

SENATE JOURNAL

EIGHTY-NINTH LEGISLATURE — REGULAR SESSION

AUSTIN, TEXAS

PROCEEDINGS

FIFTH DAY

(Wednesday, February 5, 2025)

The Senate met at 6:38 p.m. pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by the President.

The roll was called and the following Senators were present: Alvarado, Bettencourt, Birdwell, Blanco, Campbell, Cook, Creighton, Eckhardt, Flores, Gutierrez, Hagenbuch, Hall, Hancock, A. Hinojosa, J. Hinojosa, Huffman, Hughes, Johnson, King, Kolkhorst, Menéndez, Middleton, Miles, Nichols, Parker, Paxton, Perry, Schwertner, Sparks, West, Zaffirini.

The President announced that a quorum of the Senate was present.

Senator Perry offered the invocation as follows:

Heavenly Father, it's us again, all sinners with the opportunity to be saved by grace. We started this session, it's our first bill with many more to come. I just pray that as the times get long, the days get long, and the emotions get high, that we always temper our responses and our debates, as we always do, with Your will in mind and Your love and grace that You extend to us every day. I just ask that, I'm thankful for the people on this floor, for their servant's hearts, they're dedicated to serve the people of Texas. And I thank You for big thinking. You gave us a mind that's big enough to handle the challenges we face today for the Texans that we serve. But I'm also reminded we're not bigger than You. I just pray that we keep Your will, Your way as we go throughout this session. And this day, travel grace to and from our districts each and every weekend and thank You for the God that You are and I remember the ultimate sacrifice that You made that is a representation that we all should ascribe to through Your son Jesus Christ. In Jesus' name. Amen.

Senator Zaffirini moved that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day be dispensed with and the Journal be approved as printed.

The motion prevailed without objection.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS POSTPONED

The President announced that the introduction of bills and resolutions on first reading would be postponed until the end of today's session.

There was no objection.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING CALL

The President at 6:40 p.m. announced the conclusion of morning call.

SENATE BILL 2 ON THIRD READING

Senator Creighton moved to suspend the regular order of business to take up for consideration **SB 2** at this time on its third reading and final passage:

SB 2, Relating to the establishment of an education savings account program.

The motion prevailed by the following vote: Yeas 20, Nays 11.

Yeas: Bettencourt, Birdwell, Campbell, Creighton, Flores, Hagenbuch, Hall, Hancock, A. Hinojosa, Huffman, Hughes, King, Kolkhorst, Middleton, Nichols, Parker, Paxton, Perry, Schwertner, Sparks.

Nays: Alvarado, Blanco, Cook, Eckhardt, Gutierrez, J. Hinojosa, Johnson, Menéndez, Miles, West, Zaffirini.

The bill was read third time and was passed by the following vote:: Yeas 19, Nays 12.

Yeas: Bettencourt, Birdwell, Campbell, Creighton, Flores, Hagenbuch, Hall, Hancock, A. Hinojosa, Huffman, Hughes, King, Kolkhorst, Middleton, Parker, Paxton, Perry, Schwertner, Sparks.

Nays: Alvarado, Blanco, Cook, Eckhardt, Gutierrez, J. Hinojosa, Johnson, Menéndez, Miles, Nichols, West, Zaffirini.

STATEMENT REGARDING SENATE BILL 2

Senator Alvarado, joined by Senators Cook, Eckhardt, Gutierrez, Johnson, Menéndez, and Miles, submitted the following statement regarding **SB 2**:

We strongly oppose Senate Bill 2, which creates an "Education Savings Account" (ESA) program. This latest voucher scam siphons off billions of taxpayer dollars for private vendors without requiring the transparency, accountability or anti-discrimination standards our public schools must follow.

ESAs will almost certainly be utilized only by wealthy families. The fiscal note estimates 95 percent of students opting into the program in the first year would be those already in private school and home school. S.B. 2 would provide \$2,000 a year per student for participating home-schooling families, \$10,000 a year per student for tuition and additional expenses at an accredited private school and \$11,500 per student with a disability.

Even at these amounts, the ESA will not cover the full cost to attend most private schools in Texas where the average tuition is \$11,337 per year (2024-25). Tuition for schools that specialize in special education is higher, averaging over \$19,000 (2023-24). Further, tuition varies considerably by region and grade level. For example, the average tuition for private schools in Houston was \$24,225 in 2022-23. Private schools are also not distributed equally across the state; an estimated 158 of Texas' 254 counties do not have a private school. S.B. 2 will leave the vast majority of low or middle income families still unable to afford private schools if one is available

in their community. Consequently, vouchers will serve only to subsidize tuition for those students already enrolled in private schools. As we've seen in other states like Arizona, vouchers are coupons for the wealthy.

In addition to concerns about who will really benefit from ESAs, the potential costs to the state over time are alarming. Costs have increased significantly in other states with similar programs. For example, the cost of Arizona's voucher program was five times its projected price tag. According to the fiscal note for S.B. 2, the program is expected to quadruple in annual cost from \$1 billion in 2027 to nearly \$4 billion in 2030. Yet the bill author rejected safeguards for the legislature to implement against ballooning costs and attempts to limit eligibility by changing the definition of "low-income household" from a whopping 500 percent of FPL (\$160,750 for a family of four) to better reflect the income of Texas' working families (median household income in Texas was \$75,780 in 2023).

Multiple amendments to protect Texas children and hold these private entities to the same standards required of our public schools were summarily rejected, strictly on partisan lines. Rejected amendments included provisions to protect and prioritize children with disabilities, requirements for private schools to institute the same anti-discrimination protections as public schools and requirements for basic reporting and accountability data. If this new entitlement program was intended truly to help low-income children, children with disabilities and at-risk children, then it would hold private schools to at least the same minimum standards required of our public schools and would not allow them to pick and choose what students they accept.

While there were attempts to prevent the subject of public education from entering today's debate, the record must reflect how S.B. 2 is inextricably linked to the future erosion of our public schools.

Texas school districts are already struggling under the weight of a severely underfunded system. Texas is 46th in per pupil funding with our students receiving \$4,400 less than the national average. The current basic allotment, which has been unchanged since 2019, is \$6,160 per student. Adjusted for inflation, it should be \$7,671 by 2025 even though this level of investment is still short of the national average. Or put another way, public schools are receiving nearly \$10 billion less in constant dollars since 2020. Now is not the time to pull even more money away from public schools, which S.B. 2 would do directly through reduced attendance-based funding as well as the potential impact on recapture.

Teacher pay also has yet to be increased after being held hostage last session. Texas teachers earn about \$9,000 less on average than the national average and 23.4 percent less than other college graduates in the state. In addition, special education services are underfunded by \$2 billion. The state is only funding approximately \$400 million of the \$2 billion needed for transportation services. The school safety allotment is also woefully inadequate for schools to meet new mandates to keep students safe.

All of these needs must be addressed before we even consider giving away public dollars to private entities, especially when those funds will not be held to the same accountability and transparency standards and will not serve all Texas families. It is not only our moral obligation but a constitutional one—the Texas Constitution

requires the Texas Legislature to provide "for the support and maintenance of an efficient system of public free schools." Every child in this state is guaranteed that right.

With a budget surplus of \$24 billion, we have another historic opportunity to show our children are our top priority by making long-overdue investments in public education. Instead, state leaders are prioritizing a voucher program that will be nothing more than a coupon for the wealthy to keep sending their children to the private schools they're already attending and will do little to help the 5.5 million children in our neighborhood schools. By diverting billions of taxpayer dollars to private entities, S.B. 2 limits future investments in our public schools to reduce class sizes, increase teacher pay, enhance school safety or improve student outcomes. Notably, these private entities—who stand to make millions of dollars—will only be accountable to their shareholders, not the public.

We remain laser-focused on fully funding our public schools, supporting our teachers and fighting for the future of every Texas child. We cannot support legislation that will sacrifice more than the 98 percent of children who rely on our neighborhood schools for the benefit of a wealthy few. History will show Senate Bill 2 was not "school choice" for Texas families but rather public subsidization of private schools' choice.

ALVARADO	JOHNSON
COOK	MENÉNDEZ
ECKHARDT	MILES
GUTIERREZ	

STATEMENT REGARDING SENATE BILL 2

Senator Blanco, joined by Senator West, submitted the following statement regarding **SB 2**:

We strongly oppose Senate Bill 2, which creates an "Education Savings Account" (ESA) program. The fiscal note estimates 95 percent of students opting into the program in the first year would be those already in private school and home school. S.B. 2 would provide \$2,000 a year per student for participating home-schooling families, \$10,000 a year per student for tuition and additional expenses at an accredited private school and \$11,500 per student with a disability.

Even at these amounts, the ESA will not cover the full cost to attend most private schools in Texas where the average tuition is \$11,337 per year (2024-25). Tuition for schools that specialize in special education is higher, averaging over \$19,000 (2023-24). Further, tuition varies considerably by region and grade level. Private schools are also not distributed equally across the state; an estimated 158 of Texas' 254 counties do not have a private school.

In addition to concerns about who will really benefit from ESAs, the potential costs to the state over time are alarming. Costs have increased significantly in other states with similar programs. For example, the cost of Arizona's voucher program was five times its projected price tag. According to the fiscal note for S.B. 2, the program is expected to more than quadruple in annual cost from \$1 billion in 2027 to over \$4.5 billion in 2030.

Multiple amendments to protect Texas children and hold these private entities to the same standards required of our public schools were rejected. Rejected amendments included provisions to include children with disabilities, requirements for private schools to institute the same anti-discrimination protections as public schools, and requirements for basic reporting and accountability data. Amendments concerning accountability in contracting, prioritizing the most needy students in our state schools, fiscal accountability for private schools, and ensuring accurate reporting of participation and private school admissions, were also rejected.

From a historical perspective, we know the genesis of vouchers – racism. There is nothing in this bill that will hold this legislation accountable from not developing into a segregated education system. While understanding the need to ensure we have parental choice, we need sound tools to analyze the demographic impacts of this legislation, to ensure that we do not re-segregate our schools. Failure to accept these reasonable amendments will put the state in a precarious situation.

Texas school districts are already struggling under the weight of a severely underfunded system. Texas is 46th in per pupil funding with our students receiving \$4,400 less than the national average. The current basic allotment, which has been unchanged since 2019, is \$6,160 per student. Adjusted for inflation, it should be \$7,671 by 2025 even though this level of investment is still short of the national average. Or put another way, public schools are receiving nearly \$10 billion less in constant dollars since 2020. Now is not the time to pull even more money away from public schools, which S.B. 2 would do directly through reduced attendance-based funding as well as the potential impact on recapture.

Teacher pay has also yet to be increased. Texas teachers earn about \$9,000 less on average than the national average and 23.4 percent less than other college graduates in the state. In addition, special education services are underfunded by \$2 billion. The state is only funding approximately \$400 million of the \$2 billion needed for transportation services. The school safety allotment is also woefully inadequate for schools to meet new mandates to keep students safe.

All of these needs must be addressed before we even consider giving public dollars to private entities, especially when those funds will not be held to the same accountability and transparency standards and will not serve all Texas families. It is not only our moral obligation but a constitutional one—the Texas Constitution requires the Texas Legislature to provide "for the support and maintenance of an efficient system of public free schools." Every child in this state is guaranteed that right.

With a budget surplus of \$24 billion, the Legislature has another historic opportunity to show our children are the top priority by making long-overdue investments in public education.

By diverting billions of taxpayer dollars to private entities, S.B. 2 limits future investments in our public schools to reduce class sizes, increase teacher pay, or improve student outcomes.

We remain laser-focused on fully funding our public schools, supporting our teachers, and fighting for the future of every Texas child. We cannot support legislation that will sacrifice more than the 98 percent of children who rely on our neighborhood schools. History will show Senate Bill 2 was not "school choice" for Texas families but rather public subsidization of private schools' choice.

BLANCO
WEST

STATEMENT REGARDING SENATE BILL 2

Senator J. Hinojosa submitted the following statement regarding **SB 2**:

Today, I voted against Senate Bill 2 relating to the establishment of an education savings account (ESA) program, commonly known as the Voucher Bill. Our constitution guarantees a free public education, and it is our duty to protect this fundamental right. This bill, under the guise of "school choice," creates a program that subsidizes private schools with taxpayer funds—funds that should be used to support and strengthen our public schools. SB 2 undermines the principle that public tax dollars should be dedicated to our Pre-K-12 public school system. Instead, it sets up a system that diverts public funds meant for public schools to private schools, which are unaccountable to taxpayers.

By siphoning funds away from public schools, SB 2 will harm the very institutions that serve the vast majority of Texas students. If 1%, 3%, or 5% of students in my district, Senate District 20, were to accept a voucher under SB 2, those public schools would face significant financial losses. According to an analysis, at 1% voucher participation, public school in SD 20 would lose \$25.3 million, \$76 million at 3%, and \$127 million at 5%. The hardest-hit districts include large school systems such as Corpus Christi ISD (\$13.5 million loss at 5% take-up), Edinburg CISD (\$13.8 million loss at 5%), and Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD (\$12.3 million loss at 5%), all of which serve thousands of students. The loss of these funds means that students who remain in public schools will suffer from fewer educational opportunities and a diminished quality of education.

Public schools play a key role in training our future workforce. They provide a comprehensive education that prepares students for the challenges of the modern world. All of this is accomplished without parents writing a check or taking out loans to pay for this valuable education. By diverting state funds to private schools through vouchers, we risk weakening our public education system and hindering the development of a skilled workforce. This will have a negative impact on our economy.

It is important to address the unmet needs within our public schools before considering any diversion of state funds. Our teachers and school employees deserve a pay raise for their tireless dedication to our children's education. We can and must do more to address the high cost of health insurance for our educators and their families to ensure their well-being. We must also prioritize the safety of our students and address unmet safety needs and ensure adequate resources for school security. While SB 2 claims to provide options for low-income students, it does not ensure that these students will actually gain access to quality private education.

SB 2 raises significant concerns regarding administrative costs and the potential for fraud within the certified educational assistance organizations and other private entities authorized to receive ESA funds. The fiscal note highlights that the program would require additional auditing, enforcement personnel, and legal oversight to investigate fraud and recover misused funds. This mirrors past issues seen in other states' voucher programs, where lax oversight led to funds being spent on ineligible or fraudulent expenses, including luxury items, entertainment, and unregulated private services. The risk is further compounded by the lack of clear standards for how vendors and service providers qualify for funding, opening the door to predatory businesses that may exploit the program without delivering a quality education.

Public schools are the foundation of our communities, and they should be fully funded and strengthened, not undermined by policies that divert resources elsewhere. Vouchers will not solve the pressing issues impacting our students and teachers; instead, they will only exacerbate them. We must focus on strengthening our public education system, not dismantling it. We should focus our efforts to ensure our public schools remain the cornerstone of our community, providing a quality education for all Texas students. I oppose school vouchers and will continue advocating for a brighter future for our public education system. Our children deserve nothing less.

J. HINOJOSA

STATEMENT REGARDING SENATE BILL 2

Senator Nichols submitted the following statement regarding **SB 2**:

For the past decade, I have seen various versions of a proposal to use state tax dollars for private schooling. There have been different names with different components, but ultimately, they each had one common element – public dollars for private education. While the latest proposal for Education Savings Accounts has made an effort to be more inclusive, referring to it as "universal" and making it applicable to a larger group financially, it falls short of that goal and is still taxpayer funds for private education.

This bill creates the illusion of choice but does nothing to guarantee that a parent's choice for their child will be fulfilled. It offers a *chance*, not a choice. Ultimately, the true decision-maker in this system is not the parent, but the private school. If your child has discipline issues or needs accommodations for a learning disability, the school will have the *choice* to remove them. If you can't afford to transport your child to school, you don't have the *choice* to send them to private school. If the tuition is more than \$10,000, parents would have to come up with the remaining balance. One school in my district charges over \$13,000 a year. If a family with three children wants to send them there, they would have to come up with an extra \$9,000 a year. And that's just for tuition; paying for school supplies, transportation, and uniforms would cost even more. Over 62% of children currently in public schools come from socioeconomically disadvantaged families and many live paycheck to paycheck. They don't have an extra \$9,000 in their household budget. That's not really a choice.

The practical, geographic, and financial barriers for some students will be insurmountable and prevent them from utilizing the program. Public schools provide transportation. Private schools do not. A low-income family where both parents work and only have one vehicle could not participate. So, those children would be left out. Many of the rural parts of the state do not have private schools within reasonable

travel distances. So, those children would be left out. Special education students are offered extra money in the new proposal. But even that slight increase would not cover the costs to educate those children. There are very few private schools in Texas that will take them, even if they can afford to cover the additional costs. So, those children, our most vulnerable, would be left out. If a child has a discipline record or has behavioral issues, that child would be left out. The same goes for children that are low aptitude and poor performers in school. So, those children would be left out. The bill claims to be universal, but clearly is not.

While barriers to access are problematic for Texas families, elements of the bill conflict with long-standing and established ideals in both the Texas and US Constitutions. There are at least two sections of the Texas Constitution that, on the face, seem to complicate the issue. Article 1, Section 7 of the Texas Constitution states: "No money shall be appropriated, or drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any sect, or religious society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purposes." Many of the private schools operating in Texas have a religious affiliation of some kind, in fact most of the private schools in my district are church schools. While I have no problem with parents wanting to send their children to a religious private school and believe that is their right, the Texas Constitution explicitly prohibits public money from being appropriated for the benefit of any sect.

The Texas Constitution goes further in Article 7, Section 5, which plainly states "The permanent school fund and the available school fund may not be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school." While this bill does not use monies from either the permanent or available school funds, it's my belief that when this section was written into the Constitution, the spirit and intent of the language was to prevent public money from going to religious private schools.

Both of the aforementioned sections reflect sentiments our founding fathers shared. Thomas Jefferson sought to "build a wall between Church and State" and James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, believed religion belonged to the realm of conscience, not government. However, a recent Supreme Court ruling, *Espinoza v. Montana Department of Revenue*, established that if a state has a program that provides public funds to allow students to attend private schools, the state cannot discriminate against religious schools. Therefore should we create a voucher program, both religious private schools and secular private schools would be eligible for funding. Further, if the state is going to fund religious schools, the state cannot discriminate against any specific religion that establishes an accredited private school. There will be objection to funding religions that are hostile to the ideals our government stands for, but we would have to fund them regardless.

Beyond the Constitutional arguments, the economics of this bill will hurt small, rural schools like those in my district. The math is not complicated. As an example, these schools do not have multiple classrooms teaching 7th grade math. If there are 17 students in 7th grade math, and two or three students leave, the school still has to teach the course. They still have to pay the teacher and pay for the classroom, the utilities, insurance, the cafeteria, and buses to pick up the students. Because we fund schools based on average daily attendance, every child that leaves affects the school's

income. While the school will have the same expenses, there will be less funding to pay for them. A large school is scalable. If they lose 5 percent of their students, they can scale down the number of classrooms. Small schools don't have that luxury.

Some would argue that it is too expensive to have small, rural schools and that they should consolidate. Creating countywide school districts would require students to spend hours on the bus twice a day. Moreover, the schools and community would lose their identity. Bigger is not always better. As we look at some of the problems in our biggest school districts – like the problems HISD is going through – it's clear that it is too big.

In these small schools, the superintendent knows all the principals and teachers. More importantly, the teachers and principals know the students. They know who is behind, and who has troubles at home. They watch these children grow up year after year. I love these rural schools and I don't know why we would want to hurt them.

It's not just the consequences for small schools that concern me. I am very concerned actions taken over many years are driving our schools back toward a different form of segregation. Our public and private schools do not look like a cross-section of our society. Instead, many public schools serve as a safety net for those that struggle to afford anything else. The number of students who require more resources and thus are more expensive to teach continues to rise in public schools. The ratio of socioeconomically disadvantaged, non-English speaking, and special education students to general education students continues to increase in our public schools. TEA testified in Finance last session that the children who are attending public school are increasingly more expensive to teach, as more fall into these specialized categories.

Weighted average daily attendance, or WADA, reflects the cost to educate each child in school finance formulas. Schools receive more funding for each child that requires more support for various reasons including learning disabilities, socioeconomic background, and bilingual status. TEA said that in the 2024-2025 biennium, there will be an estimated increase of 15,700 students in average daily attendance across the state, which, they said, translates to an increase of 63,000 in weighted average daily attendance. WADA growing at increased rates means students who are coming to or are left in public schools are increasingly more expensive to teach. The data suggests the students who need the most help aren't going to private schools but are being concentrated in public schools.

Segregation based on ability is not my only concern. Reflecting on our history gives context to the negative impacts of separation, whether by race, class, or ability. I grew up in the Jim Crow south, and though *Brown v. Board of Education* was decided by the Supreme Court in 1954, it would be years before schools in Texas integrated – and mine were no different. From kindergarten in Pasadena, through high school graduation in Jacksonville, I never had a class or played a sport with anyone who was black. While my local schools had integrated by the time my younger siblings attended, I wasn't in an integrated class until college. Two years after *Brown v. Board* was decided, the state of Texas commissioned a Governor-appointed study on segregation in the public schools. The report states one of the "problems" to be addressed is "the prevention of forced integration." One of the solutions proposed in that report was a voucher system for white children to attend segregated private

schools. The bill to create such a system failed to pass. I asked my staff to see if there was a substantial growth of private schools after forced integration. There was a lot! I found an article in Time Magazine that highlights this growth. It's from 1969 and it's titled "Private Schools, the Last Refuge for Whites." I truly do not believe the intent of Education Savings Accounts is to promote segregation in any way. *But the reality is that it will.* The new form of segregation will be by income and ability, and it will be separate and inherently unequal.

Lastly, the cost of the proposed program is untenable and unsustainable. To commit an additional \$1 billion per year to a program is a huge fiscal decision. The Legislative Budget Board projects that spending on this program will increase over the next five years, growing from \$1 billion per year to \$4 billion per year by 2030, or \$8 billion over the biennium. In my opinion, that is *not* conservative and certainly not a responsible use of tax-payer dollars. This continuing cost needs to be studied in greater detail, and controls to cap it should be implemented.

As a fiscal conservative and a believer in the value of public schools, I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill. It is not fair to the children and parents of Texas, has little oversight of how the public funds are spent, creates Constitutional questions about separation of church and state, hurts public schools, leads to class segregation, and is not fiscally conservative.

NICHOLS

STATEMENT REGARDING SENATE BILL 2

Senator Zaffirini submitted the following statement regarding **SB 2**:

Today I voted against Senate Bill 2, which establishes Education Savings Accounts, commonly known as vouchers. My decision is consistent with my long-standing record of opposing vouchers dating back to SB 10 in 1999. It reflects my steadfast commitment to supporting Texas' public education system and to protecting equal educational opportunities for all Texas students, regardless of their zip code or financial background.

Despite claims of broad public support for vouchers, my constituents have overwhelmingly expressed opposition to SB 2. This session alone, 459 constituents contacted me in opposition, while only one constituent expressed support. As a representative of Senate District 21, I prioritize the needs and interests of my constituents, and my vote reflects their voices.

Public schools are the foundation of Texas communities, yet SB 2 would divert their critical funding to private institutions. This threatens to widen educational disparities, particularly for rural and underserved students who do not have access to private schools. What's more, SB 2 does not ensure that private institutions accepting vouchers will accommodate students with disabilities or those requiring special education services. Consequently, parents would be required to waive their federal and state special education rights, leaving vulnerable students without the support services they need.

Equally troubling, private schools receiving these funds would not be held to the same curriculum standards, admission and expulsion policies, or non-discrimination requirements as public schools. This lack of regulation means taxpayer dollars would support institutions that do not adhere to the same accountability measures as public schools, creating an inherently inequitable system.

As a product of private education and a parent and grandparent of private school students, I support private schools. Families, including my own, choose private schools for various reasons, such as religious education, knowing tuition is their responsibility. Government should not subsidize private education while public schools remain underfunded. If public schools were fully funded, teacher salaries were raised, and strong safeguards ensured private schools met the same standards as public schools in admissions, curriculum, and accountability, I would consider supporting a voucher program. Under those circumstances, it would be an opportunity funded in addition to—not in lieu of—funding for public schools.

Before providing any funding for private schools, we must ensure that our public schools receive the resources they need to thrive. Strengthening public education means prioritizing resources, supporting teachers, and improving access to quality education for every student in Texas—not only those pursuing a private education. For these reasons, I respectfully voted "NO" on Senate Bill 2.

ZAFFIRINI

RESOLUTION SIGNED

The President announced the signing of the following enrolled resolution in the presence of the Senate: **SCR 11**.

MOTION IN WRITING

Senator Zaffirini offered the following Motion In Writing:

Mr. President:

I move to suspend Senate Rule 11.13 so that committees may meet during the reading and referral of bills.

ZAFFIRINI

The Motion In Writing was read and prevailed without objection.

CO-AUTHORS OF SENATE BILL 2

On motion of Senator Creighton, Senators Birdwell, Flores, Hancock, Schwertner, and Sparks will be shown as Co-authors of **SB 2**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 9

On motion of Senator Huffman, Senator Middleton will be shown as Co-author of **SB 9**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 49

On motion of Senator Zaffirini, Senator Flores will be shown as Co-author of **SB 49**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 207

On motion of Senator Paxton, Senator Middleton will be shown as Co-author of **SB 207**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 242

On motion of Senator Flores, Senator Middleton will be shown as Co-author of **SB 242**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 260

On motion of Senator Huffman, Senator Bettencourt will be shown as Co-author of **SB 260**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 261

On motion of Senator Perry, Senator Sparks will be shown as Co-author of **SB 261**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 371

On motion of Senator Campbell, Senator Sparks will be shown as Co-author of **SB 371**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 509

On motion of Senator Bettencourt, Senator Hall will be shown as Co-author of **SB 509**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 510

On motion of Senator Bettencourt, Senator Hall will be shown as Co-author of **SB 510**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 511

On motion of Senator Bettencourt, Senator Hall will be shown as Co-author of **SB 511**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 522

On motion of Senator Perry, Senator Bettencourt will be shown as Co-author of **SB 522**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE BILL 677

On motion of Senator Hughes, Senator Flores will be shown as Co-author of **SB 677**.

CO-AUTHOR OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

On motion of Senator Birdwell, Senator Eckhardt will be shown as Co-author of **SJR 39**.

RECESS AND MOTION TO ADJOURN

On motion of Senator Zaffirini and by unanimous consent, the Senate at 8:04 p.m. agreed to recess, until 11:00 a.m. Friday, February 7, 2025, for the introduction of bills and resolutions on first reading.

The Senate further agreed to adjourn, upon completion of the introduction of bills and resolutions on first reading, until 11:00 a.m. Tuesday, February 11, 2025.

APPENDIX

BILL ENGROSSED

February 5, 2025

SB 2

RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED

February 5, 2025

SCR 11, SR 28, SR 29, SR 34, SR 35, SR 36, SR 37, SR 38, SR 39, SR 40

