

PUBLIC COMMENTS

HB 2393

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY & CIVIL JURISPRUDENCE

Hearing Date: April 14, 2021 8:00 AM

Thomas Allen
Allen Thomas L Atty
Lancaster, TX

This bill violates the freedom of lawyers to exercise their freedom of conscience when voting for their leaders. It allows anyone to file a suit in Austin to enjoin a lawyer from voting if the person filing the suit suspects the lawyer will base his or her vote on any of the bases referred to in the law. That lawyer, to exercise his or her freedom of conscience would have to defend his or her right to vote in a Travis County court. The State Bar's leadership is already diverse. We have two women running for State Bar president this year. We have directors from many different religious affiliations. We have members of minority groups among our directors. Most directors are nominated by the sitting members of board of directors. It is clear that the board of directors have been nominating people from varying backgrounds. Lawyers shouldn't have to be compelled to tell a judge what motivated them to vote one way or the other.

Robert Bennett
Bennett Law Firm
Houston, TX

Please allow this bill to go forward and make the State Bar Elections to be on a democratic basis. lowering the numbers will all more minorities to participate

Rich Robins, Esq., TexasBarSunset.com editor
TexasBarSunset.com
HOUSTON, TX

Please support HB 2393. The Texas Bar's board of directors has been formally asked in writing and during public comment interactions to finally lower the quantity of signatures required for petition candidates for the Bar presidency from 5000+ to a significantly less burdensome quantity. No such change has materialized though. Meanwhile no purported justification for this ongoing unhealthy concentration of power in so few hands has been responsively presented to the compulsory membership, nor even to the reform proposal's most vocal supporters. In the interests of increasing attorney self-rule while potentially reducing Texas Bar self-enrichment which still occurs at all other Texans' expense due to the apparent and predictable lack of ideological diversity among Texas Bar leadership, please support HB 2393. Here are some justifications:

1) Increased membership voter participation: Whenever a petition candidate is running for president of the Texas Bar, the Bar experiences an atypically low approximately 70% membership voter abstention rate. This is documented at: <http://www.TexasBarSunset.com/voter-abstention>
There has only been a petition presidential candidate certified around three different years, at least during recent decades. Otherwise the Texas Bar's internet-enabled, month long annual elections each spring endure closer to an 80% voter abstention rate among the 105,000+ attorney members. How is this healthy for supposed "self-rule"? It is not. Meanwhile:

2) Increased ideological diversity among the candidates: The Texas Bar repeatedly prioritizes further enriching the Texas Bar above nearly all else, and it appears to seductively reward (virtually unaccountable) board of directors members who vote in support of such lavish priorities. This prioritizing helps neither the (still compulsory) Bar membership nor Texans overall (who must absorb the increased costs that their lawyers are consequently forced to endure). Presently the Bar's board selects two

Printed on: April 16, 2021 4:34 PM

contenders annually for the year-long bar presidential terms. Such Bar anointees almost never come up with any particularly helpful reform proposals that appeal to the membership, however. This helps explain why meaningful reforms such as these remain evasive: <http://www.TexasBarSunset.com/reforms> . Almost always the Texas Bar's board picks the only two Bar presidential candidates each year, just as U.S. state legislatures reportedly used to elect all U.S. federal senators before democracy finally gained ground in that realm and citizen voters got to select federal senators for themselves. Whenever Bar presidential contenders are not of the same priorities as the Bar's lavishly compensated management (further detailed at <http://www.TexasBarSunset.com/salaries>), they typically do not get selected as the annual pair of anointed presidential candidates. Consequently Bar membership is left without an appealing electoral choice. Can't we fix this, please?