JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE

Second Extraordinary Session, 103rd General Assembly

SEVENTH DAY, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2025

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

Speaker Pro Tem Perkins in the Chair.

There was a moment of silent prayer.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was recited.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has taken up and passed **HB 1**.

Mr. Speaker: I am instructed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has taken up and passed **HCS HJR 3**.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS

The following Representatives offered objections to **HB 1**, which were appended to the bill.

September 11, 2025

Joe Engler
Chief Clerk
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri State Capitol
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Mr. Engler:

Pursuant to Article III, Section 30 of the Missouri Constitution[1], I do hereby object to the signing of **House Bill No. 1** in the 103rd General Assembly, 2nd Extraordinary Session (hereafter "the Bill").

I object to the signing for two general reasons, each standing alone is sufficient to prohibit the signing and implementation of the Bill.

[1] References to "the Constitution" are to the current Constitution of the State of Missouri unless otherwise indicated. Likewise, references to the "Supreme Court" are to the Missouri Supreme Court unless otherwise indicated.

a. The Missouri Constitution Prohibits "Mid-Cycle" Redistricting U.S. Congressional Seats
   i. Pursuant to Article III Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution the power to redistrict US Congressional Seats is limited to the period directly following the United States census.

While acknowledging the plenary nature of legislative power, such power does not extend to instances where the Constitution prescribes limitations. "Constitutional provisions are subject to the same rules of construction as other laws, except that constitutional provisions are given a broader construction due to their more permanent character." *Pestka v. State*, 493 S.W.3d 405, 408–09 (Mo. banc 2016). "A constitutional provisions should never be construed to work confusion and mischief unless no other reasonable construction is possible." *Id*. at 409 *quoting Am. Fed'n of Teachers v. Ledbetter*, 387 S.W.2d 360, 363–64 (Mo. banc 2012).

Article III Section 45 governs "Congressional apportionment" and provides in whole:

> When the number of representatives to which the state is entitled in the House of the Congress of the United States under the census of 1950 and each census thereafter is certified by the governor, the general assembly shall by law divide the state into districts corresponding with the number of representatives to which it is entitled, which districts shall be composed of contiguous territory as compact and as nearly equal in population as may be.

Art. III, Sec. 45.

> The Governor certified the outcome of the 2020 census and the general assembly divided the state into districts in May, 2022. No subsequent census has been conducted nor its outcome, in terms of number of Congressional representatives for Missouri, certified by the governor.

Pestka v. State is instructive. 493 S.W.3d 405. That case concerned the legislative process for overturning gubernatorial vetos. Prior to 1970, the legislature had the power to reconsider bills at its convenience, but in 1970 the Constitution was amended to provide that:

> If the governor returns any bill with his objections after the adjournment of the general assembly... in odd-numbered year, the bill shall be placed at the top of the calendar of the house to which it is returned for considerations when the general assembly reconvenes the following year. If the governor returns any bill with his objection after the adjournment sine die of the general assembly on the ninetieth calendar day after its convening in even-numbers year, the general assembly shall automatically reconvene on the first Wednesday following the first Monday in September of such even-numbered year for a period not to exceed ten calendar days for the sole purpose of considering bills returned by the governor.

Art. III, sec. 32 (1970).

Although the amended Section 32 did not explicitly prohibit the legislature from reconsidering bills at other times, the Missouri Supreme Court found that "the amendment stripped the legislature of its power to reconsider bills at its convenience." *Pestka*, 493 S.W.3d at 410. The Court went on to consider subsequent amendments which provided that if the governor vetoed a bill near (or after) the end of the prior legislative session, the general assembly must convene in September "for the sole purpose of considering bills returned by the governor." *Id*. at 410–11. The case turned on whether the governor returning a bill late enough to trigger a veto session entitled the legislature to *also* consider other bills vetoed by the governor that were not late enough themselves to trigger a veto session. The Court held that even without language expressly prohibiting the reconsideration of other bills the legislature was confined to *only addressing late-vetoed bills during veto session*. *Id*. at 412. In other words, the Constitution proscribed bills that could be considered in a veto session and therefore prohibited consideration of other all bills in such session.

The Supreme Court's prior finding that apportionment must be done only under Article III Sec. 45 (*Pearson v. Koster*, 359 S.W.3d 35, 38 (Mo. banc 2012)) is consistent with the title of that section as well. The section concerns "Congressional apportionment" and provides that the power rests with the general assembly *only* after certification of the number of representatives apportioned to Missouri is made following a census. *See, State v. Rousseau*, 34 S.W.3d 254 n6 (W.D.Mo. 2000) (titles can be an "aid to statutory interpretation… when construing the meaning of the provisions herein").

So, the Supreme Court, the leading voice for the judiciary, the Governor, the leading voice for the executive, and a plain reading of Article III Section 45 all have reached the conclusion that Congressional reapportionment can only be done "when the number of representatives to which the state is entitled… is certified by the governor." That was done in 2022 and, therefore, cannot be re-done until a new census causes a new certification of House seats, presumptively after the 2030 census.[2]

The Supreme Court in *Pestka* rejected the use of "Air Bud" rules for Constitutional interpretation.[3] Sec. 45 proscribes the conditions for U.S. Congressional apportionment, meaning that it prohibits Congressional apportionment outside of the period immediately after the census outcome is certified.

ii. Article III, Section 10 does not apply to U.S. Congressional Redistricting.

The Supreme Court has already held that Art. III, Sec. 45 "sets out only three requirements for the redistricting of seats in Missouri for the United States House of Representatives." *Pearson v. Koster*, 359 S.W.3d 35, 38 (Mo. banc 2012). The Governor recognized this in his Proclamation calling the legislature into extraordinary session, when he said: "WHEREAS, Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution *authorizes* the general Assembly to divide the state into districts for the United States House of Representatives." (*italics* added). Thus, the two branches of government to speak on the issue agree that the legislature's authority to redistrict necessarily runs through Art. III, Sec. 45, not Art. III, Sec. 10.

In debate, the Gentleman from District 100 argued that Sec. 10 covers not only state legislative districts but also U.S. Congressional districts because is uses the term "representative districts" and "apportionment". The 1945 Constitution originally apportioned State Representative districts by county:

> Apportionment of Representatives.—Until apportionment of the representatives can be made in accordance with this article, the house of representatives shall consist of one hundred fifty-four members apportioned among the several counties as follows: The County of Buchanan shall have three; the County of Greene shall have three; the County of Jackson shall have eleven; the County of Jasper shall have three; the County of St. Louis shall have eighteen, the County of St. Louis shall have seven, ad each of the other counties shall have one.

Art. III, § 9 of the original 1945 Constitution.

State representative districts were apportioned, in a process that had been described in the immediately above Section 10, until an Amendment on January 14, 1966. In addition, the neighboring Sections of Article III also use the term "representative" solely in contexts that could only apply to state representatives, not federal representatives, so any plain reading of Section 10's use of the term should be read in the context of state representatives as well. It is the only plausible reading where Section 9 describes *state* representative apportionment and Section 10 describes the "Basis of Apportionment".

If the Representative from District 100 were correct, the outcome would remain the same. If Sections 7–10 of the Missouri Constitution did also refer to federal congressional districts, the authors of Section 45 expressly chose to

---

[2] The alternative reading, which the Governor and Supreme Court have rejected, is that Section 45 only limits the legislature in instances of Congressional apportionment following the certification of the outcome of a census, but *allows* the legislature the power to apportion at all other times. If that were true, it would also follow that the limits placed by Section 45's (compactness, contiguous territory, equal populations, etc.) are *only* requirements of reapportionment after a census and not reapportionment at other times, since the text plainly subjects the general assembly to those requirements only in apportionments that follow the census. The legislature would be free to apportion districts unevenly, alphabetically, by height of resident, or however we please. If such a thing as a non-post-census Congressional apportionment existed, there are no rules for it in the Missouri Constitution, an absurd result *Cf. Humane Soc'y of U.S. v. State*, 405 S.W.3d 532, 537 (Mo. Banc 2013) (finding that constitutional interpretation producing an absurd result is unreasonable).

[3] A reference to the 1997 movie "Air Bud" in which a referee justifies allowing a golden retriever to play youth basketball under the theory there "Ain't no rules says a dog can't play basketball".

not include the language "from time to time, as public convenience may require" when it was adopted Section 45 and de-coupled (to the extent it ever was coupled) apportionment and redistricting of state house seats and federal Congressional seats. That the citizens of Missouri chose to *exclude* such language with respect to Congressional apportionment underscores that even to the extent that the legislature may have once had that right, it no longer does. Indeed, the intent of the modern § 45 appears to be to create strict rules for redistricting that would avoid then-recent chaos that led to Missouri having at-large congressional districts in 1933–35.

Finally, as the Missouri Supreme Court has held, the language in Art. III, Sec. 10 stating that "[s]uch districts may be altered from time to time as public convenience may require" does not allow for mid-census alterations of the districts even for state legislative seats. *Preisler v. Doherty*, 365 Mo. 460, 472 (Mo. banc 1955) ("Under the 1945 Constitution this provision for altering districts can no longer refer to the power of the Legislature because now *it has no power of apportionment of either senators or representatives*.")(emphasis added). Therefore, even if Section 10 applied to both state and federal representative districts, it does not permit redistricting here.

Section 45 is the lone provision permitting the legislature to conduct Congressional apportionment as agreed by Governor Kehoe in his petition and the Supreme Court in *Pearson v. Koster* and it does not provide the legislature with a second bite at the apple. Having reapportioned congressional seats under the 2020 census, it cannot do so again.

b. The process by which the Bill passed through this body violates the Missouri Constitution, and the Rules of the 103rd General Assembly.

The process was sufficiently flawed as to render the Bill unconstitutional.

i. The Governor's call was unconstitutional

The Governor is permitted to convene the general assembly by proclamation only "on extraordinary occasions." The Governor presents two explanations, both of which are facially not "extraordinary occasions". The first is that the existing maps "may be vulnerable to a legal challenge under the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment." The Governor's pearl-clutching concern for the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment is particularly unconvincing because: (1) there is no unresolved challenge to the previous maps; (2) there have already been two elections utilizing the existing maps; (3) the proposed new maps are publicly and clearly designed to likely result in a representative of color losing re-election in 2026; and (4) the proposed new maps were created and voted upon by the legislature without the data necessary to evaluate legality under the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Governor's second assertion is similarly unconvincing in that he asserts that "our congressional delegation should reflect the values of Missourians".

State legislative districts are drawn "in a manner that achieves … partisan fairness" and has resulted in both chambers being comprised of roughly one-third of representatives being elected members of the Democratic party. In recent statewide elections, majorities of Missourians have voted for values such as abortion access and paid-sick leave only to have the Republican party veto Missourians' values. Missourians have also voted for Democratic candidates approximately two-fifths of the time and Republican candidates approximately three-fifths of the time. Over 99% of the public testimony received from Missourians was in opposition to the Bill.

The Bill is intended to shift the state Congressional representation from one-quarter to one-eighth Democratic. The intent of the session is expressly *not* to present a congressional delegation that reflects the values of Missourians.[4]

Instead, this special session was called merely to appease the sitting president of the United States, who called this "a very Special Session … that will give the incredible people of Missouri the tremendous opportunity to elect an

[4] Indeed, the Governor admitted that the purpose of the extraordinary session is to "get Missouri's values to match Washington DC's value". "Trump social media post boosts Missouri redistricting talk", SPECTRUM NEWS, Aug. 21, 2025, available at: https://spectrumlocalnews.com/mo/st-louis/news/2025/08/21/trump-missouri-congressional-redistricting

additional MAGA Republican[5] in the 2026 Midterm Election – A HUGE VICTORY for our America First Agenda."[6] The Republicans in the legislature agree it was called to appease the President. "The Missouri Freedom Caucus called for a special session on congressional redistricting over a month ago. We have your back @POTUS @WhiteHouse @JDVance!"[7]

There is no "extraordinary occasion", only a DC power-grab.

ii. The House began the 2025 2nd Extraordinary Session and conducted business without the Constitutionally required quorum.

The Missouri Constitution is very specific in its requirements for the enactment of bills. These requirements must be strictly followed for a bill to pass the constitutional test of valid passage.[8]

Art. III Sect. 20 states that "A majority of the elected members of each house shall constitute a quorum to do business". On September 3, the Extraordinary Session commenced and the Bill was First Read. On September 4, the Bill was Second Read and referred to the Special Committee on Redistricting. In addition, on September 4, the General Assembly had a prayer and recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. The Journal reflects the lack of quorum on both of those days. On both of those days members on the floor noted the absence of a quorum but were not recognized.[9]

"When a legislative journal shows affirmatively that an essential constitutional requirement has not been met, a law purportedly enacted in accordance with the Constitution may be shown to be invalid." *State v. O'Toole*, 673 S.W.2d 25 (Mo banc 1923). Since the Journals reflect a lack of quorum on September 3 and 4, the House could not "do business" on those dates.[10]

While those currently sitting in the General Assembly are accustomed to "technical sessions" not requiring quorum, that has not always been the case — and the Constitution has not changed. From the ratification of the 1945 Constitution until 2001 the General Assembly's practice was, consistent with the Constitutional requirements, to require quorum to begin a session. While the General Assembly subsequently changed its practice, it has been in violation of the Constitution in so doing, particularly here, where the lack of quorum has been noted in the Journal and on the floor.[11] It is "improper and dangerous" for the legislature to adopt procedures less rigorous than those required by the Constitution. *Power v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 533 (1969) (quoting James Madison speaking at the United States Constitutional Convention).

The only remaining issue is whether the opening of the extraordinary session or the reading of bills constitutes the doing of business. These actions were included in the House Journal in a "legislative day" specifically intended for the purpose of reading the Bill. Moreover, Rule 2 of the House of Representatives 103rd General Assembly clearly identifies that "introduction of petitions" (such as the Governor's petition), the "Introduction and first reading of House Joint Resolutions", the "Introduction and first reading of House Bills", and the "Second reading of House Bills, Joint Resolutions, and Concurrent Resolutions" as part of the "Order of Business".

---

[5] The reference to a "MAGA Republican" distinguishes Republicans who kowtow to the President (a reference to his campaign slogan "Make American Great Again") as distinct from Republicans and Democrats who oppose Presidential priorities like expanding the national deficit, distancing ourselves from allies, coddling authoritarian regimes, denying the science of vaccinations, using public resources to intimidate private schools, private businesses, and private citizens, and nationalizing private corporations.

[6] Posting by the President of the United States on the social media site "Truth Social"

[7] Posting by the Missouri Freedom Caucus ("@MOFreedomCaucus") on social media platform X (formerly Twitter) on August 21, 2025.

[8] The bill must also be free of substantive defects, which are discussed separately.

[9] A lack of quorum was also apparent on September 5, however objections to the lack of quorum, plainly apparent from the House's official video feed, were not recognized by the Chair.

[10] Missouri House Rule 92 does not require quorum for the above activities, but the House Rule cannot trump the clear Constitutional requirement of a quorum to "do business".

[11] See "Speaker's formula for session draws fire", St. Louis Post Dispatch, Sept. 6, 2001 (quoting Rep. John Griesheimer (R-Washington) "You can't have a meeting until you have a quorum, and we are not going to have a quorum…").

The convening of a session, introduction of the Governor's petition, first reading of bills and second reading of bills are unquestionably subsumed within "do[ing] business", as is the Pledge and prayer. Accordingly, the absence of a quorum renders the House's special session, and the Bill's progress through the House, unconstitutional.

Best regards,

/s/ Mark Boyko
State Representative, District 90

September 12, 2025

Joe Engler
Chief Clerk
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri State Capitol
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Mr. Engler:

Pursuant to Article III, Section 30 of the Missouri Constitution, I object to the signing of **House Bill No. 1** in the 103rd General Assembly, 2nd Extraordinary Session as a violation of Article III, Section 20 and Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution.

Article III, Section 20 of the Missouri Constitution states:

> "A majority of the elected members of each house shall constitute a quorum to do business."

On Wednesday, September 3, 2025, First Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 74 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative and Regular business were conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

On Thursday, September 4, 2025, Second Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 81 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative and Regular business were conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

On Friday, September 5, 2025, Third Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 69 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative and Regular business were conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized. Furthermore, the Rules-Legislative committee convened at 9 a.m. to discuss this bill, but it was not referred to this committee from the floor until the whole House convened at 10 a.m.

On Sunday, September 7, 2025, Fourth Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 76 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative business was conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

Rule 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives 103rd general assembly, adopted on January 14, 2025, and which were never suspended, outlines the correct order of business:

> Rule 2. (1) Administrative Order of Business. The first of each day, after the House is called to order, shall be employed as follows unless otherwise ordered by the House:
> (a) Introduction of petitions, memorials, remonstrances, and resolutions.
> (b) Introduction and first reading of House Joint Resolutions.

(c) Introduction and first reading of House Bills.
(d) First reading of Senate Joint Resolutions and Bills.
(e) Second reading of House Bills, Joint Resolutions, and Concurrent Resolutions.
(f) Second reading of Senate Bills, Joint Resolutions, and Concurrent Resolutions.
(g) Reports of regular standing committees.
(h) Reports of special standing committees.
(i) Messages from the Senate.
(2) Regular Order of Business. At the close of the administrative order of business, the Speaker or any member may call for the regular order of business. The administrative order of business may be dispensed with by unanimous consent of the House at any time. The regular order of business shall be employed as follows unless otherwise ordered by the House:
(a) Prayer.
(b) Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.
(c) Reading and approval of the Journal of the previous day's session.
(d) Bills, reports, and other business on the table.
(e) House Joint Resolutions to be perfected and printed.
(f) House Bills to be perfected and printed.
(g) Third reading of House Joint Resolutions and Concurrent Resolutions.
(h) Third reading of House Bills.
(i) Messages from the Senate.
(j) Third reading of Senate Joint Resolutions and Concurrent Resolutions.
(k) Third reading of Senate Bills.
(l) Adoption of petitions, memorials, remonstrances, and resolutions.
(m) Reports of subcommittees.
(n) Such other orders of business as deemed necessary pursuant to law.

These rules were never suspended for the second extraordinary session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly. Administrative Business was conducted without unanimous consent of the dispensation of Rule 2. My written objection to the rules violations, and conducting business in absence of a quorum was submitted to the Assistant Clerk on September 9th, 2025.

Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution states:

> "When the number of representatives to which the state is entitled in the House of the Congress of the United States under the census of 1950 and each census thereafter is certified by the governor, the general assembly shall by law divide the state into districts corresponding with the number of representatives to which it is entitled, which districts shall be composed of contiguous territory as compact and as nearly equal in population as may be."

Missouri's congressional maps were redrawn most recently in 2022 after months of deliberation and debate. There has not been a census certified by the governor since the 2020 census was conducted.

This extraordinary session, business was conducted in the absence of a quorum. There has not been a census certified since these congressional districts were redrawn 3 short years ago. This violates provisions of The Missouri State Constitution which we took an oath to uphold.

Furthermore, this extraordinary session was called under the pretense of representing Missouri values. While not a constitutional objection, I have a personal objection to that statement. As a life-long Missourian, I know that Missouri does not value cheaters.

For Missouri,

/s/ Wick Thomas
State Representative, District 19

SIGNING OF HOUSE BILL

All other business of the House was suspended while **HB 1** was read at length and was signed by the Speaker Pro Tem to the end that the same may become law.

Having been duly signed in open session of the Senate, **HB 1** was delivered to the Governor by the Chief Clerk of the House.

CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS

Representative Thomas offered objections to **HCS HJR 3**, which were appended to the bill.

September 12, 2025

Joe Engler
Chief Clerk
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri State Capitol
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Mr. Engler:

Pursuant to Article III, Section 30 of the Missouri Constitution, I object to the signing of **House Committee Substitute for House Joint Resolution No. 3** (HCS HJR 3) in the 103rd General Assembly, 2nd Extraordinary Session as a violation of Article III, Section 20 of the Missouri Constitution.

Article III, Section 20 of the Missouri Constitution states:

"A majority of the elected members of each house shall constitute a quorum to do business."

On Wednesday, September 3, 2025, First Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 74 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative and Regular business were conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

On Thursday, September 4, 2025, Second Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 81 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative and Regular business were conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

On Friday, September 5, 2025, Third Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 69 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative and Regular business were conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

On Sunday, September 7, 2025, Fourth Day of the Second extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly, only 76 members were present of the required 82 members needed to establish a quorum. Administrative business was conducted in the absence of a quorum. Members of the House of Representatives attempted to point of order on the floor but were not recognized.

Rule 2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives 103rd general assembly, adopted on January 14, 2025, and which were never suspended, outlines the correct order of business:

Rule 2. (1) Administrative Order of Business. The first of each day, after the House is called to order,

shall be employed as follows unless otherwise ordered by the House:
(a) Introduction of petitions, memorials, remonstrances, and resolutions.
(b) Introduction and first reading of House Joint Resolutions.
(c) Introduction and first reading of House Bills.
(d) First reading of Senate Joint Resolutions and Bills.
(e) Second reading of House Bills, Joint Resolutions, and Concurrent Resolutions.
(f) Second reading of Senate Bills, Joint Resolutions, and Concurrent Resolutions.
(g) Reports of regular standing committees.
(h) Reports of special standing committees.
(i) Messages from the Senate.
(2) Regular Order of Business. At the close of the administrative order of business, the Speaker or any member may call for the regular order of business. The administrative order of business may be dispensed with by unanimous consent of the House at any time. The regular order of business shall be employed as follows unless otherwise ordered by the House:
(a) Prayer.
(b) Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.
(c) Reading and approval of the Journal of the previous day's session.
(d) Bills, reports, and other business on the table.
(e) House Joint Resolutions to be perfected and printed.
(f) House Bills to be perfected and printed.
(g) Third reading of House Joint Resolutions and Concurrent Resolutions.
(h) Third reading of House Bills.
(i) Messages from the Senate.
(j) Third reading of Senate Joint Resolutions and Concurrent Resolutions.
(k) Third reading of Senate Bills.
(l) Adoption of petitions, memorials, remonstrances, and resolutions.
(m) Reports of subcommittees.
(n) Such other orders of business as deemed necessary pursuant to law.

These rules were never suspended for the second extraordinary session of the First Regular Session of the 103rd General Assembly. Administrative Business was conducted without unanimous consent of the dispensation of Rule 2. My written objection to the rules violations, and conducting business in absence of a quorum was submitted to the Assistant Clerk on September 9th, 2025.

This extraordinary session, business was conducted in the absence of a quorum and out of order of the Rules of the House of Representatives. This violates provisions of the Missouri State Constitution which we took an oath to uphold and the Rules of the House which were not dispensed with by unanimous consent.

Initiative petitions are one of Missourian’s only opportunities to participate directly in the legislative process. In addition to the constitutional violations, this HJR does not reflect Missouri values.

For Missouri,

/s/ Wick Thomas
State Representative, District 19

SIGNING OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

All other business of the House was suspended while **HCS HJR 3** was read at length and was signed by the Speaker Pro Tem to the end that the same may become law.

Having been duly signed in open session of the Senate, **HCS HJR 3** was delivered to the Secretary of State by the Chief Clerk of the House.

The following members' presence was noted: Bush, Clemens, Cook, Davis, Douglas, Ealy, Falkner, Fuchs, Griffith, Haley, Hovis, Johnson, Kelley, Lucas, Oehlerking, Perkins, Peters, Plank, Sassmann, Schulte, Sharpe (4), Simmons, Smith (46), Thomas, and Wilson.

ADJOURNMENT

The Speaker Pro Tem declared the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Third General Assembly, convened in the Second Extraordinary Session of the First Regular Session on September 3, 2025, adjourned sine die as of September 12, 2025, pursuant to the Constitution.

JONATHAN PATTERSON
Speaker of the House

JOSEPH ENGLER
Chief Clerk of the House