne, I'll probably send him to the Bill Room. He knows where that is. That's too easy because that's too close-- that's close to your office. No, I'm not going to do that. All right, I got to get creative. Unless somebody beats me to it. Somebody could beat me to it. I see Senator Aguilar, he's, he's over there. He's thinking about what he's-- if he gets Senator Wayne to come, he's thinking about what he's going to do. Oh, boy. Now I've put everybody on to it, everybody's going to be thinking. No. All right. So appreciate our pages.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: And, it's an interesting experience, I can imagine. So the pages do all kinds of things. You maybe see them in committee hearings. They help distribute the materials during committee hearings. They-- this is very old school, very old school. But we have in committee hearing, we have old pads of paper. And they are oftentimes-- we're very frugal in the state of Nebraska-- they're oftentimes recycled, repurposed letterhead from previous senators. And they, they bind them into little notepads. And we have these little notepads, quarter, quarter-page notepads and legit, like, write notes and pass notes. I've had a note passed to me during a committee hearing just to say I'm stepping out, can you take over chairing the hearing?

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: Senator Hunt, you are recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Continuing some of my thoughts that I was just sharing, I've also heard some of you argue that if our politics don't work for someone, then maybe they should just leave. Maybe this isn't the right state for them. But this is so shortsighted and narrow-minded. Not everybody can leave so easily. And why would you be proud of living in a state where people want to leave just because of our politics? When we lose people because of bad politics, we're hurting ourselves in the long run. We're weakening our communities. We weaken our communities, we reduce our collective knowledge and our collective skills and we make it harder for our entire state to thrive. And that's whether we're targeting people

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

based on their race or their gender or their immigration status or their gender identity or sexual orientation, what language they speak, whatever it may be. We need to do better. We need to make sure that our elected officials are listening to the will of the people and that they're making decisions that are best for all of us, not just best for their own political careers and not just best for the leaders of their own personal parties that they belong to, whatever that is. We have to priority-- prioritize the needs of our constituents, the needs of residents of Nebraska over any kind of narrow partisan interests at all. And we have to make sure that we're creating a welcoming and inclusive environment for all Nebraskans. We can't afford to drive people away because of their political beliefs, their race, their gender, or any other factor. We need to be a state that welcomes everyone, that values everyone, that works to create a better future for everybody. As I said before, the idea that people should simply leave if they don't agree with the politics of their state or community is shortsighted and narrow-minded. It assumes that people can easily uproot themselves from their homes, families and communities, and that doing so will have no negative consequences for anyone. That you would personally be better off, perhaps if there were no trans people in Nebraska. But the reality is that when people leave, it has a ripple effect that touches everyone. Everyone in Nebraska is a really valuable asset that can help our communities thrive, and losing them can set us back in many ways. When people leave, we also lose the benefits of their diverse perspectives and ideas. A state or a community that's open to a range of viewpoints and ideas is more likely to be innovative and successful. But when people with different perspectives feel unwelcome or unsupported, they're more likely to leave. And then that leads to homogenization of the state, where everybody thinks and acts in the same way. It hurts creativity, it hurts innovation, it hurts progress and business. And another consequence of people leaving is that it weakens our social fabric. Communities are built on relationships, and when people move away, those relationships are disrupted. It's a really big deal that-- you know, I got on this topic because I saw that a a good friend of mine I didn't know was moving away. And I saw that online on her Instagram story that this was her last time in Nebraska as a Nebraska resident or whatever she said. And it's amazing to me because this is a person who has been involved in the nonprofit community for a long time. She's worked her way up to the top of her field in the nonprofit community.

KELLY: One minute.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. She's been active and engaged. She's worked at different foundations; and in the world and in that industry, she worked all the way to the top. So this isn't somebody moving for a job. This is someone who already has a job and is able to work remotely and is choosing not to do that in our state anymore. And why is that? It's because of our politics. It's literally because of this Legislature in this session, specifically, the radical culture war issues you are pushing against the will of Nebraskans and the way you have run roughshod over the people of Nebraska who have trusted you with their vote, who trust you to make Nebraska a place for everyone. And you have let them down. So you understand when some of you stand up and say things like, good, if our politics don't work for you, then maybe you should move. When you say that, you're really hurting yourself and you're really putting your own state down. When people leave, we also lose the economic benefits that they bring. People who leave, they take their money with them. My friend who's moving, she's keeping her job. She's keeping her six-figure job, by the way. But that money's going out of Nebraska. This is going to have a negative aspect of--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: You're next in the queue, and that's your last time on the amendment.

HUNT: Thank you. When people take their income out of Nebraska, it has a negative impact, most of all, our local economies. That's people who aren't going to the corner bakery anymore, who aren't going to the coffee shop anymore, who aren't going to the bookstore anymore. To say nothing about, you know, the taxes and fees and things that they aren't paying to the state anymore. They also take with them the potential for future economic growth. They might have been involved in starting or growing a business or investing in local projects or contributing to the local tax base. When we lose all of this social capital, that's what makes us more divided and more distrustful, more isolated. And all of these factors contribute to a weaker, less vibrant community. They make it harder for us to attract new residents in the first place, to grow our economy, to build a thriving, sustainable, stable future for our state. It also affects the people who choose to remain here. It makes it harder for them to feel a sense of belonging and purpose. And they see their friends and neighbors leaving the state and they wonder what their future holds. So what can we do to prevent more people from leaving? For one thing, we've got to

get off this anti-trans bill. Everybody hates it. Everybody in the body hates it. Nebraskans hate it. I hate it. I would rather do literally anything else. I even offered to trade a vote to Senator Linehan for the Opportunity Scholarship bill. That's how deep. It's just gone way too far when we're getting into the attacks on people's human rights. You want a tax credit or an incent-- all we have is money that we give out to people for tax credits. That's all we do in here, other than discriminate, hate against other people who the introducer of LB574 says she doesn't even want to have living in this state. So that's where we're left. Why is that something that we should be proud of? It's a shame. Past statesmen of this state, past Legislatures never would have even gone there. We would never even be entertaining a conversation like this. We need to create a more welcoming, inclusive and supportive community. And that means prioritizing the needs of our residents, the needs of Nebraskans who reach out to us all the time over the culture war, over the narrow partisan interests that nobody actually cares about that don't have any impact on the quality of your life, but could have a deep, deep impact on harming someone else. It means investing in our schools, investing in our healthcare system, our infrastructure, so we can provide the best quality of life to people. And that's when we have a state that we can really be proud of, when we know that people are better off. Not better off because the books are banned. Not better off because we're not learning about, you know, racial segregation in the history of our country. Not better off because there's no more trans and gay people in the state. Not better off because women are dying from miscarriages during their pregnancies. It means promoting diversity, it means equity and justice for everybody. It means equality before the law so that everybody feels welcome and valued. And it means creating opportunities for people to participate in the political process, so their voices are heard and their needs are met and they know that they have a voice at the ballot box. And they know that they actually have an opportunity to vote for someone who's going to represent them. The idea that people should simply leave if they don't agree with the politics of a state is wrong. When people leave, we lose their skills, knowledge and experience.

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. And we lose the benefit of their diverse perspectives and ideas. It weakens our social fabric. It weakens our economic power. It divides us. It's got us arguing. It reduces our sense of community. But by working to create a more welcoming and supportive community, we can prevent people from leaving and we can build a stronger, more vibrant state for everybody. And we

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

can model that behavior here in the Legislature. I think that's what we should commit to do. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on AM1273.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK, So, let's see here. I was reading this article bipartisan gets-- gets a boost. This is from NCSL. I'm probably going to reread where I left off. The leadership of the Delaware House of Representatives decided to hold the civility workshop to open this year's session. Majority Leader Valerie Longhurst (D)-- I think that's irrelevant, but-- says they wanted to welcome new members and bounce back from the disconnect and-- of the pandemic years of Zoom calls. While Democrats are in the majority, Longhurst says the state has a history of the parties working together, but they wanted to build on that. They're now planning a dinner together and activities like volleyball or ziplining. She says the workshop helped in ways constituents will be able to observe. What we did discuss in our conference civility training was social media and attacking people. The negative-- attacking people. The negatively-- it just breeds more negativity, Longhurst says. I think so far this year you haven't seen the negativity on social media because people are respecting each other more. Natalie Wood, director of the Center for Legislative Strengthening at the National Conference of State Legislators, says that every state has rules and traditions aimed at supporting free and fair debate. They allow the majority to get their way, she says, but they also allow the minority to get their say. States have different means to ensure the minority party has a role in committees and to give minority party bills a chance. Some states make sure every bill gets a committee hearing. Hey, that's Nebraska. New Hampshire goes even further. Every bill will get a vote in the House. Wow, that's something. And Texas has a decades-long tradition of giving some committee chairmanships to the minority party. All legislators-- legislatures have an array of rules about how to address each other formally in the chamber and rules against name calling or-- and inappropriate language. Another reason it's important-- another reason it's of importance to understand the rules and to follow the rules is that they can also ensure decorum and civility, Wood says. And that really goes hand in hand with bipartisanship. A younger perspective. Another national group focused on bipartisanship, the Millennial Action PAC [SIC] targets young lawmakers, says its president and CEO, Layla Zaidane. We exist to help bridge the partisan divide and improve American democracy, she says. MAP, Millennial Action Project, was really born out of a sense of possibility that rise-- the rising generation could do things differently. To that end,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

MAP helps young state legislators, generally under 45-- what, I still qualify? What? Yes, awesome-- for future caucuses with bipartisan leadership to explore how to work together to get things done. So far, there are future caucuses in more than 30 states focused on issues such as affordable housing, college tuition rates, voting reforms and access to healthcare. Zaidane notes that Gen Zers, people born between 1997 and 2013, increased their numbers in state legislatures by 170 percent in the last election, and Independent is the fastest-growing--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --party affiliation. She thinks this generation isn't buying into hardline party politics. Quote, It's not really how long people are operating, Zaidane says. Quote, And that opens up a lot of opportunity to have these really productive conversations inside the legislature where you can really pick and choose the ideas in ways that feel relevant and resonate-- resonant to your community. Zaidane says these caucuses are certainly about issues, but they also include a good bit of socializing. Like in Kansas, where the future caucus got together for one of its early meetings to try ax throwing. Interesting. I've never done ax throwing. I think I'd like it. Sounds like a good, like, exercise. I don't think it would be easy because axes are heavy. You know, you have to, like, get it over your head and throw it. And then kind of like a dart, you got to make sure it hits the right way so that it gets into the wood or whatever you're throwing the ax at.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Call of the house.

KELLY: 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: 9 ayes, 1 nay, Mr. President, on the motion to place the house under call.

KELLY: 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 on the floor please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senators Dorn, Wishart, Jacobson and McDonnell, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. All unexcused members are now present. Members,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

the question is the adoption of AM1273. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 35 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the amendment.

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

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Cavanaugh would move to amend with AM1281.

KELLY: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on the amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK, friends, this is the amendment that I will probably vote for. And it would be great if you voted for it too. I had-- I filed two amendments, so I got to look up exactly what this one is before I get into it. OK. On page 6, line 4, after "military leave," insert "family medical leave." What? Yes, let's do it. Let's insert "family medical leave" into LB816. Colleagues, wouldn't that be amazing? After military leave, family medical leave. Pretty nice. I don't know. You don't even have to think twice. Just do it. Feels good, doesn't it? Doesn't it feel good? I think it does. OK, so I'm going to pull up the underlying bill. So it is on page 6, line 4. OK. On page 6, gotta go down. Gotta go down. Doo-doo-doo-doo-doo. This is my hold music while I'm scrolling down to page 6. Doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo. Going to page 6. All right, page 6, line 4. OK, so Agency 18 [SIC]. OK. the appropriation or the salary limit-- OK, I'll read the whole thing. Bottom of page 5, line 28: It is the intent of the Legislature that if the appropriation or the salary limit is insufficient in this program, Agency 16, Department of Revenue. OK, that's the program. A Program No. 13, Salary: Tax Commissioner. If the salary limit is insufficient in this program to meet anticipated expenditures, the Tax Commissioner shall request an additional appropriation or a higher salary limit, or both from the Legislature by the usual deficit process. The appropriation or the salary limit shall not be administratively increased solely by the Department of Administrative Services without legislative authorization. Wait a second. Am I reading this wrong? Page 6, line 4. Page 6, line 4. I am-- I don't know, I'm looking at something wrong. Did we adopt an amendment? We adopted an amendment. We did. Let me go to that. OK, bear with me. Page 6. Again, the hold music scrolling down to page 6. Doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo-doo. Scrolling down to page 6. OK. Oh, that's page 5. OK, here we go. Now we're cooking with gas. At the top of page 5, last sentence-- or last line, 30: Total expenditures for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems means

all remuneration paid to employees treated as taxable compensation by the Internal Revenue Service or subject to Social Security coverage, specifically including payments accounted for as vacation, holidays, sick leave, military leave, family medical leave. I think this implies that then you would have to have that be paid. Maternity leave, administrative leave, compensatory leave, deferred compensation or any other similar form. OK. Full disclosure, this doesn't really do anything, even if adopted. It just states that that is taxable income. But it does lay the groundwork for us being a family-friendly state, implying that maybe at some point we will allow for paid family medical leave. What? That would be amazing. That is the dream, folks. That is the dream. So that is what AM1281 does. It inserts "family medical leave" after "military leave" on page 6, line 4 of the adopted version of LB816, not the original green copy. So sorry for the confusion there at the start. OK. Now, how much time do I have left, Mr. President?

KELLY: 4:50.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. An opening always throws me off a bit because it's 10 minutes, and I'm used to the 5-minute increments. And so I almost wish that it was like 5 minutes and then 5 minutes, like, you break it up 5 minutes. But yeah, so really, AM1281 is giving us an opportunity as a Legislature to entertain. And this would really be for state employees and constitutional officers. Don't forget about our constitutional officers. I, I see you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. It would entertain the idea of offering paid family medical leave for state employees. Right? Has there ever been a wackier idea? No, because it's not wacky at all. Or yes, there has been a wackier idea because it's not wacky. It is not a wacky concept. We could be a leader in this state in paid family medical leave. Not paternity, medical. So when I worked for the university, I started looking into paid family medical leave and the policy at the university. That sent me down quite the little journey. I haven't looked at the university, I believe at least they were working on a new policy. I don't know if they adopted their new policy. But when I was there, if you were a managerial-level employee after two years of service to the university, you qualified basically for six months of paid medical leave. Whether that was maternity or for anything, anything that you needed medical: a gallbladder, prostate, chemo. You name it, you had up to six months annually covered leave. Of course, it had to be medically necessary. It had to fall under the specific FMLA guidelines to be paid for. But you got it. If, however, you were an hourly employee, I at that time calculated that you would have to work for five years, not take a single day of vacation and maintain your

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

accrued sick leave before you would have enough time to take off three months with the birth of a child. Five years and utilizing zero leave in that five years. So for anyone who has worked while pregnant, that would be impossible because you have medical appointments that you have to go to. Not have to. Really should. Highly recommended. It's not state employees, it's just constitutional officers? OK. Sorry, state employees. My bad. Don't worry, I got you next time on some other bill, I'm sure. It is just for the constitutional officers. So, oh, LB816 contains the salaries and benefits for constitutional officers, judges, public service commissioners, the Parole Board, and the Tax Commissioner. Well, I assume that all of them would benefit from this. All of them probably have some variation--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --of illness that they could use compensation for. So we still should do it. Wow, the ticket number on this one, the last bill we moved was under \$600,000, around \$600,000. It was \$600. Definitely under a million. That was our salaries, there's 49 of us. This one is 34,000,589-- 9-- 401 dollars thousand. OK, I am curious how many people this encompasses. That would be interesting to find out and what the various salaries are within this. Huh, I can find that-- you know how I can find out? I can read the bill because the bill will tell me all that. Because that's the job of the bill. It won't be new language necessarily unless we've changed something, but it will be in there. Yeah, it will have the general-- yeah, there we go. It's got all the different-- now does it say who the positions are though?

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

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

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. When this session began and the most controversial thing that was happening was regarding the Committee on Committees assignments and chairmen, you know, elections and things like that, a small group of senators, including myself, met with Senator Arch to talk about kind of a cards on the table, setting the tone. Things are already acrimonious. Can we smooth the waters a little bit? Can we find a way to keep moving forward? And this was maybe day, like, three or four. I don't know, maybe a little bit later. But it was very early in the session. And a couple of us in the meeting mentioned to Senator, Speaker Arch that LB574 was probably going to be the biggest bombshell of the session. And he was very

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

surprised to hear that. He was like, what? Really? That one? Huh, I wouldn't have thought that. And that was kind of the canary in the coal mine to me a little bit. Maybe the wrong analogy, but that set off such a red flag for me when he said that. Today as all of this is happening in Nebraska, in our Legislature, it's also a very dark day for democracy in Montana. I mentioned a couple of times on the mike ago, and this is all happening in real time right now. As we are in session, so is Montana. And they have stuff going on around the same issue because they have a transgender representative elected in Montana, just like all of us, just like all of those people who are in that legislature, Representative Zephyr. And she has been an outspoken advocate for trans rights against a bill that they have exactly like our LB574. And she made a statement saying that if this bill passes, if it results in children harming themselves or taking their own lives, and we know that calls to our own crisis centers in Nebraska spiked after General File debate on LB574. They went up again on Select File debate on LB574. So it's not even passing the bill that harms people in our state and not just the kids, but the families and teachers and loved ones and people who care about them. It's even introducing it. It's even debating it, is causing these spikes and calls to suicide hotlines in Nebraska of trans and gender-expansive kids who are afraid of what this Legislature is doing. So Representative Zephyr made this comment and she was prevented from speaking ever again in the legislature in Montana. She'd put her light on, she'd get in the queue just like I'm in the queue right now. And I bet, you know, out of 48 of you other senators, probably 46 of you would rather that I not be in the queue and we move on to other things. But you can't prevent me from speaking and you know that. You wouldn't do that. The presiding officer, who's now Senator Dorn sitting up there, Senator Dorn would never see me in the queue and then say, we're going to just skip over you. That would just not be done. But that's what's being done in Montana today. They don't have a rule for that. They don't have a precedent for that. It would be just like if that happened here. And today, the Montana House of Representatives took a vote to expel or censure Representative Zephyr, and that motion was successful. And Senator Zephyr is now barred from the House of Representatives for the rest of their session in Montana. She will be able to vote via video, vote remotely. She won't be able to be on the floor.

DORN: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. She won't be able to attend anything else at the Capitol for the rest of the session because she stood up for trans rights. And we knew this would happen. We knew this was

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

coming. We knew that this is the logical outcome of bills like LB574. People like me getting-- I'm under investigation now by the NADC for conflict of interest because I stood up for trans rights. Representative Zephyr got kicked out of her body for, for standing up for trans rights. This is happening all over the country. And it is a direct consequence of these policies. It's not worth it. The degradation of the civility, of the productivity, of the respect for the institution over one bill, it's not worth it, colleagues. Thank you, Mr. President.

DORN: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Is this my first time on this one? Yeah. OK.

DORN: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Well, yeah. That's terrible, Senator Hunt. That's terrible. That's terrible. It's unconscionable. Stifling of free speech, silencing an entire constituency represented by that member. That's terrible. Because you disagree with the person. Because you disagree with the person. Man, no one would be in this Chamber if we kicked people out when we disagreed. My brother and I disagree like 50 times a day, and he still gives me a ride. Civil discourse is important, but it's not the end-all. Sometimes civility isn't going to get the job done. Sometimes you have to be honest and direct. And Representative Zephyr was being honest and direct when she said, you will have blood on your hands. If you take offense to that, then you should reflect on that. Why do you take offense to that? If it is untrue, then it should be discounted and you should move on. It's the truth to it that's the problem. That's the statement of speaking truth to power. The body, whether it's Montana or Nebraska or any other state, the legislature is the power. And speaking truth to the Legislature is our responsibility. It's the responsibility of every member of this Legislature, of Montana's legislature, of all legislatures. It is your responsibility to speak the truth to the power. Otherwise, you end up with an emperor with no clothes. The way the emperor paraded down the street with no clothes is because no one was willing to speak truth to the emperor in power. No one was willing to stand up and say, you're not wearing any clothes. Everyone went along with the facade that this silk or fabric was real and that it was OK, that it was invisible, that those that believed could see it. And no one wanted to be the person that stood up and said, it's not

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

real, except for the child. The child had the courage. That is an amazing thing about children.

DORN: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Children have-- they don't have the lived experience yet to be afraid to speak the truth. They still have the innocence of thinking that speaking the truth is what you are supposed to do. And it is. It is what you are supposed to do. It absolutely is what you are supposed to do. So thank you to Representative Zephyr for speaking truth to power, for telling the emperor they didn't have clothes, for standing up. It is essential for our democracy to have individuals stand up and speak out, even when it is hard.

DORN: Time.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

DORN: Thank you, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh. Senator Hunt, you're recognized to speak.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Is this my third opportunity?

DORN: Second time.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, the attack in Montana on Representative Zephyr is an attack on all of us. It just is. It was done to silence her, to silence her advocacy. It's silencing her constituents. She was duly elected, just like all of them. And now their constituents don't have any, any representation in, in the House of Representatives. How is that right? It's so important that we not be silent about this from state to state to state. And it's so important that people stand up against this rising movement, this very radical movement, and say it is not welcome in Nebraska. And don't be fooled. It's creeping in. It's here. The retaliation and the punishment, the exclusion, the censuring. Somebody attempted to censure Senator Machaela Cavanaugh already this year for defending the trans rights of Nebraskans. So Representative Zephyr has been banned from the House floor in Montana, silenced for the remainder of the session. And she did have one opportunity to rise and make some remarks. And here are some of the things that she said just about one hour ago. She said, it's my honor today to rise on behalf of my constituents for members of House District 100 and my members who elected me to represent them. This legislature has been systemically attacking that community. We have seen bills targeting our art forms, our books, our history and our healthcare. And I rose up in defense of

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

my community that day, speaking to the harms that these bills bring. A trans teen attempted to take their life watching that hearing. In that hearing, our caucus pleaded to the leader of that hearing to keep decorum. And we were told that many people have many different opinions about these things. Does that sound similar to something Senator Arch said a little while ago? We have to keep decorum because people have many different opinions on these things. But there's only one side that's causing spikes to the suicide hotline, isn't there? There's only one side-- I mean, it goes without saying. I don't need to say it. Be real. Representative Zephyr also said, if you use decorum to silence people who hold you accountable, then all you are doing is using decorum as a tool for oppression. When I continued to not be recognized to speak, my community came and said that they should let me speak. When the speaker gaveled down, he was driving a nail in the coffin, the nail of democracy. But you cannot kill democracy that easily. And that's why they kept chanting, "let her speak." I'm not sure what comes next here, but I will do what I always have. I will rise in support of my community. I will take the hard and moral choice to stand up for the people who elected me to do so. And I'm grateful for those who stood up in defense of democracy. I hear from my constituents. I hear from your constituents that stood up on my behalf. I know in this building, in these quiet halls, the staff come up to me and say, thank you for defending our community. I will always stand up for them and I will always stand up for democracy in the state of Montana. And those are the words of Representative Zephyr in Montana, who was censured today in Montana for standing for trans rights, literally. You're going to be like, oh, Megan, you're exaggerating. She surely did some Antifa stuff or something. Just--

DORN: One minute.

HUNT: Just Google it, like, it's not that deep. Thank you, Mr. President. Just Google it. Educate yourself about what's happening here. If you think that you're on the right side, if you think you're one of the good guys in this democracy, that you're just trying to protect kids, whatever it is you're telling yourself so you can sleep at night. Although I hear there's a lot of people who are not sleeping at night, who are waking up at 2:00 a.m. and feeling the need to draft amendments and solve problems and things like that. Colleagues, the fact that you're waking up in the middle of the night shook about your own vote should be all you need to know that you're doing the wrong thing. I've never woken up at 2:00 a.m. unable to sleep because of some vote I took. I'll put it that way. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

DORN: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak. And this is your third time.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I've never lost sleep over one of my votes either. I have lost sleep over this job. I have lost a lot of sleep over this job, over your votes, colleagues. But I have never once lost sleep over my vote. I have never once even anguished over a vote. I have always voted my conscience. Always. And that is not easy. It is not expedient. It is hard. Sometimes I think people think that it's not hard for me because I am outspoken. I am outspoken. Yes. I am honest and direct and outspoken. And it is infuriating. I know. But that does not mean that it is not hard. It is hard. It is hard to take action that I know will have repercussions. It is hard. When I voted against LB1107 in 2020, that was not easy. And the easiest thing in the entire universe that I could have done was voted for it. It had 44 votes. It didn't matter what I did. It did not matter if I voted for it or if I voted against it. It did not matter. But I voted against it. And it came at a cost. It came at a very real cost, a very real political cost to me personally. But I still voted against it because I believed it was bad public policy. And I never lost sleep over that. I lost a lot over that vote, but I never lost sleep over voting against it because it was bad public policy. It is not easy to stand up. It is not easy to stand alone. It is hard. But none of you were sent here to do easy things, you were sent here to change the world. You were sent here to change the world. Whether that means making taxes more equitable for your community, for your constituency. Whether it's environmental impact, education, healthcare, you were sent here to change the world. And changing the world is not easy. It is not easy. And it shouldn't be. Why am I standing up here talking at 4:00 in the afternoon on the second bill on the agenda that I'm going to vote for, that's going to pass, that's going to get probably everyone to vote for it? Why? Because of another bill. That is why. That is why. Yesterday, and I was asked by numerous people, why did everything move all of a sudden yesterday? Why did everything move yesterday? Everything moved yesterday because this body did a good thing. This body elected to continue feeding 10,000 Nebraskans. Ridiculous as that might sound to people listening--

DeBOER: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --and watching at home-- thank you-- listening and watching at home, that a good thing is electing to continue to feed 10,000 Nebraskans. Yes, we were on the verge of cutting off SNAP access to 10,000 Nebraskans. Yeah, I know, right? We're going to build a lake. We're going to build a canal. But we can't feed 10,000

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Nebraskans. Yes, it is as ridiculous as it sounds. But because this body chose to do something good in this session, I chose to sit down. But I'm not going to keep sitting down because you are continuing to make another choice. And until something else changes, I am standing up. Thank you, Madam President.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Senator Hunt, you are recognized, and this is your-- oh, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Thank you, Madam President. Your Committee on Health and Human Services, Chaired by Senator Hansen, reports LB204 to General File with committee amendments. Additionally, notice that the Appropriations Committee will hold a meeting under the north balcony at 4:00 p.m. Appropriations under the north balcony at 4:00. Additionally, your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB562 to Select File. That's all I have at this time.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Hunt, you're recognized, and this is your third opportunity.

HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a really big deal today, you guys, what happened in Montana. Maybe you don't care. Maybe you've never heard of this before and so you don't think it's a big deal or you're, you know. But if you go look at your, your websites and you get your newspapers, you're going to see everybody is talking about this. In The New York Times, they just dropped their story a couple minutes ago. The headline is Montana House Votes to Discipline Transgender Lawmaker. Legislators voted to bar Representative Zooley Zephyr, the state's only transgender legislator, from the House chamber for the remainder of the legislative session. Then disenfranchising all of her constituents, of course. From Helena, Montana: The Montana House of Representatives took the extraordinary step of blocking the state's only transgender lawmaker from the House floor for the remainder of the legislative session on Wednesday. After an escalating standoff over her ability to speak in the House, because they're just not calling on her. Like once again, that's on them, like just let her talk. She's not saying anything wrong. Nothing spicier than anything any of us have ever said-- over her ability to speak in the House led to heated protests and arrests on Monday and the abrupt cancellation of Tuesday's session. The vote was 68 to 32 in the Republican-controlled chamber. The speaker adjourned the session immediately after the vote. Ms. Zephyr will still be allowed to cast votes during House proceedings for the remainder of the session, but must do so remotely. The move is the culmination of a week-long battle between House leadership and Representative Zooley Zephyr, who is

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

barred from participating in deliberations on the House floor after she made impassioned comments during debate over a bill that would prevent hormone treatments for transgender minors. Same thing we're doing. The bill has since been sent to Governor Greg Gianforte, who has indicated he will sign it. It was one of a half dozen similar bills targeting transgender youth that the legislature had considered in the last week alone. And it comes amid an avalanche of similar legislation in Republican-controlled legislatures across the country. Sue Vinton, the House majority leader, introduced the measure to discipline Ms. Zephyr, saying her actions, quote, disrupted and disturbed the orderly proceedings of this body. Is the introduction of LB574 not disrupting and disturbing the orderly proceedings of this body? I guess I'd argue no, we're still according to the rules. But we got to a point where Senator Erdman had to change the whole rules in the middle of the thing. We got to the point where Speaker Arch had to stop debate in the middle of the thing and go have a 45-minute closed-door meeting in his office. Do a mulligan, do a timeout, then come and reset the ball to make sure that that terrible, bigoted bill could advance. So in that way, I guess I would say yes, it has disturbed the orderly proceedings of this body. Speaking from the floor, Ms. Zephyr said she was rising up in defense of her constituents from Missoula of her community, and quote, of democracy itself. When the speaker asks me to apologize on behalf of decorum, what he's really asking me to do is be silent when my community is facing bills that get us killed. He's asking me to be complicit in this legislature's eradication of our communities, she said. I refuse to do so, she added. I will always refuse to do so. Republican legislators have characterized transition care as harmful and experimental, arguing that young people should not be allowed to begin medically transitioning before they become adults. But major medical organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, support this care and say that bans pose serious mental health risks to young people, infringing not only on their rights but on the rights of doctors and patients. We also know that these bans impose--

DeBOER: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair. We also know that these bans impose risks on people just by being introduced. The effects that these have on democracy themselves is serious, even happening in this body here in Nebraska. The furor over Ms. Zephyr began during an April 18 session when the house was considering the ban on transitional care. Ms. Zephyr said that if Republicans passed such a ban, it would put, quote, blood on your hands. House Republicans have been threatening discipline actions-- disciplinary action since that session. The

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Montana Freedom Caucus, a group of 21 conservative lawmakers-- I wonder if they're related to the Freedom Doctors, Senator Cavanaugh-- threatened to censure Ms. Zephyr, accusing her of, quote, attempting to shame the Montana legislative body by using hateful rhetoric. The caucus once again called for action on Monday and accused Ms. Zephyr of encouraging an insurrection. I will continue discussing this on my next time. Thank you, Madam Chair.

DeBOER: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Cavanaugh, Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized to close on your motion.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. The Freedom Doctors. Oh, yeah, the Freedom Doctors. That is an interesting, interesting group. We'll say it's an interesting group. OK, so AM1281 adds on page 6, line 4 of the amended bill of LB816 after "military leave," it adds "family medical leave." What is family medical leave? Well, kind of what it sounds like. So you have yourself, your own person. You get sick, you got your sick time, you take your sick time. But if you have a spouse or partner who has a major surgery and needs to be taken care of, let's say a massive coronary event. And they cannot be left at home alone and they need-- or they need just transportation to their rehabilitation, who knows? You could use family medical leave. If you have a child who has a major illness. And unfortunately, in Nebraska, we are seeing an exponential increase in pediatric cancer. God forbid you have a child that has pediatric cancer, that is an intensive illness that is going to take up a lot of your time. You can use family medical leave. Let's say you have a baby and you need to care for them and yourself. You can use family medical leave. So you don't have to have maternity leave any longer because you have family medical leave. And you don't have to have paternity leave any longer because you have family medical leave. So you can take care-- you can take your leave under this one policy, a one-stop-shop, shall we say, of leave. So it has to be a medically qualifying event. You can't just like, say, my kid's got the sniffles and whatever. It has to be a medically qualifying event. If it's an extended leave, usually there has to be documentation from the doctor's office. When I took my leave, when I had one of my kids and I had, I think, like six weeks of maternity is assumed medically necessary. And I wanted to take the additional six weeks that people tried to take-- you try to take 12 weeks, if you can. If you're lucky, you can. Tried to take 12 weeks. But I had to have my doctor write a note for it. So I couldn't-- it was not just assumed. In order to utilize my medical leave, I had to have a doctor's note. And I was very fortunate on all fronts. Oddly, when we talk about what other countries are doing medically, they all

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

offer very generous and very, very robust leave. In the UK, you can take a year off when you have a kid. You don't get full pay that whole time. I think it's the first six months is full pay and then it's like graduated down, like the next three months is 75 percent and then the final three months is maybe 50 percent. But you get your job back and you get a significant amount of your pay for that entire year. That is-- now, that's a good policy.

DeBOER: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. So OK, one minute. AM1281 is a family medical leave amendment into the appropriation for the constitutional officers. Yeah, totally vote for it. Go bananas. Have fun. Vote green for a Cavanaugh amendment. Why not try something new? Try something new. Vote green for, well, a Machaela Cavanaugh amendment. I know people have voted for the other Senator Cavanaugh. Vote green for a Senator Machaela Cavanaugh amendment. It will feel good, I promise you. You won't regret it. Thank you. Call of the house.

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: 7 ayes, 2 nays 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 Blood, Kauth, Fredrickson, Walz, Slama, Ibach, Wayne, Murman, Dungan, Hunt, Arch and John Cavanaugh, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Hunt, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. All unexcused senators have now returned to the Chamber. The question before the body is the adoption of AM1281 to LB816. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all those voted who care to? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 31 nays, Mr. President-- Madam President, on AM1281.

DeBOER: The amendment is not adopted. Mr. Clerk, for items. I raise the call.

CLERK: Madam President, next amendment, AM1282 introduced by Senator Machaela Cavanaugh.

DeBOER: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're welcome to open.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Madam President. AM1282. On page 6, line 5 after the first comma, insert "paternity leave." We do have maternity leave, so we should add paternity leave. Fellas, this one's for you. This ded-- this amendment is dedicated to all the gentlemen out there that want to take paternity leave. You're welcome. Yep, so that's what AM1282 does. So I don't know if you all recall, there was a day-- I've lost track of-- time has no meaning any longer. There was a day where I spent a significant amount of time discussing TANF, Temporary Assistance to-- Assistance to Needy Families. OK, bear with me. Let's go on a journey here. TANF is Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. One of the programs under TANF is a fatherhood program. Yes, a fatherhood program, which we put, I don't know, \$1, maybe \$2 million towards. Probably we're going to put \$20 million towards it because that would be directing direct cash assistance away from the people who currently qualify for TANF and giving programming to people who financially don't qualify for TANF. But bygones. Doesn't matter. OK, we have this pater-- fatherhood program under TANF and we put resources, mostly federal, towards it. Well, if we value fatherhood so much that we have created a program within a program to address fatherhood, then AM1282 should be your jam. It should be the jelly you spread on your bread in the morning because it is paternity leave. How better to promote fatherhood than promoting paternity leave? Now, if we were to embark on a paternity leave program in the state, one thing I would suggest is a little bit of flexibility. Flexibility, you say. What's that? Well, let me tell you. Let's say we have eight weeks of paternity leave. OK, I think that's kind of a standard amount. More is always better, but we'll start with eight. You have eight weeks of paternity leave. Do not require it to be taken consecutively. So, for example, the first two weeks, if you are-- if you're bringing a baby home from the hospital, newborn, fresh out of the oven, the first two weeks you might want to take, be home. Be home with your partner, if that's how this all came to be. Help them recover physically. Be there to, you know, fold laundry. If there's other kids in the house, pick them up so that the person who just gave birth doesn't have to pick them up, all of those fun things. OK, so you take those two weeks and then you've got six weeks. Well, if you're forced to take them consecutively, I'm sure you will. But if you're not, if you're not forced to take them consecutively and the person in this particular instance, there's lots of different scenarios we can go down. But in this particular instance, let's say that the other person actually gave birth and they have, let's just be super generous and think that their employer gave them 12 weeks. So that first two weeks you're

there, you're home together. Then you go back to work and they're home with the kiddo for 12 weeks. You're on a waiting list because you got on it the moment you found out you were pregnant for a childcare, because that's how it goes. I found out I was pregnant very early with my third kid. Long story. Anyways, and I already had childcare. We had the sort of you get kind of grandfathered in, so to speak. If you already have kids there, then you, you know, you put your name in and that, the keeping siblings, etcetera. It was a year and three months later after we put our name on a waiting list where we had priority as a family that already had two kids there. A year and three months before we got a spot. So let's just say you put your name in on a list for childcare and you're trying to extend out your time as much as possible. And the person who's staying home with the kid right out of the gate, let's say they have that 12 weeks, but your childcare does not kick in until your kid is, let's say, 16 weeks old. What to do? Well, if we had paternity leave that we didn't require you to take consecutively, by the way, then you could take that first two weeks, be home with your newborn baby. Hey, look at you. Ah, vomit. OK? And then you go back to work. Your partner stays for-- until 12 weeks and then you take the rest of your leave at the end when your partner goes back to work. I will tell you also that probably mentally will help your partner go back to work. Because I remember when I dropped my first child off at childcare for the very first time, you would have thought someone had just been murdered in front of me. I was hysterical. I was hysterical because I was going back to work, I was dropping my first kid off, first day of childcare, first time going back to work. It was horrible and traumatic. And I had to sit in the parking lot for a very long time because it was not safe to drive. So I was also late for my first day back at work. But if I hadn't had to do that on my first day back, if I could have left my precious little baby with their dad or mom or partner, if I could have left them at home with that person, I wouldn't have had that experience on my first day back at work. And then when I had, you know, maybe worked for a couple of weeks and then it was time to take them to childcare, it probably would have been an easier transition, to be honest. An easier transition. But we are where we are. Why am I talking about this? Paternity leave, AM1282. That's what it is. It inserts paternity leave into LB816. Now, this is just for constitutional officers, but it's a start. It's a start. Why not start somewhere? Let's start with constitutional officers and give them paternity leave. It's as good a place as any. No step too small to take. It is a start. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

KELLY: 2:45.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. I use that time of asking you the time to get in the queue. Aren't I sneaky? OK, so maternity leave is already language in this bill. This would be inserting paternity leave. What does it do in effect? Nothing, really. Doesn't pay for anything. It's more of a conversation, a thought exercise, if you will. But we're so family-centered and family-forward-focused all of the time, nuclear family. Not nuclear like the bomb. That figure, why not? Let's put our no money-- there's no money in this, but let's put our money where our mouth is, metaphorically speaking. So paid leave has always been a passion of mine. Paid leave is one of the things that we can do to ensure greater equity in our workforce, higher quality of living for the people of Nebraska. And if we do it in a collective way where, just like unemployment insurance, it is contributed into by the greater community so that it can support those in need of it the most when the need arises. That's the whole point. OK, so.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: One minute. Thank you, Mr. President. The ability to take time off from work when faced with an illness or injury is a fundamental right that should be available to everyone. But unfortunately, many employees in our community are not currently afforded this privilege. Without access to paid medical leave, individuals are forced to choose between their health and their income, often leading to negative outcomes for both employees and the community as a whole. A paid medical leave program can have significant financial benefits for our community. First and foremost, it can help reduce the spread of illness and disease. When individuals are unable to take time off from work--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: And you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: When people are unable to take time off from work due to illness, they are more likely to come to work sick, potentially infecting others in the workplace. This can lead to decreased productivity and increased healthcare costs for both the employer and the community. In addition, a paid medical leave program can reduce the burden on our healthcare system. When employees are able to take time off to recover from an illness or injury, they are more likely to fully recover and return to work at full capacity. This can reduce the need for long-term medical care, which can be costly for both the

individual and the community. By reducing the strain on our healthcare system, we can allocate resources more efficiently and ensure that everyone has access to the care they need. A paid medical leave program can also lead to increased job satisfaction and employee retention. Where employees feel valued and supported by their employer, they are more likely to remain with that employer long term. This can reduce the costs associated with hiring and training new employees and increase the overall productivity of the workplace. Paid medical leave program can have a positive impact on the local economy. When employees are able to take time off from work without fear of losing their income, they are more likely to spend money in the local community. This can lead to increased economic growth and job creation, benefiting everyone in the community. Paid medical leave program is not only a moral imperative, it is also a smart financial decision for our community. By supporting the health and well-being of our employees, we can reduce healthcare costs, increase productivity, and promote economic growth. I urge this body to consider, at least for today, adding to this bill, paternity leave. It's not paid medical leave, but it is a start down a comprehensive program of paid medical leave that would encompass family leave and individual leave. And in encompassing family leave and individual need-- leave, we would also be using maternity and paternity leave. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

KELLY: 1:45.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Thank you. OK. I think that was-- do I have one more time? I got in the queue. I think I have one more time. Yeah, I'm seeing head nods. Cool, thank you. OK, so, yeah, paid leave. So, my first year, Senator Sue Crawford brought a bill. She brought it numerous times. She worked really hard on it, she worked really hard on it for eight years. She kept bringing it. She kept compromising with people. She kept listening to opposition. She had meetings. She traveled the state. I traveled with her once to meet with members of the State Chamber across the state--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --to hear about their concerns about paid family leave. And we still never passed it. But she worked really hard on it. And I got to tell you, legit, not being sa-- saucy here, people loved Senator Crawford. People in this Legislature loved Senator Crawford and she worked really hard on this bill. And I think if we didn't have term limits and she was still here, she probably would have gotten it done. But unfortunately, she just didn't have just enough time to do

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

what she needed to do, which was listen to the opposition, continue to take feedback, make adjustments, make compromises.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

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

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to AM1282 and in support of LB816 to fulfill our constitutional duty to appropriate funds for salaries of constitutional officers. And I rise in horror at what's happening around this country with LGBTQ members of legislators being investigated, being censured, being expelled. And this just happened today, about an hour ago in Montana, to Representative Zoey Zephyr, who represents District 100 in the Montana House of Representatives. In The New York Times, which I was reading before, they continue: Instead of issuing a formal reprimand-- well, I'll say the last part, one more time. The Montana Freedom Caucus, a group of 21 conservative lawmakers, threatened to censure Ms. Zephyr, accusing her of, quote, attempting to shame the Montana legislative body by using hateful rhetoric. The caucus once again called for action against Ms. Zephyr on Monday and accused her of encouraging a, quote, insurrection. Instead of issuing a formal reprimand, lawmakers have refused to call on Ms. Zephyr for any bill for consideration before the House, including environmental and economic measures, as well as transgender issues. On Tuesday, Republican leaders canceled a planned session of the House a day after protests led to arrests in the chamber. In a hasty news conference, Speaker Matt Regier blamed Representative Zephyr for the conflict, saying that, quote, the only person who is silencing Representative Zephyr is Representative Zephyr, unquote. Legislators started Wednesday's session with a final reading of bills before turning to the status of Ms. Zephyr, who spoke from the House floor for the first time in a week and the last time, we now know. The gallery was closed to the public, but the session was broadcast online. Montana politics, once a competitive mix of Democrats and Republicans, has become much more conservative in recent years. Governor Gianforte, a Republican, is a fundamentalist Christian and a wealthy former software executive. Republicans hold a supermajority in both the state House and Senate, and one conservative family from Flathead Valley in particular, the Regiers, wields great influence over both chambers. Keith Regier is the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. His daughter, Amy, is chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. And his son, Matt, is the speaker of the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

House who has repeatedly refused to recognize Ms. Zephyr's request to speak on the floor. The number of transgender and non-binary people elected to public office nationally increased to at least 70 this year from 25 in 2019, according to the LGBTQ+ Victory Fund, which supports these candidates. Of those officials, there are 14 sitting state legislators who are transgender or non-binary, said Elliot Imse the executive director of the LGBTQ+ Victory Institute, which is affiliated with the fund. If the Montana House votes to censure Ms. Zephyr, he said, 2 of those 14 will have been formally censured. The other is Representative Mauree Turner of Oklahoma, a non-binary lawmaker who was censured last month after inviting a protester into their office. Leaders of the state House said the lawmaker had harbored a fugitive wanted for questioning. Mr. Imse noted it was unusual for state legislatures to censure lawmakers. That one in seven of our trans and non-binary state legislators have been targeted is pure politics. And now Megan's addendum, two in seven have now been formally--

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: --censured. Over the past few years, Republican state lawmakers have introduced a wave of bills to regulate the lives of transgender youths by restricting the bathrooms they can use, the sports teams they can join and the medical care they can receive. These efforts have been particularly aggressive since the start of the 2023 legislative session. This year, 11 states have passed laws prohibiting what's known as gender-affirming care for young people. Before this year, just three state legislatures had enacted full or partial bans. On Tuesday, Doug Burgum, the Republican governor of North Dakota, signed a bill limiting transgender people's use of certain restrooms, locker rooms and other facilities that align with their gender identity. And in Missouri, an unusually restrictive rule that would limit transgender care for adults could go into effect as soon as Thursday unless it is blocked by a judge. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak. This is your last time before your closing.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So what I've been talking about here is AM1282, and this is to add the language of paternity leave into the bill that is appropriating the funds for our constitutional officers. So I was watching-- looking over at Senator Hunt while she was speaking, and I saw some like animated conversation happening over in, let's call it the "press corps." And in my mind, the "press corps" was having an animated conversation over the Oxford

comma, because that's what I like to imagine you all are talking about all of the time. So I'm going to talk about the Oxford comma, because I assume that that's what you were talking about. The Oxford comma, also known as the serial comma, is the comma used before the conjunction "and" in a list of three or more items. It's usage has been a topic of debate among writers, editors-- writers, comma, editors, comma and grammarians for decades. However, there are several good reasons to support the use of the Oxford comma. I am taking a controversial stand in support of the Oxford comma today. Let it be known for the record that I support the Oxford comma. First and foremost, the Oxford comma can help to clarify meaning in a sentence. And I think that this is really the essential part of the function of the Oxford comma. Without it, it is chaos. What words are grouped together? What words are not grouped together? Chaos. Without it, a sentence can be ambiguous, leading to confusion or misinterpretation. For example, consider the sentence: I would like to thank my parents, comma, Oprah Winfrey, comma, and God. Without the Oxford comma, it's unclear whether Oprah Winfrey and God are the speaker's parents. My parents, Oprah Winfrey and God? Yes. Is that my parents? No, those are not my parents. That would be pretty amazing, though, if it were-- if they were. But the Oxford comma clarifies it. Clearly Oprah Winfrey and God are not my parents. I'm just thanking them in addition to thanking my parents. So it clarifies whether they are separate entities being thanked. However, with the Oxford comma, it becomes clear Oprah Winfrey and God are two separate entities being thanked in addition to the speaker's parents. I would like to thank my parents, Oprah Winfrey, and God. OK. Secondly. Next, the use of the Oxford comma can help to ensure consistency in writing, which we saw, if we all remember, and I'm sure we do, because it was pretty exciting. When I read the draft BEAD plan on broadband and I was editing it as we went along and questioning if we were consistently using or not using the Oxford comma. So yes, the use of the Oxford comma can help ensure consistency in writing. By using the Oxford comma consistently without a piece-- throughout a piece of writing, the writer can avoid potential errors or inconsistencies that may arise from omitting it in some instances and using it in others.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: I'm really talking myself into the Oxford comma here. The Oxford comma is widely used in many style guides, including the Chicago Manual of Style. Oh, here we go. Here are the style guides, friends: the Chicago Manual of Style, The Oxford Style Manual and the MLA Handbook. By using the Oxford comma, writers can adhere to the conventions of these style guides and avoid potential confusion or

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

errors. In conclusion, the Oxford comma is a valuable tool for writers that can help to clarify meaning, comma, ensure consistency, comma, and adhere to established style guides. Its usage may be continued to be debated, but for those who value clear and precise communication, the Oxford comma is an important punctuation mark to consider using. And I now need to know what-- how it is in APA.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

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

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, this effort in Montana to censure Representative Zephyr is just the latest attempt to punish LGBTQ elected officials, allies and community members and push them out of the conversation completely. And that's happening across the country just for signaling support of LGBTQ people. Representative Mauree Turner in Oklahoma, the first non-binary representative in Oklahoma, was censured in early March for helping a demonstrator. Representative Justin Jones and Representative Justin Pearson of Tennessee were both expelled from the legislature for participating with constituents who were protesting a lack of action on gun safety legislation. In that same legislature, a white colleague-- the two that were expelled, were black-- a white colleague was spared from expulsion for the same violation. For anti-LGBTQ lawmakers to launch a verbal and legislative and procedural war against transgender people in Nebraska, in Montana, in Oklahoma, in Illinois, in Missouri, in Ohio, in Texas and Florida, in Nevada, in Idaho, Oklahoma, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, all over this country, and censure Montana's only trans lawmaker just for telling the truth, that they have blood on their hands, is destructive and absurd. What Representative Zephyr said is incomparable to the harmful and hateful rhetoric of these anti-LGBTQ lawmakers, and it's incomparable to the undeniable harm that this legislation is going to have on the people of Montana. It's incomparable to the measurable, serious harm that bills like LB574 are going to have on the people of Nebraska. And people like Representative Zephyr, their voices are needed now more than ever at this moment. And our opponents know that. Our opponents understand that. Our opponents want to pass these bills at any cost, taking you moderates along with them as collateral damage, circling the wagons around you and telling you you don't have a choice, as they are determined to silence the people who are standing up for this community. Government representation for LGBTQ people in the United States is more important than ever. It's so essential for all people

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

to be able to see themselves in positions of power reflected by the people who make decisions about their lives, especially in conservative states like Montana, especially in conservative states like Nebraska. Transgender people have to be allowed to have conversations about their lives. This is the same recycled playbook that we've seen year after year in the '70s and '80s and '90s around the AIDS crisis. Cutting gay men in particular out of public life, not letting them talk about their families and their experiences. Even up until recent years, you know, not having marriage equality, not allowing gay couples to adopt. Still, in Nebraska, if I was married to a woman and I had a picture of a woman on my desk and I worked for a private company in the state, I could be fired for that. So how does it make sense that I get elected to the state Legislature in this state, I've got an office in the Capitol and I could have a picture of my wife on my desk and nothing happens to me?

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. While all of you would vote to say that in a private business they can. That makes no sense. The silencing and the censure against Representative Zephyr for speaking up in support of transgender Montanans is an attack on our nation's democratic ideals. It's an attack on free speech. It's an attack on our values. And it's an assault on democracy to suppress the already underrepresented, already marginalized voices of LGBTQ people and people of color and the lawmakers who are elected to represent them. This is a very disturbing trend across our entire country as LGBTQ people and their allies in Tennessee, Oklahoma and other states have also faced recent--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

HUNT: --threats of censure.

KELLY: You're next in the queue. And that's your last time on the amendment.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. As people all over this country have faced threats of censure who are elected by their constituents to come in here and do the same exact job as you. It's discrimination, too. It's discrimination in the exact same way. It is BS, and it's discrimination. For me to have this complaint, this formal investigation hand-delivered to me in my office saying that I have a conflict of interest because I'm a mother. Do mothers not have conflicts of interest who may be voting on LB626 to ban abortion care

in Nebraska? There's like 14 of you who grow yellow corn in here. You don't have a conflict of interest for contributing to the ethanol industry? Talked all about that yesterday and, you know, Thursday or whatever day we were here. It goes without saying, I think when things go without saying, we can let them go without saying. But it must be said that the standard for what is a conflict of interest has reached an absurd point. Senator Brandt said, you know, trying to be supportive, but he said, I don't even think it's worth talking about. No. All of you need to stare in the face of what you have brought to this Legislature, what you have brought to this state by insisting that LB574, come hell or high water, make it across the finish line. Whether we have to pause the session in the middle of the final minutes of Select File reading-- Select File debate so that Speaker Arch and Senator Kauth can have a private meeting for 45 minutes. I've never heard of it. Nobody has. We had to close the Chamber doors after that vote because protesters in the Rotunda were yelling and chanting and protesting so passionately. And Speaker Arch says, well, we all must moderate our passions. The problem is when we get too passionate. Many people would say that's fascist rhetoric and gaslighting, at least, to say the reason you're upset-- you know, equivocal-- equivocating being upset at someone taking your rights away as the same as being upset that someone was rude to you, that somebody sent you a mean email, that you had to hear a protester yelling. That that's what's uncivil, that that's what's uncollegial. That it was a breach of decorum for Representative Zooey Zephyr to say that when increases in suicide come to Montana because of bans on trans healthcare and exclusion of LGBTQ Montanans, that those representatives who voted for that bill will have, quote, blood on their hands, to say that that's violence, inciting an insurrection. Mind you, there was an insurrection in this country on January 6. They really did try that. It is not the same thing as a duly elected official saying that lawmakers will have blood on their hands for supporting a ban on trans healthcare. This false equivalency has got to stop. Whether it's accusing me of having a conflict of interest for being a loving mother. Whether it's saying that the first trans lawmaker in the state of Montana trying to stop the suicide of trans kids is the same as an insurrection. Get real. Be serious. Trans kids aren't-- they're just kids. They're just kids like everyone else's kids. I know that Senator Kauth is very afraid of her son seeing a woman in the locker room or something like that.

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. But these kids are just kids like everybody else. My son is in track. He's a long-distance runner. And

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

today he has a meet. And it's maybe his fourth or fifth meet. And I have not been to one of them yet this year. It's my only child's first foray into athletics, and I haven't been able to see him one time running because I've been here fighting for his rights. But I think I'll get to go to his meet on Friday so I'm excited about that. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Seeing no other names in the queue, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized to close on AM1282.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, AM1282 inserts "paternity leave" on page 6, line 5. I have more to say about the Oxford comma, but first I want to talk about paternity leave and how it can positively impact health outcomes of both fathers and their families. Paid paternity leave is a type of leave granted to fathers after the birth or adoption of a child, allowing them to take time off from work to care for their newborn or newly adopted child and to bond. Maternity leave has been a norm for quite some time. Paternity leave is a relatively new concept that has been gaining traction in recent years. One of the main reasons why paternity leave is crucial is that it allows fathers to bond with their newborn children, which is essential for a child's social and emotional development. Research has shown that fathers who take paternity leave are more likely to be involved in their child's lives-- children's lives, which has positive impacts on the child's academic achievement, behavior and mental health. So this really should be part of our whole fatherhood program under TANF. Paternity leave. Moreover, paid paternity leave can have significant benefits for fathers' mental and physical health. Caring for a newborn can be a stressful experience, and taking time off from work can help fathers cope with the emotional and physical demands of parenting. Studies have also shown that fathers who take paternity leave are less likely to suffer from postpartum depression, which is a serious mental health condition that affects many new parents. Paid paternity leave can also have positive impacts on the health outcomes of mothers and children. When fathers are involved in childcare, mothers are more likely to return to work, which can have economic benefits for the family. Fathers who take paternity leave are more likely to be involved in household chores, which can reduce the burden on mothers and improve their mental health. Paid paternity leave is a vital policy that can have numerous positive impacts on families' health outcomes. Allowing fathers to bond with their children, comma, improving their mental and physical health, comma, and have positive ripple effects on the entire family. So, colleagues, I encourage you to vote for AM1282, an amendment that would add paternity leave to the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

underlying bill of the salaries for constitutional officers in LB816.
How much time do I have left?

KELLY: 1:56.

M. CAVANAUGH: Is that enough time to revisit the Oxford comma? I don't know. I got a lot to say about the Oxford comma and the APA style. It's a controversy. Just a spoiler. You know what? I think I'm going to wait for when I have a ten-minute opening. We shouldn't-- we should not truncate the conversation about the APA Style guide controversy and the Oxford comma. That should not be truncated. So with that, I would request a call of the house and just a machine vote. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. 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: 6 ayes, 3 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those 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 Conrad, Kauth, Fredrickson, Walz, Bostelman, McDonnell and Erdman, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. All unexcused senators are now present. Members, the question is the adoption of AM1282. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

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

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

CLERK: Mr. President, regarding LB816, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to strike Section 1.

KELLY: Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. My apologies. I realized that those were still sitting on my desk as we were voting, so that was a little bit-- I had those written for several hours and forgot to submit them. OK. OK. APA versus the Oxford comma. Duh-duh-dah. The use of the Oxford comma in APA, or American Psychological Association Style of writing, is somewhat controversial. According to the current

APA Publication Manual, Seventh Edition, the Oxford comma should only be used when it is necessary to avoid ambiguity. This means that it should be used in a list of 3 or more items only when omitting it would create confusion or change the meaning of the sentence. For example, consider the following sentence. The study included 3 conditions, colon, condition A, comma, condition B and condition C. No comma there. In this case, the Oxford comma is not necessary because omitting it does not change the meaning of the sentence. However, if the sentence were written as: This study includes 3 conditions, condition A, comma, condition B, comma, and condition C, in this case, the Oxford comma is necessary because omitting it would potentially create ambiguity and confusion. The study included 3 conditions. In this-- OK, well, the use of the Oxford comma in this sentence makes it clear that condition C is a separate item in the list and not a combination of condition B and C. Yes, I believe so. In general, APA style emphasizes clarity and precision in writing, and the use of the Oxford comma should be guided by this principle. Some prefer to use the Oxford comma consistently. I am one of those people. I think that consistency-- consistent use of the Oxford comma is paramount to clarity. I realize this is a controversial stance, because I am a fan of the APA writing style. So it is incongruous with my own desire to utilize the APA writing style. Fortunately for me, I don't write much anymore. I just talk. And if I do write, I'm writing for myself to talk. So comma or no comma. But I do enjoy reading. And so I like that consistency of the Oxford comma. Just use it. Just use it. It's always going to provide clarity. It's never going to provide ambiguity. So use it. What's the harm? What's the harm in using the Oxford comma? I get it. Hard liners on the APA style, I get it. You want to be precise all of the time. And if the comma is unnecessary for clarity, I understand the desire to not utilize it because it isn't necessary, but it isn't harmful. And it provides a sense of consistency in the style of writing. Hence the controversy over the Oxford comma. It is really one of those things. You either love it or you hate it or you're completely indifferent about it. But it's one of those things. I personally love the Oxford comma, as is evidenced by the amount that I discuss the Oxford comma. There's lots of different memes and gifs and gifs, and I don't even know. I'm saying all the things wrong. I'm saying them all wrong all of the time. Like saying Rick Ainsley earlier today. I know this brain of mine, this, this noggin, it's whoof! It's holding on, barely. So where was I? I was probably talking about Moonstruck. No, I'm kidding. We are at 5:07, and I believe we typically break for dinner at 5:30 to 6:00, the early bird special, and-- no, the early bird special would be 4:00. We're not-- we're not quite there, but close. So, yeah, we've got about 23 minutes before we

break for dinner. And, just kind of like, all right, well, we've talked about the Oxford comma. We've gone through the controversy. Oxford comma, APA style. How does the Chicago style handle it? Are they just willy-nilly? Just free-- riding free with that comma, using it whenever. I see what's happening. I see what's happening here. We've got some excitement over hot cocoa happening. The Chicago style-- I think I should dig in. Over the dinner break perhaps I will dig in on the Chica-- Chicago style comma stance, on the Oxford comma. Not Chicago style pizza, which I-- this might be a controversial stance as well. I don't like-- I don't like deep dish pizza. It's not for me. I do like-- had a conversation last night about Valentino's Pizza. I do like Valentino's Pizza. That is not deep dish pizza. It's as deep dish as I would get in my pizza. I do like Valentino's pizza. What I had recently-- oh, my God, I still have dreams about this focaccia bread. That focaccia. Oh. Some focaccia bread from Goldenrod Bakery, and I am still dreaming about it. And one of the things about it, in addition to it's just sheer buttery deliciousness, was that it also reminded me of Pizza Hut Pizza in, like, the best possible way. And when I was growing up, I worked at Cinema Center, a movie theater that no longer exists in Omaha, but I worked there. And next door to the movie theater was the Pizza Hut. But in grade school, before I was old enough to drive, my parents would, or other parents, who knows, would drop us seventh graders off at the movie theater and we would go to dinner at Pizza Hut because it was just at the other side of the parking lot. We would go, it was so cool. We felt so cool. Go to Pizza Hut, and order our personal pan pizzas, and then go to the movie theater and watch the movie My Girl, and cry your eyes out, because that is a horribly, horribly depressing movie. But I remember doing that in grade school. So the focaccia bread from Goldenrod just took me back to that, that time. And it's delicious, and super buttery, and just really amazing. Just really amazing. I don't know if it's butter, maybe it's oil. Who knows? I don't know what genius magic they are whipping up over there, but it is delicious. OK. How much time do I have left on this one?

KELLY: 1:40.

M. CAVANAUGH: I keep-- I keep asking you, and I keep getting that one minute and 40 seconds on my ten minute opening. That seems to be where I hit, where I'm like, hey, am I almost done? I am almost done. But still one minute, 40 seconds. Thank you for that, Mr. President. OK, so this strikes something and I don't remember what it strikes. So I'm going to pull it up and look and see. We are on LB816 and we are on a floor amendment. And what does that floor amendment do? I don't know. Let's find out. Here we go.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. This is FA73. OK. FA73 strikes Section 1. OK. Let's see what that does. All right. All right. Section 1. All right. Section 1. OK. Got to go all the way up to the front of the page. Section 1. OK, don't vote for this, friends. Section 1, Appropriation Language. There are hereby appropriated for FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25, the amounts specified in this act, or so much as may be necessary, for the salaries and benefits of officers of the Nebraska state government. So it would be unkind to vote for this.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator, and--

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: --you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Just going to-- OK. It would be unkind to vote for this, because it allows the money to be appropriated. It's really the authorizing language. And without it, our constitutional officers will not get paid. So-- oh, sorry. OK. So that is, like, Section 5 is Supreme Court judges' salaries. Section 6 is Court of Appeals judge salaries. Section 7, retired judge salaries. Section 8, district and juvenile court judges' salaries. Section 9, county court judges' salaries. Section 10, the Governor. Section 11. This is awkward. If you vote for this, we will not be able to pay our presiding officer, the Lieutenant Governor. Again, don't vote for this amendment. I know, I was concerned that you might, but just don't do it. Resist the urge. OK. Section 12, Secretary of State. Section 13, Auditor of Public Accounts. Section 14, Attorney General. Section 15, State Treasurer. Section-- what one was I on? Section 16, Public Service Commission. Section 17, Board of Parole salaries. I didn't know that they were constitutional officers. Are those constitution? That's what this is, right? Yeah. Hmm. All right. I did not know that the Board of Parole were constitutional officers. Good to know. Section 18, the Tax Commissioner. I hate to admit this. I don't know who the Tax Commissioner is. I'm assuming it's different than the Direc-- the Treasurer. OK. Section 19, Workers' Compensation Court judges' salaries. Section 20, Workers' Compensation Court retired and acting judges' salaries. [INAUDIBLE]. That is it. That's the last one. All right. So, again, FA73. It just, you know-- oh, pardon me. FA73 basically strikes the authorizing language for the appropriation of the funds to pay all these people. And as I said on the previous bill, we should definitely pay people for their work. Would I like to get paid as much as these people? Absolutely. Any of them. Because, yeah,

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

they all get paid at least somewhat of a livable wage, if not an actual livable wage. I mean, this includes, I assume that this includes benefits. So it's not an exact-- oh, it has a s-- it lists the salary limit, which is interesting because there's no-- there's not consistency. Like, I'm looking at the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor of Public Accounts. So the Secretary of State--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. --and the Auditor make the same amount, but the Attorney General makes more. The Lieutenant Governor makes less. Sorry. Sorry for that, Lieutenant Governor. The State Treasurer makes the same as the Auditor and the-- and the Secretary of State. It seems kind of odd that they're not, like, there's no parity across these. I wonder how-- I wonder how that's decided. I mean, it's clearly it's in statute because the amounts are not changed at all in this bill. Did we decide that? Did we like arbitrarily decide to pay this position more and this position less? And frankly, personally--

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: And Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you are recognized to speak, and this is your last time before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. You're going to like this one, Mr. President. I'm on the salaries. I think we should give you a raise. I think that the Lieutenant Governor should be paid on par with the other constitutional officers for a couple of reasons. One of them being he has to sit here and listen to me talk for hours on end. There's probably some, like workmen's comp pay that you should get with that. So at the bare minimum, that should be a reason for a raise. But yeah, we must have set this. Historically, I am curious. We must have set the salaries. And I wonder how long ago we set the salaries, and are we keeping up parity with these salaries? Because again, this is a similar issue. Like, yes, these are much closer to like real livable wages, but these are not like-- this is not-- I know that the Lieutenant Governor has been a successful attorney in his life and in his career. This isn't like a windfall for him, and we should be paying for the service. So I feel like we could-- we could put more money towards these constitutional officers' salaries. And I apologize that I didn't try to do that between General and Select. But we are where we are, so maybe we can pull it back from Final for a

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

specific amendment and do the pay raises then. Well, who knows? We'll see. Hazard pay. That's the word I was looking for, not workmen's comp, hazard pay. You should get hazard pay for having to sit in here all the time. As should everyone get hazard pay. You all should get hazard pay. OK, so this is-- I'm almost out of time and then I have my close and then we'll probably get to a vote on this floor amendment. And then, we'll probably break for dinner. So that'll be that. Great. How much time do I have left on this time, Mr. President?

KELLY: 2:45.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. Thank you. All right. So striking Section 1 of this amendment is going to strike the authorizing language for LB816. Don't recommend it. Not a great idea. Don't do it. OK. But I think I have talked on that enough, so I'm going to go back to a place where I was earlier. I-- I am going to dig in on the APA versus the Chicago style and the Oxford comma, but that will be after dinner. So for now, I'm going to go back to the article that I was reading earlier. That is, Groups Help Lawmakers-- Groups Help Lawmakers Pursue Civility and Bipartisanship, the Unicorns of Politics. I like to use that term, like a unicorn, oh, it's a magical unicorn. But I probably shouldn't use it so much because the reality is the magical unicorn isn't a real thing. So saying you're a magical unicorn is like-- or this is a magical unicorn is essentially saying that you don't think that it's real. It's a fantasy. So the unicorn of politics, it's fantasy. But, all right. Despite limits, public favors bipartisanship. For all this talk of bipartisanship benefits, is there a downside? Some legislators say they have encountered backlash from constituents who don't want them to compromise. OK. Harbridge--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: I'm sorry. One minute.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Harbridge-Yong, the Northwestern professor, says her research shows that in primary elections, where the party's most partisan voters are likely to turn out, candidates can face opposition for having compromised-- having compromised to reach agreement with the other side. But she notes that the outside of that arena, there's a strong evidence the public favors bipartisanship. And no one is saying all divides could disappear: bipartisanship has its limits. Quote, I don't want to sugarcoat it. Politics is a rough and tumble business, Harwell says, adding that she

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

encouraged-- she's encouraged about civility work in statehouses. I should remind everyone this is actually a current article. It is from March 21, 2023.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: And now you're recognized for your close on the floor amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So, yes, this article is from a month ago. And the, the person speaking now says that she's encouraged about civility work in statehouses. Meanwhile, Senator Hunt has been sharing with us the complete opposite of civility work in a specific statehouse, in Montana. But I will continue to read this article for my remaining time. OK. I think there's great opportunity at the state level because many of the folks that go on to national politics start at the state legislative level. And it's a great training ground at a smaller capacity to say, we can work things out even though the issue is difficult. Bipartisanship ultimately is a path toward regaining public trust, Harwell says. Civility is not just good manners-- it's really being able to get something done, she says. And if I hear anything from the public right now, it's that they're hungry and thirsting for our elected officials to come together and work out solutions. Now, this is from a podcast. Civility-- 3 Paths to the Prize. It is Kelley Griffin in-- is the host of NCSL's Across the Aisle podcast. OK. Civility-- 3 Paths to the Prize. 3, I wonder if they will use the Oxford comma. Whether you're waiting in line in a public place or stuck in traffic, examples of incivility are all too common. State legislatures are rife with their own examples. In some forums, the art of civility-- of speaking honestly, openly and courteously to others-- seems to have been lost. But there is hope! The nonprofit South Dakota News Watch reported a recent upswing in civility in the state's legislature. That follows the 2022 censure of a state representative and a poll that year by the nonprofit news group in which a majority of state residents said civility was on the decline. The improved lawmaking process in Pierre, and improved-- in Pierre, and improved discussion on hot topics is benefiting the residents of South Dakota because stronger legislation is being passed, Representative Oren Lesmeister told News Watch. Senator Helene Dumel-- Dummel-- Dummel-- Duhamel? Duhamel. Sorry. --added that legislators should have-- should behave like the leaders they are. If you don't treat people well, how in the world do you ever expect to work with them and find a compromise or have them see your

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

point of view? Although debates over legislation did not co-- become less contentious, a spirit of bipartisanship prevailed when dealing with the cha-- challenging issues. Here are 3 paths to greater civility, civility in all aspects of life. Before I start, Senat-- Senat-- Mr. President, how much time do I have?

KELLY: 1:18.

M. CAVANAUGH: I was so hoping you were going to say 40 seconds again. One minute, 40 seconds. All right. The 3 paths: ethics, example, endurance. OK. To be clear about ethics, to be clear about your internal values and what--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --guides-- thank you, Mr. President-- what guides your conduct. What do you believe about civility? How do you promote civility in your life? Are you constantly searching within, within to note what's important to you? Two, example. Set the example and lead with your actions. How do you treat others? An important test of civility is how you treat those who have no power over you: the store clerk, the custodian, the restaurant server. Do you give them the same respect as those with authority over you? How do you respond when you are treated in an uncivil manner? Do you respond in kind, or do you take the high road? Endurance. Has your civility lasted? Are you striving to be civil each day and with each interaction? And although it's sometimes difficult to maintain an air of civility, do you try?

KELLY: That your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, call of the house, machine vote.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator. 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: 6 ayes, 4 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: 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. Those unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under the call. Senators Raybould, Conrad, Wishart, Bostar, McDonnell, Ibach, John Cavanaugh, and Brandt, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The house is under call. Senators Conrad, Bostar, McDonnell, John Cavanaugh, and Brandt, please return to the Chamber and record your presence. The

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

house is under call. All unexcused senators are present. Members, the question is the adoption of FA73. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 33 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of FA73.

KELLY: The amendment is not adopted. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Mr. President, your Committee on Retire-- Nebraska Retirement Systems, chaired by Senator McDonnell, reports LB198 to General File with committee amendments. Additionally, amendments to be printed-- amendments and motions to be printed, Mr. President, from Senator Riepe to LB191, and Senator Blood to LB757. That's all I have at this time, Mr. President.

KELLY: We will stand at ease until 6:05.

[EASE]

KELLY: Mr. Clerk for a motion.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Blood would move to overrule the Speaker's agenda pursuant to Rule 1, Section 16, consider LB757 prior to further discussion of LB6-- excuse me-- LB816.

KELLY: Senator Blood, you're recognized to open on the motion.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators, friends all, those that have actually come back from dinner, which isn't a lot. Hopefully people are listening. You know, the Legislature has rules so we are able to transact business in an orderly fashion. And these rules in general allow us to operate efficiently and fairly and expeditiously. And within this system of rules, the filibuster is allowed and is clearly being used to its full extent this year. And those leading said filibuster have the right to use this tool. But with that said, other tools are available at our disposal as well. One tool is the ability to file a motion to overrule the Speaker's agenda, to bump a bill up for discussion and take a vote for that bill and any amendments. It is in no way in this case an effort to discredit our Speaker or disrespect the process. It is an attempt to work together to accomplish something and then move back to the agenda to continue the filibuster, should those senators choose to do so, and continue business as usual. We have the ability to respect the process while still allowing time to do the people's business. Many of us do not have the luxury of hitching rides on the legislative committees' omnibus bills or being placed on the agenda unless we amend from the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

floor. If we don't make bold moves using our set of rules, we miss opportunities. I am not making a hostile amendment. I am not doing a pull motion. I'm using, using a motion allowed within our Rule Book to attempt to get something accomplished. This year is a year where we must be creative and thoughtful to get things accomplished. Thirty-three of you, perhaps more, have expressed support of my amendment for domestic violence victims. Please allow me the benefit of sharing that effort on the floor by voting green on this motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Blood. Senator Arch, you're recognized to speak.

ARCH: Thank you, Mr. President. So I, I rise in opposition to overrule the agenda. And I, I guess I want to explain what I'm doing with the scheduling right now. Obviously, we have a constitutional requirement to pass our budget. We have a limited number of days remaining in our session. And so, today, I scheduled the three budget bills in anticipation that next week we begin the mainline budget bills but that we could get these out of the way and make sure that they are taken care of on Select. So that's where we are. Earlier today, I did have a conversation with Senator Blood regarding her LB11 and did, did agree that she can-- that she could attach that to LB757. And I understand what her motivation is, is for doing this. But I think that there is a, a larger issue, and that is that, given the limited amount of time that we have remaining in the session, given the priorities of, of making sure that we cover those, I, I have been very thoughtful in my selection of what bills come first. And so I would say-- I would ask you, I've-- you know, I have had to prioritize and I would ask that you vote no on MO994 in overruling the Chair. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Arch. Senator Clements, you are recognized to speak.

CLEMENTS: Thank you, Mr. President. I also rise in opposition to the motion. LB816 is on the board. We've been discussing that today. It's coming out of the Appropriations Committee. It is the salary approval for the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, other constitutional officers and is part of the bucket-- budget package that will harm the flow of the budget process, in my opinion. And I agree with Speaker Arch that we should continue with debate on LB816 at this time. And I am in opposition to overruling the agenda. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: Thank you, Senator. Senator Blood, you're recognized to speak.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. I hadn't planned on speaking more than one time, but it sounds like I will now. Fellow senators, we will be getting back to Senator Arch's bill, and the allotted time that is allowed will allow us to finish debating and getting to that bill for a vote. If we move expeditiously on the bill that we hope to move forward, there is no reason we can't get both done. But I do understand the concerns. And I said this at the very beginning, I'm not doing this because I have an issue with our Speaker. I'm doing this because it is one of the tools that we are allowed to do. And sometimes we have to do things that make us uncomfortable because we want to make progress and we want to move things forward. And that doesn't seem to be the theme of this year's session. We have bills that were controversial that were put on the agenda early in the session that started all of this. And I, like many others, have waited patiently to try and get things accomplished. And I don't blame any one person. I don't blame any one bill. What I'm saying is-- and I don't have high hopes that this is going to pass, but you can't blame a girl for trying. I'm sick of waiting for hours and hours and hours and not accomplishing anything. I will never get back the amount of time that I put into my, my very thoughtful bills this year. And based on what I've been told, I'll be lucky if any of them even, even get on the agenda for next year. And that will be my last year. People put me in this position to get things done. People put me in this position to be their voice. My voice was muted, as many of yours were this year. This is the option that I came up with for tonight. I'm guessing how the vote's going to go in advance, but I really hope for those of you that have sat and listened, that you understand that we have many tools in our toolbox. And many of you have used both pull motions and hostile amendments before on this floor. This is not a hostile amendment. This is a tool that we have to get things done. So if you were willing to vote for those things, perhaps you're willing to vote tonight for this tool that I've decided to use. And if not, no hard feelings. We'll move on and we'll continue to listen to additional motions on a bill that eventually we'll get to vote on. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Blood. Speaker Arch, you're recognized to speak.

ARCH: Thank you. I just have, I just have one other brief comment. I mean, I, I appreciate what Senator Blood just said. I, like many others, have waited patiently. I would certainly wholeheartedly agree with that statement. That being said, we have limited amount of time.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

And I have attempted to prioritize. I think this would be a very bad precedent. Then everybody-- well, why not? I mean, everybody then just-- I, I've got my priority. Well, I've got my priority. Well-- you know, everybody has priorities. I-- absolutely correct. But somebody-- and, and it, and it falls on me right now-- somebody has to prioritize the priorities and make sure that we get done the work that we have to get done. And so, again, I would ask you to vote red on overruling the agenda. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Arch. Senator Moser, you're recognized to speak.

MOSER: Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening, colleagues. Not to comment so much on the bill itself, but the precedent. We all have bills we'd like to jump to the front of the line. And if we vote for this motion to overrule the agenda, then we're going to do it a dozen times. And whose bill deserves to jump in front of mine or in front of Senator Lowe's or Senator Sanders'? I think it would make a free-for-all that we just don't-- we just-- I just don't think we want to go there. So, that's my opinion. I appreciate it. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Moser. Senator Wayne, you're recognized to speak.

WAYNE: Thank you, Mr. President. I'll respond to Senator Moser. It doesn't open up a floodgate or cause problems because the body has to-- at least the majority of the body has to vote on it to-- for that to happen. I think the issue and the angst is starting to become that certain bills are, are being heard, certain bills can get attachments, certain bills could have more than five amendments, certain bills can only have three amendments. And the arbitrariness of kind of this body and how we're getting there is part of the issue. The reason I'm actually speaking is because I think it's important, especially with the, the, the number of new senators here, that-- we are a Speaker-led body, but this body has a lot of power to move things forward if they choose so. Two or three people might be able to slow it down. But even within the slowdown, to be very honest, we're not making anybody work for a filibuster. My first two years, this body used to make me work to filibuster. But we're, we're, we're not doing that. This motion, I, I'll, I'll probably vote for because I think we need to make sure the body understands we actually run the body. We elect the Speaker and the Speaker puts the agenda forward, but how this body operates is determined by how long and how well we all get along. And part of forcing people to get along and forcing people to do things is our Rule Book and is the motions that we can all make on many things. I

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

mean, technically, we could open up and never actually get on the agenda. I know 100 percent how to do it, and we can do that if people are that upset. I think what people are trying to figure out is how we are moving things, how, how we are putting things-- and this is including me as a committee Chair. I take ownership of that. So many of the committee Chairs are picking and choosing what amendments they want to put on a committee priority, which is their right. But then they're being told not even-- they're telling other members not to even put it on. Once this-- a bill hits this floor, it is the-- it is our bill. It is no longer just yours. I keep reminding people OPS was split on a floor amendment into three different districts. Any time there is a section opened up or there is something that is common in it, you can file an amendment. If you want to attach a bill, attach a bill. We own that. And we also own the time that we have. The Speaker can get up and say, we are going to recess for the rest of the day right now. That doesn't happen unless we vote for it. So-- while everybody sometimes would get mad at the Speaker, there's plenty of things we can do right now in here to move anything we want to move on. And I think this is an attempt. I like that. That's why I'm probably going to vote for it because we as a body have to start taking our own ownership of how we want things to run instead of just sitting around saying, it's this person's fault. It's that person's fault. These two are holding it up. No. We can get things done if we choose to, and this is an attempt to get that done. I think we should all start talking about what more attempts we should be making and having conversations with the Speaker and with Chairmanship-- Chairman, leaders-- Chairmen and Chairwomen. I hate-- "Chairman" is just a normal word-- but to figure out how to move things. We knew this was going to happen when it slowed down. The body has to adjust to adding things to people's bills. And we got to be able to adjust. And sometimes we can look at the agenda and say, this might move faster if this is going on. So now we got a question. Do we continue till 7:00-- or, at this point, 7:30 maybe-- and then just keep going? Or we could actually pass a couple other bills--

KELLY: One minute.

WAYNE: --that won't be filibustered. I don't know the answer. But I guess what I'm telling everybody, particularly, we-- this is part of our, our class when we came in. We did have some people who knew the rules and would get up and say these so you can learn them. And so there are plenty of things any individual senator can do to move things on. And this is one example. This is one example. Sometimes you drop it. Sometimes you don't drop it to force a conversation saying, hey, I'm going to drop it. We're going to have this debate. And you

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

know what? The Speaker may say, OK. We'll schedule your bill next week. Or work with your committee to get this part done. But each individual senator has plenty of motions to make sure that you're having conversations and moving this body forward. I don't blame two people for slowing this body down. There's plenty of things we could have done to keep moving things forward. We chose not to. Some of us chose not to stand with them. Some of us chose not to because they just didn't care. But we can move this body forward if we choose to--

KELLY: That's your time.

WAYNE: --and we've got plenty of time. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Wayne. Senator DeBoer, you are recognized to speak.

DeBOER: Thank you, Mr. President. Well, this is kind of an odd situation. I'm kind of in a Sophie's Choice situation because LB799 is my bill. It's next up on the agenda. And this bill that, that Senator Blood is trying to move forward is also my bill. They are both my bills. So I can't decide between the two of them. I'm going to be present, not voting because I cannot say which bill is more important and wouldn't want to say to one group that one of my bills is more important than the other. But I hope we can get to both of these bills over the course of the rest of our session. I mean, LB799 is a bill for judges' salaries. That seems pretty important to me. But LB757 is a bill that deals with victims of crime and how they should be treated, children. So, both bills are incredibly important. And I hope-- maybe the Speaker will give me a heads-up if this is possible-- that, if not today, that there's another day that this bill will come up so that, that both bills will have their chance to be heard. All right. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator DeBoer. Seeing no one in the queue, Senator Blood, you're recognized to close.

BLOOD: Thank you, Mr. President. Fellow senators-- and I do say still "friends all." Many of you missed the introduction. So in a synopsis, we have rules and regulations for a reason. They are tools that allow us to do the people's business. Sometimes we do things that may be unexpected and not real popular, but they're not done to disrespect the Speaker. In fact, they're done in respect to the process, the process that, unfortunately, as freshman senators this year, you really haven't learned a lot about. And it's unfortunate because learning the rules is a powerful tool to try and move this engine

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

forward. In my first few years, we had pull motions where bills that didn't get voted out of committee were then pulled out by unanimous vote by, by this body. Those are hostile things. And many of you that may vote against this have voted for those. We do have important things coming up for the budget. But if we can move through this expeditiously, we can get to those. I'm not sure why we have rules and regulations if, every time we try and utilize them to the benefit of the people's business, we constantly shun them because we either don't understand them or we've been told we can't vote for them. There may come a time when you need to use this motion. Remember what happens on the floor today because many of us have very long memories. Do it-- if you vote for it for the right reasons-- and if you're voting against it, do it for the right reason. I, unlike Senator DeBoer, do not have high expectations that we will necessarily get to those bills. And my personal priority bill will never be on the agenda this year, and that's a whole nother story. And it's really unfortunate because I've worked for years on that bill. So maybe I'll be pleasantly surprised by Senator-- by Speaker Arch and those bills will indeed come up again on the agenda and we'll get to discuss them. But for now, I'm trying something different. I'm trying something that, as a freshman senator, I was trained to do. I do ask for your green vote. And if not, we'll move on and continue to talk about Senator Arch's bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Blood. 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: 17 ayes, 4 ayes to place the house under call.

KELLY: 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. All unexcused members are present. The question is the motion to overrule the agenda. There's been a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Aguilar. Senator Albrecht voting no. Senator Arch voting no. Senator-- [MICROPHONE MALFUNCTION].

KELLY: This will take 30 votes.

CLERK: Senator Aguilar. Senator Albrecht voting no. Senator Arch voting no. Senator Armendariz voting no. Senator Ballard voting no.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

Senator Blood voting yes. Senator Bosn voting no. Senator Bostar voting no. Senator Bostelman voting no. Senator Brandt voting no. Senator Brewer voting no. Senator Briese voting no. Senator John Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh voting yes. Senator Clements voting no. Senator Conrad voting yes. Senator Day. Senator DeBoer not voting. Senator DeKay voting no. Senator Dorn voting no. Senator Dover voting no. Senator Dungan not voting. Senator Erdman voting no. Senator Fredrickson. Senator Halloran voting no. Senator Hansen not voting. Senator Hardin voting no. Senator Holdcroft voting no. Senator Hughes voting no. Senator Hunt voting yes. Senator Ibach voting no. Senator Jacobson voting no. Senator Kauth voting no. Senator Linehan voting no. Senator Lippincott voting no. Senator Lowe voting no. Senator McDonnell. Senator McKinney. Senator Moser voting no. Senator Murman voting no. Senator Raybould. Senator Riepe voting no. Senator Sanders voting no. Senator Slama voting no. Senator Vargas. Senator von Gillern voting no. Senator Walz not voting. Senator Wayne voting yes. Senator Wishart not voting. Vote is 6 ayes, 31 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to overrule the agenda.

KELLY: The motion fails. I raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to amend the bill with FA74.

KELLY: Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to open on your amendment.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. FA74. Let's see here. OK. Strike Section 2. OK. Strike Section 2. And I've lost my place entirely. Oh no. One moment, please. What is Section 2 that we are striking or not striking? Probably not striking. I've struck out [LAUGHS]. I'm amusing myself. OK. Section, Section 2. Strike Section 2. Let's see here. Section 2, Definition of appropriation period. For purposes of this act, FY 2023-2024 means the period beginning July 1, 2023, and ending June 30, 2024. And FY 2024-2025 means the period beginning July 1, 2024, and ending June 30, 2025. Interestingly, is that language necessary? I don't know. I think if we struck it, would it cause any problems? Probably, much like the Oxford comma or not using the Oxford comma, it would cause a lack of clarification and precision in the intent of the legislation because we are leaving out the definition of the appropriation period. Now, we know what the appropriation period is because we appropriate things on a biennium, a two-year fiscal period. So it is inherently implied, if we are appropriating something, that it is being appropriated through the biennium. So it's not necessary. So you could vote for it. You could

get away with voting for this in my nonexpert, nonlegal opinion. You could get away with voting for this. Probably shouldn't though. Just because you can doesn't mean you should. It's like if we were to strike Section 2, we may as well be striking an Oxford comma, and chaos could possibly potentially ensue of complete misunderstanding as to the time period to which we are appropriating. Therefore, I recommend that this body not vote for this amendment. See, that Oxford comma, it's a good life lesson, friends. Sorry. I needed to get back in the queue. Hope everybody had a nice dinner break, no matter how brief. So we are on the salaries. And I did consider-- Mr. Lieutenant Governor, I did consider doing another quick floor amendment to give you a raise. But I thought that maybe I should take more care in just, like, slashing and burning and-- I don't know. We could still do it on Final. We could pull back for a specific amendment and give you a raise then. You can't vote on it-- well, you could. I guess you're the-- if we had a tie, you would be the deciding vote. So you could potentially vote on it. But as it stands, there'd be no conflict of interest for the Lieutenant Governor if I were to introduce an amendment to increase his pay. So there we go. Something to ponder. I do think it's interesting that our constitutional officers make different amounts. And it's clearly up to us because it's not in statute-- or, it's not in the constitution. They're constitutional officers, but their pay is not in the constitution. So perhaps we should consider having a more equitable distribution of what the pay actually is because we have the Public Service Commission is paid something. We have the Lieutenant Governor, the Governor, the Treasurer, the AG, Secretary of State. They're all paid different amounts. Judges. Judges are a little bit different because they are constitutional officers, but they're different constitutional officers, and so their pay is a different thing and it's, it's not an elected position. So anyway, different. But I do think that we should consider creating a more equitable and clear payment for our constitutional officers. So I think this bill goes till-- well, originally, it was going till 7:10, but I think we started a little bit late after our dinner break, so maybe it goes to 7:20-ish. I'll find out eventually. 7:20? 7:30? 7:21? 7:11. One and four. 14. It's a pantomime. It goes to 7:14. That is in-- 17 plus 14-- oh my gosh. I have to do math. OK. 17 plus 14 is 31 minutes. Yes. I think that's right. I didn't even use a calculator. I think this bill is done in 31 minutes. I hope this bill is done in 31 minutes. OK. So I was going to get back to the NCSL website for some more fun information. So I talked about this earlier on the day. I know. It feels like it was five days ago. It does for me as well. NCSL, the National Conference of State Legislators-- great, great resource for lots of things. My

first year here, everything-- like everything in everyone's life-- everything is demarcated pre-pandemic, pandemic, post-pandemic. My first year here was pre-pandemic. And as such, I went to a conference. What? Yes, I did. I went to the NCSL conference in Nashville, Tennessee. And at that conference, the big to-do topic was Medicaid expansion. I love me some Medicaid expansion. So in talking about Medicaid expansion, one of the things was learning what other states had already done in their implementation of Medicaid expansion. And as a newbie-- had just been on the job for six months or so at that point. And I was really trying to learn as much as I possibly could about Medicaid expansion because we had just had it pass on the ballot. And it had gone to a vote of the people. And then it was put to the agency to do Medicaid expansion. They had to do a SPA, a state plan amendment. And that is basically a state plan amending the Medicaid program in our state. And there was a timeline on when that was supposed to be. We missed it by a lot. It was also very clear when it passed at the ballot that Medicaid expansion was to be the same benefits as the current Medicaid population. And at that time-- and at this time as well-- we had fairly decent Medicaid policy. But there was an attempt to change the benefit level. And in doing so before the state plan amendment could be implemented, first, the agency had to attempt to change the benefits program for the current--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --population. Otherwise-- thank you, Mr. President-- otherwise, they couldn't have a diminished implementation for the new population unless they diminished the current population. So there was an attempt to diminish the benefits for the current population to a lower standard, lower level coverage so that when they implemented Medicaid expansion, the new population would be at that lower tier. Clearer-- clear? Clear. Yeah. So, I found that to be confusing. Turns out it couldn't happen. Turns out the federal government said, no, no, no. You can't do that. So, I don't know. Two years, three years later, bygones. We have Medicaid expansion in the way that the voters intended it to be from the outset. So, yay, right? Yay.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you.

KELLY: And you're next in the queue.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. I'll just take a sip of water. Why is she talking about Medicaid expansion? Excellent question,

colleagues. I'm talking about Medicaid expansion because, throughout today, I have been using the National Conference of State Legislators as a resource when talking about the pay in the Legislature. And I am just reminiscing now about the time I learned about Medicaid expansion from the National Conference of State Legislators because it is an excellent resource. So, I'm at this conference, several states. It's the hot thing to do in 2019. Well, really, it was probably more in 2018-- 2017, 2018, the hot thing to do was expand Medicaid. And Nebraska had just jumped on the bandwagon in the 2018 election and passed Medicaid expansion. And it was summer 2019 and everybody was like, Medicaid expansion's where it's at. Yeah, let's give people healthcare. What? Even if they can't afford it. No. That's bananas. But we did it. So it was a hot topic at the conference. And a couple of states had already done it. A couple of states were in process. They had submitted their state plan amendments. And these were states of varying political ideologies. And so they had a panel where they came and they discussed and they shared their different approaches to Medicaid expansion. And it was extremely helpful, extremely informative. I learned so much about all the different things you can do with a waiver, all the things you can't do with a waiver but people have tried, unsuccessfully. I learned about ways that government can slow-walk implementation. I learned about ways that government can bloat government through the implementation. So all in all, an interesting learning exercise, I guess. So if you go to the NCSL website, they have a Resources page. And they've got-- under the Resources page, they have these different topics: Research and Policy, Legislators, In D.C., Find Your State Liaison, Caucus and Networks, A to Z Issues and NCSL Contacts, Training, Legislative Staff. Under Legislative Staff: NCSL provides a one-stop shop for professional development and connections to legislative staffers around the country and is home to nine professional staff associations and other staff networks. Cool. Let's look at Research and Policy, shall we? Early Childhood Fellows Program-- oh. I was the Early Childhood Fellow for the state of Nebraska. I was also the Maternal Health Fellow for the state of Nebraska. You might sense a theme in areas of, of my interest. So-- let's see here. Early Child-- Early Learning Fellows Program is a year-long opportunity-- legislators and legislative staff particularly interested in topic of early care and education. Child Welfare Fellows Program, Youth Homelessness Fellows Program. Interesting. NCSL's statement addressing our nation's fiscal challenges. Oh, that was updated today. Well, that is very interesting as we're talking about these budget bills. Let's take a look and see. It's loading. It's thinking. It's considering sharing this information

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

with me. It's giving it very deep consideration at the moment. Very, very deep consideration.

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. It's still considering, with one minute left, if it's going to share this. So I will probably-- if it shares this information with me, I will share it with you on my next time on the microphone as it continues to think about what it wants to share or not share. Seems like everything now is just thinking. We're just in a thinking mode. Computer's in a thinking mode. It's like, it's almost 7:00. You've been using me a lot today. I'm just going to think for a little bit. I get it. I get you, computer. I feel the same. Absolutely. Here we go. NCSL statement addressing our nation's fiscal challenges. For immediate release today, April 26, 2023. Interestingly, we also had our fiscal forecast today. And I haven't had a chance to catch up on what the forecast is, but I heard it was a mixed bag. So love to learn more about that.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President.

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

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition of FA74 and in support of LB816. I also supported Senator Blood's motion to reorder the agenda and here we find ourselves. I received a letter today from a child in New Jersey who's 12. And it says-- it's handwritten on loose-leaf paper. Dear Senator Megan Hunt, thank you for what you are doing. I'm not trans, but even I can see how unfair this law is. And they go on to say some very flattering things. But a 12-year-old saying that, I'm not trans, but even I can see how unfair this bill is, reminds me of what my kid said. You know, when I asked him, are you experiencing bullying? Are you OK? Are you doing OK at school? He shrugs and goes, the only people who bother me are your colleagues. The only people who bother me or say anything about me are the people you work with. Kids don't treat each other this way. Anyway. A mess. What I'm a little bit focused on today and what I think we cannot be silent about, even-- all of us-- I mean, no matter where you stand on this issue-- is people across the country who are lawmakers who are being silenced or disciplined or censured just for vocalizing their support for LGBTQ+ people, just for vocalizing support for progressive issues, like Representative Zooey Zephyr today, who was removed from

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

the Montana House of Representatives. And about an hour ago, she released this statement that I want to share in our own record in Nebraska. In a disturbing affront to democracy, today, the Montana House of Representatives voted along party lines to banish me from the house floor, effectively stripping me of my ability to represent my 11,000 constituents in debate. After silencing me for a week, they then proceeded to silence hundreds of Montanans who showed up to demand that their representative's voice be heard. As the House debated my punishment, I stood unwaveringly in defense of my constituents, my community and democracy itself. In recent months, the Legislature has launched a relentless assault on the LGBTQ+ community, introducing bills that aim to undermine our art forms, our literature, our history and our healthcare. As I confronted the ban on gender-affirming care and exposed the grievous harm these bills inflict, I held those responsible to account. Subsequently, Speaker Regier denied me the right to be heard on any bill moving forward. When I continued to not be recognized, Montanans gathered to, to support my right to speak on behalf of my constituents. When the Speaker refused to acknowledge me, they raised their voices in protest. As he attempted to gavel them down, what he was really doing was driving a nail into the coffin of democracy. But you cannot kill democracy that easily. And they persisted in chanting, Let her speak, joining our country's great history of protesting on behalf of democracy. And as I raised my mike, I sought to amplify their voices in solidarity. Though the Republican supermajority has voted to strip me of my ability to take part in debate, I remain steadfast in my commitment to my community. I will continue to make the difficult moral choices necessary to stand up for the people who entrusted me with their representation. My gratitude for those who spoke out on these principles is boundless--

KELLY: One minute.

HUNT: Thank you, Mr. President-- and I pledge to always stand up for them and to tirelessly advocate for democracy in the state of Montana. When we focus on these divisive issues, we really create an environment of hostility that drives people away from our state. We heard from the Nebraska Chamber of Commerce, the Omaha Chamber today, there's already two organizations that have declined to host events in Omaha because of these laws that are pending in our state. This is a big deal. It's a shame. And one person in this body has the power to change that. I know there's more than one of you who want to. In the end, maybe we see, like, six people end up voting for that bill because you all finally come off and have the courage to hold together as a bloc and do the right thing. Thank you, Mr. President.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Hunt. Senator Machaela Cavanaugh, you're recognized to speak. This is your last time before your close.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So NCSL statement addressing our nation's fiscal challenges. For immediate release. OK. Washington, D.C., the National Conference of State Legislators, NCSL, released the following statement in response to potential reductions to discretionary funding. NCSL continues to call on both the administration and Congress to address the U.S. statutory debt ceiling and consider serious, long-term reforms that will reduce the national debt and put the country on more sustainable fiscal footing. We believe a comprehensive, bold and aggressive-- they did not use the Oxford comma, everybody. We believe a comprehensive, bold and aggressive plan is needed to address our nation's fiscal challenges and strengthen our economy. NCSL urges all options to be on the table-- pardon me-- discretionary and nondiscretionary spending. This means examining all possible avenues for deficit reduction, including entitlement reform, tax expenditures and federal tax reform, reform and that any legislation be analyzed through-- thoroughly for its potential impact on state and local governments. OK. While responding to budget pressures, NCSL urges the federal government to avoid simply shifting costs-- great. Then-- let's see here. What else do they have to offer us? OK. It's thinking again. I like when it thinks about what it wants to tell us. And-- let's see. So-- well, I guess I can just talk while it's thinking. It's just going to think. I think I've over-- overutilized it today, so it's just going to think. Interestingly, though, the Oxford comma, or lack thereof, continues to become an issue. So we see-- and I meant to-- I'm sorry. I was-- I am not being a person of my word. I said before dinner that I was going to dig in on the Oxford comma and the differences or the, let's say, interplay of the Chicago style of writing versus the APA style of writing and the stance on the Oxford comma with both. And I did not do my homework. Why? Because I ate food. That's why. It's a 30-minute break, and I ate some food. So, my apologies to everyone who was waiting with bated breath to hear the scintillating conversation of the APA style's take on the Oxford comma versus the Chicago style's take on the Oxford comma. I may yet get to it tonight, but I just won't get to it right now. So I think that I-- how much time do I have left, Mr. President?

KELLY: 1:27.

M. CAVANAUGH: 1:27. And then I have my closing? Yes, my closing. OK. Well then. So again, this bill is the salaries for constitutional officers. And the FA47 strikes Section 2, which--

KELLY: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --much like the Oxford comma, depending on who you talk to, is necessary or unnecessary. Provides clarity, for sure. Section 2 provides clarity in the underlying bill. But is it necessary? Eh. Not-- I don't think it's an essential section. It's not an essential section, but it does provide clarity. And when we are talking about laws and statute, regulations, all those beautiful, sexy things, clarity is key. So I suppose, to that end, we should not vote for FA47 [SIC]. I'm going to stand firm on this. Colleagues, vote against FA47. No, not FA47. That's not on the board.

KELLY: That's your time, Senator.

M. CAVANAUGH: Well, maybe vote against that too. I don't know.

KELLY: And Senator Cavanaugh, you're recognized to close on FA74.

M. CAVANAUGH: FA74, as opposed to FA47. If any of you have FA47, I am sorry for disparaging it. I don't know what it is. I meant FA74. FA74 is the Oxford comma of this bill, LB816. It is not essential, but it does provide clarity, and clarity is key. So I suggest, colleagues, that you not vote for FA74 because-- well, because of the Oxford comma, to be real. Provides clarity. Section 2 provides clarity. Without either, it's chaos. So let's just do that. I think, I think I'll leave it there. And a call of the house, Mr. President. Thank you.

KELLY: 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.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 7 ayes, 2 nays to go under call.

KELLY: 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 Wayne. All unexcused members are present. The question is the adoption of FA74. There's been a request-- all those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 0 ayes, 36 nays, Mr. President.

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

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to strike Section 3. This is FA75.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. Section 3. Now, Section 3 is not going to be the Oxford comma of this bill. The call's been raised, by the way, colleagues. I know you all are dying to hear how this Oxford comma saga plays out, but I thought I'd just let you know you don't have to. OK. So Section 3. Let's get the-- let's get to it, shall we? We have 14-- 6 minutes, 6 minutes. So don't go far before we get to cloture on this bill. Or do. I don't-- I mean, I guess. Just letting you know that in six minutes we will be getting to cloture on this bill. OK. So-- sorry. I was just ill-prepared for the next one. FA75. Section 3. What is Section 3? What are we striking? Let's see. Appropriations amendment. There we go. Section 3, Nebraska Accounting System Manual Definitions. Oh, maybe this is another Oxford comma. I may have spoken too soon. Hold on, folks. OK. The definitions contained in the Nebraska Accounting System Manual and any amendments thereto on file with the Clerk of the Legislature are hereby adopted by the Legislature as the definitions for this act, except as provided in Section 21 of this act. Ooh. Saucy. What happens in Section 21 of this act that supersedes the manual-- the Nebraska Accounting System Manual on file with the Clerk of the Legislature? Let's jump down and see, shall we? Section 21. Section 19, 20. And-- OK. Section 21, Limitation on salaries, wages and per diems. As used in this act, salary limit means total expenditures for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems. And total expenditures for permanent and temporary salary-- salaries and per diems means all remuneration paid to employees treated as taxable compensation by the Internal Revenue Service or subject to Social Security coverage, specifically including payments accounted for as vacation holidays, sick leave, military leave, funeral leave, maternity leave, administrative leave, compensatory time, deferred compensation or any other similar form and amounts withheld pursuant to law, but excluding state contributions for Social Security, retirement and employee insurance plans. (2), total expenditures for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems are limited to the amount provided by law for constitutional officers. The limitation-- (3), the limitation on expenditures for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems for FY 2023 shall be increased by certified encumbrance amounts from FY 2022-23 for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems. The limitation on expenditures for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems for FY 2024-25 shall be increased by certified encumbrance amounts from FY 2023-24 for permanent and temporary salaries and per diems. Enumer-- encumbered

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

amounts shall be calculated in accordance with Section 81-138.01. Whoo. That's a lot of information. So that is what Section 21 is. So going back up to striking Section 3: Definitions contained in the Nebraska Accounting System Manual and amendments-- any amendments thereto on file with the Clerk of the Legislature are hereby adopted by the Legislature as the definition for this act, except as provided in Section 21 of this act. Now, the question I have is, if we are to adopt this act, pass this law, pass this bill, if we are to adopt this, then does Section 21 of this act get incorporate-- automatically become incorporated into the Nebraska Accounting System Manual filed with the Clerk of the Legislature? Also, how do I get a copy of the Nebraska Accounting System Manual filed with the Clerk of the Legislature? I am wondering if this is the kind of thing that you can find online under things that are filed with the Clerk of the Legislature. I don't know. We have all kinds of reports online. If you go to the Legislature's website, there's, on the left-hand side, a tab that says, of all things, Reports. I know, right? And with that, where it says Reports-- let's see. Let's see. Agency Reports, Standing Committee Reports. I don't see where this-- like, Revisor of Statute Reports?. Yeah. See? Now, where would this be? Where would this be housed? Where would the Nebraska Accounting System Manual, if available, publicly available, where is it publicly available? Because it is filed with the Clerk of the Legislature. So I'm going to do something super high tech. I'm going to google it. DAS website. What? That makes sense. State Account-- Accounting Manual Table of Contents. Of course it's with the DAS website. Department of Administrative Services. Why wouldn't it be with them? That is exactly where you would want your Accounting Systems Manual to be. But it does say it's on file with the Clerk of the Legislature, which does-- I find to be a bit confusing if it's with DAS. I just am curious. And-- now I kind of want to know, does the Clerk of the Legislature have a paper copy of the Nebraska Accounting Systems Manual? And if so, how long is it? And if you do, will parts of this-- Section 21 specifically-- be added as an addendum to said Nebraska Accounting System Manual? It is now 7:14. And I think that if I stop talking, that perhaps the Speaker will have a motion for cloture if I just stop talking. So you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to stop talking. Thank you.

KELLY: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. Mr. Clerk, you have a motion on your desk?

CLERK: I do, Mr. President. Senator Arch-- Speaker Arch would move to invoke cloture pursuant to Rule 7, Section 10 on LB6-- LB816, excuse me.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: Speaker Arch, for what purpose do you rise?

ARCH: Call of the house. Roll call vote. Regular order.

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

CLERK: 15 ayes, 2 nays to place the house under call.

KELLY: 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. Speaker Arch, we're missing Senator Bostar. May we proceed?

ARCH: Yes, please.

KELLY: Members, the first vote is the motion to invoke cloture. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 41 ayes, 0 nays to invoke cloture, Mr. President.

KELLY: Cloture is invoked. The next vote is on the adoption of FA75. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 39 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of the amendment.

KELLY: The amendment is not adopted. Senator Ballard, you're recognized for a motion.

BALLARD: Mr. President, I move that LB816 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

KELLY: Senators, you have heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed, nay. It is adopted-- it is advanced. Raise the call. Mr. Clerk, for items.

CLERK: Mr. President, amendment to be printed from Senator Machaela Cavanaugh to LB816. Additionally, conflict of interest statement filed by Senator Kauth. That will be on fire-- file in the Clerk's office. Next item on the agenda, Mr. President: LB799, Select File. First of all, Senator, I have E&R amendments.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

KELLY: Senator Ballard, you're recognized.

BALLARD: Mr. President, I move the E&R amendments to LB799 be adopted.

KELLY: You've heard the motion. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. The E&R amendments are adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would move to bracket LB79-- LB799 until June 2, 2023.

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

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. President. OK. LB799, judges' salaries. Let's, let's see. LB799. OK. So we-- well, we just passed with E&R, voice vote. Oh, let's see what the E&R is. I'm curious how many people read the E&R amendments before we do our voice, voice vote on them. And you don't have to do a voice vote. You can do a record vote on E&R if you so choose. So-- OK. On page 1, beginning with "judges--" strike beginning with "judges" in line 1 through line 4 and insert, quote, law; to amend Sections 24-209, 24-211, 24-212, 24-503, 24-1109, 48-152, 48-153, 49-506, 49-617, 49-702, revi-- Reissue Revised Statutes of Nebraska and Sections 24-201 and 85-177, Revised Statutes Cumulative Supplement, 2022; to change judges' salaries, provisions relating to publish judicial opinions as prescribed, the number of county court judges and Nebraska Workers' Compensation Court judges and provisions relating to the College of Law; to rename the Reporter of the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals as the Reporter of Decisions and provide duties; to harmonize provisions; to provide operative dates; to repeal the original sections; and to declare an emergency. OK. Now, the interesting thing of this is the amount of work that went into it. So this is E&R-- and that's a significant amount. So it's-- it was placed on Select File on April 13 with E&R. We advanced to Enrollment and Review on April 11. They, they turned that around pretty quickly, actually. Good on them. OK. So we adopted the E&R amendments. And-- oh, we adopted Senator DeBoer's amendment. There was a Judiciary amendment adopted. And let's see. The Judiciary amendment. But the E&R amendments-- OK. So it advanced to E&R. And then we have the E&R amendments placed on Select File with E&R. But this is where I always get a little bit confused because where is the, like, final version? I suppose that's the Judiciary. If AM-- OK. Follow with me, if you can. I'm not sure I can. I'm getting a little tired. If AM1255, which was Senator DeBoer's amendment on General File, was adopted, was it adopted to the Judiciary Committee amendment AM671? And if so, if I were to open up AM671, would that be the conglomeration of the amendments that were moved forward on General

File? So when I look at it, does AM671 now become-- nope. It doesn't. It doesn't because I opened it and it was not. So where do I see the entirety of what we moved forward? This is more I'm just thinking out loud to myself. Because that is where I get kind of like-- all right. So the E&R amendments on page 1 strike "beginning with," but I'm not entirely sure-- page 1 of what? Page 1 of the underlying bill? I guess I'll go to the introduced copy. Yes. OK. Page 1 of the underlying bill, starting with "judges," amends Section-- OK. All right. I got it. I'm catching up here. The E&R amendments opens up more statute. Ah. OK. Here's what's going on: we added amendments to the original underlying bill. And when we added amendments to the original underlying bill, E&R had to update, which is basically the main page of the first bill, where it tells you what parts of statute are in the whole thing. And so, magic, presto, voila, E&R amendments are adopted. That update, that first page-- the first page originally read, A bill for an act relating to judges' salaries to amend Section 24-201.01, Revised Statutes Supplement-- Cumulative Supplement 2022; to change judges' salaries; to provide an operative date; to repeal the original section; and to declare an emergency. Be it enacted by the people of the state of Nebraska. That was the original part. Now, the E&R, a little bit different. When we strike it through, we add in several new parts of, of, of statute. I assume because we had a committee amendment that was most likely more than one bill packaged into it, we are now amending multiple sections of statute. And the fun/interesting thing here-- although-- no, wait. Would that have come out of-- this is a Judiciary bill, not a budget bill? Could-- would Senator-- how much time do I have left?

ARCH: 3:00.

M. CAVANAUGH: Would Senator Wayne yield to a question?

ARCH: Senator Wayne, will you yield to a question?

WAYNE: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: Sorry, Senator Wayne. I'm tired. So, I-- in my head, this-- because it's a salaries bill, it was an appropriation bill, but it's-- is it-- it's a Judiciary Committee bill?

WAYNE: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: How does that work?

WAYNE: What do you mean?

M. CAVANAUGH: Well, like, why wasn't it an Appropriations bill?

WAYNE: Because 30 years ago, all judicial salaries below, below judges went to Appropriations. Thirty years ago, we decided to peel off the judges and have them come in primarily because of sentencing issues and other things. So Judiciary Committee historically was able to ask the Supreme Court and judges on certain issues as it relates to sentencing.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. But the last bill had judges in it, and that was an Appropriations budget bill.

WAYNE: The, the, the-- Speaker Arch's bill?

M. CAVANAUGH: Yeah.

WAYNE: That would have been the constitutional officers, which-- the Supreme Court is the only thing laid out in the constitution in district courts. There's other judges that are laid out in statute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Ah. Thank you for the history lesson, Senator Wayne.

WAYNE: Actually, I don't know if that's really true. I just-- it sounded good when it came out of my head. So if anybody's listening, I could be wrong. But it sounded really good when I said it.

M. CAVANAUGH: I mean, it made sense to me, but-- I, I choose to believe it, how about that? OK. So we've got-- wait. Would Senator Wayne yield to another question?

ARCH: Senator Wayne, will you yield to another question?

WAYNE: Yes.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. I apologize. So we had a Judiciary Committee amendment--

ARCH: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: --on this last go-round. Did that include other bills?

WAYNE: Yes. It--

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. There we go. That's what I was slow on the uptake.

WAYNE: Yeah, it included a Court of Appeals reporting that can be online because it has to be in statute. That's the official record. So

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

we updated that. And then there was a Workers' Comp judge bill. Gives the flexibility to reduce the court-- the Workers' Comp Court by one. And there was one other bill.

M. CAVANAUGH: OK. All right. Thank you.

WAYNE: Thank you.

M. CAVANAUGH: See, I was going on my own educational journey here, and I had to, I had to call in reinforcements because I couldn't answer my own question. So, thank you for the clarification, Senator Wayne. That was very helpful. I think I'm about out of time, so I will yield until my next time.

ARCH: Thank you, Senator Cavanaugh. You're next in the queue. You are recognized.

M. CAVANAUGH: What? Thank you, Mr. President. OK. So, LB799. Judges' salaries, amended, E&R amendments. All right. Here we go. We got the, we got the bill. We got the committee amendment. We got the E&R amendments that update the statute to be reflective of the amendment that we passed the last go-round. And now-- ooh, we should have an updated fis-- do we have an updated fiscal note? That-- no. Just the original fiscal note, which is, expenditures 2023-24 is \$2,156,105 of general funds and then cash funds, \$105,447. So, curious what the cash funds are about. Supreme Court judges receive an increase in salary. Their agency also receives one Worker Compensation Court, but it doesn't say with cash fund. Salaries-- court judges' salaries are based-- I'm just cur-- I'm just curious now what the cash fund is that we are taking \$100,000 out of because it's on there. So, \$105,477.09. Don't forget about the \$0.09. I'm guessing it comes out of the Workers' Compensation Court Cash Fund because they have a fiscal note that specifically reflects that amount. Cool beans. All right. So, as provided in Nebraska Revised Statute, Section 48-159, each judge of the Nebraska Workers' Compensation Court shall receive an annual salary of 92.5 percent of the salary set for the Chief Justice and judges of the Supreme Court. If the Supreme Court judges receive an increase in salary, the Workers' Compensation Court judges also receive an increase. The, quote, benefits increase, stated below, is for FICA and the Medicare surcharge for the additional salary amount. LB799 provides an 8 percent increase on July 1, 2023, and an 8 percent increase on July 1, 2024. Cool. Great. So there we go. The cash fund is a Workers' Compensation Court Cash Fund, presumably because we are paying Workers' Compensation Court judges. So there you go. That was a fun little looky-loo under the hood, see what it says. Then we have

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

the committee statement. Came out 8-0. We've got the proponents: Senator DeBoer; Chief Justice Mike Heavican; Dave Lopez, the Governor's chief of staff; Corey Steel, the Nebraska Administrative Office of Courts and Probation; Susan Strong, District Court Judges; Tricia Freeman, County Judges' Association; Jason Grams, Nebraska State Bar Association. LB799 increases the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Starting July 1, 2023--

ARCH: One minute.

M. CAVANAUGH: Thank you-- the salary will be \$214,300.63. Starting on July 1, 2024, the salary will be \$231,444.68. The amendment reduces the salary to \$212,000 and \$225,000. OK. So that's what we did. We increased the salary but also reduced the salary at the same time. Easy peasy. I see-- I think I'm going to just let us-- I'm going to waive my closing and just let us get to-- just do call of the house and we can vote on this bracket motion. Thank you.

ARCH: 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. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 8 ayes, 3 nays, Mr. President, to place the house under call.

ARCH: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator Brewer, Brewer, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Cavanaugh, we are missing Senator Moser and Senator Brewer. How would you like to proceed? OK. Mr. Clerk, we may proceed. The question before the body is the bracket motion, M0869. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed, nay. Has everyone voted who wishes to vote? Mr. Clerk, please record.

CLERK: 0 ayes, 34 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to bracket.

ARCH: The bracket motion fails.

CLERK: Mr. President, next motion: I have M086--

ARCH: Excuse me. I raise the call.

CLERK: Sorry, Mr. President. Concerning the bill, I've got M0868 and M0867, both with notes that Senator Machaela Cavanaugh would withdraw. In that case, Mr. President, I have nothing further on the bill.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office
Floor Debate April 26, 2023

ARCH: Senator Ballard.

BALLARD: Mr. President, I move that LB799 be advanced to E&R for engrossing.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. All those opposed, nay. LB799 advances. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, a single name add: Senator John Cavanaugh, name added to LB254. Priority motion: Senator Slama would move to adjourn the body until Thursday, April 27, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.

ARCH: All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. We are adjourned.