

Exhibit 5

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

ALL: America and to the Republic, for which sustains one nation indivisible liberty and justice for all.

MR. SPEAKER: Morning hour number four.

MADAM CLERK: Official journal. The House of Representatives. The House of Representatives was called to order at 5:55 p.m. by the Honorable Phillip

[OVERLAY]

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Bacala moves to dispense the reading of the journal and moves to adopt the journal without objection, so ordered. Members, we are going to stand at ease for a little bit for the respective delegations to meet and discuss some of the conversations going on with the maps that we have in front of us. So I think each delegation is going to make announcement on where you all will be meeting. Representative Willard, do you want to make announcement? He does not need to make-- What about Representative Wright. Do you need to make announcement on a meeting?

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Republicans we are going to meet downstairs [INDISCERNIBLE 00:01:13] effective now.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will stand at recess.

[00:01:20]

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

[02:39:09]

MR. SPEAKER: Roll call. Members, vote your machines. Rep. Freeman, Rep. Emerson, Rep. Green. We have 104 members. Present in a quorum.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, Representative [PH 02:39:42] Boyer moves to advance to regular order number six. Senate bills on third reading and final passage.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, first instrument in this order, only instrument in this order is Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack to enact Title 18. Relative to congressional districts, provide relative to redistricting Louisiana's congressional districts provide with respect to offices, positions other than congressional, which are based on congressional districts.

[02:40:11]

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Boyer, on the bill.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Madam Clerk, members. Also thank you, thank you for your patience this week. I know we have been charged with a tall task and your patience, your fortitude, your strong desires to represent your district. It's impressive. It's nice to see, especially with some of the new members, you've been awesome this week and you've stood strong. And to say it's impressive is just the bit of it. Members, I'm bringing you this congressional redistricting map that Senator Womack presented. You've heard it debated a couple of times. You heard it in committee as well. Yesterday, we added an amendment in committee to Senator Womack's bill. And so my first order of business, even before I make my opening remarks, is going to get this bill in the proper posture. I'd like to offer up an amendment to delete the amendments that we added in committee yesterday. So if you'll check your monitors, or Madam Clerk, would you mind reading in the amendment?

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, Representative Boyer, as he's just discussed is offering up a one-page set of amendments, that set is online. It's set number 83.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: So, members, after hearing from a lot of you, it's my thought that this instrument was in its best posture when it came over here from the Senate. And so, I am offering an amendment to put it back in that posture, and I'd ask for your support.

MR. SPEAKER: I see no questions on the amendment. Representative Morse for the floor on the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE MORSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and chairman, and thank you, members. On yesterday, we had a pretty-- I would say, heated debate in H&G about these amendments. And so, I rise in support of removing those amendments. And I had a lot of questions after I got home about why didn't I object to the amendments. But I'd stepped out of the room, and so that's the reason for me not objecting to the amendments. I did object to the bill because the amendments had been added. I know this is the process. I think that the bill was in its best posture when it came over with representative-- I mean, with Senator Womack, Senate Bill 8; however, I tried to put that bill in a better posture. That matter failed. I know the process. I appreciate the process, and I appreciate the chairman taking that amendment off. That I think does us no good to get to a better place where we can get the second congressional district. And I'd ask that you all would support the chairman in removing the amendment that was placed on there on yesterday. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any objections to the adoption of the amendment? Representative [INDISCERNIBLE 02:43:43] objects. Would you like to speak on your objection? President Boyer, would you like to close on your amendment?

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: Members, I just ask you to support the removal of the amendment that we added in house and governmental. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Boyer has offered up an amendment which Representative [INDISCERNIBLE 02:44:00] objects. All those in favor, vote yai. All those opposed, vote nay.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

The clerk will open the machine. Write, yay, Emerson, yay. Are you through voting, members? The clerk will close the machine. We have 84 yays and 16 nays. And the amendment passes. President Boyer on the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, members, for supporting me on that amendment. You'll bear with me for a second. I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to be with you here today. Two years ago, I sat on the committee that passed the original congressional map after redistricting, and we spent a lot of time going around the state, listening to folks from all over our state.

[02:45:05]

And this house, by over two-thirds vote supported a map that we thought was fair, that we thought was representative of the State of Louisiana. As Senator Stein said earlier in this week, it's with a heavy heart that I present to you this other map. But we have to. It's that clear. A federal judge has ordered us to draw an additional minority seat in the State of Louisiana. We have the Federal Voting Rights Act litigation. It's still going on in the US District Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. The map in this bill that I'm presenting is one of a product of long, detailed process with several goals. First, and as a lot of you are aware, Congresswoman Julia Letlow represents North Louisiana in our nation's capital and serves on both the appropriations and agricultural committees. The boundaries in the bill that I'm presenting ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both unimpaired with any other incumbents and in congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican Congress for the remainder of this decade. I have great pride in the work Congresswoman Letlow has accomplished. And this map will ensure that Louisians will continue to benefit from her presence in the halls of Congress for as long as she decides to continue serving our great State of Louisiana. Second, of Louisiana's six congressional districts, the map in the proposed bill ensures that are for safe Republican seats. Louisiana's Republican presence in the United States Congress has contributed tremendously to the national discourse, and I'm very proud and it's remarkable that both the speaker of the United States House of Representative Mike Johnson and the US House Majority Leader Steve Scalise, are both from our great state. This map ensures that the two of them will have solidly republican districts at home so they can focus on the national leadership that we need in Washington, DC. The map proposed in this bill ensures that the conservative principles retained by the majority of those in Louisiana will continue to extend past our boundaries to our nation's capital. Finally, the maps in the proposed bill respond appropriately to the ongoing federal litigation the ongoing Federal Voting Rights Act case in the Middle District of Louisiana. For those who are unaware of the background, the congressional maps that we enacted that I mentioned a second ago in March of 2022, have been the subject of litigation roughly since the day the 2022 congressional redistricting bill went into effect, and even before we enacted it. So the suit was filed before we actually enacted the bill. After a substantial amount of prolonged litigation, two trips to the Fifth Circuit asking it to reverse it, and a trip to the US Supreme Court, the Federal District Court has adhered to its view that the federal law requires that the state have two congressional districts with a majority of black voters. It's that simple. Our Secretary of State, our Attorney General, and our prior legislative leadership appealed, but have yet to succeed. And we are now here because the federal court's order that we have a first opportunity

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

to act. If we don't act, it is very clear that the federal court will impose the plaintiff's proposed map on our state, and we don't want that. The district court's order that we must have two majority black voting age population districts, combined with the political imperatives I just described, have largely driven the boundaries for District 2 and District 6, both of which are over 50% black voting age population, or BVAP, as you've heard discussed a lot in committees and may hear with folks discussing today. Given the state's current demographics, there is not a high enough black population in the southeast portion of Louisiana to create two majority black districts and to also comply with the US Constitution's one vote; one person requirement. That is the reason why District 2 is drawn around Orleans Parish, while District 6 includes the black population of East Baton Rouge Parish and travels up the I-49 corridor and the Red River to include black population in Shreveport. While this is a different map than the plaintiffs in the litigation have proposed, this is the only map I reviewed that accomplishes the political goals I believe are important for my district for Louisiana and for our country.

[02:50:00]

While I did not draw these boundaries myself and I'm bringing the bill to the floor for the Senator Womack carried through the Senate and through committee yesterday in this House, I firmly submit that the congressional voting boundaries represented in this bill best achieve the goals of protecting Congresswoman Letlow's seat. Maintaining strong districts for Speaker Johnson and Majority Leader Scalise ensuring four republican districts and adhering to the command of the federal court in the middle district of Louisiana. I submit to you this map and I'll be happy to take any questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Taylor on a question.

MADAM CLERK: She waives.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Amedee on a question.

REPRESENTATIVE AMEDEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rep. Boyer thanks for carrying the bill over here. Is this bill intended to create another black district?

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: Yes, ma'am. And to comply with the judge's order.

REPRESENTATIVE AMEDEE: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Seems no further questions. Representative Bayham for the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE BAYHAM: When I ran for the legislature, I had one goal and that is to give my community a voice. I've studied some of the plans that were submitted by my colleagues here. Representative Wilford Carter had a plan, I believe, that kept St. Bernard Parish intact and I appreciate that. Representative Carter. I am here to stand up for my community. St. Bernard has never been split into two congressional districts. We've already been split into two Senate districts. And to be brutally honest, looking at the way these precincts are and I know

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

every precinct, I've campaigned in every precinct in St. Bernard. We have two precincts, for example, that are in the second congressional district. One Precinct 24 gave President Trump 75% of the vote. Precinct 25 gave President Trump 69% of the vote. Those are in the second district. The first district is Precinct 44 which gave President Biden 83% of the vote. Precinct 45 gave President Biden 85% of the vote. It seems like these precincts were just thrown together like a mechanical claw machine just grabbing people and dropping them off. Now, I participated in the hearings on the congressional reapportionment where they toured the state. And I appreciated the leadership of the House and the Senate, the committees, in doing this, I took advantage of it. I testified. We are being told that we have to redraw all of this in a period of less than eight days. That is not how you make sausage. That's how you make a mess. I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill that divides my community and I will stand by that for my community. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: There's no questions.

REPRESENTATIVE BAYHAM: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Boyer to close on the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: As a colleague mentioned earlier. Sorry, Representative Cox, if I have to quote you. Everybody likes to eat sausage but nobody likes to see how it's made. And it has been painful, and it has been painful for all of us. But it's simple. We're under federal judge's mandate and this bill is our best attempt to comply with her decision. So, members, I ask you to support me in voting for this map. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Boyer moves for final passes of the bill. Those in favor of, vote yea. Those opposed vote nay. The clerk will open the machine. Vote your machine, members. Members, are you through voting? The clerk will close the machine. We have 86 yeas, 16 nays, and the bill is finally passed. Representative Boyer moves to adopt the title and moves to reconsider the vote for which the bill finally passed and lay that motion on the table without objection.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

[02:55:00]

Open the machine for co-authors. The clerk will close the machine. We have 10 co-authors. Morning hour number five.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, the House has received a message from the Senate. The Senate has passed the following House Bills. Senate House Bill 16 return with amendments respectfully submitted. Yolanda Dixon, secretary of the Senate. The House in receipt of another message from the Senate. Senate has passed. House Bill 17 return with amendments respectfully submitted. Yolanda Dixon, secretary of the Senate.

0119_24_1es_day5
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

[02:56:09]

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

[03:06:00]

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Bagley for a motion to move to correct his vote.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: I want to correct on Senate Bill No. 8. I want to correct from absent to nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Taylor moves for a motion to correct her vote.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Good afternoon, I would also like to vote from absent to yay on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection. Representative Jackson moves to correct his vote.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Yes, I want to change my vote from nay to yay.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speakers and members. Representative McFarland moves suspend the rules for the purpose of considering House Bills amended by the Senate at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members first instrument in this order is House Bill 16 by Representative McFarland to appropriate funds make certain reductions from certain sources be allocated to designated agencies purposes. Mr. Speaker and members, as a reminder there were Senate committee amendments adopted from Senate Committee on Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative McFarland.

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues, I'm going to ask at this time that you concur with the Senate amendments. Just simply put the bill in its best posture.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

[03:10:00]

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Willard on a question.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Chairman McFarland, could you just hit on what those Senate Amendments did?

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: Yes, I can. So since there were no constitutional amendments that advanced, they removed the money we had allocated for the constitutional amendments. Since the closed primaries are going to be delayed until 2026, that allocation was no longer needed as well. So the only thing left now is the \$1.4 million for the congressional mail outs notifying our constituents and voters of a change in the congressional districts.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: So to be clear, the only funding in this bill now is \$1.4 million, and the purpose of that is to send a mailer out to constituents to let them know of the changes of the congressional districts.

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: That's correct. It's \$1,401,377, to be exact.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Phelps for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just real quickly, Representative McFarland. Obviously, this is a new cost for mail out for our new congressional districts, and this is not what we do for when we redistrict for the House -- for the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: I'm sorry? I couldn't understand.

REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: This is a new first for the mail out for new congressional districts.

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: And we do not do this for redistricting in the legislature, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative McFarland, would you like to close?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE MCFARLAND: I'd appreciate your favorable passage.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative McFarland moves to concur in the Senate Amendments, those in favor, vote yea, those opposed vote nay. The clerk will open the machine. Vote your machine, members. Are you through voting Geymann yea, Representative Miller yea, Representative Green yea, Representative Jordan yea, Deshotel yea, Representative Zeringue yea. Are you through voting, members? The clerk will close the machine. We have 104 yeas, 0 nays, and amendments are concurred in.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, the next instrument in this Order is House Bill 17 by Representative Emerson to amend Title 18 relative to elections provide for a party primary system for elections for certain offenses, provide relative to nomination of candidates, qualification of candidates, voting, election dates, qualifying fees.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Emerson?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I'm going to ask you to concur in the Senate Amendments. Basically, it does four main things. It moves the effective date to 2026 to start the party primaries. Well, first they removed everything but Congress and the Supreme Court. And when I say Congress, I mean all of our federal elections. So Congress and Senate. But then they added back BESE and PSE. So this will include our Federal elections, Congress and Senate, Supreme Court, BESE and PSE. It's also going to move it back to having a primary or not back -- but it's going to move it to having a primary and a runoff, so you'd have to have a majority vote. If you get over 50% in the first round, then you would obviously be the winner. If not, you would go through a runoff. And then it also allows unaffiliated voters to pick a party primary to vote in. So they would walk in and say if they wanted to vote in the Republican or Democrat party primary and they would get to choose on election day.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Jackson for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Emerson or Chairwoman Emerson, I have a question just on the logistics of the bill with these amendments. One, thank you for accepting to move the date back, and also thanks for agreeing to the --

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: I mean, frankly, we accepted your amendment that you had in the House.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Somewhat yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: So you're happy, right?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: I am. But I do have some confusion or some questions about in 2026 Shreveport, we'll have a local election. So we'll have a Mayor's race, a School Board race, City Marshal and all that. We'll also have a U.S. Senate race and a Congressional

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

race. Will people be able to vote whatever party they want in those local elections, or will they be confined to voting for a specific party in that local election because they're going to be on the same ballot.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Yeah. So the local elections would not be included in the party primary process.

[03:15:00]

And so, as of now, they are not in this bill at all and they would still be under our current laws and how the election process works.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Right. So do we think we need to do some education on letting folks know that, hey, if you have a local election on your ballot, you're free to vote for whomever you want as opposed to making -- I can just see people going into the ballot when you have two different types of elections on the ballot. And people may think, well, I can only vote for a Republican, for School Board, Mayor, Sheriff, that could lead to some confusion.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: So I understand the question. Of course, in that instance, when they would go in and see their ballot, obviously, they would see the different people that are on it. And if they're choosing to vote in a Republican primary, in a race that had a primary, then they obviously would choose from those candidates. In the event of the other races that would fall under the jungle primary system, they would see all those candidates on the ballot regardless of party.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Okay. Well, I thank you. I appreciate you for your willingness to bring forth those amendments and hope good luck on your bill. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Hilferty?

REPRESENTATIVE HILFERTY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairwoman Emerson, so we have moved this from a plurality to a majority, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE HILFERTY: What is the five-year total on the fiscal note now?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Well, if you look at it in front of you, the five-year total says 46 million.

REPRESENTATIVE HILFERTY: So we're looking at a \$46 million, almost \$47 million fiscal note to move to this and then ongoing. So after 2027, let's say 2028 to 2029, would that be a \$10 million continuation going on?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Well, you're obviously looking at the same fiscal note as I am right here. And obviously, it's a five-year total. So my understanding, in the initial phases of just trying to prepare and get ready, and, of course, there were a lot of changes to this bill along the way. And so, there were also a lot of very fast changes to the fiscal note. So I think over time, hopefully we'll be able to curb those costs. But I think initially there is going to be a cost for set up to prepare for this because it is a different election system. But, Representative Hilferty, we are charged with funding our elections and it is an important thing for us to fund. Obviously, we are required to and I believe it's an important thing.

REPRESENTATIVE HILFERTY: My concern is this is \$47 million over five years. That's a lot of money, \$47 million over five years to implement this system. I know this isn't quite what you had when this initially came out, but in its current, it wasn't posture. It's a \$47 million plan that we're voting on. Thank you, chairwoman.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Hughes for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairwoman, first of all, let me thank you for your extraordinary leadership and for the manner of respect in which you have guided this process. I really appreciate it. For clarity, I want to understand, I know you said that we're going to a majority system. Does that majority system apply to both the primary election and the general election, or just the primary election?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: It applies to the primary election.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES: Okay. So hypothetically, correct me if I'm wrong, but a voter can go to the ballot. We can have a race for public service commission and mayor on the same ballot. And in essence, what we're saying is we could find ourselves in a situation where the public service commissioner is being elected by plurality, but the voter would still have to potentially go to a runoff election to select their mayor. So we're using two different standards for our elected officials. Is that accurate?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Change takes time and sometimes it's difficult.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES: Do you think that would create voter confusion for our voters?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Look, I think that it's the responsibility of us and also of candidates to make sure that voters are educated and understand what they're going to see on election day. I mean, look, Representative Hughes, our process right now is long and complicated. We have very long ballots. This is an attempt honestly in the general elections to try to make those ballots a little bit shorter. I will totally agree with you that we need further work on this issue. We have more elections than most states. The secretary of state and the

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

election commissioner testified to that in committee. We do have an enormous amount, so we'll certainly be working with them and everybody in here to try to make that better, showing that situation better.

[03:20:00]

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES: Yeah. The argument was made previously that we really needed to elect members of Congress under a plurality system so that they could get to Washington as soon as possible to get their committee assignments. What is the wisdom for electing members of BESE and members of the Public Service Commission and members of the Supreme Court by a plurality rather than a majority?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Well, Representative Hughes, as in your previous question, you mentioned that we're looking at a couple of different systems here. It is my preference that we would move toward one system, and certainly, as you know, in the previous versions of this bill, we had a lot more offices in it. Representative Landry also brought an amendment that added even more offices to it. So I tend to agree with that. I would love to see us move to the same system for a lot, but as you know, how this process works in this building, negotiations go back and forth, and this is what I believe is the appetite of the body.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES: Great. Well, I appreciate you indulging my questions, and again, thank you for your leadership and your respect. Thank you, Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Brown for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairwoman Emerson, let me just -- clarification. So when you refer to unaffiliated voters, we're talking no party voters, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: That's correct. They're not registered in a party.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: So because the independent party is a recognized party.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: There is a political party in Louisiana that is called the Independent Party. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: So those would not be considered unaffiliated. When we refer to unaffiliated, we're just saying no party voters that would be able to vote in [INDISCERNIBLE 03:21:53].

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Willard for a question.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rep. Emerson, I just have a couple of questions. So you talked about those unaffiliated voters being able to participate in the primary. Would they have to change their party or temporarily change their party to vote in a democratic or republican primary?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: This bill does not do that.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Okay. So they could just show up and pick which one they want to vote in?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: That is what is. That's what's in this amendment that the Senate added in my understanding.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Okay. So I know what Representative Hughes was going through about the general election. So is it still possible in your bill to have more than two people end up in a general election?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Yes. So you would have a nominee from the parties that fall under the provisions that we have in the bill as far as having party primaries, and then other candidates from other parties or unaffiliated candidates can join the general election ballot. That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: So in an instance where you have three candidates in a general election, is it possible that somebody could win election to that seat with only 34% of the vote?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Mathematically, yes. Likely, no.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: But it's possible?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Mathematically possible.

REPRESENTATIVE W WILLARD: Okay. What about how we're going to treat those third-party candidates? Was anything changed on that side? Do they still have to require the signatures in order to run?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: So candidates that would like to join the general election ballot would still have to get these signatures and do a nominating petition to be on the ballot? Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: So for those signatures, can they get those signatures from all across the state?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: If they're running statewide, yes. From their respective districts, they would be running in if they're running in a district.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: So somebody brought up BESE. So let's say somebody was running for BESE. They would not be able to get signatures from across the state. They would have to get those from that BESE District.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Would they be able to get signatures from anybody, regardless of their party affiliation?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: They would be able to get signatures from those that are not involved in the party primary process.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: So they would have to get signatures from people that identify as them?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Not necessarily. It would be people who did not identify with one of the parties that was eligible for a party primary.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: So if the Democrats and the Republicans have a primary and I'm running as birthday party candidate, I could get signatures from --

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: I know you joined that party.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: No, I haven't. But I'm just giving you --

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: You and [PH 3:24:49] Kanya.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: I'm just giving an example. I could get signatures from birthday party people, independents, green party, tea party. Okay.

[03:25:00]

You don't think that's still discriminatory on how we're treating candidates who want to run outside of the democratic or republican party?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: So, Representative Willard, I think that as we debated when this was on the floor before. I think it makes the process fair because you're asking the candidates that would have to go through a party primary process and election. You're asking them to campaign to raise money to put themselves on a ballot, to go through that situation, to be in the general election. This, in my opinion, kind of levels the playing field of requiring some type of process for unaffiliated, independent, any other party candidate to be on the ballot. So I feel comfortable with it, and I understand if you don't, and certainly the will of the body as far as how they feel about it.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: I mean, I don't feel comfortable with it because I do feel it's discriminatory, but I appreciate you answering my questions. Thank you, Rep.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Stagni for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE STAGNI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rep. Chairman Emerson, I appreciate the work that's been done on the bill, and I appreciate the Senate doing its best to try to make the bill better. You and I talked last night.

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: I don't know if I totally agree it's better, but it is in the posture that I think the body has an appetite for.

REPRESENTATIVE STAGNI: I'll say in my view, it's a little bit better. I think there's still a ballot access issue for candidates that subjects your bill if it passes or when it passes to a legal challenge, because you allow Republicans and Democrats to get on the ballot by way of a qualifying fee, and yet you put a high hurdle for all other parties and non-affiliated voters by not giving them the ability to be on the ballot by a qualifying fee. So that's what really does make your -- you said change takes time and we want to make the ballots shorter. Is that how it makes it shorter?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: I don't think so. I mean, I think this alleviates multiple candidates from the same party by going through a party primary process. Now, of course, if you have five libertarians that want to qualify to be on the general election ballot, they certainly have the ability to do so. But again, you have those candidates, if they're running in the party primaries, they actually can choose to do the nominating petition, but they can also choose to pay the qualifying fee.

REPRESENTATIVE STAGNI: So why not give them the same ability of just paying a qualifying fee and getting on the ballot? Why is that a problem for these other parties, but you feel like it's fair for just Republicans and Democrats to do that?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Because the two parties that you're mentioning that meet the threshold that we laid out in the bill, again, they have to go through a process that is a proper vetting process that they're going to go through their party primary. And the other candidates, I think it's also fair that they go through some type of vetting process and get other people to basically agree that they would like to see them on the ballot as well.

REPRESENTATIVE STAGNI: The difference is we elect people, not parties, and every person ought to have had the opportunity to qualify for that seat. I think that could be a legal issue. I want to touch on the voter confusion because that's why they repealed the closed primary back in 2010. So I go in to vote and the person in front of me is a non-party voter and they're allowed to vote. Person behind me is an independent, of which I have 8,000 in my district and

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

there's a number of districts that have a whole lot of independent voters. They are not allowed to vote. Is that correct based on the amendment from the Senate?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: The Senate Amendment allows unaffiliated voters to walk in and choose the party primary they would like to vote.

REPRESENTATIVE STAGNI: The unaffiliated voter is a voter who's not chosen a party. So the non-party voter can vote. The person behind me who's the independent voter cannot. I just want to close with this question. We are ranked in the top 10 on holding elections. Anybody who wants to run for office can qualify and run. Anybody who wants to vote can vote for any of those people qualified. We're in the top 10. What necessitates do you think we'll get better? Why should we change the system we're in?

REPRESENTATIVE EMERSON: Well, I do have a lot of faith in the Secretary of State's office to make sure that our election stays secure and full of integrity.

[03:30:00]

So I don't think that this is going to confuse that process or make that not the case.

REPRESENTATIVE STAGNI: Thank you, chairwoman.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Marcelle, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, chair lady and thank you for the process that you've use to get here. I am still a little bit confused about what the amendments have done in the Senate. With the amendments, if you're an independent, you can just come in and participate in the primaries. Is that it?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: If you're an unaffiliated voter, so if you're a no party voter.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: If you're no party.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: If you were part of the capital I independent party, you are part of an actual party because we have that in Louisiana.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So help me to understand what is the difference between them being able to vote and an unaffiliated. I guess my question would be why wouldn't all the independents in the state just go and make themselves an unaffiliated voter so they can just vote how they want to? I mean what would that change?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: And this may clear that up for them. They may realize they would like to be unaffiliated and it may have been their intention to be unaffiliated.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Are you aware that when, I don't know how long ago, but hundreds of years we've had Democrats and Republicans, but not so many independents. Are you aware of the growth in the independent party in this state?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I've heard about it, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You are?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I've heard about it.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You've heard about it. So why would we want to disenfranchise those voters?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I don't feel that we are, Representative Marcelle. Everyone can go vote in a general election. This is a party primary process. This is about the individual parties selecting their nominee to go on the general election ballot.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And I guess my question would be they would have to do something in addition to what I as a Democrat would have to do and you as a Republican, is that accurate? So they have to get signatures but they have --

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: To be a candidate in the general election, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Do you have to get petitions and pay the money or you can do either or, right?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I can do either or. If I want to be in the republican party primary, I can do either or. But this doesn't apply to the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Right. No, I'm just using us as citizens, as Democrats and Republicans. And let's just say it was PSC and I wanted to run for that. As a Democrat, I can get the signatures or I can pay the money. Correct?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: To qualify for the party primary, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: To qualify.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: In order to qualify for the general election, you would just have to win the party primary.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. But if I'm an independent. I would not have that same opportunity. Is that accurate by this bill? If this bill passed?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Well, again, to be on the general election ballot as a Republican or a Democrat, as laid out by the threshold in this bill, if you win your party primary, you advance to the general election. In order for other candidates to get on the general election ballot, you would have to use the nominating petition process. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. And I just think that's additional for them to have to go through a hurdle, additional hurdle then we have to go through.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I would argue that the candidates and the other two parties have to go through an additional hurdle of being in the party primary.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well, let me just say I'm wondering if it will pass the threshold of the legal system and will it be challenged in a court of law if this bill passed? And that's my concern. It's about the 900,000 independents that we represent, and I think that they should have access as equal as possible to the Democrats and the Republicans. And thank you for your work.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Bagley, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are we growing government here, Representative? I mean, I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I'm not trying to grow any government. I'm actually trying to just change the process about how people get elected.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Well, I wasn't going to ask the question until you made a couple of statements about all the elections we're about to have. And I was understanding this is going to cause fewer, but I've not heard anything that came from you about fewer elections. It's been about more elections. And so, I was just wanting to be sure that I was thinking right.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Well, change takes time, Representative Bagley.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Will it'll be fewer elections. That's the question.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: What's that?

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Will there be fewer elections?

[03:35:02]

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Will there be fewer elections? I hope there are going to be fewer elections in the future. But in this bill, the intention is to have the primary on

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

an already scheduled election day. Of course, the decision was made to move back to majority instead of plurality. So if nobody gets 50%, you would have an additional election in that scenario. But my hope is that we continuously try to reduce those situations.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: And in my district, I have a large number of independent, several of them are office holders who are not happy at all with this. And certainly, I've already voted no the first time. I'll vote no again this time. It's like we're picking out groups. Everybody's an American citizen should have the right to vote. Could not be abridged by anybody else. In this particular bill, I think we're changing that right of Louisiana citizens to vote or hold office in any election, because you've named several times where they'd have to go through certain things that they couldn't, that sort of thing. So I'm going to say [INDISCERNIBLE 03:36:04].

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Okay. I don't think most other states do their elections in this way and have a party primary. So I don't think that we're doing anything that, like 40 something other states don't do or do.

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Freiberg, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE FREIBERG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam chair. If you're running for the presidential, if you're running in the presidential election, do you have to have a qualifying -- do you have to have a list? Do you have to have signatures? Or can you just pay a fee?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: So when you qualify for the presidential preference primary, you pay a fee, obviously, from the national candidates. They pay a fee to be in the presidential preference primary. And president's a little bit different because the process for electing the president actually comes from the national conventions. It's a little bit more of a formality now, but it comes from delegates in the national convention. So what happens is we have the PPP, and then those delegates go to convention and different states do different things as far as how they allocate delegates. And then the delegates at the convention officially nominate the person, and then those people and then those nominees have to re qualify for the general election ballot as president.

REPRESENTATIVE FREIBERG: So I guess that's --

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: That's a slightly more complicated process.

REPRESENTATIVE FREIBERG: I go back to having to have signatures and not also having the option of paying the fee. That does seem fair. Thank you.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Taylor, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Thank you. [INDISCERNIBLE 03:37:59].

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Microphone. Yeah. There you go.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Good afternoon. I'd like to thank you for allowing me to ask the question. But my question is, how much would this process cost?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: So if you look on, there's a fiscal note that you should have received. And look, honestly, this changed very quickly as the senate added some of these amendments. Frankly, my hope is to continue to work through this process to make sure it doesn't cost as much. But I do realize there's some upfront costs in it. So if you look on the fiscal note, it has a 2025, 26 fiscal year. It has a \$19 million fiscal note in order to prepare for the process of doing this. And then in subsequent years, it begins to fall off.

REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Okay. And my subsequent question would be, why will we spend millions of dollars for this new process? Aren't there more important things in the budget that we can allocate these funds for rather than spending this money to change an election process?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you for the question, Representative Taylor. Look, I think there's a lot of really important things that we pay for in the state, and I certainly think that elections are a very important thing that we have to pay for in the state. In my opinion, there's also a lot of things that are not important that we put in the budget. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Travis Johnson, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE TRAVIS JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairwoman Emerson, I know you intend for this bill to clean up the elections, but do you see any unintended consequences with having two different elections and also having independence paid? Do you see any unintended consequences making her pay and have a thousand signatures correct to get on the ballot?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Well, it depends on the office that you're running for. We were talking about congress a lot and for congress it is a thousand. Yes.

[03:40:01]

REPRESENTATIVE TRAVIS JOHNSON: How many signatures is it for the PSC and for BESE?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I think it, I'm not sure on PSC and BESE, either 750 or 1000.

REPRESENTATIVE TRAVIS JOHNSON: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: It trickles down from there as far as legislative races, but I believe in the districts of those size, it would probably still be 1000.

REPRESENTATIVE TRAVIS JOHNSON: Well, when I say unattended consequences, did you know that in some states this create more bureaucracy? For example, let's say you have a PSC member independent and it takes 750 signatures to qualify. Let's say they get 850 signatures. You have a well-funded Democrat, well-funded Republican who wants to get them kicked off the ballot. They challenge the signatures. Now you have to have a staff to go to each signature, make sure that that constituent reside in that district, they make sure it's their legible signature. It's a whole process. Right now, I'm witnessing other states where those individuals have had to go line item by line item making sure that each constituent can sign that particular ballot. Then if they make the ballot, have a retired judge, may make a decision, board of ethics, then they can appeal it. It can go on in a court process time and time again, so I just know that other states have many unattended consequences when using this particular process. So do you think that this situation can lead to that unacquainted consequence?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: You know, Representative Johnson, you and I have served together here we're in our fifth year, and I think there's a lot of bills that we pass here that may or may not have some unintended consequences. The good thing about this bill is the implementation is not until 2026. So I'll be happy to work on any type of cleanup language that we need even in the upcoming general session and over the next couple of years.

REPRESENTATIVE TRAVIS JOHNSON: You don't think of this big or disenfranchised independent voters?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I don't.

REPRESENTATIVE TRAVIS JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Knox, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Chairwoman.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: Are you aware that there's approximately 200 plus thousand veterans in the State of Louisiana?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I'm sorry, what did you say?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: The veteran population, are you aware? Both those --

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I'm not sure how many we have, but I certainly appreciate their service and I'm glad they're here.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: Thank you. I appreciate you making that comment. As a veteran, I have a large population of veterans in my district, many of whom are independent or non-party affiliated. So my question, is there any consideration or exception that would allow these veterans to vote in the primary?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: So thank you for the question, Representative Knox. And again, certainly I'm glad that we have so many veterans that live in the State of Louisiana. Just like all of our other citizens who certainly enjoy the right to vote, they're going to be able to vote in the general election process. This process is a party primary process that is specifically related to choosing the nominees of those individual parties. And if those veterans are part of the parties that meet this threshold, which in current case would be Republican and Democrat, or if they're unaffiliated, they would be able to go vote in the party primary.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: So they would have to go through the extra hurdle to vote in the general if they're not affiliated?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: There's no extra hurdle for them to vote in the general. No.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOX: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Boyd, for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, Madam. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to piggyback on something Rep. Knox just said, because it does seem like they have an additional hurdle as an independent. Because if we have a party primary, an independent with the big eye, as you called it, is a party but they can't qualify in a primary. They have to get the signatures for the general. It does appear that they're getting like a double standard because the no party can just go the day of the election, the general election, and decide where they want to vote, but not the independent. But the independent can't qualify in a primary party election. Is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: That's correct. I just want to be clear. I wasn't trying to misspeak. Representative Knox asked me if the voters would have an additional hurdle to be able to vote. That's how I understood his question. So they would not have an additional hurdle to be able to vote.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: I'm making his question more specific then, because the independent party can't qualify in the party primary. Correct?

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: The members of the independent party, which is a recognized party in this state would be eligible to be on the general election ballot by nominating petitions.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: So it is an additional hurdle because we have a party primary with the Republican and Democrats, independent is a party.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I disagree with -- okay.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: On the day of the question, on the day of the general, a no party person can go in and vote, but the independent would not have the same privilege?

[03:45:11]

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: To vote in a party primary?

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: So unaffiliated voters can vote in party primary.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: That's what I said.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: So it is an additional -- it's almost like a double standard for the independent.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: To be a candidate or to vote?

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I'm sorry. I'm just trying to clarify. There's not an additional hurdle for anyone to vote in the general election.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: I called it a double standard.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Because the independent with the big eye is a party.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: It is.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: But they cannot participate in the party primary.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: They're not holding a party primary. Correct.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Correct. But they are a party. They would have to then get signatures to participate in the general election.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: In order to be a candidate. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Okay. To vote on that day as an independent, the no party person can go in that day and decide if they want to vote Democrat or Republican.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Unaffiliate, yes. No party unaffiliated voters in the senate amendment --

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: No party unaffiliated whatever we want to ask with that. But the independent party person could not.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: They are recognized party, so that is not the case.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Thank you. Because you just proved my point. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Cox.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: Thank you, Chairman Emerson. Just about personal info, how many signatures will be required for the three elections that are going to the closed primary for the general election?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: I'm sorry, can you put your microphone a little closer?

REPRESENTATIVE COX: How many signatures will be required for those non-affiliated candidates to get the general election?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: So it's a thousand signatures.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: It's the same for all three? A thousand?

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: My understanding is yes. For congress, BESE and PSC, it's a thousand signatures and supreme court so, yes. Every single one of these offices included in here is a thousand signatures.

REPRESENTATIVE COX: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I see no further questions. You have a right to close.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JULIE EMERSON: Thank you Mr. Speaker, members. I really appreciate the in depth debate that we've had on this bill the last few days. It's not exactly how I wanted it, but again, this is a process that we go through, and we have 144 different voices here and represent 144 different constituencies. And I certainly appreciate the process and also just really want to thank the house and governmental staff, Trish and Annie, of all of the hours they put into helping me draft this bill so appreciate your favorable passage.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Emerson moves to concur in the senate amendments. Those in favor, vote yay. Those opposed vote nay. The clerk will open the machine. Vote your machine, members. Are you through voting members? Representative Green, no. Representative Jackson, yay. Representative Bacala, yay. Representative Boyer, yay. Representative [INDISCERNIBLE 03:48:16], yay. Representative Bayham, yay. Representative Mena, yay. Are you through voting members? Representative Mena, yay. The clerk will close the machine. Representative Mena, are you a yay or a nay?

[OVERLAY]

He's a nay. Thank you. The clerk will close the machine. We have 67 yays, 36 nays, and the amendments are concurred in. Members, we're going to stand at ease. We're going to wait on the senate. Representative Boyer for a personal privilege. Representative Willard for a personal privilege.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLARD: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Members, I just wanted to take a second to acknowledge and thank the plaintiffs in the redistricting lawsuit who are here with us today. We have Dr. Perez, Robinson, Dr. Alice Washington, Ashley Shelton. For the Power Coalition. We have Commissioner Davante Lewis.

[03:50:01]

We have president of the NAACP, Mike McClanahan. We have Mr. Edgar Cage. We have Ms. Dorothy Nairne. We have Bishop Edwin Soule, Reverend Clee Earnest Lowe, and we have Martha Davis and Ms. Ambrose Sims. Thank you for all of your hard work. We appreciate you being here with us today. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Boyer for a personal privilege.

REPRESENTATIVE BOYER: Members, I know that this has been a long week for you all. It's also been a long week for staff, in particular our house and governmental staff. So I think they might be hiding in the amendment room right now, but if they could step out for a second. Is Ms. Annie and Ms. Patricia in there? So these ladies have worked tirelessly this week. They work well into the weekend and late nights. And so I want to publicly thank Ms. Sarah Baker. She's not up here with us, but Ms. Annie Smith and Ms. Trish Lowry, thank you for everything you've done for us over this week and continue to do. We can't thank you enough. Thank you.

0119_24_1es_day5

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for your service. Should I say it again? Members, we're going to go ahead and stand at ease, and we're going to be waiting on the senate.

[03:51:51]

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

[04:49:20]

Roll call. Members, vote your machines. Vote your machine, members. Are you through voting? Green? Newell? Weibel? Firment? Are you through voting, members? We have 102 members present in a quorum.

MADAM CLERK: Somebody's TV is glaring.

MR. SPEAKER: Can someone turn their tv down, please? Morning hour number 12.

MADAM CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, Representative Boyer moves to revert to morning hour 12 at this time.

[04:50:01]

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.

MADAM CLERK: And Mr. Speaker and members, Representative Boyer moves to discharge House Bill 19 from the House and Governmental Affairs Committee for the purpose of withdrawing this bill from the files of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection. Representative Thompson for a motion.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, members, I move we adjourn sine die.

MR. SPEAKER: Without objection.

[04:52:02]



I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that “0119_24_1es_day5” is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate transcription in English.

Anders Nelson
Anders Nelson (Feb 15, 2024 13:31 EST)

Anders Nelson
Project Manager
TransPerfect Legal Solutions

February 15, 2024