HOUSE JOURNAL

EIGHTY-NINTH LEGISLATURE, SECOND CALLED SESSION

PROCEEDINGS

TENTH DAY — THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 2025

The house met at 9:57 p.m. and was called to order by the speaker.

The roll of the house was called and a quorum was announced present (Record 133).

Present — Mr. Speaker(C); Alders; Allen; Anchía; Ashby; Barry; Bell, C.; Bell, K.; Bernal; Bhojani; Bonnen; Bowers; Bryant; Buckley; Bucy; Bumgarner; Button; Cain; Campos; Canales; Capriglione; Cole; Collier; Cook; Cortez; Craddick; Cunningham; Curry; Darby; Davis, Y.; Dean; DeAyala; Dorazio; Dutton; Dyson; Fairly; Flores; Frank; Garcia, L.; Garcia Hernandez; Gates; Gerdes; Gervin-Hawkins; González, J.; González, M.; Goodwin; Guillen; Harless; Harris; Harris Davila; Harrison; Hayes; Hefner; Hickland; Hinojosa; Holt; Hopper; Howard; Hull; Hunter; Isaac; Jones, J.; Jones, V.; Kerwin; King; Kitzman; LaHood; Lalani; Lambert; Landgraf; Leach; Leo Wilson; Little; Lopez, J.; Lopez, R.; Louderback; Lowe; Lozano; Lujan; Luther; Manuel; Martinez; McLaughlin; McQueeney; Metcalf; Meyer; Money; Moody; Morales Shaw; Morgan; Muñoz; Olcott; Oliverson; Orr; Patterson; Paul; Perez, M.; Perez, V.; Phelan; Pierson; Plesa; Raymond; Richardson; Romero; Rose; Rosenthal; Schatzline; Schofield; Schoolcraft; Shaheen; Shofner; Simmons; Slawson; Smithee; Spiller; Swanson; Talarico; Tepper; Thompson; Tinderholt; Toth; Troxclair; Turner; VanDeaver; Vasut; Villalobos; Virdell; Vo; Ward Johnson; Wharton; Wilson; Wu; Zwiener.

Absent, Excused — Davis, A.; Gámez; Geren; Guerra; Hernandez; Johnson; Longoria; Martinez Fischer; Meza; Morales, E.; Noble; Ordaz; Walle.

Absent — Garcia, J.; Morales, C.; Reynolds; Rodríguez Ramos.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE GRANTED

On motion of Representative Orr and by unanimous consent, all members who were granted leaves of absence on the previous legislative day were granted leaves for this legislative day.

REGULAR ORDER OF BUSINESS SUSPENDED

On motion of Representative Orr and by unanimous consent, the reading and referral of bills was postponed until just prior to final recess.

GENERAL STATE CALENDAR
SENATE BILLS
THIRD READING

The following bills were laid before the house and read third time:

SB 8 ON THIRD READING
(Orr, Metcalf, Bonnen, Leach, Harris, et al. - House Sponsors)

SB 8, A bill to be entitled An Act relating to the designation and use of certain spaces and facilities according to sex; authorizing a civil penalty and a private civil right of action.

SB 8 - REMARKS

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: Members, I'm motivated to speak because of the comments from two of our colleagues previously. First, my democratic colleague Ms. González, and second, my Republican colleague Mr. Virdell caused me to want to come up here and make a comment on this bill before we deal with it on final passage.

The most haunting figure connected with this bill is the undeniable fact that—year in and year out, decade after decade, century after century—about one percent of the population experiences some kind of gender dysphoria or gender ambiguity. They're there always. They have always been there, and they always will be there. That is the nature of humankind. Rather than recognize that—that there are ambiguities in life and everything is not just black and white and simple—this bill seems to try to remake the facts and act as though there is no one like that. And if there is, then they should not be with us. That's the direct implication of this legislation.

The fact of the matter is this bill is not to protect women. My colleague, Ms. González, made a salient point when she pointed out that if we were concerned about protecting women, we would be dealing with the 400,000 women who are sexually assaulted every year in Texas. We're not dealing with that here—not by a long shot. My colleague, Mr. Virdell, speaking earlier, exhibited a very typical kind of black-and-white analysis when asked, "What would you do, Mr. Virdell, if your child turned out to be a transgender child?" And his response was that would never happen because, "In my household—or I think in my town—we would teach them otherwise." I believe that's what he said. And I'll certainly let him phrase it his own way.

I had the opportunity several years ago to meet for the first time a family with a transgender child and talk at length with the father, who did not know what to do because he wanted to raise his son as his son. But his son was, from the earliest moments of that boy's childhood, behaving like a girl, and there was no changing that. And it continued. They did not know what to do, and they were desperate. I told this story—and I can mention this family because they came to the Capitol and testified. I told this story when we took up the transgender legislation two years ago. You took away their right to continue to get the kind of psychological medical help that child needed. That was taken away. I do not know what they're doing now. But the anxiety and the torture suffered by that man and his wife trying to figure out what to do with this situation would bring anyone to tears.

Colleagues, this is in the nature of human life. Trying to deny it and trying to legislate away from it and act like it doesn't exist is a sin. We heard a lot of religious talk up here from a lot of folks who do a lot of religious talking in

debate. But I just want to tell you something: Everyone born is a child of God, and everyone who is born into this life deserves to be treated that way. That is what the Bible says, that's what our hearts tell us, and the only time we act differently is when we get into politics and we have a lot of misinformed people after us wanting us to act as though that is not true. That is what's motivating this bill—not protection of women, not some kind of a need that's realistic to try to determine the way our society goes forward, but simply fear of politics based upon ignorance.

Let me point something out to you about this bill: It prohibits people who are defined in this bill as female—rather, it requires them—to enter a women's restroom as a person having been born a female and having the reproductive capacity of a female at birth. What are you going to do about the people who have already transitioned into maleness, who look like big old men and have big old beards? The law says they have to go into a women's restroom. That's how ridiculous this bill is. It's upside down. It's misconceived, and it's going to do a lot of damage to a lot of people, cause a lot of confusion, and every time it happens, it's going to cost one of our agencies $25,000. And the second time? $125,000. This is a bad bill. It's a cruel bill. It goes against what all of our mainstream churches have said. I could read them off, but it's late, and I won't do it. But you name the denomination, and I can quote to you what they have said about this bill. It's a bad bill. It's wrong. It separates us from other human beings, and it separates us from the will of God. I hope you will vote no.

REPRESENTATIVE GERVIN-HAWKINS: I speak today for Mandy. Mandy is a non-transgender woman and a mother of three. And the reason I speak for Mandy is because during the time of the hearing, she was not able to speak. She was not able to be heard. But one thing she wanted to be sure of was to let each and every one of you know that she guarantees that every person here has shared a bathroom with a transgender person and survived, so the fear factor is not what has all been told to you all. Transgender people do go to public bathrooms; that's a fact. The bill states that every reasonable step will be taken to make sure that people don't use the wrong bathroom. As y'all have heard, members talk about taking their little ones to the restrooms, and possibly someone who doesn't like how they look or how they walk or how they talk can now file a complaint. That's scary and should not be.

So we want to be clear on what we're doing as we establish these rules that are not clear and so vague. This bill is so vague that it opens up a window of opportunity to be able to criminalize folks in the wrong kind of way. I think Representative Bernal shared it—by him taking his daughter to the restroom properly, he may be penalized for that. That's scary. That's why we need to take time to really look at this bill and make sure that we're not criminalizing people or have unintentional consequences. Mandy wanted to be clear, because she doesn't look like a textbook woman. Too tall, hair too short, maybe too muscular, breasts too small, shoe size too big—she may be identified as someone that she's not. So is it that she needs to carry a note from a doctor because she's had a hysterectomy? Or maybe there is an inspection of her private areas? We're talking about these things as really ridiculous because the bill is ridiculous in

terms of what it's attempting to do. It has nothing to do with protecting women and children and everything to do with targeting transgender children and adults—making them unsafe, humiliating them, and restricting their movements and existence in public. It's gross and shameful. We need to vote no on this bill.

I also want to talk for Julia, another woman who's a cancer survivor and not transgender. "My name is Julia, and I'm a cisgendered woman and a cancer survivor. I'm here to urge you to oppose **SB 8**, the so-called 'bathroom bill,' because it puts women like me, and countless others, at risk." Even though you may not understand the idea of transgender or people who are different, I think as we invoke the Lord all the time and we're supposed to take care of people, that indeed we should think about that—how we take care of those who are different than us. Julia says, "During my cancer treatment, I lost almost all my hair. Even now, after months of recovery, my hair is thin and patchy. During treatment, I was confronted while trying to use the woman's restroom at my local library." Can you imagine a woman who has just been dealing with cancer was confronted because she doesn't have any hair? A stranger questioned whether she belonged there or not simply because her appearance didn't fit the expectations of what a woman should look like. "That moment was so humiliating and frightening. It made me feel like less of myself in public. And this is what some of our folks are suffering from."

Bills like **SB 8** are not really about safety; they're about appearance. They send the message that how someone looks is more important than who they are. This law will embolden people to police one another based on stereotypes and personal prejudice, turning every public restroom—I want to repeat that—turning every public restroom into a potential scene of confrontation, not just for transgender or nonbinary Texans, but for any woman who doesn't fit the norm. Julia says, "I survived cancer, but now I worry about being publicly shamed, harassed, or even denied access to necessary facilities because of my haircut and my body." We should trust people for who they are, not subject them to scrutiny over how they look. Julia says, "**SB 8**—please oppose it. It's not right. Texans deserve better than laws that encourage suspicion, exclusion, and harm, all in the name of policing gender. Reject fear, and stand up for dignity, privacy, and respect for all."

Members, I ask again, like I asked a week ago—we need some brave Texans. We need some brave Republican Texans who are willing to step away from the playbook and do what's right for people. So Julia and Mandy say, "Vote no on **SB 8**, and protect people who are different."

REPRESENTATIVE J. JONES: I'm respectfully asking that you vote against this bill. As I read the bill, it made me think of two people. The first person I want to talk about is a woman named Nikki Araguz. Nikki was born intersex, and, interestingly, so was her grandmother. And I didn't really understand about intersex until Nikki sat me down and shared with me how her parents' decision—because the doctors forced her parents to pick who she was, because they thought she had both sexes. They decided that Nikki was a boy. Nikki's parents raised Nikki as a boy, but Nikki was never a boy. And her life was literally destroyed because she was misidentified at birth. Not by parents who

hated her; her parents loved her, but they thought that she was a boy. And Nikki is the person, ultimately, that went all the way up to the Supreme Court. She lived the best life that she could with the discrimination that happened to her because of the decision her parents made. And she took it up to the Supreme Court, where she was allowed to be married to her husband, notwithstanding that her parents picked the wrong sex. She would be negatively affected by this bill all because of her parents—nothing to do with her.

The next person I think about is a client I had years ago, who was trans. He was mistreated in the jail—or I should say she was mistreated in the jail—and the jail tried to force her and tried to make me refer to her as a name that she was born with, which I refused to do. But when I was trying to figure out mitigation evidence for my client, I called her mom because the courts didn't understand who she was. When I called her mom, her mom said that when she was in preschool—when the teachers lined up the kids at the restrooms and they put the boys in one line and they put the girls in another line—that her daughter would always go to the girl line, even though her daughter was born in a male's body. Her daughter wasn't molested; her daughter didn't have anybody around her telling her or trying to change her mind; that's just who she was. Since before she ever got to school, her daughter always played with dolls. So just because you're born into a body, that does not mean that that is who you are. And I worry about her, under this bill, when she goes to the women's restroom. She was raped multiple times in the Harris County Jail because they put her in the general population of men. They brutalized her, and they did not care about her. This bill is just not right.

This bill penalizes people for who they are, because they're born like they're born. And because of Nikki and because of my client—whose name I'm not going to share—there is no way on God's green earth I'm voting for this bill. Because it targets people for something they cannot control. Who are we to be the police? We're not. Just like you're different in your own way, and that's just who you are. I respect that, and I just wish that the State of Texas would respect other people like we respect you. I respectfully urge you to vote against this bill because it really does affect people's lives negatively. I fear that it's going to cause a lot of people to just not want to live anymore because the State of Texas has targeted them.

REPRESENTATIVE BERNAL: In the past, I've come to talk to you about issues where I think we're making bad decisions or we're making bad policy. I know that you might be tired and tired of it. But sometimes I feel like it's our job to be the Jiminy Crickets of the house. I say that because this is about trans people. You say it's about safety, and you might believe that, but I don't. Because you didn't make it illegal for someone who has been convicted of rape to access a public bathroom. If it was about safety, you would have done that. But that was never part of the conversation. In the 10 years we've been talking about this, that's never come up. Somehow danger is only from someone who's trans, so don't tell me it is when you drop the ball on that. You could have made it illegal for someone who's been convicted of sexual assault to access a public bathroom, but you did not. Somehow the greater danger is someone who's trans, not

someone who's demonstrated to you that they're capable of that kind of violence. You could've made it about someone who's on the sex offender registry. You could've said, "It is illegal for this person to use a public bathroom." And you did not, because it is not about that.

It is about a particular group of people that you don't like and you want to score political points off. And you're making an assumption—a conclusion—that somehow the three groups of people that I just listed and the trans community are the same. They are not. So it's bad policy. You know what else is bad policy? Because, as I mentioned before, I can take my young daughter to the men's room, but I can't take her to the women's restroom, even if it's empty. That is bad policy. If she were a toddler and I were in a situation where only the women's restroom had a changing table, I could not use it, even if it were empty. That is bad policy. And you're doing it, like you said, because you can. But that doesn't make it okay. If anyone's seen *Jurassic Park*, you spent so much time thinking about whether or not you could, you didn't think about whether or not you should.

Someone asked me why we care about—or why I care about; I only speak for myself—why I care about trans people so much. And you may be surprised to find out that I don't. I don't care about trans people so much. I care about people. And what you don't seem to understand is that in caring about people, we care about all people. The big tent. You have to stretch it out and include everybody. And that actually includes you. I want you to be able to work 40 hours a week and afford a place to live. I want your kids to go to schools that are well-funded and safe. If you're from another country, I want you to earn a path to citizenship. I don't want you to be denied the ability to buy land based on where you're from. We don't just care about one group of people; we care about all people. So much of the work that you have done here is about excluding people—focusing on them and creating a very narrow version of Texas that I completely reject because Texas is all of its people. The work that we're doing is not about one group; it's about every group. And believe it or not, it includes you too. It includes you, it includes the people you care about, and it includes the people you don't care about. I think we should be done with this kind of legislation because it is not governing, it is not protecting, and, as I mentioned before, it's disingenuous. So let's get on to bigger and better things and work on behalf of all Texans, as opposed to pointing them out and cleaving them out, because that's not Texas for all of us. That's just the Texas for some, and we should reject that.

REPRESENTATIVE ZWIENER: I stand up here furious. I'm furious because I stood up here in May and told you about a friend of mine, Van, who was fleeing the state because of our policies. And I'm furious because now my friend, Jessica, is fleeing the state because of these policies. A lot of us have talked about the impact on trans people, but y'all don't seem to hear it. These folks are afraid that they are going to be killed because of the climate you are helping build in the State of Texas, because of the hate that is being stoked every single day. And y'all, I'm going to tell you what the trans agenda is. It's real simple. They just want y'all to leave them the hell alone. They want to be able to live their lives,

raise their families, work their jobs, and enjoy this great state we call home. Y'all just are so obsessed with them that you can't leave them alone. It's cruel and it's unfair.

I'm also furious because in this body's hunger to do something to "own the libs," to "own the trans people," this bill is also doing violence to the rule of law. Every single attorney in this room that has picked up this bill and has actually read it knows that. Page 10 of this bill lays out that a Texas court cannot hear challenges to the constitutionality of this bill. We do not believe our elected judges here in the State of Texas should be able to hear challenges to this bill? Y'all, judicial review is a foundational part of the American and Texas governments since 1804. We decided as a country that the legislature alone should not get to determine constitutionality or get to interpret the law. We committed that to the judicial branch, and Texas followed in that tradition. Open courts are a foundation of how our nation works, and this bill is trying to erase that core principle. And here's what's wild: I think if that were the only provision up before this body, it wouldn't have reached the floor. Because y'all know it's wrong. But there is not the political courage in this room to stand up for the rule of law if you might have to also not be as mean as possible to trans people at the same time. I think that is what is so infuriating. People in this room know we are doing harm both to trans people and to the foundation of how our government works. The Texas Legislature keeps turning over our chamber—our work—over to one man, Jonathan Mitchell, who is using our legislation as an experiment for how far he can push the American legal system. And y'all just keep sitting back and letting it happen. That is wrong, and it is cowardly. It is also disgraceful that I have been unable to ask the author questions about any of this portion of the bill.

Look, if y'all support a piece of legislation, if you're going to carry a piece of legislation, then stand up here and defend it with your whole chest. If you can't do it, don't carry the bill. If you're going to vote for a piece of legislation, stand up and tell me why every provision of this is good with your whole chest. If you can't do that, rethink your vote. Vote no.

REPRESENTATIVE J. GONZÁLEZ: You know, we're here again today because folks like to continue legislating on topics that they have no basic knowledge of. That was made very clear in the layout from the author.

Look, our duty as lawmakers is to make informed decisions that will impact not just our constituents but the entire State of Texas. With that in mind, I can't allow the excuse of ignorance to undermine my neighbors, my friends, my nieces, my nephews, their children, and my colleagues' children; how they will be treated with dignity under the law. So let me be clear: Transgender people exist. It's not just a theory. They are not a debate topic, as a lot of folks in this room like to make them. They're human beings just like each of us in this room. They are Texans, our constituents, our neighbors, and our students, whether you admit that or not—whether you admit that you have trans people in your districts or not. They're people just like us. Every major medical association in this country recognizes that transgender people deserve the same respect and rights as anyone else. That's not my opinion; that's a fact. But facts don't seem to matter to a majority of this body I've come to learn in the last four sessions that I've served.

Let me also be clear about what **SB 8** does. It does not make anyone safer. What it does is give a license to harassment. It encourages strangers to play gender police in schools, airports, stadiums, hospitals, courthouses, and even domestic violence shelters. Folks here are just trying to seek a place to feel safe. It invites people to confront shame and exclude anyone that doesn't fit their personal stereotype of what a man or a woman should look like. That is not public safety. That is legalized bullying. And members, you should know better than that. If this body truly wants to understand, here is a much-needed "Trans 101." We all have a deep, innate, and inherent understanding of who we are as individuals. That is no different for a trans person. When talking to trans people—or anyone for that matter—it should be common courtesy for us to be respectful of someone's whole and full identity and understand where education ends and privacy begins. Everyone's medical information is personal and private. I would never think to ask any of you to disclose private medical history.

Members, I know many trans people in this state and across America that I've had the pleasure to get to know—especially in my service here in my Texas house. They are just loving, welcoming, and warm people who perfectly encapsulate the spirit of what it means to be a Texan. Many are better Texans than myself, I think, and certainly better than folks that are supporting this bill. But I'm proud to know them and I'm proud to fight for them every day even though this is exhausting. I don't know how much more bullying this body wants to make them go through. But if they were here as members of this body, I would believe that they would come to this front mic to proudly and loudly share that there's no big secret. There's no big conspiracy that they're working to enact or ideology that they're working to spread across the state or the country. They would stand here, look you in the eye, and ask you to leave them alone and just let them live their lives the way that they know is best for them. Just like many of you have taken for granted every single day. And in fact, you wouldn't survive even five minutes in their shoes. So just let them live; let them be. That's all that they want, and that's all that they ever expected from this body. But for the better part of the decade, they've been disappointed by the government that is supposed to represent their interests and advocate their rights and liberties. I can tell you that they would much rather spend their waking moments worrying about the same problems that each and every one of us worry about. Should this bill become law, an entire subsection of the Texas population will have a target on their back, with many people who are not trans being thrown in the crossfire.

I have witnessed an unprecedented amount of targeted hate against my fellow trans Texans. These people are part of my community. I will not let you attack their dignity and human rights because of your own discomfort or because you want to gain political points. This legislature has spent the entirety of 2025 disrespecting and dehumanizing trans and gender-expansive Texans. There has been an ever-growing presence of bigotry and transphobia in this very building—in this very building. This bill isn't rooted in justice, law, or humanity. This is pure politics. Shame on the author for bringing this before the body and for the pain that will be caused by passing this bill.

I want to share a couple of situations that have happened here in this very Capitol. And some of the folks we need to be worried about regulating—some of these folks—are men from this body that do actually go into the women's restroom. In fact, one member of this body last regular session when I was walking into the women's restroom was in the women's restroom because it was closer to his office. Another member—who was not a member when this happened—was here advocating for some anti-trans policy—I can't even remember which one it was—went and grabbed a little girl out of the women's restroom because he thought she was trans, and she was, in fact, not. Her dad—you can imagine what her dad wanted to do to this gentleman. I certainly would've handled it a little bit—I don't know how I would've handled it. But that last example—this is exactly what this bill is going to do. People are going to play the potty police. People are going to think that they know if this person is a man or a woman, and you are going to have creepy men going into the women's restroom trying to pull a child out. If that's what you want, hey, that's what you're going to get with this bill right here. So members, vote against **SB 8**. Let's put this fight aside and get to work for the good of the people. Because we're tired and they're tired. They just want to be left alone and just live their lives. This creepy obsession—I think you guys really need to be thinking about that.

REPRESENTATIVE BUCY: Representative, I wanted to ask the bill author, but she just decided not to take questions, and I want to set a record straight. In the layout of second reading at about 1:45 p.m. today, it was stated in a question to the bill author: Can you point to Texas examples of where this has happened? And one of the only two examples given mentioned Round Rock ISD. As a representative that represents Round Rock ISD, to hear this was surprising. So I had my staff immediately go do research and figure out where this accusation could be coming from. We searched all the credible new sources we could find—no reference to this accusation made in the layout in the second reading. So then they dug deeper, and they found, from an advocacy group—a rogue rag group called Texas Values—they found an article from 2021 accusing a boy of being in a female locker room—this banned student that was referenced. The reason given when you ask for why this bill is needed: this was one of the two examples given. Well, I just want to be clear—I can't ask the bill author because she's not taking questions—if she reached out to Round Rock ISD for their side of the story. Well, I did. And speaking with Round Rock ISD, it may surprise you to know they wanted to clarify that the article wasn't an accurate report. When they came to testify based on that article, it was an inaccurate testimony. It's an incredible misrepresentation of the truth. I think it's important that the justification for this bill that was given by the bill author to know that it was bullshit. There was no truth to that article except for rogue, paid-for organizations that are here to try to pass this bill. They're getting paid to do it. So I think we need to be honest with the people of Texas. That was a fake story from Round Rock ISD.

J. GONZÁLEZ: Thank you, Representative, for looking into the actual facts. As I mentioned in my speech, it doesn't seem that the majority of this body seems to really care about.

ZWIENER: Thank you so much for yielding, Representative Orr. I wanted to ask you just about the last two sections of the bill, hopefully very quickly. I know that we're all very tired. I'm looking at page 10 around the jurisdiction, and I wanted to ask—this provision, as I read it, prevents any challenges from this bill being brought to Texas courts. Is that accurate?

ORR: Yes.

ZWIENER: Why does this section need to be included in the bill?

ORR: We wanted to direct all the appeals to the Fifteenth Court of Appeals.

ZWIENER: I'm sorry. I think that's actually appeals for people that are bringing the private cause of action or the AG suits. I don't think this section actually gives any authority to the Court of Appeals. It just blocks any challenges to this law in any Texas court. So if you were to say that this law was unconstitutional, either under the Texas Constitution or the federal Constitution, you couldn't bring that to a Texas court. Is that accurate?

ORR: That is accurate.

ZWIENER: Okay. So are you confident in the constitutionality of this law?

ORR: I am.

ZWIENER: So why would we block people from being able to have their day in court and settle that in a Texas court?

ORR: It is a commonsense bill. It is a commonsense idea. I don't think that the challenge of this is the most important thing about this bill.

ZWIENER: Are you aware of any other instances where we have precluded Texas citizens from being able to challenge one of our laws in Texas courts?

ORR: I am not advised.

ZWIENER: I am not aware of any, I will posit. Then I wanted to ask about the section of the bill on pages 11 and 12 around fee shifting. My understanding of this language is that it makes it so that if somebody does challenge this bill in either state or federal court—obviously they're presuming the previous section gets thrown out for it to be challenged in state court—but that if somebody challenges this bill in court and that challenge is dismissed for any reason, whether it's voluntary dismissal or dismissal without prejudice or dismissal with prejudice, that both the party that brought the claim and their attorneys are liable for all of the attorney fees for the state. Is that your understanding?

ORR: That is my understanding.

ZWIENER: So why do you think we need this draconian provision that, to my knowledge, has only been put in one other bill, actually earlier **SB 8** from 2021? Why do we need this provision that penalizes Texans for trying to access the judicial system?

ORR: We're talking about the fee shifting provision?

ZWIENER: Yes.

ORR: The fee shifting was put into the bill to try to protect taxpayers if a city councilman or a commissioner in a commissioner's court chose to knowingly produce a bad policy—or not enforce a policy—that's in place and got sued. We didn't want that burden to be on the local governments.

ZWIENER: The challenge, I think, is this provision only applies one way. So if a city, the state, or another entity was blatantly wrong, they wouldn't owe fees back to the challenging party. But if even for good cause, there's a good-faith claim that ended up in a dismissal, the challenging party would end up paying all of those fees over. And the other thing that's very unique about this is that liability isn't just on the party; it's also on the attorney themselves. Are you concerned that this is functionally foreclosing Texans' access to justice?

ORR: I am not.

ZWIENER: Are you aware that for this bill to be challenged somebody has to try to find an attorney who is what we call "judgement proof"—i.e., has nothing to collect from them or is willing to take on this financial risk?

ORR: Yes.

ZWIENER: Do you think that's reasonable?

ORR: I do.

REPRESENTATIVE ROSE: Representative Orr, I just have a couple of clarifying questions for you. Does the definition of "multi-occupancy private space" impact areas of public hospitals like an emergency room or a recovery area where patients are located in the same area but separated by curtains or a partial wall?

REPRESENTATIVE ORR: There is a provision in here for medical and emergency services. I believe it falls under that designation. That's page 4, line 23.

ROSE: Page 4, line 23?

ORR: Yes, ma'am.

ROSE: Okay, and my second question: Is the medical personnel exemption on page four, line 23, broad enough to cover all of the hospital personnel that are required to be in those patients' care areas that are not providing direct medical care—such as health care personnel, registration, and family members?

ORR: I think that will meet that exception.

ROSE: Okay.

REMARKS ORDERED PRINTED

Representative Plesa moved to print all remarks on **SB 8** and **HB 7** on second reading.

The motion prevailed. [Please refer to the Day 9 cont'd supplement for the text of the debate on **SB 8** and **HB 7** on second reading.]

Representative Plesa moved to print all remarks on **SB 8** and **HB 7** on third reading.

The motion prevailed.

SB 8 was passed by (Record 134): 86 Yeas, 45 Nays, 1 Present, not voting.

Yeas — Alders; Ashby; Barry; Bell, C.; Bell, K.; Bonnen; Buckley; Bumgarner; Button; Cain; Capriglione; Cook; Craddick; Cunningham; Curry; Darby; Dean; DeAyala; Dorazio; Dyson; Fairly; Frank; Gates; Gerdes; Guillen; Harless; Harris; Harris Davila; Harrison; Hayes; Hefner; Hickland; Holt; Hopper; Hull; Hunter; Isaac; Kerwin; King; Kitzman; LaHood; Lambert; Landgraf; Leach; Little; Lopez, J.; Louderback; Lowe; Lozano; Lujan; Luther; McLaughlin; McQueeney; Metcalf; Meyer; Money; Morgan; Muñoz; Olcott; Oliverson; Orr; Patterson; Paul; Phelan; Pierson; Raymond; Richardson; Schatzline; Schofield; Schoolcraft; Shaheen; Shofner; Slawson; Smithee; Spiller; Swanson; Tepper; Tinderholt; Toth; Troxclair; VanDeaver; Vasut; Villalobos; Virdell; Wharton; Wilson.

Nays — Allen; Anchía; Bernal; Bhojani; Bowers; Bryant; Bucy; Campos; Canales; Cole; Collier; Cortez; Davis, Y.; Dutton; Flores; Garcia, L.; Garcia Hernandez; Gervin-Hawkins; González, J.; González, M.; Goodwin; Hinojosa; Howard; Jones, J.; Jones, V.; Lalani; Lopez, R.; Manuel; Martinez; Moody; Morales Shaw; Perez, M.; Perez, V.; Plesa; Romero; Rose; Rosenthal; Simmons; Talarico; Thompson; Turner; Vo; Ward Johnson; Wu; Zwiener.

Present, not voting — Mr. Speaker(C).

Absent, Excused — Davis, A.; Gámez; Geren; Guerra; Hernandez; Johnson; Longoria; Martinez Fischer; Meza; Morales, E.; Noble; Ordaz; Walle.

Absent — Garcia, J.; Leo Wilson; Morales, C.; Reynolds; Rodríguez Ramos.

STATEMENTS OF VOTE

When Record No. 134 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted no.

C. Morales

When Record No. 134 was taken, I was excused because of a family medical emergency. I would have voted yes.

Noble

When Record No. 134 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted no.

Rodríguez Ramos

REASONS FOR VOTE

Representative C. Morales submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote on **SB 8** was cast, I was away from my desk in protest of this special session's redistricting scheme and the harm the proposed map would impose. I would have voted no. **SB 8** targets transgender Texans, especially youth and women, for exclusion from public spaces and services, discriminating based on gender identity. This bill creates state-sanctioned barriers to access, particularly at family violence shelters and correctional facilities, and continues a pattern of centralization of state authority to enforce social control over local governments, schools, shelters, and health providers. This Big Brother-style government surveillance of bathrooms creates costly legal uncertainty for schools, local governments, shelters, and businesses, making Texas a hostile and expensive place to invest.

Representative Rodríguez Ramos submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote for **SB 8** was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session called to pass a racially gerrymandered redistricting scheme. I would have voted no. **SB 8** targets transgender Texans, especially youth and women, for exclusion from public spaces and services, discriminating based on gender identity. This bill creates state-sanctioned barriers to access, particularly at family violence shelters and correctional facilities, and continues a pattern of centralization of state authority to enforce social control over local governments, schools, shelters, and health providers. This Big Brother-style government surveillance of bathrooms creates costly legal uncertainty for schools, local governments, shelters, and businesses, making Texas a hostile and expensive place to invest.

GENERAL STATE CALENDAR
HOUSE BILLS
THIRD READING

The following bills were laid before the house and read third time:

HB 7 ON THIRD READING
(by Leach, Hickland, Troxclair, Pierson, Metcalf, et al.)

HB 7, A bill to be entitled An Act relating to prohibitions on the manufacture and provision of abortion-inducing drugs, including the jurisdiction of and effect of certain judgments by courts within and outside this state with respect to the manufacture and provision of those drugs, and to protections from certain counteractions under the laws of other states and jurisdictions; authorizing qui tam actions.

HB 7 - REMARKS

REPRESENTATIVE LEACH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I move passage of **HB 7**.

REPRESENTATIVE GARCIA HERNANDEZ: Texas is founded on principles of liberty, justice, and personal responsibility. **HB 7**, however, threatens those very ideals. It replaces our institutions with vigilante enforcement, criminalizes health care, and isolates Texans—especially those in crisis. **HB 7** fails Texas women and families in the following ways: **HB 7** denies access to essential care. For countless Texans, abortion pills represent the last safe and accessible health care option. Restricting this route not only denies health care but endangers lives—especially for those who cannot leave the state. **HB 7** creates legal instability. Judge after judge has raised concerns about the constitutionality of citizen-enforcement mechanisms like those in **HB 7**. **HB 7** is merely rewriting a flawed model. We shouldn't court legal chaos and create it and billions in litigation to enforce policy. **HB 7** causes a chilling effect on the practice of medicine. Physicians must worry about legal retaliation simply for fulfilling their duty to save lives, whether in emergencies or routine reproductive health, and that's unacceptable. Fear should not be a treatment plan. **HB 7** encourages litigation over compassion. **HB 7** turns our legal system into a marketplace for lawsuits. Power doesn't belong to procedural profiteers. It belongs to Texas families and the public institutions we've empowered to advance justice. **HB 7** overreaches and has federalism concerns.

This bill reaches beyond Texas' borders and intentions. Our approach must respect the bounded authority of our state and avoid launching interjurisdictional legal wars that neither our courts nor our citizens can win. Earlier, I heard one of my colleagues discussing with the author of the bill regarding the fearfulness of pregnancy. I wanted to thank, in particular, one of my colleagues who's up here with me, Representative Mihaela Plesa. Both me, as well as Representative Mihaela Plesa, struggle with fertility. We are one of two women here in the legislature, but there are others all over the State of Texas that are fearful not only in planning our families but of what will happen whenever we get pregnant—if we're even able to get pregnant. These are the kinds of things that are weighing heavy on women's minds all over Texas.

I understand that the author was very moved and concerned about the fact that women in Texas may be fearful of pregnancy. I can tell you as someone who has been struggling with this for quite some time, it's something that I am fearful of. These kinds of bills that we put forward are not just bills that impact our constituents but also impact us here in this building as well. I hope that y'all will have compassion and recognize that these bills have real impact on people in Texas—especially women. Let's invest in real solutions like maternal support, health care education, and access to care—not lawsuits. **HB 7** doesn't protect Texas women, families, me, Mihaela Plesa, and so many other women across this state—women like us who are struggling with fertility and wanting to also figure out how to start our families as well. These types of laws punish us, hurt us, and very often even kill us. I urge you to vote no on **HB 7**.

HB 7 was passed by (Record 135): 82 Yeas, 48 Nays, 3 Present, not voting.

Yeas — Alders; Ashby; Barry; Bell, C.; Bell, K.; Bonnen; Buckley; Bumgarner; Button; Cain; Capriglione; Cook; Craddick; Cunningham; Curry; Darby; Dean; DeAyala; Dorazio; Dyson; Fairly; Frank; Gates; Gerdes; Guillen;

Harless; Harris; Harris Davila; Hayes; Hefner; Hickland; Holt; Hopper; Hull; Hunter; Isaac; Kerwin; King; Kitzman; LaHood; Lambert; Landgraf; Leach; Leo Wilson; Little; Lopez, J.; Louderback; Lozano; Lujan; Luther; McLaughlin; McQueeney; Metcalf; Meyer; Morgan; Olcott; Oliverson; Orr; Patterson; Paul; Phelan; Pierson; Richardson; Schatzline; Schofield; Schoolcraft; Shaheen; Shofner; Slawson; Smithee; Spiller; Swanson; Tepper; Tinderholt; Toth; Troxclair; VanDeaver; Vasut; Villalobos; Virdell; Wharton; Wilson.

Nays — Allen; Anchía; Bernal; Bhojani; Bowers; Bryant; Bucy; Campos; Canales; Cole; Collier; Cortez; Davis, Y.; Dutton; Flores; Garcia, L.; Garcia Hernandez; Gervin-Hawkins; González, J.; González, M.; Goodwin; Harrison; Hinojosa; Howard; Jones, J.; Jones, V.; Lalani; Lopez, R.; Manuel; Martinez; Moody; Morales Shaw; Muñoz; Perez, M.; Perez, V.; Plesa; Raymond; Romero; Rose; Rosenthal; Simmons; Talarico; Thompson; Turner; Vo; Ward Johnson; Wu; Zwiener.

Present, not voting — Mr. Speaker(C); Lowe; Money.

Absent, Excused — Davis, A.; Gámez; Geren; Guerra; Hernandez; Johnson; Longoria; Martinez Fischer; Meza; Morales, E.; Noble; Ordaz; Walle.

Absent — Garcia, J.; Morales, C.; Reynolds; Rodríguez Ramos.

STATEMENTS OF VOTE

When Record No. 135 was taken, I was shown voting no. I intended to vote yes.

Harrison

When Record No. 135 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted no.

C. Morales

When Record No. 135 was taken, I was excused because of a family medical emergency. I would have voted yes.

Noble

When Record No. 135 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted no.

Rodríguez Ramos

REASONS FOR VOTE

Representative Holt submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

I voted for **HB 7** out of a deep conviction that I must vote for any piece of legislation that could save the life of even one unborn child. I am proud to have taken that vote. I also support equal protection for the unborn and respect my colleagues who spoke out on the importance of passing legislation that

completely abolishes abortion. I will continue to co-author and support bills that protect the unborn, whether in steps or in a whole measure, and look forward to the day when the intentional killing of the unborn is completely unthinkable.

Representative C. Morales submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote on **HB 7** was cast, I was away from my desk in protest of this special session's redistricting scheme and the harm the proposed map would impose. I would have voted no. **HB 7** silences and intimidates communities by turning private citizens into bounty hunters, even if the claimant is not injured, while creating an avenue for "charitable" private entities to recover up to $90,000 in damages. **HB 7** will hurt women and intimidate working families considering whether to start a family. This bill profits from restricting health care and funnels the money into shadowy anti-choice organizations

Representative Richardson submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

I voted for **HB 7** because I support any legislation that saves life. I will continue to co-author and support bills that protect the unborn whether in steps or in a whole measure.

Representative Rodríguez Ramos submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote for **HB 7** was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session called to pass a racially gerrymandered redistricting scheme. I would have voted no. **HB 7** silences and intimidates communities by turning private citizens into bounty hunters, even if the claimant is not injured, while creating an avenue for "charitable" private entities to recover up to $90,000 in damages. **HB 7** will hurt women and intimidate working families considering whether to start a family. This bill profits from restricting health care and funnels the money into shadowy anti-choice organizations.

HB 15 ON THIRD READING
(by Hefner, Ashby, and Cook)

HB 15, A bill to be entitled An Act relating to certain files maintained by a law enforcement agency regarding certain employees of the agency.

HB 15 was passed by (Record 136): 90 Yeas, 41 Nays, 1 Present, not voting.

Yeas — Alders; Ashby; Barry; Bell, C.; Bell, K.; Bhojani; Bonnen; Buckley; Bumgarner; Button; Capriglione; Cook; Cortez; Craddick; Cunningham; Curry; Darby; Dean; DeAyala; Dorazio; Dyson; Fairly; Frank; Gates; Gerdes; Guillen; Harless; Harris; Harris Davila; Hayes; Hefner; Hickland; Holt; Hopper; Hull; Hunter; Isaac; Kerwin; King; Kitzman; LaHood; Lambert; Landgraf; Leach; Leo Wilson; Little; Lopez, J.; Lopez, R.; Louderback; Lowe; Lozano; Lujan; Luther; McLaughlin; McQueeney; Metcalf; Meyer; Money; Moody; Morgan; Muñoz; Olcott; Oliverson; Orr; Patterson; Paul; Phelan; Pierson; Plesa; Raymond;

Richardson; Schatzline; Schofield; Schoolcraft; Shaheen; Shofner; Slawson; Smithee; Spiller; Swanson; Tepper; Tinderholt; Toth; Troxclair; VanDeaver; Vasut; Villalobos; Virdell; Wharton; Wilson.

Nays — Allen; Anchía; Bernal; Bowers; Bryant; Bucy; Campos; Canales; Cole; Collier; Davis, Y.; Dutton; Flores; Garcia, L.; Garcia Hernandez; Gervin-Hawkins; González, J.; González, M.; Goodwin; Harrison; Hinojosa; Howard; Jones, J.; Jones, V.; Lalani; Manuel; Martinez; Morales Shaw; Perez, M.; Perez, V.; Romero; Rose; Rosenthal; Simmons; Talarico; Thompson; Turner; Vo; Ward Johnson; Wu; Zwiener.

Present, not voting — Mr. Speaker(C).

Absent, Excused — Davis, A.; Gámez; Geren; Guerra; Hernandez; Johnson; Longoria; Martinez Fischer; Meza; Morales, E.; Noble; Ordaz; Walle.

Absent — Cain; Garcia, J.; Morales, C.; Reynolds; Rodríguez Ramos.

STATEMENTS OF VOTE

When Record No. 136 was taken, I was shown voting yes. I intended to vote no.

Bhojani

When Record No. 136 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted no.

C. Morales

When Record No. 136 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted no.

Rodríguez Ramos

REASONS FOR VOTE

Representative C. Morales submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote on **HB 15** was cast, I was away from my desk in protest of this special session's redistricting scheme and the harm the proposed map would impose. I would have voted no on **HB 15** because the public has a right to know if officers have a pattern of abuse or misconduct. This bill hides those records from public view, even when a community's safety may be at risk. By shielding complaint documents and hiding evaluations from public oversight, **HB 15** reduces accountability and limits the public's ability to identify patterns of abuse or misconduct. With the hindsight that the senate would strip the amendment that would allow the families of Robb Elementary students to obtain these records—supporting this bill would be an affront to them and the 22 families that were destroyed in Uvalde.

Representative Rodríguez Ramos submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote for **HB 15** was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session called to pass a racially gerrymandered redistricting scheme. I would have voted no on **HB 15** because the public has a right to know if officers have a pattern of abuse or misconduct. This bill hides those records from public view, even when a community's safety may be at risk. By shielding complaint documents and hiding evaluations from public oversight, **HB 15** reduces accountability and limits the public's ability to identify patterns of abuse or misconduct. This could prevent the families of the Robb Elementary tragedy from getting the answers and closure they deserve.

HB 265 ON THIRD READING
(by Hull, Meyer, Slawson, Leo Wilson, Leach, et al.)

HB 265, A bill to be entitled An Act relating to governmental oversight of youth camps, including youth camp rules, duties, and the advisory committee.

HB 265 was passed by (Record 137): 128 Yeas, 3 Nays, 1 Present, not voting.

Yeas — Alders; Allen; Anchía; Ashby; Barry; Bell, C.; Bell, K.; Bernal; Bhojani; Bonnen; Bowers; Bryant; Buckley; Bucy; Bumgarner; Button; Cain; Campos; Canales; Capriglione; Cole; Cook; Cortez; Craddick; Cunningham; Curry; Darby; Davis, Y.; Dean; DeAyala; Dorazio; Dutton; Dyson; Fairly; Flores; Frank; Garcia, L.; Garcia Hernandez; Gates; Gerdes; Gervin-Hawkins; González, J.; González, M.; Goodwin; Guillen; Harless; Harris; Harris Davila; Hayes; Hefner; Hickland; Hinojosa; Holt; Hopper; Howard; Hull; Hunter; Isaac; Jones, J.; Jones, V.; Kerwin; King; Kitzman; LaHood; Lalani; Lambert; Landgraf; Leach; Leo Wilson; Little; Lopez, J.; Lopez, R.; Louderback; Lowe; Lozano; Lujan; Luther; Manuel; Martinez; McLaughlin; McQueeney; Metcalf; Meyer; Moody; Morales Shaw; Morgan; Muñoz; Olcott; Oliverson; Orr; Patterson; Paul; Perez, M.; Perez, V.; Phelan; Pierson; Plesa; Raymond; Richardson; Romero; Rose; Rosenthal; Schofield; Schoolcraft; Shaheen; Shofner; Simmons; Slawson; Smithee; Spiller; Swanson; Talarico; Tepper; Thompson; Tinderholt; Toth; Troxclair; Turner; VanDeaver; Vasut; Villalobos; Virdell; Vo; Ward Johnson; Wharton; Wilson; Wu; Zwiener.

Nays — Collier; Harrison; Money.

Present, not voting — Mr. Speaker(C).

Absent, Excused — Davis, A.; Gámez; Geren; Guerra; Hernandez; Johnson; Longoria; Martinez Fischer; Meza; Morales, E.; Noble; Ordaz; Walle.

Absent — Garcia, J.; Morales, C.; Reynolds; Rodríguez Ramos; Schatzline.

STATEMENTS OF VOTE

When Record No. 137 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted yes.

C. Morales

When Record No. 137 was taken, I was excused because of a family medical emergency. I would have voted yes.

Noble

When Record No. 137 was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session. I would have voted yes.

Rodríguez Ramos

REASONS FOR VOTE

Representative C. Morales submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote on **HB 265** was cast, I was away from my desk in protest of this special session's redistricting scheme and the harm the proposed map would impose. I would have voted yes. The July 4 flooding in the Hill Country highlighted the need for the state to ensure that youth camps follow health and safety standards to protect young campers. **HB 265** provides commonsense safety guidelines and closes previous loopholes that undermined protections for families and campers.

Representative Rodríguez Ramos submitted the following reason for vote to be printed in the journal:

When the record vote for **HB 265** was taken, I was away from my desk in protest of the special session called to pass a racially gerrymandered redistricting scheme. I would have voted yes. The July 4 flooding in the Hill Country highlighted the need for the state to ensure that youth camps follow health and safety standards to protect young campers. **HB 265** provides commonsense safety guidelines and closes previous loopholes that undermined protections for families and campers.

PROVIDING FOR RECESS

At 10:50 p.m., Representative Leach moved that, at the conclusion of the reading of bills and resolutions on first reading and referral to committees, the receipt of messages, granting the request of the senate to appoint conferees, and administrative actions, the house recess until 12 p.m. Tuesday, September 2.

The motion prevailed.

Friday, August 29

(Bonnen in the chair)

The chair called the house to order at 3:52 p.m. Friday, August 29.

RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO COMMITTEES

Resolutions were at this time laid before the house and referred to committees. (See the addendum to the daily journal, Referred to Committees, List Nos. 1 and 2 - August 29.)

HOUSE AT EASE

At 3:53 p.m. Friday, August 29, the chair announced that the house would stand at ease.

Tuesday, September 2

(Speaker in the chair)

The chair called the house to order at 11:42 a.m. Tuesday, September 2.

RECESS

In accordance with a previous motion, the house, at 11:42 a.m. Tuesday, September 2, recessed until 12 p.m. today.

ADDENDUM

REFERRED TO COMMITTEES

The following bills and joint resolutions were today laid before the house, read first time, and referred to committees, and the following resolutions were today laid before the house and referred to committees. If indicated, the chair today corrected the referral of the following measures:

List No. 1 - August 29

HR 108 (By V. Perez), Congratulating Michael Neff of Montwood High School on his selection as the 2025 Secondary Teacher of the Year in Socorro ISD.

To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 109 (By Leo Wilson), Commemorating the 175th anniversary of First Lutheran Church of Galveston.

To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 110 (By V. Perez), Congratulating Edith Miranda of Sgt. Roberto Ituarte Elementary School on her selection as the 2025 Elementary Teacher of the Year in Socorro ISD.

To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 111 (By V. Perez), Congratulating Sandra Iglesias of Cielo Vista Elementary School on her selection as the 2024-2025 Elementary Teacher of the Year in El Paso ISD.

To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 112 (By V. Perez), Congratulating Mary Bejarano of Hornedo Middle School on her selection as the Secondary Teacher of the Year in El Paso ISD.

To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 113 (By V. Perez), Congratulating Adair Margo on her induction into the Texas Women's Hall of Fame.

To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 114 (By DeAyala), In memory of Chloe Madeline Childress of Houston.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 115 (By DeAyala), In memory of Molly Claire DeWitt of Houston.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 116 (By DeAyala), In memory of Lucy Dillon of Houston.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 117 (By DeAyala), In memory of Katherine Frances Ferruzzo of Houston.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 118 (By DeAyala), In memory of Kellyanne Elizabeth Lytal of San Antonio.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 119 (By DeAyala), In memory of Sarah Catherine Marsh of Mountain Brook, Alabama.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 120 (By Wu), In memory of Mary Kathryn Jacobe of Houston.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 121 (By DeAyala), In memory of Margaret Gaffney Sheedy of Houston.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 122 (By DeAyala), In memory of Renee Marilyn Smajstrla of Ingram.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 123 (By Button), Commending Scott LeMay for his service as mayor of Garland.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 124 (By Kitzman), In memory of Virginia Larins Hollis of Bellville.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

HR 125 (By Flores), Commemorating the 40th anniversary of CapMetro.
To Local and Consent Calendars.

List No. 2 - August 29

HR 128 (By Vasut), Amending the House Rules of Procedure to authorize additional constitutionally compliant, proportional penalties for members absent without leave for purpose of impeding the action of the House that do not unfairly impair members' representative functions.
To House Administration.

APPENDIX

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Favorable reports have been filed by committees as follows:

August 27

Agriculture and Livestock - **HB 238**

State Affairs - **HB 7**

ENGROSSED

August 27 - **HB 25**, **HB 26**, **HB 48**, **HB 149**, **HB 192**, **HB 254**

ENROLLED

August 27 - **HB 16**, **HB 23**

SENT TO THE GOVERNOR

August 27 - **HB 4**