CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Call the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs to order. Today is Wednesday, February 16. Lastly, if you wish to give testimony, please fill out a card, green in support, red in opposition, white for information only, please silence all cell phones. We don't disturb the presenters or any of the legislators who are giving testimony. Members, we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight items on the agenda today. I am going to go out of order and take Mr. President up first with SB-1. SB-1 which is the reapportionment of the senate map members. Oh, yeah, we need to call a role. I'm jumping way ahead, Ms. Ammersbach, please call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Vice-Chairman Duplessis?

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Beaulieu? Representative Wilford Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER:

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Deshotel?

REP. DESHOTEL: Here.

Hearing Exhibit
PR-70
3:22-cv-00211-SDD-RLB

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Farnum?

REP. LES FARNUM: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Gadberry?

REP. GADBERRY: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Hodges? Representative Horton? Present. Representative Ivey? Representative Jenkins? Present. Representative Mike Johnson? Present. Representative LaCombe? Representative Lyons? Representative Magee? Represent Newell?

REP. NEWELL: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Thomas?

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative White?

REP. WHITE: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Twelve members.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Twelve members in the court room, Mr. President. Whenever you're ready.

MALE 1: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Chairman and members of the committee, Senate Bill 1 is the reapportionment of the senate, the 39 senate

1 districts. I know you all are familiar. You went
2 through the same process with the house map with
3 regards to the population shifts but just to kind of
4 talk a little bit about what we did, our districts,
5 28 to 39, which are the northern, we're numbered
6 opposite of you all that numbered north. Those had a
7 collective combined absolute deviation of a negative
8 108,633 from the ideal population of 119,429. So
9 effectively, they were collective. Those North
10 Louisiana districts were collectively 91% shark or
11 almost a whole senate district sharp. By contrast,
12 I'm going to tell you, the Northshore districts
13 collectively had 85,403 positive deviations. So they
14 were 85,000 above the ideal. So effectively, you had
15 one less senate district in the north, and you had
16 about two thirds of a senate district in the
17 Northshore area. So what we effectively did in this
18 map is migrated a district from northwest Louisiana
19 to the Northshore. Everything else had to be affected
20 by that. I'll tell you, I don't want to go into
21 detail because you all have heard this over and over,
22 but the population bumps were in the Kalkaska area,
23 in the Lafayette area, in the Northshore and
24 Livingston Ascension area, and then, of course, in
25 Orleans, they had some increase. And so all of those

increase is suggested we had some shifts in the population. So as much as possible, we tried to maintain the status quo what we had and as best possible, maintain the continuity representation. I'll tell you, I spent a lot of time with each and every senator speaking about the commonalities, the communities of interest, and the basic tenets of their district that they wanted to maintain. And so we try to do that as much as possible with that, I'm happy to answer. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. President. We do have a question, Representative Carter for a question.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Mr. President, I just wanted to look at 27 -- my home district, my home area and I think what they did, they made my district more 35% minority right now, but it was 40%. So I'm trying to figure what precincts you took out, you added more precincts or you took precincts out of that.

MALE 1: So, again, following what I mentioned earlier, everything north of you, every district north of you had to flow to the northwest. The problem we had was there was a majority minority

district that's currently held by Senator Jay Luno. That is right down the middle of North Louisiana.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Okay.

MALE 1: Goes from Lincoln Parish down to Bossier Parish.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Okay.

MALE 1: And so in order to maintain that when everything had to go around that either and so some of the calculus you had to move north, that particular district you're speaking of actually had wasn't over, it's was over the ideal population, so it had to lose population. The district also currently held by Senator Abraham was over by, I think 12,000 or 13,000. It had to lose population.

[00:05:00]

The idea or the thinking of Lafayette having gained population, everything was Senator Abraham's district was going to move west so that it would be more compact. So he wanted to move out of Acadia Parish. It stretched all the way to Crowley. We did that. We couldn't get him all the way out. And by doing that, it moved Senator Stein's district north, and then that moved Senator Reese's district north and into Rapides Parish.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: So 27 basically went more north. Basically, went more north, 27 went more north.

MALE 1: Correct. They all had to go north and west pretty much every unless you in that hot bubble of NorthShore, which everything went either there. So there was sort of like I said, there was two magnets pulling. One was on the NorthShore, and one was in northwest Louisiana.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Okay. Thank you. I understand.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Carter. For question, Representative Deshotel?

REP. DESHOTEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Mr. President. Quick question, I represent of Avoyelles Parish, and I got a few calls concerning the Bunkie area kind of been moved out into District 29. It was my understanding that that was to kind of help District 29 and not hurt District 28.

MALE 1: Correct. So you're hitting on -- I think both of you all just hit on sort of what did we have to do to fix the migration. And Rapides Parish and Avoyelles Parish were the two Parishes that had enough population to where you could fix all the

other districts around them. So you know, Senator Cloud tried to keep that as whole as possible. In one of the first iterations, it actually fell into Senator Ward's district because he needed to pick up population. And so it turns out he ended up thinking that St. Andrew was a better fit and Avoyelles was a better fit in Senator Cloud's district. And then when Senator Luno got there in order to get his numbers right population was he had to come down and pick up some there. This also was affected by Senator Bernard's district which he needed part of [PH 00:07:11] Pineville which would have previously been part of Senator Luno's district. And we had all of these moving parts, but that's the reasoning. And yes, we tried to keep them as much as possible. Every Parish would try to keep them whole.

REP. DESHOTEL: I appreciate the explanation. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Deshotel. For question, Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON: Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Welcome.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. I know you've worked very hard on this. I'm sure you understand I'm a little disappointed that I don't know if that's the right word, but we now have six senators in 130,000 population in our Parish. I worry about how that diminishes my Parish's influence and power when we really don't make up a majority of anybody's senatorial district except for 32. Are there any other options looked at that might have accomplished what you needed to accomplish but that would have left Rapides?

MALE 1: Well, if you go with the principles that I started out with and I didn't read them all to you but one of the principles was continuity of representation.

REP. JOHNSON: Right.

MALE 1: What that means is in layman's term is the same people who voted someone in ought to have the right to vote them back out. So the quagmire in your Parish and I've had many conversations with people from your Parish is that Senator Luno's district is like a fence right down the middle. It's a majority minority district. So if it's down the middle in order to remain continuous you got two sides.

REP. JOHNSON: Yes.

MALE 1: And it was problematic and it doesn't go halfway down. It goes all the way through the Parish. So you literally have no way other than to go all the way south into Avoyelles Parish which Representative Deshotel just mentioned and through Evangeline to come back up if you go north you would have to go all the way to Lincoln Parish and come back down to try to get the same senator which doesn't make sense from a compactness argument. I was here eleven years ago in the same room when we did the house map and I served in the house and I was in house District 43 and my house district had grown by some 18,000 that's a house district had grown by 18,000 to 20,000 in South Lafayette Parish. So at the time my district had to give up population my colleague, Taylor [PH 00:09:39] Barras, was to the south of me, it was in Iberia district. And the people of the City of Broussard were given me the same argument that look, you're now splitting us we want to have influence and it was a math equation. I said there's no way to fix it. Well, four years later after reapportionment turns out that Taylor Barras becomes a speaker of the house and they have the speaker house and I moved

over to the senate and they had the same senator that was their former house rep.

[00:10:00]

And they now have the Speaker of the House. And then Stewart Bishop was elected to represent that house. They were pretty happy that they could get on just about an amendment on just about any committee throughout the building because they felt now they had more representation. And while I did have I know a good friend of yours from Rapides and I had a conversation, we talked about it the other night and I said, what you had now and I know it's hard to digest sometimes, but what you have now is literally six options on the senate side. And given that each senator serves on three or four committees, unless they're the President, or really the three or four, but let's say three. You represent now 18 different committee's thoughts in your Parish, so you don't have to go search for somebody on judiciary see to offer an amendment. You got somebody in your Parish likely that can do it for you if it's something that the Parish is pushing forward.

REP. JOHNSON: Well, the main thing I take from this is that you're telling me I could be speaker and Senator Womack could be President.

MALE 1: There's a real chance of that.

REP. JOHNSON: I don't know about that.

MALE 1: Trust me. There's a real chance.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. Representative Johnson. Members, that clears the board of questions. Well, no, we do Representative Jenkins has a question. I'm sorry.

REP. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. President, right over here. First of all, good morning. Welcome to the committee. From everything I've heard, your effort here was very inclusive of discussions with people across the aisle, as well as the different races. And you try to reach out and make sure everybody has something to say, and it's very commendable. So your map maintains the same number of minority districts, is that correct, sir?

MALE 1: That's correct.

REP. JENKINS: And my understanding, of course, we had our hands full over here. They didn't have enough time to follow too much on the senate side. My understanding, whether or not some separate bills or amendments that set forth adding was it two minority districts?

MALE 1: That's correct. Sent a price had a bill that added. So mine is the same number of majority minority districts that were filed eleven years ago that were approved under the justice department's preference. So he was attempting to add two to make it thirteen.

REP. JENKINS: Okay. I thought that's what I gained from that. So can you maybe explain to the committee why that cannot be accomplished or alternatively, why at least one additional minority district cannot be accomplished?

MALE 1: Well, again, I didn't give you my principles, but I'm going to give them to you now. So it may be give you a little bit of backdrop. So number one principle is it's based on populations. So as you all know, the one person one vote is the first requirement we have to reapportion. That's what we're here for. Secondly, we wanted to provide that the current majority minority districts will have an equal opportunity for the minority community to elect its candidate of choice. Anything that would not give that opportunity or would violate one of the other principles was not considered. I would say not considered was considered to the point until they violated it. Number three and these are in no

1 particular order. I'm just numerating them so you
2 know that they're a different one but they're just
3 bullet points. As best possible maintain continuity
4 of representation. So I just alluded to that which is
5 the same people who voted you into office ought to
6 have the right to vote you out of office. If you take
7 and start what we call I'm going to pick my voters
8 rather than my voters picking me. Some people call
9 that gerrymandering. When you start saying I want
10 those people because they can elect me well you're
11 doing a disservice to the process. The people who
12 elected you ought to have a right to unelect you. The
13 next one was apply the compactness respecting the
14 population shifts. So we did have population shifts.
15 You all know that we've been through that. The next
16 part was communities of interest. I think you all
17 have heard that line. And then preserving the cores
18 of the existing districts so, I'm going to give you
19 an example. You know we had a delegation I know
20 Representative Duplessis is well aware of that which
21 dealt with preserving the cores of the existing
22 district down in the New Orleans area but in senator
23 prices map to your point if you were to go back into
24 look at Senate District 31 it did exactly what I just
25 had the conversation over here with Representative

Deshotel. It took Senate District 31 and quit completely above Lincoln Parish and wrapped all the way around so you would have had to have left, gone through your district, gone through another district next to you.

[00:15:00]

And then get into another area of people that you've never met before and have never voted for you. Almost it was more than 50% of the people in that district would never have voted for the person currently holding. Say this one, if you looked at Senator Mills, Fred Mills district in that map, he represents what I'm going to call the west side of the Atchafalaya Basin, St. Martin and Iberia Parish. He has a little bit of Lafayette Parish. If you were from New Iberia, you would have to go 30 miles north [PH 00:15:30] Atkins, get on a Basin bridge, which is the largest freshwater Basin in North America, cross it, and then go south on LA-1 one to Iberville Parish to meet your constituents that you've never met before. So, for communities of interest. It did everything to violate that principle. It violated the continuity of representation. And so those are just two examples. The other part, as you know, in this building, you got to get votes. That map so destroyed

many of the districts and didn't keep that continuity of representation that there was not a real chance of getting the 20 votes. So did we look at it? Yes. Did Senator Price and I have conversations about it? Yes. Senator Tarver and I had many conversations. So up in your area, we had many conversations about it. That's about what I'm going to say. Was there an effort? Yes. I think it violated the principles, and I think every time I looked at it, it took the possibility that the opportunity was gone for another district, meaning a current district when you added an additional.

REP. JENKINS: So it sounds like the compactness of the geography was an allergic reason. Was that an overriding fact? No. There's just one of the factors. There are multiple factors.

MALE 1: The number one factor was by trying to create it, you were going to dilute other districts or you're going to create communities of interest problems. Are you going to create all these different problems with the principles that I had laid out, that I believe me and the non-lawyer that all are appropriate and follow the federal law.

REP. JENKINS: Was there any increase in the voting age population for minorities in any of the majority districts?

MALE 1: I'm sure there were, but I'm sure that --.

REP. JENKINS: You feel that there may have been some increases in some of those areas.

MALE 1: Yeah, I know. Senator Tarver just off the top of my head. I know that was one of his number one request. So we'll give you a little backdrop of how we went through this. I filed a map. It was a starting point. And I met with each and every Senator to say, what is your request in your district? And his thing was I feel like I've got too many minorities in my district. I'd like to reduce the number of minorities. And so we did meet that goal in his district which, of course, increased the others next to him.

REP. JENKINS: So do you feel like the map that you have here not adding any minority districts? Do you think that could be subject to a legal challenge?

MALE 1: Well, everything is subject to a legal challenge. It's kind of like asking me if it's constitutional. I'm not a lawyer but I am in the legislature so I leave the judicial branch to do

their job and I try to just do the legislative branch so I'm offering up a policy that some other people in a different branch of government will decide if it's-- but everything is subject to legal. Even if we pass the law commemorating mothers on Mother's day, that's subject [INDISCERNIBLE 00:18:58] nowadays.

REP. JENKINS: Okay. All right. Well, Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the effort. It just appears that with the increases in African-American population it just appears that reaching at least one additional minority district was something that could be accomplished. I'm not discounting the fact that it was looked at and considered I certainly appreciate your effort on it.

MALE 1: Thank you for that.

REP JENKINS: But it does give pause for concern.

MALE 1: Thank you for that. And just to be clear with regards to that when we went to committee in an effort to be as transparent as possible we brought the build a committee offered amendments a committee we deferred it in committee. We came back a second time so that everybody could see what the changes were. We came back a second time in committee offered no amendments, we forwarded it to the floor let the committee members see what the amendment version was.

[00:20:00]

We sent it to the floor of the senate. We offered amendments on the floor of the senate returned it to the calendar to let the public and everybody see it. It was due to be taken up a few days later. We came in, there were members of the Senate. Of course, again in the New Orleans, Jefferson region, in the Acadiana region in Northeast Louisiana, everybody had amendments they wanted to bring. Central Louisiana had some. We amended it again. We returned it to the calendar again to allow for all of this process. We amended it on the last iteration in the Senate Chamber and the purpose of that was that, in what I kind of said upfront is, if everyone is in agreement, have you spoken to you back home, you know, mayors? Because you know, there was this concern that certain mayors were having a concern or certain Parish presidents were having a concern. If you all come together and any senator whose district is affected is all in agreement that all of the locals are good with it, we adopted it. We had a global set of amendments. It was about four amendments. There were some that came that there was not a 100% unanimous agreement, and that amendment failed. So, in saying all of that, there were three or four times that

there was an opportunity to bring an amendment offering just one additional, and nobody brought that amendment. I had many conversations behind the scenes. No one was willing to bring that amendment forward. Now, you may ask the question why, and I can't speak for other people, but I could speak for me. I believe the only way to add another one was to dilute other minority districts near it to the point where they would not have the opportunity to elect the candidate of choice that currently do have the opportunity. I think you would have put in Peril some of the current minority districts, without a major shift of what we just talked about earlier, to all of those other foundational principles.

REP. JENKINS: All right.

MALE 1: So, I hope that answers your questions. There was opportunity. No one brought it.

REP. JENKINS: Yeah, it did answer my questions and I guess I close to saying you now said to the speaker and to Chairman Stefanski, I know the effort was there, no one is complaining about that, and I know that was a lot of discussions and negotiations so I know this is a very difficult process. The effort was there but, you know, the outcome is somewhat disappointing to some of us that it felt

like the population increases should have provided for more opportunities for minorities to be in the legislature, be it in the Senate or in the House, but we certainly are not, you know, discounting the effort that was made by you and the leadership that you showed in this effort. All right.

MALE 1: Thank you.

REP. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. President.

MALE 1: I appreciate those comments. Thank you.

REP. JENKINS: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, MR. President. Thank you, Representative Jenkins. For question, Representative Horton.

REP. HORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. President, for being here today and for your hard work. I see it passed -- this bill passed out of the Senate 2712 and appears to be it was [PH 00:23:18] bipartisan vote. I see that we lost a Republican senator from North Louisiana, Senator Barrow Peacock, and so, can you tell me, because Bossier grew, but Caddo lost. So, I guess, was his district sorely lacking, or was it because he's term-limited out and you were able to -- it was the easier one to move? I was just wondering what that was.

MALE 1: Yeah. It was a byproduct of the number of below the absolute deviation that occurred. So, Senator Tarver's district, now don't hold me to these numbers.

REP. HORTON: That's okay.

MALE 1: But approximately 15,000 below the deviation. Senator Milligan was below, and I don't have the numbers in front of me but 8,000 or 9,000.

REP. HORTON: That's okay.

MALE 1: Senator Bernard who came up that way was below about 14,000 or 15,000. So, if you just add those three districts, okay, you probably had 40,000 people that were below. Now when you say Senator Peacock's district, okay, so I want to be clear that wherever Senator Peacock lives, if he were termed or not termed, he would have a district to run in. We didn't remove his house from Shreveport.

REP. HORTON: I understand that. I totally understand that.

MALE 1: He's still got a district to run.

REP. HORTON: I totally understand that, his representation, sure.

MALE 1: He would just be running against some other member of the current legislature. Part of what you just asked was why did we migrated 37.

REP. HORTON: Yes, sir.

MALE 1: And the reason is because 37 was the most compact of all the districts out there.

[00:25:00]

If you were going to bring people to get that population, it's much easier to go to one point than to try to go to a bunch of different points around a larger, gerrymandered I'm going to call, district. So, the other part of that equation is, and if you don't know your history, which I love history, I was told I wasn't here, that in the '90s and maybe I could get corrected by the House staff if I'm wrong. In the '90s, Northeast Louisiana lost a Senate District after the 90-decennial census. So, they were more able to keep their districts together this time around, not for any other particular reason than that there's been less change up there. Again that was the big numbers in, you know, Tarver's district, Milligan's district, Bernard's district, those three were big numbers, and they all circled that one.

REP. HORTON: Right, and his was compact because the population was [INDISCERNIBLE 00:26:03] there.

MALE 1: By the way, he had lost 10,000 or 11,000 as well.

REP. HORTON: In Caddo?

MALE 1: Yes.

REP. HORTON: Okay.

MALE 1: In his district. His district I think was almost wholly Caddo.

REP. HORTON: In part Bossier, but I appreciate your hard work. I know it's difficult, but the numbers are -- our main guide, we can't deny but the numbers are, and so although we are saddened that we lost a senate representation, we understand it, just like we lost a State rep seat with Kenny Cox, but we understand it because the numbers just don't lie. And so, I thank you for your hard work and I support you.

MALE 1: Thank you.

REP. HORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Horton. Members, that clears - Representative Lyons, you have a question? Every time I say that clears the board, we get another. Representative Lyons for a question.

REP. LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. President, thank you for all the hard work and you did an exemplary job explaining your process and how you went through, you know, the process of coming to your maps, and it's just a few things that I just want to say, and you kind of touched on it which

1 brought to me this point, the core of districts. And
2 I know you alluded to Representative Duplessis that
3 there was an issue that involves our areas that you
4 worked on, and what I want to say is on that note,
5 and we talked about Jefferson Parish and there's been
6 a lot of conversation on the numbers of the minority
7 population in Jefferson Parish, and that population
8 has grown, you know, as it was stated to over almost
9 50% of the parish, with the majority of those
10 residents residing on the West Bank of Jefferson
11 Parish. So, as the glowing growth of the Parish and
12 the numbers of detailing, the expansion of many
13 districts including Senate Districts are something
14 that, you know, the minority population is interested
15 in doing and of course, you know, in this body, we
16 entail to just this body, and I appreciated the
17 debate, you know and going a part of that, and I
18 guess it's -- I'd like to say, you know, that it put
19 me in a mix, you know. My name was in the mix.
20 MALE 1: You were in the audience watching. I saw
21 you in the back.
22 REP. LYONS: Yes. It's interesting to watch these
23 things unfold and do so and I had a, you know, an
24 opportunity to see how representation takes place in
25 that, and you may not know the very first day we were

in session here, we had groups from Jefferson and other groups that came here to advocate, you know, for fair maps, what have you, and we had no idea of knowing how to tell them what day, what bill would be heard and where, but they were gravitating to myself, number one, because, you know, I am from Jefferson Parish and I represent that and even though there's districts that overlap from St. Bernard. I'm not St. Bernard. From St. Charles. Yeah St. Bernard and all of these that overlapping into Jefferson, the core of Jefferson as it pertains to the West Bank is split in many areas, and I understand the demographics of how we it goes, but even right now, the conversation is, how does -- when you talk about communities of interest, how does the community in Marrero have an interest with the community of Uptown New Orleans? How does the community currently now, and I guess in Kenner and in St. Charles Parish have some, you know, commonalities with them? So, as we go forward, you know, I'm hoping that, you know, from whatever numbers are there, that the minority population in Jefferson Parish, particularly the West Bank, plays a part in things that we've done, but I do commend you on your efforts. I saw it. I saw how you worked and what you did, and the process of doing that.

[00:30:03]
But it's just important that the people just in past know that from where I'm sitting, you know that someone is concerned and they didn't do it. I know the council passed a resolution asking for on where we at. So, we're in a different place, but we could be much worse, and just wanted to say thank you for that.

MALE 1: Well, you hit on a point with Jefferson Parish, but also you mentioned four different parishes. You mentioned St. Charles, Jefferson, Orleans and St. Bernard. Again, 11 years ago, when we went through this process, it was Post-Katrina, and there was a lot of exodus from Orleans, Jefferson area, and maybe Jefferson was the beneficiary of some of that Orleans leaving. St. Bernard, as you recall, there was a mass exodus. They're starting to come back. St. Bernard is starting to have an increase in population, as is Orleans. And you mentioned the Jefferson. So, I would say that we're still while it seems like it's a long time ago, it's 17 years. But since the last map, which you still haven't had people coming back in 11 in mass droves coming back to the New Orleans area, you're only 11 years removed

from that. So, I think as time goes by, you're going to see that it's going to keep changing.

REP. LYONS: Yeah, and I know we have an enormous percentage of growth minorities on the West Bank of Jefferson Parish, it indicates that there's growth. So, as we go and we continue to grow, we're hoping that some things change in a different direction, but I say we could always be worth.

MALE 1: There's a large growth in all the different boxes that you check. I don't know if you noticed that Senator Connick brought it to my attention that there's been a large growth of other a large growth of Asians and a large growth of Hispanics in his district. And so, Senator Connick is well aware of the diversity in his district. And so, he made that point to me, whether it was on the mic on the floor or in private. He certainly made me aware of the diversity in his district, and I know you're aware of it because you represent the similar area.

REP. LYONS: Yes.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you.

REP. LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Good deal. Thank you. Representative Lyons. Members that clears the board.

So, I'm not looking again in case anybody else pops up. Mr. President, I want to commend you as somebody who had a similar stance on this side and had to do a lot of work and a lot of long hours, I know you did that as well. We maybe had two of the only cars that were here some nights working. So, I appreciate your hard work and I appreciate where we've come from this. I'm going to make a motion that we move favorable, although I am going to give the President an opportunity to close if you would like.

MALE 1: Thank you. I'll waive the closing. Thank you, all of her job.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: The chair is going to move favorable on Senate Bill One. Is there any objection? Representative Jenkins does object. So, members, we are voting a vote yes. Moves this bill to the House floor. A vote no means the bill remains in committee. Ms. Ammersbach will call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Vice Chairman Duplessis? No. Representative Beaullieu? Represent Wilford Carter?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Deshotel? Representative Farnum?

REP. LES FARNUM: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry?

REP. GADBERRY: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges?

REP. HODGES: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Horton?

REP. HORTON: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Ivey?

REP. IVEY: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Jenkins?

REP. JENKINS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Mike Johnson?

REP. MIKE JOHNSON: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative LaCombe? Representative Lyons.

REP. LYONS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee? Representative Newell?

REP. NEWELL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas?

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White?

REP. WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Nine yeas, four nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Nine yeas, four nays, and the bill is reported or rather is moved favorable. Thank you, Mr. President.

MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you, Members and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Mr. Vice Chair and the chair. Housekeeping, I apologize again, Mr. Card [PH 00:34:20]. There was a red card in opposition, Chris Kaiser with ACLU of Louisiana, and I wish him to speak. My apologies on that. Missed it.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

[00:35:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Next on our agenda this morning. I think we have a few from Judge Carter. Would you like to start with HB 10? Whatever order you'd like to go in, which is HB 13?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Yes. All right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You want to defer. All right. You want to move to defer HB 10?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: HB 10, yes please.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: All right. Judge Carter would like to defer HB 10. We're going to go ahead

and get started with HB 13 whenever you're ready, sir. Okay.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman. HB 13 is just an effort to come up with nine judges on the Supreme Court. There was much discussion past session and a lot of folks were behind it. And so, I just present this as a possibility if someone enough of us thought it's a good idea, I think it's a good idea. The Supreme Court now makes up seven. If you have any cases going through the Supreme Court process takes a long time. It's a lot of work. These nine judges will certainly help the movement of cases to conclusion faster and if we get a more diverse opportunity of judges on the panel. And so, House Bill 13 simply creates a solution for constitutional amendment to create nine judges on the Supreme Court, and it will require five judges to have a deciding decision. And the language would be on the Ballot is in the bill. I'll read it to you. The Ballot language.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

Madam staffer might read the ballot language. Can you read the ballot language? I don't seem to have that bill in my packet. I took the wrong thing.

PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Members, Representative Carter is asking for Ballot language from House Bill 13 to be read. It would be on the November 8, 2022, election. And the question to the people would be, do you support an amendment to add two associate justices to the Supreme Court to require the concurrence of five justices and to change the number of Supreme Court districts from six to nine?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: That's all I have, any questions?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Question for Representative Thomas.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Carter, I thought we had seven supreme court justices?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Now we have seven, yes, ma'am.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Why does it say six? Actually, you have six associate justice and one chief justice on supreme court. This bill would make eight associate justice and one supreme court justice. Nine justice all total.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Okay, but I think it's confusing because the language is saying going from

that [PH 00:38:51] Trisha just read said going from six to nine.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: The associate justice is would be actually --

REP. POLLY THOMAS: It would have to go six to eight, wouldn't it?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Right, it has to go from nine justices.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: But if you're removing the I'm sorry, I don't know what you call the head of the --

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Chief justice.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Chief justice. Thank you very much. If you remove the chief justice, then you have eight associate justices. So, shouldn't that language read going from six to eight?

[OVERLAY]

PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: If you will turn please to page two it's lines eight through 11 and it says, do you support an amendment to add two associate justices to the supreme court to require the concurrence of five justices and members that's to render a decision into to change the number of supreme court district from six to nine.

[00:40:01]

PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: It's districts. And so, the Constitution currently says that there shall be six Supreme Court districts and at least one Justice elected from each. Prior to 1997, there was a just, there were two Justices elected from one Supreme Court district. After 1997, that changed and the legislature created seven single-member districts. But what the Constitution says is at least six districts, from which at least one Justice shall be elected. So, that was okay under the Constitutional language.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: That's right. So, that's well-explained, Trish, thank you. Thanks from me. That's why she teaches the class. Look, we had, we had the Constitution says six districts, but two at one time elected from each district.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Judge, can you speak into the mic, please, so that you can be heard.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Two at one time and selected from one district. But in '97, the legislation passed and changed that and had seven, elect from seven different districts.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Not, but did not change the Constitution. Is that correct?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: No, ma'am. No, ma'am. No, ma'am. Did not change the Constitution.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: So, the Constitution still says six.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Yes, ma'am.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Districts.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Yes, ma'am. So, this bill resolution would offer to the people opportunity for nine districts, nine Justices instead of seven.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: I got it. I would prefer for it to say seven to nine or six to eight, if you leave out the Supreme Court, I mean, the Chief Justice. But, I do think it's going to be confusing for the people.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: It's still a correction. A change has to be made to the Constitution that says six.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Uh-huh.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: And that's what this resolution is doing.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: Thank you, Representative Carter. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Rep. Thomas for your question. Representative Jenkins.

REP. SAM JENKINS: Hi. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman and Representative Carter. You know, I certainly appreciate you bringing this bill to the committee. We had a bill during the last regular session I think that tried to expand the court. And so, can you, maybe just for the public's sake, explain the difference between that bill and what you are trying to do since the number seemed to be the same?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Right. Actually, the bill you're talking about last session, it did a lot more things than just change the numbers.

REP. SAM JENKINS: Right.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: It is set forth, had the effect or change in Supreme Court presence because it said in the bill, in the Constitution amendment, that all the districts will be equal, number one. It did that. And it said that if the con, if the legislature could not agree on the district, then the Supreme Court will [INDISCERNIBLE 00:42:52] district. So, it said a lot of things in that bill that created problems, with certain me. I don't think the Supreme Court will to be [INDISCERNIBLE 00:43:02] own district. The constitution get that to the legislature. So, that bill did some things that was

novel and was questionable and was border on whether or not we should be changing the long-standing constitution requirement that the legislature change districts, not the individual body. This bill don't change these districts. The legislature does. So, that's the difference in the bill. You could just simply say to the people; do you want nine districts? If you want nine districts and judges, if you want nine judges, this really not, this bill doesn't deal with the districts. It says nine judges, so you will have nine districts, but it doesn't break down the districts. All it does is give the people an opportunity to vote on whether or not they want nine judges with the need five in order to reach a decision, okay, and there would be nine districts.

REP. SAM JENKINS: Right. And I know I had [INDISCERNIBLE 00:44:01] about the bill that was in the last regular session is kind of tying it to population and I just thought that wasn't a good idea. Your bill here is not [INDISCERNIBLE 00:44:12]. Okay. All right. Okay. Well, you know, I believe it is something that's worthy of consideration. And so, I leave it at that, Mr. Vice Chairman. And thank you, Representative Carter.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Rep. Jenkins. More question, Representative Farnum.

REP. LES FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. Give me your thoughts around this fiscal note that goes along with this. How do you, how do you justify nearly a million dollars a judge?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: I don't [INDISCERNIBLE 00:44:39].

I don't think it's a million dollars a judge. I think it's probably another million dollars total, but.

REP. LES FARNUM: [INDISCERNIBLE 00:44:45] fiscal note says.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: But, well, if you want, if you want a decision resolve quickly, quicker, and you want resolution of dispute resolve quicker, you have more people have an input on a judge.

[00:45:04]

More people on one judge have input. You have more diversity in the court. What is that worth? What is the confidence to the court, improving the confidence to the court worth? Is it worth a million? I think it's worth a lot more than a million. What is it worth to be able to resolve your issue from the [INDISCERNIBLE 00:45:24] court level to the Supreme

Court level and more rapid speed? To wait, the justice delayed is justice denied. And this would shorten it so tremendously. So, it's a million dollars, or two million, whatever you say it is, it is what it is, but it's, I think it's worth it if you can have quicker justice. If you can have more diverse justice, you know, I think it's worth it.

REP. LES FARNUM: So, I guess it's been my experience from my limited time in government that the more people you gather with opinions, the slower decisions come out of that.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: That's not, it has not been my experience.

REP. LES FARNUM: It's been mine. You get more different opinions entered into something and it just slows the process down.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Well, it wouldn't be, it wouldn't be necessarily a different opinion. You will need five people to render a decision.

REP. LES FARNUM: Yeah. Well, you know, it's just, you know, everything in the state has to come down a priority of what you spend your money on coming out of the general fund. And, you know, we've got education issues that we're trying to attack and just a long, long laundry list of infrastructure

issues that we're trying to deal with, and I don't, I don't really see where this stacks up into the priority list as high as children's education and getting bridges that don't have a toll on them and things of that nature. So, appreciate your effort into this, but I'm not going to be able to support it.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: I understand.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: That clears the board. There are no other questions on HB 13. Is there a motion [INDISCERNIBLE 00:47:11]?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Move [INDISCERNIBLE 00:47:12].

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, actually, before we have a card in favor present, in support, does not wish to speak, Chris Kaiser with the ACLU. We have a motion from bill author Judge Carter to move favorably? Is there an objection? Madam Secretary, please call the vote.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaullieu. Representative Wilford Carter.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Deshotel. No. Representative Farnum.

REP. LES FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry.

REP. GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges?

REP. HODGES: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Horton.

REP. HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey?

REP. IVEY: Yes. Representative Jenkins?

REP. JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson.

REP. MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe. Representative Lyons?

REP. LYONS: Yes. Representative Magee? Representative Newell?

REP. NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas.

REP. POLLY THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White. Six yays. Seven Nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you , Judge. You want to present HB 17?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: No. We don't need 17. We need the Constitution amendment.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. Got it. That won't work?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: That won't work.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: So we can go to --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: 18?

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Eighteen or twenty, either one.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It's your choice. We can start with 18.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: All right.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: And, you know, we had a lot of discussion on it. Nine judge bill last session. Nobody never came to the mic to say it was too much money. But, that's the way it goes. Reasons changes, different sessions. Eigteen is just another effort. I know we passed Representative Ivey bill out and I thought it was, I think it's a decent bill, voted for it. And I'm a supporter on the floor. This 18 is just another option, okay? It's just another way that you

can reapportion to seven judicious Supreme Court and get two of minority-majority districts. That's all it does. Twenty and eighteen, that's all it does. And this bill really goes, takes, create another district base up in from part East Baton Rouge Parish going down to the I-10, and creates another district. That's, that newly-created District 4, I think it is, would be, would be 59% of African-American, 37% white with a population of 343,000, I think it is. That's basically what it does. Any question?

[00:49:59]

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: It is just another option. All the things we said about Representative Ivey Bill say the same thing except Ivey Bill takes most of the northern parishes and run it down in the Mississippi River to East Baton Rouge Parish. This bill takes East Baton Rouge Parish and run it west a way in creating same district but it didn't have the disruption of Louisiana as the Ivey Bill has. So, it's just another way to look at it not another offer of possibilities and so I would offer that up.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right, question Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you Representative Carter. Currently our current Supreme Court, Louisiana Supreme Court, just map North Louisiana has the ability to elect two and your map takes away that ability for us to elect two. And let me ask you --

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Excuse me. You will still elect two, you have -- this District 5. District 5 goes all the way up to Ouachita Parish.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Yeah, that's northeast.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Basically it's more east but right now you have a judge from Union Parish and judge from Caddo Parish based on Bossier-Caddo.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Well, it's not. I do know the map currently. And we currently have two from North Louisiana and of course with the community of interest and it seems like we're constantly losing now with Supreme Court. The population doesn't so much in a run as it does. The ability for people from all across the state to be able to let proper representation. Let me ask you from your testimony, is your map purely race driven?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No. The map is not purely the race driven. The map does try to comply with what we say we want to do when we pass a legislation in order to deal with the population growth in the state. It does try to create another minority district.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: So, it is race driven, the changes you're making.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Well, I would call it section 2 of the Voter's Rights Act driven because it tries to create a minority district.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: But does that apply? Does that apply to the Supreme Court Justice Districts?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes, it is. Section 2 does. And we said we were going to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Oh, I thought it's one vote one person. One vote does it?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: That doesn't? I'm sorry. I'm confused. My bad.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: That's a United States Supreme Court case, used case. And in 1973 decided and set in full was a used case Well versus Woods and where the United States Supreme Court says

that judges don't represent people, they serve the public so they don't have to have one man one vote.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: I got you. Thank you for clarifying that for me.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: So you really have North Louisiana and instead of dividing it going north and south. Dividing North Louisiana north and south, it pretty much went east and west. And you can still elect to Judges but from North Louisiana even with this map.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: We can't from northwest and then northeast like we have now and that's what our objection is but I appreciate you answering my questions and I do appreciate your passion. Thank you, sir.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you. Representative Deshotel for question.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: Thank you Mr. Vice-chair. Thank you Judge. I commented on Rep. Ivey's bill yesterday. I did not think that his bill had kept communities of interest together. I think your bill does a whole lot better job. I think it's a better representation. I know it's probably not perfect but I do like it better. I'm going to support it.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Representative Thomas for question.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you. Mr. Vice-chair. Representative Carter. I'm looking at the map, at the picture of the map and it appears to me that District 4 has been drawn ranges from Calcasieu all the way to Tangipahoa. Am I reading that correctly?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: That's right. Basically it's true. But it affects a lot less parishes in other districts.

[00:55:01]

It doesn't run nearly as far as some of the other districts though but it does run from East Baton Rouge Parish based down Mississippi at end of Calcasieu. And let me tell you, I'm 74 years old. I'm not trying to run for nothing. Okay. I'm not trying to create no district for my benefit. I'm trying to create a district. So I retired from Judge 2013 that's what I want to do. I don't intend to -- that's something about in my past. I'm trying to create a district to comply with section 2 of the Voters Right Act. I'm trying to make us have a legal Supreme Court District. And in order to do that, I'm trying to

ensure that there will be sufficient numbers in order that it be more than likely minority be elected.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Well, I do understand that when you only have six districts that you do have to spend a greater number of parishes. But to me, this looks a bit tortured. I don't know about the compactness whether it would meet a compactness standard.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Well, you don't have to really be compact in a Court District. There's been jurisprudence that has ruled since it's not one man one vote. And since you're not even required to have population deviation requirements that it doesn't have to be. It's a different issue. It's not nearly as an issue with judges as it is with representative people.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay. Thank you Representative Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: I was the fifth [INDISCERNIBLE 00:56:34] where we had congressional district in the past first district throughout Z with a slash with three the Z with a dash or a slash. They would not have the same problem. They would not have the same opportunity with a judicial map. It's a whole different issue.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you Representative.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right Representative Beaullieu for question.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAU BEAULLIEU: Thank you. Judge Carter. So you mentioned the compactness was not really the priority or didn't have to be the priority.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Not the main priority but compactness will be considered.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAU BEAULLIEU: And population being the same doesn't have to be the same, didn't have to be a priority as well. So, I'm kind of like along the same lines. Representative Ivey yesterday. So you talk section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. So, was race the kind of the primary driver behind this?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Section 2 really does not require that you elect a minority from a group of people. All it does it says that, if there's a group that is to protect the class and African-Americans all protect the class under the Federal Statute. If you have a protected class and they have a sufficient number which they can give a district and historic they haven't gotten one because a voting

parish of the state in this case with then you can focus in and try if you can to create a district.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAU BEAULLIEU: So, if that protected class was African-American residents of Louisiana, you would say that race was the primary driver behind this.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: In the Civil Rights Act, race was the driver in trying to get representation in proportion to the numbers in the state.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAU BEAULLIEU: Thank you, judge. I appreciate you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you Rep Beaullieu. I have one question. It is more of a historical question. And I know Representative Ivey touched on it when he presented his bill a few days ago but because it's Black History Month, I think it's important we can have an opportunity to have another historical conversation about where we are. Just talk a little bit about the history of how we got to having the current District 7 at the Louisiana Supreme Court, the history that led to that. It didn't come through -- just talk a little bit about that.

1 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Actually, I think
2 the Supreme Court was established 1836, was it? Our
3 Supreme Court? And it came from -- there was no
4 logical geographic boundaries that was created. So,
5 at some point, the legislation never reapportioned
6 the Supreme Court but maybe once or twice in 97
7 because a court ordered us to. And so we couldn't
8 agree among ourselves what court orders do. So, 97 we
9 created the six districts. I mean the seven districts
10 but the constitution says six. When the constitution
11 came about I'm not quite sure, but it was a long
12 after 1836.
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: That was after
14 the Chism case, right?
15 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Chism case that's
16 right. So, no one has ever, that I can recall, been
17 able to vote on all the members of the Supreme Court.
18 All this thing about being able to have a voice in
19 who you elect or who serves you.
20 [01:00:04]
21 The Supreme Court serves the whole entire state.
22 And actually in 1991, the consent decree, the State
23 waived the argument that you ought to be able to vote
24 on your judges if the judges serve your district like
25 parish wide judges, everybody in every Parish, every

1 judicial district ought to be able to vote one very
2 judge. That was waived back in 1991. It seemed like
3 it's bringing its head back up in a Terrebonne Parish
4 case in the Field circuit. But the bottom line is a
5 judges district do not have to be equal, judges don't
6 represent people. Judges district don't have to
7 adhere to traditional communities of interest lines
8 because the judge is not representing you. The judge
9 is just interpreting the law. And if you happen to
10 have in one community of interests, it happened to
11 have more than one judge well that's good for you
12 that you got two judges you get the vote on that's
13 fine. So community of interest have not been the
14 primary driver have been coming over judicial
15 districts, okay? And since the Civil Rights Act has
16 made it an issue that population growth of any
17 particular protective class should be impacted on any
18 additional withdraw. So in Louisiana, we have a
19 third of the population is black. If you multiply
20 that times the number of judges, that's really right
21 close to two and a half judges. If you take the white
22 population that's reduced since 1836 in proportion of
23 the total state population, then it's 57%. You take
24 57% of 7 is 3.3. Okay. So actually, if you got seven
25 judges and two of them are black and five are white,

that's really more representation than a white proportion representation is represented in the state. I'm just putting numbers together. That's just simple math. So if you can draw a district that would accommodate two African-American possibilities and that doesn't guarantee they get elected because, you know, sometimes there are districts that are down in minority district, but they don't lack a minority necessarily. That's why the law says a candidate of their choice, whoever they come up with. So this district four that is created in this bill, it may or may not result in a minority being on the Supreme Court. It has like a 5% or 54% registered voter [INDISCERNIBLE 01:02:44]. So it's likely, but it's not guaranteed. And so we are trying to it's been litigated since Chism for a long time now. We've been in court in and out of court for a long time. We've been spending -- you're talking about spending money. We spend a lot more than $2 million on this Supreme Court issue. A lot more. And this is one way to try to resolve that and stop those deep pockets from spending all that money and not getting anywhere and try to let the legislature decide rather than some judge. Now, I don't know what a judge would do, how he would write up the districts. Okay. But this is

1 another effort to show what could be done if we want
2 to do the right thing. And the right thing is to have
3 two minority-majority districts on the Supreme Court
4 because the population have grown so substantially.
5 Actually, black population Louisiana have been a
6 third for a long time and maybe for as long as when
7 the Supreme Court was initially fined in the 18th
8 century. But we have never been able to agree to do
9 the right thing. Why race? I don't know. One could
10 argue race, one could argue lack of power. But at
11 some point, we had to step in the 65 Voters Right Act
12 made a big difference. And everybody want to blame
13 the north on the Voter Right Act, but it really was
14 LBJ from the south. He passed the Voters Right Act, a
15 good sum from taxes and very conservative. That was
16 passed because it was the right thing to do. And the
17 nation's in the uproar, they were not feeling like
18 they're getting a fair shot. And so our court system
19 is one of the most basic bashing of democracy. If you
20 don't have a fair court system, your court don't
21 appear to be fair, then you got a very challenge to
22 use democracy. You got something other than a
23 democracy. A democracy allows everybody to have input
24 upon the judiciary and if you can't convince a third
25 of the people that this judiciary is fair, give them

a fair opportunity to resolve their issues then we're creating a problem.

[01:05:15]

And I see that happen a lot of folk don't have confidence in the judiciary system in Louisiana and that's one reason why. Because we're getting a lot better, we're a lot better was when I started out in 1990 there were probably four black judges in the whole state that has substantially changed now, thanks to what we've done in the consent decree but a court order us to do something, we did it, and now it's more in proportion with the number of people in a state. So it's a good thing when your court reflects your people numbers. It's a good thing. It's not a bad thing. Now we have seven judges, four got to make a decision. You can have two blacks on there, and they may not have any ability to be of the four, they can, but it was certain look fair. It was certain be fair and it was certain comply with the section 2 of the Civil Rights Act. That was this bill is trying to do.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate it. I just wanted to just reiterate that point that the current seat that is held by an

African-American woman on the Supreme Court was the result of a court order.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: A court order.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Chairman Stefansky who was sitting in for Representative Duplessis.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: We swapped places. Representative, I know you said some of those core redistricting principles aren't necessarily applicable to the court, but man, I'm having a tough time with number four, man.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Well, number 4 is an interesting district, but I got another one. Number 20. If you don't like 4, look at 20.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: All right. Well, I'm willing to look at 20 after this, but four judge, I don't know, man. I mean, you're cutting in, you're coming down--

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Down the I10, everything and all for I, lone and off boarder I10 is all it does. It gets into tax repairs. It takes to get some numbers out there to ensure that you have a chance to let the minority. That's all it does.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I get it, but I'm just having a tough time with that geography. You coming

1 down into Crowley when you looping up into my buddies
2 in church point.
3 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: But you say, Ms.
4 Chairman, it's just Interstate 10. It's just the pre
5 stand alone in the State 10.
6 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So we'd be voting in
7 Acadia for three different judges?
8 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Three different
9 judges. Right now I'm voting Calcasieu for three
10 different senators or four different senators. I
11 mean, it's not the worst thing in the world to have
12 more than one person to have input with.
13 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I don't disagree.
14 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: The worst thing
15 in the world to have, to be able to comment, to have
16 input on two judges on the Supreme Court. They'd have
17 to come visit you at least once every ten years.
18 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I get it. And you
19 following -
20 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: You should have
21 saw the district was drawn up when the Supreme Court
22 was first created in 1836. You wouldn't like that
23 district at all. This is much better district than
24 that.
25

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I just judge. I'm just
2 telling you, based on the peer geography, boy, I'd
3 have a tough time going home. I'm just saying. All
4 right. But I appreciate your effort.
5 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Just stick on the
6 I 10. You'd be all right.
7 VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Representative
8 Farnum.
9 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. Vice
10 chair. So in section two of Voting Right Act, it
11 talks about geographical compactness. So, how does
12 that -
13 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No, no. Well,
14 actually, it --
15 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM It all comes into play,
16 right?
17 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yeah.
18 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Because we've heard
19 that statement out of several people that have come
20 and testified in opposition to almost everything
21 that's been presented here.
22 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Actually, the
23 Voters Right Act talks about unpacking, not unpacking
24 districts.
25

1 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: But it talks about
2 the opportunity to create a minority district if the
3 geographical compactness is there. So like they said,
4 this thing spreads from the eastern border to the
5 western border, and it doesn't look like it gets much
6 out of the right of way of I-10, much less getting
7 into some precinct. So I take your word that it does.
8 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yeah.
9 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: But how do you factor
10 geographical compactness into something like that
11 that just slides down the interstate and picks what
12 it wants to pick along the way?
13 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yeah. Well,
14 that's what 18 did. Okay. Actually, it's not all the
15 way east. You make it sound like it starts from the
16 east. It starts from Baton Rouge. It's not the most
17 east part of the state. Okay. It's more central east
18 of the state. And so it starts in East Baton Rouge
19 Parish, and it goes down Interstate 10. Okay. And
20 you're talking about communities of interest. There's
21 no district that has one community of interest in it.
22 It's impossible.
23 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I never talked out --
24 [OVERLAY]
25

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: You got rural areas.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I'm talking about geographical compactness.

[01:10:00]

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Actually, some of these other districts in the present bill, in the present district map and the map that Ivey voted out and the map we voted on in 97. There are more communitive interests that are divided up in those maps, too. You got like in district 5, you got like 35 parishes.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So, I guess I'm going to go back to what I talked about with Rep. Ivey's bill was that if the whole objective here is to create another minority district, why don't you just put your thumb on an area that creates that instead of mixing the puzzle all up.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: It's not that easy to do. The minorities are diverse throughout the state. For example, people in Monroe has a large minority population in Shreveport, in Rapides Parish, you can't connect you to have real art shaped -

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Which is exactly why it's hard to create any art district in any fashion.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: But it is hard to do. But it can be done, and this result in two districts. Okay? And you can amend out some of this high end of state ten map and still probably come up with close to about 53% minority district, and so, this was just an idea to make it more securely minority. That's what it was to be honest with you. 53% would be kind of close. 52%, I think the original district map. I took a map that had 52%. I just made it 57%.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I appreciate your passion, but I'm an extremely logical person, so things have to make good sense of how you came to the decisions that you came by. So, I appreciate your passion on this. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. No more questions. We have a card from in support president. Does not wish to speak from Chris Kaiser ACLU. Judge Carter, would you like to close on your bill?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes. It's just another option. We do have a bill on the floor, but this bill here presents another option because it does not take all of North Louisiana and come down to Mississippi River and go to East Baton Rouge Parish.

1 So, I think this is a better option than what we
2 voted out here.
3 VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. And I
4 would like to move this bill favorable. I think we
5 have an objection from Representative Beaullieu.
6 Madam Secretary, will you call the vote?
7 MADAM SECRETARY: Vice Chairman Duplessis?
8 VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.
9 MADAM SECRETARY: Excuse me. Yes. Represent
10 Beaullieu?
11 REPRESENTATIVE BEAU BEAULLIEU: No.
12 MADAM SECRETARY: No. Representative Wilford
13 Carter?
14 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes.
15 MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Deshotel?
16 REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: Yes.
17 MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Farnum?
18 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.
19 MADAM SECRETARY: No. Representative Gadberry?
20 REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: No.
21 MADAM SECRETARY: No. Representative Hodges?
22 REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: No.
23 MADAM SECRETARY: No. Represent Horton?
24 REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.
25 MADAM SECRETARY: No. Representative Ivey?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Jenkins?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson?

REPRESENTAIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.

MADAM SECRETARY: No. Represent LaCombe?

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Magee? Representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

MADAM SECRETARY: No. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

MADAM SECRETARY: Yes. Nine yays, seven nays.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Nine yays, seven nays. And the bill moves favorable. All right. Judge Carter, do you have another? Is that -

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Thank you. Mr. Speaker.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: No. It's the Vice Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Mr. Vice Chairman. He wouldn't speak with me bad though. But this bill here, if you don't like going down in the Interstate 10, Representative Farnum going too far out there, this impacts it better. This takes the -- I think it's not, but about 67 parishes affected in this bill and it creates the fourth district be a minority district and it goes up towards Rapides Parish, Representative Johnson area, and they pull out some representation in that Parish, and it's more compact than the last bill. It's much more compact. So, actually it's more compact than the present bill. It's more compact than the bill we voted out of here and so, I offer this as an opportunity to create another minority district. Keeping in mind it is more compact, and understanding that it troubles the idea of a community of interest less.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay so -

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: I answer the question.

[01:15:00]

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, the objectives are largely the same. It's just drawn differently.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Different map. It doesn't go down in a state and it keeps it more closer. The district is smaller. It's more compact. It would meet the requirement of any review of a court I think, because it's sufficiently compact.

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Okay. Might even address Chairman Stefanski's concerns about Acadia.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Definitely. He might. It does improve that situation.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And I appreciate this effort judge, a little bit better. We only got to vote on one now, and you kept Church point in it, too. Again, I appreciate your effort. Do you have any concern with two instruments going on the floor? You're pretty lucky this morning already.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: I think I'd be tempted to get this now. I think this would get more likely to support and then we were looking to see what Representative Ivey does. I might throw up my hand if this bill pass.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Carter, one thing I have to ask you is you made comments earlier to representative Farnum about how compactness really done all those traditional

1 redistricting principles, you said really don't apply
2 with the courts.
3 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No. It applies,
4 but not in the same extent that -- he was talking
5 about Civil Right Act. He was talking about the
6 Voters Right Act, okay? That's what I thought his
7 question was about, and as to the Voters Right Act,
8 it doesn't deal a lot with communities of interest
9 and compactness. It deals with uncompacting districts
10 that prevent minority members from having input in
11 other districts, okay? When you have 89% black
12 district is totally work against having more black
13 representatives.
14 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Some of the case law
15 does reference that has come out of the Voting Rights
16 Act Litigation, does reference some compactness,
17 isn't that correct?
18 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: That's right.
19 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And in fact, one of the
20 cases that's been cited numerous times in this
21 committee and through this process dealing with the
22 Voting Rights Acts. One of the three elements of that
23 is a minority community that sufficiently compact.
24 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Every case really
25 deals with compactness, but not to the extent we

1 legislature seem to look at it. The compactness spoke
2 of in the Voters Right Act, is that if you got a
3 sufficient number of protected class, where they can
4 get a district, and they can be sufficiently
5 reasonably compacted. I'm not trying to go from this
6 district four up to Monroe to get the large black
7 population in Monroe or the Shreveport. When they
8 talk about compact is, they don't expect you to go
9 all over the state and touch every black community,
10 try to get numbers. So, you got to have some
11 compactness. So, I think this district is within that
12 compactness jurisprudence, okay?
13 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. And I appreciate
14 your clarification. I was trying to rectify these two
15 kind of statements based on both bills because you
16 were saying some of that stuff really isn't really
17 important on this one. But then you use that to
18 defend this one.
19 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Keep in mind,
20 when you go to court to defend a civil rights case,
21 one of the things you have to show is that it's
22 sufficiently compact in order to get enough numbers
23 to get a district, and so, to that extent I did not
24 attempt to take advantage of population outside of
25 this area that we form in district four and I think

the only concern I have in Ivey's bill is that it goes from Caddo Parish, from the west to all the way across the east of the state down the river all the way to East Baton Rouge. Now, that's not compact.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Okay? But it accomplishes the same concern and resolve an issue. But this district here is less compact than that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I appreciate your explanation on that. Thank you, representative. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: That clears the board. We have a card from Chris Kaiser ACLU in support present does not wish to speak. Judge, would you like to close on this bill?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yeah. I just say that this is another opportunity to write up a district that got two minority districts. It's less evasive and less out of whack than the last one we voted on. It's more compact. It's more compact than any other one that we voted on thus far and it would create two minority districts and it would not offend so badly the notion of communities of interest, okay?

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. With that, I'd like to offer a promotion to move

1 favorably, and we have an objection from
2 Representative Horton. Madam Clerk.
3 [01:20:01]
4 [OVERLAY]
5 MADAM CLERK: Vice Chairman Duplessis.
6 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Yes.
7 MADAM CLERK: Representative Beaulieu?
8 Representative Carter?
9 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes.
10 MADAM CLERK: Yes. Representative Deshotel?
11 REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: No.
12 MADAM CLERK: No. Representative Farnum?
13 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.
14 MADAM CLERK: No. Representative Gadberry?
15 REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: No.
16 MADAM CLERK: No. Representative Hodges?
17 Representative Horton?
18 REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.
19 MADAM CLERK: No. Representative Ivey?
20 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Yes.
21 MADAM CLERK: Yes. Representative Jenkins?
22 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.
23 MADAM CLERK: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson?
24 REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.
25 MADAM CLERK: No. Representative Lacombe?

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

MADAM CLERK: Yes. Representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

MADAM CLERK: Yes. Representative Magee?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No.

MADAM CLERK: No. Representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

MADAM CLERK: Yes. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

MADAM CLERK: No. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

MADAM CLERK: Yes. 8 yays, 7 nays.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: 8 yays, 7 nays. The bill moves -

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Judge Carter. Thank you for your work on this. All right. Personal privilege, Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman and committee. I believe I just saw my district attorney coming to the wrong. Yes. Stand up Judge Stewart. District attorney from Caddo Parish. Doing an outstanding job in Caddo Parish. So happy to

see him here. That's Judge James Stewart, District Attorney from Caddo Parish. Welcome.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Welcome to the capital, sir. Representative Jenkins, you good? All right, let's go ahead and take Senator Hewitt out of order. We're going to go to SB5, I believe. What is it? 15. Apologize. SB15 members in your packet. Redistricting of the Supreme Court as well. And Chairwoman Hewitt, I don't know if you've been watching. It might be a good day to get Supreme Court redistricted bills out.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Seems like you all like lots of bills in this committee onto the Supreme Court.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Chairwoman Hewitt on SB15 whenever you're ready.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And members, I appreciate your time today. This is SB15. And I know you've had a number of bills in this committee and so you've had some conversation about it already. I'd like to just sort of lay the groundwork and apologize if some of this is things that you've already heard. As you know, the Louisiana Constitution and our statutes give the Legislature the responsibility for drawing boundary lines for the congressional, legislative, PSC, Bessie, and judicial

1 districts. The Constitution, however, does not
2 provide a deadline for the legislature to redistrict
3 the courts every 10 years, as it does with the other
4 elected offices, which has left the state judicial
5 districts largely untouched for decades. The
6 Louisiana Supreme Court has not been redistricted
7 since 1997. While it was considered during the 2011
8 redistricting effort, legislative leaders chose not
9 to pursue legislation to redraw these districts.
10 While the one person, one vote standard does not
11 apply, while it does apply to congressional and
12 legislative districts, the courts have found that the
13 one person, one vote standard does not apply to the
14 judiciary. Courts have reasoned that the primary
15 purpose of one person, one vote apportionment is to
16 ensure each member of an elected body speaks for
17 approximately the same number of constituents. But
18 because judges, unlike legislators, do not represent
19 people, they serve people, the courts have concluded
20 that the one person, one vote standard should not
21 apply, leaving the Legislature to determine which
22 evaluation standard it uses. In my opinion, using the
23 redistricting principles that the legislatures
24 adopted for the legislature, the PSC and Bessie is a
25 reasonable approach to redrawing the Supreme Court

boundaries. As we learned in the roadshow, the Supreme Court is severely malapportioned if you look at population with an ideal population of 665,393, the seven Supreme Court districts vary greatly in population serve with District Seven in New Orleans being the smallest at 476,554 and District Five in the Baton Rouge area being the largest at 838,610. So the redistricting principles that I've used in drawing this map include adhering to the Voting Rights Act by maintaining one majority minority district in District Seven, balancing the districts based on plus or minus 5% of the ideal population, minimizing split parishes in which I've only split six and split precincts, of which we've split zero, and maintaining the core of the prior districts. And so, that's basically what this map does. And you will see that it looks very similar in terms of how it's constructed to the current map.

[01:25:02]

It maintains something close to 55% black voting age population for District Seven and this map, as it does in the current map. And I think it does a good job of adhering again to those redistricting principles that I've outlined. And so with that, I'll open it up to questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I noticed in just looking at your statistics, you managed to bring this within 5% deviation, plus or minus on all the districts.

SENATOR HEWITT: It is plus or minus 5% again, we don't have that standard, but that was the standard that I chose to adopt in this map.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. Look, I certainly shared that concern. I think that the length of time that we've gone since we have addressed the Supreme Court is something we need to look at. And I think that's evident on both sides, seeing that we have really bills from both Democrats and Republicans attempting to do that in attempting to equalize those populations. So, I commend you on undertaking this effort. And look, I've learned a lot about the rest of the state. But for my region and for the Acadiana region, which you've done here to me, makes a lot of sense. That district is receding a little bit from St. Landry, but I think at least from our southwest corner, it does make a lot of sense. And members, before I get to our additional question, we do have an amendment. It is a very-very minor amendment. Members, it's 140. All it does is change the effective date to January 1, 2023. Would you like to

1 touch on that? I might entertain a motion to adopt
2 that in a second.
3 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. There's not too
4 much to say. I mean, I think that's consistent with
5 what Representative Ivey did the other day. We're
6 just trying to get a common effective date for all
7 the justices.
8 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Members, any questions
9 on this amendment, 140? I'm going to move the -- you
10 do have a question with it?. Hold on. Mr. Vice Chair.
11 VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chairman, I would like just to have a brief
13 discussion on the effective date in how it impacts
14 the staggered terms of the members. If we could just
15 briefly kind of talk about how it would impact the
16 staggered terms.
17 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. As you know there
18 are staggered terms. I think that we do have one
19 justice that will have an election in 2022. We have
20 at least one justice, perhaps another in 2024. And
21 so, they're staggered accordingly.
22 VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, whoever's
23 next in line, it would just adopt all that all at
24 once and they would just have to readjust when they
25 run the next time?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: That's right.

VICE-CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. Thank you.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. Members with that, if there's no more discussion on the amendment, I'm going to move that we adopt amendment set 140. Is there any objection to that? Seeing no objection, amendment set 140 is adopted. Mr. Pro Tem for question.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the things I'm noticing is the geographical reach of District Six. It's pretty large. That's my district so I'm concerned about it. And I'm not sure that we are that spread out of a region. It seems like it's a hard ask. I know that North Louisiana has some pretty big stretches, but their populations are pretty spread out. Is there any consideration? I mean, you got seven and five are pretty tiny. And one is fairly tiny, too. In comparison, in South Louisiana, six is really big and six sort of tracks the first circuit. And I know you don't know all this because you're not an attorney, but when you look at the appellate courts, the first circuit has the most caseload of any circuit. And

that's East Baton Rouge down Terrebonne-Lafourche. And you're also tracking into Jefferson. I know you have it. What's the population distribution on this? Because it seems like that's a pretty big grasp just looking at it.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. The numbers, of course, are all in the bill and they're all plus or minus 5%. The only difference in district six between the current map and the map in my bill that I've proposed is the inclusion of St. Landry. Other than that, all the parishes are exactly the same. There may be some slight differences in splits along the river, but the only new Parish is St. Landry in this map.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Okay. Well, yeah, I guess the addition of St. Landry makes it look taller because it goes further north and west. Was there any consideration about instead of adding St. Landry just incorporating more of seven into the 6th?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I don't know. I'm sure we've looked at it a lot of different ways. We were trying to keep whole parishes together as much as possible.

[01:30:02]

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: And so you know anytime you get along the river of course, that's very, very difficult to do and so you know, we solved this as you know, there was growth in District 3 and so District 3 previously had Avoyelles and St. Landry you know in this map you know they have only part of St. Landry and Avoyelles went to District 4 so same issue. You all know the population trends. North Louisiana lost population, South Louisiana gained it and so we had to be able to you know, expand those districts with some additional people up north.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure you know I understand completely. I'm just trying to -- and was District 6 in Jefferson Parish before? Are these much in the Jefferson Parish?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah, let me see if -- I've got all that with me. Yes and currently District 6 has about 50,000 people in Jefferson in the current configuration.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Okay, thank you. I appreciate it.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. For question Representative Ivey.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Hewitt, I'm going to ask you a series of questions I've been asking pretty much everybody then I'll get in some more specific ones to the map so did you personally develop this map?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I don't know that, any of us have personally developed it, maybe you personally developed yours?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I did, yeah.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No, I had help. I had map drawers that drew it but I gave them some instructions which was starting with the continuity of representation so the court districts as they're currently configured maintaining a District 7 as a north district and balancing by population plus or minus 5%.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: All right, was there a specific hierarchy that you had in that process?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I think population was my initial driver you know, that it the really reason why --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Kind of the point.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: The point, right and as I said in my opening comments and round numbers, District 7 has 400,000. Many of the other districts

have 800,000 and they are severely malapportioned so that was the initial driver.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: All right and did you have any political organizations or other special interest groups assist you in the development of any of this map?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay and so have you been contacted by any Supreme Court Justice or anyone on behalf of the Supreme Court Justice to you know, provide any comments or concerns or input on the map either before it was drawn or after it was drawn?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Really not. I mean I guess I would say I've heard from a few since we filed the maps you know, that have you know, some level of support or concern but I haven't moved any Parishes or --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Have had no influence?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No one's trying to influence how it was drawn, they're just really just kind of seeking to understand and figure out --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: The logic and all. Okay, very good, that's fair. So if a second majority-minority district can be drawn and it

adheres to our right redistricting criteria, would it be incumbent upon us as a legislative body to adopt such a plan?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well you know, we've talked about this on a number of different bills at least in my committee and I don't know to the extent you've had in this committee, but the law also says an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice and so that is the legal issue that I think the courts will ultimately resolve. I mean just because you can draw a district with 50% plus one that's a minority district.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: It doesn't -- there're no guarantees.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It's not about guarantees.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Absolutely.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It's really a sign that they have an equal opportunity so they have to have a legitimate opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice and I would submit to you that when you get to very low black voting-age population numbers. I think it looks like it's a minority district but it wouldn't necessarily perform as a minority district and so I don't know what that magical number is but

as the judge said earlier the reason why some of the maps have been proposed look so crazy geographically just to the eye and we can argue about what the compactness is or isn't those are all kind of mathematical things but to the naked eye they don't always look very compact and it's because it matters where people live and so to be able to --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Population distribution is a very important factor in trying to do that which is made like the Congressional map a very difficult proposition you know, to try to increase majority-minority population. I felt that if there was you know, the real opportunity would be in the Supreme Court map in that there was seven you know seats.

[01:35:04]

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And so therefore just a little more flexibility in that and the fact that the criteria used for the judiciary is actually different than that of all the other representative-type elected roles so and that's why I felt like if I could you know, there was no real attention given and everybody's focusing on -- that's why I personally focus on Supreme Court when -- and so you know, you mentioned and I've heard it several times, it's kind

of odd you know, where we say that you know, an equal opportunity and then when we achieve that threshold that the courts have determined to be 50 plus 1 when we can achieve that and then we acquiescence and say, "Well because it's not necessarily," it may not be enough where they actually can so we don't even -- that's the excuse to not even draw that district because it may not be a actually valid or they may not actually be able to elect the candidate of their choice and that's kind of my concern is you know, it's kind of saying two different things.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It's really not. I think the definition of a minority district is 50% plus one.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Right, of the majority-minority district, yeah.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Majority-minority district, that is not the definition of equal opportunity so I think equal opportunity that will be established probably by the courts in --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: So that's not a current standard in the course?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No, it's not. It's a subjective standard, right? That I think depends on many, many factors like voter turnout and past

1 election histories and things like that so I don't
2 know what that number is but --
3 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: But we have a
4 standard sort of given to us by the courts to comply
5 with Section 2 and it's 50 plus 1 regardless if you
6 know, if minorities are able to elect a candidate of
7 their choice or not. Depending on all the other
8 factors turn out all these that those aren't even
9 relevant, it's the opportunity it actually exists.
10 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It has to be a legitimate
11 opportunity. A legitimate equal opportunity it is not
12 just because it's 50% plus 1 is my read on --
13 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Is that not the
14 court's standard to the first Section 2 compliance?
15 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No, that's their
16 standard. That is what's going to be litigated of
17 course. That is their standard for minority the
18 definition of a minority 50% plus 1. Equal
19 opportunity, that's not necessarily 50% plus 1.
20 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: So it's an undefined
21 parameter right now?
22 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes.
23 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay and so --
24
25

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It is based on many factors, right? That other people will have to defend in terms of what that number is but --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Would you agree that more you know, 50 plus 1 is certainly more likely to allow for minorities to elect the candidate of their choice than something less than 50 plus one?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, sure. I'm sure that the larger the number, the better the opportunity, right? But I would submit to you this Representative Ivey, it is my personal opinion again, there are lawyers and their lawsuits already in place, there are judges --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I'm aware.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: They will be involved in all this. You know I do think that the spirit of the Consent Decree that we have in place right now was to ensure that we have minority representation on the court. That was the whole Consent Decree.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And why was that necessary?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Because I think back in the day, right?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Back in the day in the 90s?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: In the 90s.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I grew up in the 90s so.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: That district was -- I think the ruling was they were disenfranchise voters in New Orleans because that district includes the same minority [INDISCERNIBLE 01:39:00] and others, right? That were going to water down that's not the word, right?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Dilute?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: That district, so the Consent Decree was to form a district and there was a transition process to do that but to form a district so that they could elect a candidate of their choice. I would submit to you that I think if you reduce the number of black voting age population and I don't know what that number is but you could get to a point where you're not honoring the spirit of the Consent Decree because you're not giving them a legitimate opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice in that district.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Right so but adding a second majority-minority district by virtue of the standard of 50 plus 1, would that not allow for the opportunity for that district to elect a candidate of

their choice whether they win or not because again, there's also the electability of the candidate you know, and so competency and a lot of other things play a role so you know.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah, you know, I don't know how many -- I don't know how else to say it, Representative Ivey and we're just not completely connecting on this.

[01:40:05]

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: But let's just leave at this is my best attempt at drawing a map that I believe complies with the Voting Rights Act and federal state law and redistricting principles that I outlined.

REP. IVEY: So, you mentioned -- you said that adheres to the Voting Rights Act by keeping the one majority/minority district. I believe that is what I quoted you as here. So, does the Voting Rights Act not taken to any consideration for additional majority/minority districts when they're possible? Is it only about the preservation or does it also look at the --

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: We're mincing words on things that are going to be settled in court

1 eventually. So, I'm not going to try to debate some
2 of those words.
3 REP. IVEY: Well, we can settle these factors
4 here in the legislature instead of requiring the
5 courts to settle them for us, we have the ability to
6 draw a map.
7 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: We do, and that is our
8 job, is drawing the map and it's the court's job to
9 interpret the Voting Rights Act and did the map apply
10 to it or not. I believe this map does apply, does
11 meet the requirements of the Voting Rights Act and
12 you know, may agree or disagree with that.
13 REP. IVEY: Well, I mean, personally, I believe
14 you know, until someone shows me some better
15 alternative which is why I haven't been supportive of
16 any of the congressional maps is because they were
17 too disruptive and too -- just the changes were too
18 substantial, but my colleague, Representative Bryant
19 brought a proposal that it didn't create a
20 majority/minority district but it did increase
21 minority representation district and he did it
22 anyway, that was the least disruptive to what is
23 currently in HB1, which is for me, something like
24 that is the way to proceed when something else can't
25 be done without just wholesale disruption. I don't

1 think that serves the people, to try to just achieve
2 one thing at the sacrifice of everything else. So,
3 I'm not for sacrificing all the other good criteria
4 of redistricting for one sole criteria, but when it
5 can be achieved in a map, and it's demonstrated
6 mathematically. Like my map scores better than any
7 other maps that have been drawn, and scores better
8 than the current map, obviously. So, it demonstrates
9 one possibility, that it's more compact than yours
10 because you know, we've got to get the tape measure
11 out and measure from that bayou, Acadiana District is
12 going to be pretty lengthy. So, anyway, I don't want
13 to labor it much longer, but you know -- but I will
14 thank you, Mr. Tanner Magee. So, I feel as a
15 policymaker that history is repeating itself, that we
16 are absolutely content with allowing the courts to
17 make the decision and ultimately make us do what we
18 can do, what's been demonstrated mathematically,
19 agnostically what can be done. So, I don't know if
20 we've grown, when the request for dismissal is denied
21 and because they state in the court's reason for
22 denial that we've made no progress with regard to the
23 minority representation since the Chism decree, we've
24 done nothing. So, this is our opportunity actually,
25 try to maybe get it right, and I don't feel that

that's really a primary focus on really anybody, certainly at the leadership level. With talks of us adjourning as early as Thursday, tomorrow, it seems that absent this instrument, there's really no chance of any other Supreme Court bill even if mine or Representative Carter's would get across, we would just be [INDISCERNIBLE 01:44:26] before that could even be heard in senate. So, anyway -- and I know the logic we have the opportunity to come back and draw another bill in the regular session, and this is the least pressure cooker opportunity we have, so I don't know see how things are going to improve on a two-thirds vote in the midst of budget fights and all the other chaos that goes along with the regular session. So, it feels like this is just going to end up being a punt to the judiciary to make us do what we should do, but we'll see.

[01:44:59]

REP. IVEY: I've been pretty right so far on federal rulings. Thank you.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Ivey. For questions representative Carter.

REP. CARTER: Chairman Hewitt, my biggest problem with this map is of course --.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative, you're not speaking into the microphone.

REP. CARTER: Oh, I'm sorry. Of course, it doesn't create another minority district. Now, you're talking about opportunities. Which of these districts that you have other than the District 7 where would you say there would be an opportunity for a minority district. All the other districts, the most number is 34%. That's not an opportunity, 34% is not an opportunity. Your district goes from St. Bernard District, six schools from St. Bernard, the most farthest is eastern part -- southeastern part of the state to St. Landry Parish. You'd got a lot of different communitive interest between St. Landry Parish and St. Bernard, Terrebonne, St. Mary. Then you've got another district here that goes from Claiborne in the north, a boundary line district parish, right to Arkansas border along the northern part of state, along the Mississippi River all the way down to East [INDISCERNIBLE 01:46:30]. You know, it's -- this map, it does -- the main focus it seems is to make the districts pretty much equal population as much as possible. That was the primary force.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: That was the starting point, yup.

REP. CARTER: Okay, but now if you look at the legislation that we passed prior to entering this reapportion session, we list what we thought we ought to do when we come up with maps. One of those things was Section 2 of the Voters Right Act and I don't see any effort in this map in trying to create another minority/majority district. Actually, you split up the possibility of that. You had the possibility of it, you have three parishes up in District 5. You put the whole of East Baton Rouge Parish in District 5 and so, you dilute the minority population there. You put the population that has large, large Africa-American population of the east [INDISCERNIBLE 01:47:44]. I mean, it seemed like there was effort not to create a minority district, but only to make the district have parity in population. That seemed to be the only thing. But as a result of that, you have such a mixture of people of different interests in these huge districts that could have been at least reduced somewhat. I'm actually, what in your opinion did you do to comply with Section 2 of the Voters Right Act. What in your opinion, your work in this map does to try to comply with it?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah, it does comply with the Voting Right Act, because we looked at if you could draw, again, the minority district with sufficient population that was geographically compact to give the minority voters an opportunity, an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice that you would do so, okay? And So, I do not believe that you can do that and create again, geographically compact and give them an equal opportunity. So, a part of my discussion with Representative Ivey boils down to what's the definition of an equal opportunity. I would tell you that I don't believe it's 50% plus 1, that's --.

REP. CARTER: What is it, 34%?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No, it's not 34%.

REP. CARTER: Okay. So, when you talk about compactness, and we all have that in mind, but you use the one thing that I didn't see in the [INDISCERNIBLE 01:49:25] legislation with regards to judges especially, okay, not Senate House and other elective bodies or representative bodies. I will agree with you, okay? If this was a judge map, you know, I don't know if I can argue with you because it's pretty much equal in terms of population. But

you know, that is not one of the requirements of a judge map.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No, I know, it's not outlined all that in my opening comments.

REP. CARTER: Yeah.

[01:50:00]

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah, you're correct. There are no rules other than complying with federal and state law, right for Supreme Court Maps. But I did outline the redistricting principles that I used in this map that I think are good policy.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: Okay.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: So, you know, we're not required to balance on population, as you know. We're not required to redistrict before the end of 2022. There's a lot of things that are different about this map, compared to the other maps that were drawing. But I outlined where my redistricting principles that I used in this map, and of course, compliance with the Voting Rights Act and federal and state law is one of those.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: You know, another thing I noticed is, you're running for Judge, Supreme Court Judge in District 4, you really have to campaign in one, two, three, probably three advertisers' areas.

You know, you got East Baton Rouge, you got East Baton Rouge Parish and [INDISCERNIBLE 01:50:55] and you got an awful easy on. You got to go to bots. At least you spent money in the body, radio, television stations. You know, I'm just saying that it's, I don't think it's even compact. Four and six or not at all Compact. And it might be the worst compact district even though it achieved the numbers that you wanted to achieve. But that's not one of those. It's not even a requirement of the judges. That's all I'm saying. So, for that reason, I have a problem with those two reasons.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you, sir.

REP. WILFORD CARTER: That's all I have. Thank you.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you.

MALE 1: Thank you for question, Representative LaCombe.

REP. LACOMBE: Good morning, Chairwoman. Thank you for presenting the map of bringing here. You've answered actually great bill of questions that I have when I initially push the button. I do want to kind of recap though. Some of the other bills that we've advanced out of paid less focus on population, but it looks like from your answers to some of the other

1 questions and looking at your thing population, seem
2 to be sort of your greatest indicator. Trying to make
3 sure all of the districts seem to be within the plus
4 and minus five deviation. So, kind of all of the
5 districts now lessons are sort of the
6 malapportionment problems that we have currently.
7 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: That's correct.
8 REP. LACOMBE: So that was your sort of basis for
9 your approach to this was trying to balance
10 population with.
11 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes.
12 REP. LACOMBE: Okay. And then I looked and you
13 mentioned earlier, you'd stated in the questions that
14 you tried to keep parishes whole. And I do a cursory
15 glancing at the map. It looks like a lot of these
16 parishes are kept whole. I know you're not
17 particularly a lawyer. So, you don't practice law in
18 the same realm that many of us do here. But did you
19 give any difference to sort of, like, trying to keep
20 judicial districts whole?
21 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I did ask that question
22 of our staff, you know, I didn't personally dig into
23 exactly all of that. But that was my intent to keep
24 judicial districts whole, to the extent that we
25 could. I'm not aware of any flags in that area.

REP. LACOMBE: Because you know, in judicial districts range, and this is the hard part for anybody as we are trying to make a map. The judicial districts, depending on your parishes and location and even some historical, and he's not even definitely own population. Like, you know, Lafayette Parish is also, in the same judicial district with I think Katie and in Vermillion. They comprise one Judicial District, where you have Jeff Davis as their own Judicial District. You have Cameron, I believe is their own Judicial District. So, it kind of ranges all over the states. I know it's a difficult task, but as I'm looking at the map, you know, my Judicial District was split up. So, when the 18 JDC we're [INDISCERNIBLE 01:53:49] it reveals on West Baton Rouge those three parishes or comprise the 18 JDCs. So, all of the judges that are elected in those three parishes serve the benefit of all three, so you have someone who technically division a lives in New Roads, but services, you know, one quarter of all civil cases in there. So, we're kind of united in a dish. I see that East [INDISCERNIBLE 01:54:13] has their own judicial districts. I just was wondering, if population when you were doing your map, if

population seems to be the greater concern over trying to keep judicial districts together.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It was. I mean, it was something again we were trying to keep an eye on. But as you know, District 4 being predominantly in the north needed population, and so that was the primary driver in adding of oils and Pointe Coupee to the that district. And so, apologize of that splits the judicial district is just hard to balance competing interest.

REP. LACOMBE: I know. And so, and when we're litigating cases in Pointe Coupee of the West Baton Rouge, we fall into the First Circuit Court of Appeals. So, any case that can be heard in Pointe Coupee usually falls into the first circuit stuff here.

[01:55:03]

REP. LACOMBE: I think that this split I'm concerning about the where is Pointe Coupee will be part of it looks like. The parish itself will comprise up with other judicial districts other than the first circuit. So, I'm just, I know that this bill was move through the process. All right, if it gets to the floors and half of, you know, get the 70 votes as a high threshold and I'm just trying to

figure if there any other places in the state that maybe disruptions to judicial districts. And I'm just cursory looking at this thing and I see someone and the number three was held together, some in six were held together. I'm just trying to figure of mine was the only one or if there are other places that got out there. Because it could cause problems to getting the bill ultimately passed.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. I haven't had any of those brought to my attention and I'm certainly open if you have an idea on a solution. As you know, this area of the state that you're talking about tends to be in this process, kind of the swing area when we're trying to balance things on population. And so, I was trying to honor that overall objective and balance all the other, you know, redistricting things as well.

REP. LACOMBE: And you know, I'm not bashing. I know it's hard to make these things and you trying to put it together. For me, when I'm looking at voting on some type of a Supreme Court case, it is my livelihood. So, we deal with it a lot more than some of the other things that we do. So, I have sort of a higher bar when I started. All right, how am I going to vote on a map? What are we going to put in place?

1 Because these things, you know, certainly affect my
2 day-to-day life more so than in non-lawyers or
3 whatever. So, I know we all kind of there. I'm just,
4 I want to see from me to vote on a map, I want to see
5 things that you know difference to the circuit
6 courts, difference to the judicial districts, the
7 existing things and I know you from working with you
8 through this process, you're always willing to talk
9 and have an open door and walk through these things.
10 But I do have some concern in regards to that, you
11 know, and Judge Carter mentioned it to you. We talked
12 about being in the district with the geographical
13 bounds of four goes all the way up from the basically
14 Haynesville down to Livonia. So, there's a wide
15 geographical range of where my area would be in with
16 what also West Baton Rouge in Naperville would be
17 with someone who more likely than not the population
18 center would be down, you know. Houma, Thibodeau that
19 area looks like we probably have more of a
20 population. So, it's kind of, we're stretched out the
21 whole Judicial District. It's kind of ballooned out
22 between North and South.
23 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It's a shame our state's
24 not square or rectangular like Tennessee, you know,
25 these debates would be so much easier. But it's an L-

1 shaped state and so it makes it difficult to draw
2 things that, you know, and that we would say would be
3 compact. You know again, I don't think we, first of
4 all, we didn't change it that much, much current
5 configuration. I would submit to you that I think,
6 you know, I at least would be open for in future
7 discussions about considering, you know, the courts
8 of appeal and the JDCs, in terms of, are they
9 configured properly? Is the work load balance between
10 those? I mean, those are all things that could be
11 considered at some point in the future. So, I don't
12 know that I feel like we need the mirror the Supreme
13 Court 100% to that because that could potentially
14 change in the future. It's been since 97 since the
15 Supreme Court was redistricted. It's been even longer
16 since those were addressed. And I think that, you
17 know, there have been some outside groups that have
18 done a study, the free enterprise institute, did a
19 study kind of showing how our state looked at, you
20 know, judges per population, judges per case. Some of
21 those things and how it compared to other states. And
22 so, they've built at least a case for action, for
23 some discussion about whether that would be anything
24 that we would want to address in the future and hopes
25 of, you know, streamlining our operations and so that

is a huge undertaking. I'm not suggesting that we want to tackle it. But I just throw that out. That again, I don't know that I feel as compelled to marry the Supreme Court to our existing infrastructure in the lower courts because they could change.

REP. LACOMBE: You're dead-on right. It's a sort of a mess with in the Judiciary when you start talking about the circuit courts because as speaker Tanner Magee mentioned earlier, the first circuit which we sit in, is the sort of, they have the highest caseload, the most amount of cases, and judges and even their judges that sit on that sort of their districts of malapportioned now because the population shifted tremendously, since the last time they were redistrict. So, the same sort of arguments and mess that we have in the Supreme Court does trickle down to the Circuit Courts.

[02:00:05]

REP. LACOMBE: And one of the biggest, I guess, problems with us getting, I like the fact that we started the conversation in regards to this because I think that ultimately, the political realities is maybe nothing happens now in this special with these maps but then we also have to realize that we got to also try to tackle the circuit court problems too

because they marry into each other. They are part of that and there's so many special interest groups outside of the capital that, from right, left lawyers, non-lawyers, business interests that are going to basically try to report any map that we bring to the table. So, I do believe in like a Representative Ivey said and others, the folks that brought Supreme Court maps. I know it's a tough deal to do and I, because we just realized that we know that there's so many special interest things outside of this is going to try to pull these things apart and force the people not to come together and approve something. But then the day I think that we do really have to work on all of them. We have to work on the Supreme Court and the Circuit Courts because they really all malapportionment at this point.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I agree with you but I would also say to add to that we have to start somewhere and maybe now is the time to start, let's start here. It's easier with seven districts than all of the mini districts and all the issues of the lower courts. But let's start here at lay the foundation and then build the remaining infrastructure around it. And so, I think it's a very timely discussion. It's been a very long time because it's hard.

REP. LACOMBE: Yep.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Right? And other legislatures before us have considered this and have stepped away from it because it's hard. And so, I think, again, we are in a position to say, okay, we're going to start and let this be the first piece and then do the work because there are lots of stakeholders in this world and we want all of their input and that could be a whole separate effort to try to build around it. But I don't think that that means that we need to push it one more time. Let's start here and then let's have some discussion about how do we go forward.

REP. LACOMBE: Okay, thank you.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes, sir.

MALE 1: Thank you Representative LaCombe for a question by straight a pluses.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Most of my questions have been addressed, so I don't have many questions for you, chairwoman and thank you for your patience in answering these questions. So, I believe in your opening comments and throughout a lot of the questions you've answered already, you adopted even though we were not required by law, you adopted one of the principles that we apply to State house and

Senate maps around deviation. Did you go with 5% as your goal?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Plus, or minus 5%, Yes, sir.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Okay. I made that assumption based on the fact that the highest relative deviation for District 7 was 4.9 and when you measured criteria, or when you prioritized criteria, did population deviation ranked higher in terms of priority versus that of being able to draw a second majority minority district without any guarantees but given the fact that we've had multiple examples through either Judge Carter's legislation, Representative Ivey's legislation that the deviation was a higher priority than drawing a second majority minority district?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, I will say, to me, as long as you're within the deviation, you're good. So, I personally didn't look at. If you have a larger deviation that that's worse than having a smaller deviation. I was really trying to stay plus or minus 5% as the voting rights act and the Federal and State Law trumps everything and that is the one criteria that the Supreme Court maps are required to honor. So that was clearly the first thing, right? But what was

driving me, it was also to look at balancing by population. And so, those were the two predominant criteria. We looked at some of the others that I mentioned in my opening comments but those were the two primary criteria that I looked at and maintaining the core of the prior districts. And so that's why this map looks very similar in design to the current map.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Okay. So, on that question, I wasn't able to count the number of split parishes in your proposed map versus the current Supreme Court map. Do you have that number? Do we increase the number of split parishes or do we decrease the number of split parishes?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: In my bill, I think I split seven.

[02:05:00]

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: And I'm not sure we can figure it out what it is in the current bill.

FEMALE 1: I think you said six.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Six.

REP. DUPLESSIS: It's currently six?

MALE 2: We don't know.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Okay. Oh yeah because it's just Orleans and Jefferson, right? In the current Supreme

Court map. Yeah, I didn't know because I'm looking at it right now. The current map and all like, so we have staff is telling me that we just have two. Orleans and Jefferson that are split in the current map, but your map will effectively split six parishes. Okay.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, again, before population wasn't a factor, right? So, it's easy to not split parishes when you're not trying to meet a population.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Right, but we're not required to factor population.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: No, we're not that that's like an author choice. That was a choice that was what I laid out is the principles I was going to follow into on my map. And so, you can choose to agree or not agree with that strategy.

REP. DUPLESSIS: And I would just will just, again, be my final question, just so I'm clear your priority and your driving factor, even though we increased split parishes, even though we're not required to have a population deviation standard of upper minus 5%, we have now seven split parishes. My understanding on your map, having this 5% deviation was more important than drawing a second majority

1 minority district where we have those examples that
2 have been provided to us. I don't understand why we
3 couldn't do that in your map.
4 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. Okay. That's not
5 exactly what I said, but so the voting rights act and
6 adherence to that and the Federal and State Law
7 always has to be the first rock in the bucket. That
8 is the thing.
9 REP. DUPLESSIS: And you think we achieve that by
10 not drawing a second majority minority district when
11 several examples have been provided that we've met
12 the voting rights act standard?
13 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I don't necessarily agree
14 that those other maps meet the voting rights act
15 standard. I believe this map does meet the voting
16 rights act and then it meets the second priority that
17 I had in trying to draw them and balance them on
18 population.
19 REP. DUPLESSIS: Can you tell me how you believe
20 it meets the voting rights act standards? If we have
21 an opportunity to draw a second majority minority
22 district, but we don't do it. How do we meet the
23 criteria and a voting rights act?
24 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: You have to be able to
25 draw a second minority district that is sufficient

and population is geographically compact that gives the minority an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice and I personally do not believe if you have very low BVAPS that you are giving the minority a true equal opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

REP. DUPLESSIS: But that's a personal call, right? Because there's been no determination by the courts who have said that, correct? I think you said that you --

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: There's no unique number out there because it is going to vary by region and by State. It's based on data, data in terms of voter turnout and election history and all those things to build a model that would allow you to predict whether the minority really has a real true opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Okay, my final question, because I know I'd probably be repetitive and asked this several of the same questions to Representative Ivey had asked. I'm looking at District 7 and how it reconfigures going from just Orleans and Jefferson now stretching to all the way to, I think Iberville, no, I'm sorry. I have my parishes. It goes up to, yeah, Iberville, one of the parishes that's now split

Ascension St. James, St. John, effectively to media markets there. What does that do for district seven? Just from a compactness standpoint.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, District 7 had round numbers, 400,000 people. And so, we needed to add people. So, it's not going to be as compact in the new map as it is in the current map because you've doubled in population. But these are again all area parishes. They had to be split some because we wanted to try to maintain that it's a minority district. So, it is a roughly the same black voting age population as the current district because we know that that district at that number at least has performed and could it perform at a lower number. I don't know, but I know that it performs at that current number. And so that was part of the thought process.

REP. DUPLESSIS: Right, thank you.

MALE 2: I think it was the vice chair for a question, Mr. [INDISCERNIBLE 02:09:45].

REP. MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I'm sorry that has like by the apple but I went back and looked and I think you made a mistake. Current District 6 does not have Amber Ville west Baton Rouge

or St. [INDISCERNIBLE 02:09:57]. So, you added three parishes, not one.

[02:10:03]

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Let's see. Hang on. Yes, you're correct. I appreciate that. Yes. Absolutely. You're correct.

REP. MAGEE: And the reason why I know is because this funny enough, I have a palette Court maps, supreme Court Maps hanging over my desk at my office are did for work and I did have work in Ida. So I look at these maps lot in the new, it looked a lot bigger.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: You know, again to finish out that thought though District 6 was under populated if you're looking at the ideal number by 34,000 people. So, you know, you had to add Parishes if you started out as I did want to balance by population.

REP. MAGEE: Sure, and I understand that I'm not. I get you that we all have different goals when it comes to this redistricting, especially with the Supreme Court map. My concern is, I did this to everybody who's testified so I want to be consistent. I think I should be, is that I care about my Districts. The ones are the ones that I live in. I

1 did that to the ACLU guy. I beat him up pretty bad
2 about not knowing where anything in Terrebonne Parish
3 was and so I don't want to be accused of treating
4 people differently. I Have a problem with District 6
5 in this configuration, especially when you look at
6 it. And I think about it from this perspective as
7 well. The person who would be the Supreme Court
8 decisions they represent because they don't represent
9 anybody. But the candidate who has to run in District
10 5, we have three parishes in one media market to
11 campaign in. So that's going to be the cheapest
12 although his media marketing might be sort of
13 expensive. That's going to be one of the cheaper
14 ones. And then District 6, I mean, he probably has
15 three different media markets, including the Baton
16 Rouge media market. So that's going to be really
17 expensive campaign for him to run in. And then 7 is
18 going to have two media markets even though that
19 person comes from Orleans. So that's going to be
20 really expensive to run in. One has one media market.
21 Three has one media market, and I've been frank and
22 honest, I don't know, a thing about North Louisiana
23 as far as media market go, so they're on their own.
24 But you're welcome. I have some concerns. I love
25 North Louisiana. My dad is from North Louisiana and I

have my North Louisiana roots, I just don't know enough about it because I wasn't raised there. My concern is District 6 is can be really difficult for a candidate to really campaign in, in other than districts I mean other than North Louisiana is a really big geographical District but there's population that surrounds it, they have more of connection to you. So, it's hard for me to say that somebody from Terrebonne, or Lafourche shouldn't grab population in District 6 from St. James, St. John, St. Charles already got St. Charles, more of St. Charles, more of Jefferson or something like that instead of going all the way into Iberville, West Baton Rouge and St. Landry. And I think even the current configuration St. Martin is kind of far but so it goes. I guess my problem is, I do have some deep concerns and I would want to talk to you about possibly trying to compact District 6 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:13:17] because that is the one I care about.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: So, you know, media markets was not one of my redistricting principles that I looked at. But I appreciate the idea behind that as a candidate. We'd all rather have, you know, fewer media.

REP. MAGEE: No, it's more than that. I think it's about financing a campaign and having everybody having the same opportunity to finance a campaign. I don't think it's about, me personally it's been on media markets. I feel like there's, I know we can't get it perfectly, but it's more about showing you until media market is showing you the difficulty of somebody having to campaign in District 6 versus District 5, which really shrunk. And it's basically just Baton Rouge, and it's metro area.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It's an area where there's tremendous growth.

REP. MAGEE: Sure. So is Lafayette. So is New Orleans.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: It is population driven, and it does matter where people lives.

REP. MAGEE: But New Orleans, also grew, and it's being stretched out all the way to West Baton Rouge.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: To ensure that we protect that as a majority minority.

REP. MAGEE: I hear all you're saying but I'm saying but I'm saying that there's population growing everywhere and if I really looked at it we could say District 6 lost population, but [INDISCERNIBLE 02:14:21] between them stayed the same. And that, to

me, that's the heart of that District. But I would, I'm just going to be. I mean, I'm okay with supporting it now, but I'm not okay, if it doesn't shift around some something later on. I'm just being upfront honest with you.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, you know, I'm open. I'm open to suggestions. It's big shifts when you know, swap parishes around. Those are big numbers, but I'm open if you have some ideas on how we could reconfigure.

REP. MAGEE: Sure. I look at it and I'll get with you after.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. That'd be appreciative.

REP. MAGEE: Thank you.

REP. STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Tanner. For question Represent Jenkins.

REP. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam chair lady, the map, I mean, it really doesn't get to where many of us would like to see it though.

[02:15:06]

REP. JENKINS: But I heard you say time and again, you you're open to further work on it.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I'm always open, open to your suggestions.

REP. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Jenkins. Representative LaCombe has got his button pushed, I don't see him anywhere though so maybe he can pop back in. Members, that clears the board. I'm going to go ahead and read we do have some red card to would like to testify Madam Chairwoman, if you could maybe see the table filling out a card in opposition wishing the testify Peter Robbins Brown with Louisiana progress action. Also, just for housekeeping, filling out a card and opposition, not wishing to speak Edgar Cage with together Louisiana, and Chris Kaiser with ACLU of Louisiana.

MALE 3: Good morning, everybody. Thanks for the time. You know, we've had a lot of discussions going back to the road shows about how one third of six is two. Obviously, I have a personal opinion on sort of where I land on that discussion, but at the same time, I think that there are some reasonable arguments to be made that that, you know, there doesn't need to be a strict correlation. I'm not a lawyer. I'm not speaking to it from a legal standpoint. I just understand that there's arguments on both sides of that issue. I think when we get to seven, arguing that we don't need to create some

1 greater racial proportionality. I think we are losing
2 any sort of thread of credibility to my mind. And I
3 think that this is one where, maybe in a sense more
4 so than a "representative map" in this service map,
5 that we really do need to do everything we can to
6 strive to create some measure of racial
7 proportionality. I think another frustration I've had
8 throughout this, but particularly today on this map,
9 is this idea of performance. I have worked on get out
10 the vote campaign is not for Canada but on issues,
11 for many years all across Louisiana in communities of
12 color and white communities. Rural, suburban, urban.
13 What I've found is that when people don't turn out
14 when people don't, when communities "don't perform".
15 It's almost always because they say, my vote doesn't
16 matter. I always try to talk to them about how it
17 does matter, no matter the outcome that their vote is
18 their voice. It's their political power, you know, on
19 Election Day all of us are just as powerful as the
20 most powerful person in the state, you know, Gale
21 Benson might have billions of dollars. I might not.
22 But on Election Day, I have just as much power as
23 Gale Benson does. But you know, the way to improve
24 performance across all races, communities,
25 socioeconomic, statuses, is to make sure that people

1 feel like their vote will matter. We do that by
2 creating more opportunity for everybody to have an
3 influence on the outcome. I think with this Supreme
4 Court map, it's again to my mind, maybe a little bit
5 more important than some of the other maps. We
6 certainly have an unfortunate to say the least
7 history of the way that the justice system has
8 treated black and brown folks. I don't see how
9 anybody could deny that. I don't see how you can look
10 around at the way things are now and not see and
11 that's the case. I think a major part of that has
12 been this overwhelming historic under representation
13 of black and brown communities in our courts, but
14 maybe particularly on the Supreme Court. And when
15 folks are able to reach the highest court in the land
16 with a case that they feel is unjust, I think that
17 it's important that they are looking at and dealing
18 with a judiciary that more accurately reflects the
19 actual diversity and demographics of the state. And
20 again, I think it might be more important in the
21 Supreme Court than it is in any other body. I don't
22 want to call it a political body. I know that they're
23 here to serve not represent but you know politics
24 does come into play obviously. But I think it's maybe
25 more important on this body than it is on any other

body. And I think that this proposal by Senator Hewitt does not go far enough towards achieving that. And I would really hope that the entire legislature could get behind something, like representative Ivey's proposal that would attempt to partially solve some of the historic and current problems that we have in our Supreme Court and our Judiciary as a whole.

[02:20:05]

MALE 3: Thank you, happy to take any questions.

REP. STEFANSKI: I see no questions, but thank you for your testimony. Filling out a card also in opposition, not wishing to speak. Katie Bernhardt with Louisiana Democrat party. Chairwoman Hewitt. Ready for you, Chairwoman.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Mr. Chairman. Thank you again and members, thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to present this bill. The Supreme Court has not been redistricted since 1997 and it is difficult to balance all of the things that we're trying to balance. I do think that our voters believe that balancing the court based on population as we're doing everything else that we do is reasonable and logical and fair, even though it's not required by law. I think now's the time for us to take a step in

the right direction and to balance the court and I would ask you that you move this bill to the floor so that we can continue to have a healthy debate.

REP. STEFANSKI: Thank you, Chairwoman Hewitt. Again, appreciate all the work you've done there. Appreciate all the work you've done throughout redistricting, not only on this bill, but it is a daunting task to redraw these maps and to shepherd those through committee. So, I just want to put that on record. Representative Bouie made a motion that we report this Senate Bill 15 favorably as amended. Is there any objection? See, you have no objection on Senate Bill 15 is reported as amended. Thank you, Chairwoman Hewitt.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you, sir. Thank you, members.

REP. STEFANSKI: Next up we have our colleague, Representative Glover with two bills for us and we'll start with House Bill 23 members, 23.

REP. GLOVER: Got a couple of copies of the bill copy of each bill? Oh, she's gone. She's gotten.

[VOICE OVERLAPPED]

REP. STEFANSKI: Representative whenever you're ready.

REP. GLOVER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, honorable members of the committee. It's my great privilege to present to you all House Bill 23 and also 24, the comments I'm going to make and the debate and the discussion that we can have in this regard will generally be applicable to both bills. And so, I won't, Mr. Chairman, unless you really ask me to and would like to do so, there won't be a need to make two separate presentations for each bill that you all have been so kind and generous with your time. I want to once again commend you, Mr. Chairman and the members of this committee for the time and effort that you all have put into this process. This is one of the hardest tasks that this legislature has to take on in the course of the work that is assigned to us and it's a good thing that only happens every decade because I'm not sure if you're getting anybody who'd be willing to serve on the committee. If they were tasked with having to do that roadshow.

REP. STEFANSKI: You might not find a chairman either and you'll be in trouble.

REP. GLOVER: I guess the parking space in the office wouldn't be sufficient instead of. So know that what you all are doing and have done is most definitely respected and appreciated.

[02:25:04]

However, I felt compelled to continue to pursue the objectives of House Bill 21 and to accompany that with successive efforts in 23 and 24. And that is only possible because of the patience and the understanding and the brilliance of the staff of the house and governor affairs committee as embodied by Ms. Lowery and Ms. Lucas, Ms. Armor Basha and all the rest who are a part of the professional staff, who have made it possible for someone who is not a member of this committee to be able to parachute in and attempt to offer a perspective and an approach that I believe to be appropriate. And so, without their willingness to walk me through this process, it helped me understand exactly how it is that I could best try and posture my arguments. We would not be either. So, I want to thank them also. And as I have stated previously, the reason as to why I am offering this legislation is specifically not to try and offer any additional options in terms of what it is that you all should do with what I'm told is 88% of what it is that everyone is already in agreement of because just as with House Bill 21, House Bills 22 or 23 and 24, both have as their template as their starting point as their origin story House Bill 14 by

speaker Schexneider. And the reason for that as previously stated is because I did not want to attempt to engage in any effort to redirect what it is that apparently many have already agreed to with regard to their areas and their districts. And because I see this and view this as a serious effort within a sincere desire to see it move forward and actually be enacted into law. I knew that the only way I'd have a chance to be able to do that would be to focus on the area in which I directly represent, live in and have been a part of for the 56 years. I've been blessed to walk the area. And so, that's why this focus is on Cattle Bosure and the surrounding area. Part of what I think is relevant in terms of trying to help you all understand why I feel the need to do this, is this, 31 years ago, in April of 1991, the reapportionment process that was based upon the decennial census of 1990, is when this committee as it was chaired at that time by the honorable former speaker pro temp, Pepe Bruno, stepped forward with a plan of reapportionment because in 1991, as this committee undertook its work, the number of majority black seats and the Louisiana House of Representatives at that time stood at 15. And that number of 15, as you've already heard

me say, was it increase from zero in 1965 to one in 1968 to 1972, when the legislature or the house itself expand to 105 members and actually engaged for the first time. And a reapportionment process that adhere to the dictates of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and you saw that first wave of African-American members come from the major metropolitan areas of the state so that by 1991, that number stayed at 15. And it was the belief of the members of that community of legislators at that time was that that needed to be a substantial increase from 15. Their belief that that number needed to be 27 almost a doubling. It was the belief.

[02:30:00]

CEDRIC GLOVER: however, of the members or the leadership of the committee and the majority of the members that that number needed to only increase from 15 to 20. In fact, the district did not currently represent was not one of those 20 that the legislature or this House Committee specifically in April of 1991 decided to pass out. It was specifically stated by a democratic Governor who had managed to win with some substantial amount of democratic support and African-American support that he would in fact veto any bill that came from the

1991 house and governmental affairs committee if it contained a fourth majority-black house district in the Shreveport-Bossier area. And so that bill that created an increase of five majority Black districts from 15 to 20 did in fact pass out of this committee with considerable opposition and the district that I currently represent was not a part of. Effective cases were made by members of this committee who agreed and believed that 20 was not the correct number, but instead it should be higher. But it was not agreed to. It was not supported and ultimately was not successful in terms of changing the course of the bill that moves forward. What ultimately happened was that again as you heard me reference on the floor the other day, it took external forces outside of this body, outside of this capital and outside of this state for there to be that additional step forward of a fairer, more equal makeup of the people's house. And ultimately the plan that went into effect that was signed off and approved and ultimately by August of 1991 became the one that my predecessor to House District IV ran in and successfully one was put in place in August of 1991. Qualifying started shortly thereafter. Primaries were held in late September and for the first time, the

1 Honorable late C.O. Simpkins took the oath as the
2 first African-American to occupy the Fourth
3 Representative District of Louisiana, House of
4 Representatives. We only got there because there was
5 an understanding but there was a need not to accept
6 what was the will of this committee or of this house.
7 As I said the other day on the floor, I think we
8 should be better than that. We should be able to
9 advance ourselves for the fairer and more
10 representative legislative body. And so that's why
11 I'm yet again offering us these two opportunities
12 specifically to the legislation House Bill 21 sought
13 to create a fourth majority Black District in the
14 Shreveport Bossier northwest Louisiana area by
15 adhering to what was one of the requests of the
16 members of this body as a whole is that if we've got
17 to look to try and affect a district, let's look to
18 do so by first seeking to use those members who were
19 term-limited, otherwise not returning and affect
20 their districts. Obviously, that's a political
21 consideration fact that we're here means that we're
22 politicians and so that's understandable. And so in
23 line with that, that was the first approach that I
24 took. I also took that approach because of another
25 factor that I think is relevant as part of this

discussion, I want to thank my good friend Representative Alan Seabaugh for giving me even additional insight in terms of actually the details of how it transpired because like most folks, I saw it from up north of here as opposed to being directly hands-on in 2011.

[02:35:01]

And that is the fact that House District 5 or some other Shreveport area district was not reapportioned as majority-Black a decade ago was because of the desire on the part of the sitting member at that time, obviously in full agreement with the speaker at that time, my good friend, Speaker Tucker to offer as the official speakers reapportionment bill a configuration of a Shreveport base house district with a composition of the committee of 89.9% Black. And speaker Tucker agreed to do that and I'm sure he did it, obviously he did it at the request and the insistence of the member. I would offer to you that obviously as a speaker you try and do that which your member want you to do with regard to their district which obviously, Mr. Chairman, you have attempted to do in most instances with all of us. I would offer to you in within the context of the larger interest of fair and effective

1 government agreeing to do that is fundamentally wrong
2 and does not serve the interests of democracy. That
3 was recognized apparently by others involved in this
4 process. The Honorable Rick Gallot now president of
5 Grambling State University but former chairman of
6 this committee apparently in conjunction with others
7 recognized that was not a good thing and that there
8 were changes made at the committee level that
9 corrected that error maintain that members district
10 as being a safely majority black District, but
11 reapportion the rest of the population within that
12 area in a way that resulted in the creation of a
13 fourth majority black District. Obviously with the
14 newly arrived Mr. Seabaugh that was not anything
15 that was of great interest and the belief that that
16 was an acceptable thing to do in terms of political
17 expedience may have been relied upon because of the
18 fact that the former representative Wayne Waddell had
19 transitioned. I think he had resigned as a member of
20 the body to go in and become the Head of the
21 Louisiana State Exhibit Museum in Shreveport. And so
22 from an assumption standpoint, the conclusion may
23 have been was that they were operating with the
24 possibility of an open seat. That change in
25 adjustment was made at the committee level and as was

1 testified to and stated on the floor of the house
2 earlier, that a floor amendment made that changed it
3 back to the configuration of how the speaker had
4 originally drafted the bill. So that restored that
5 89.9% Black District took away that additional
6 majority-minority district and left those with what
7 could at best be described as fairness and justice
8 delayed for a decade.
9 And so that was my initial approach in House Bill
10 21, understanding that was something that certain
11 members were not comfortable with. I decided to, at
12 least see if it was possible to give this body and
13 the House some additional options. And so House Bill
14 23 and Trisha, correct me if I'm wrong, well, let me
15 just put it this way. One of these two bills between
16 House Bill 23 and 24 places where I'm registered to
17 vote within House District I. Both of them make House
18 District I 23 places me within House District I which
19 means if I have an interest or desire to if this is
20 passed and is enacted, it becomes law, I if I have an
21 interest and desire in returning back to a member as
22 a member of this body I'd end up having to run
23 against a sitting encumber. The other one keeps me
24 within House District IV. I don't care which one you
25 would look to pass or an act because again, I think

it is the larger, the larger issue is the fair distribution of the population of the very least, at the very least of House Districts I through VI that drives me to be here today to offer this legislation because the only way that you effectively prevent the creation of an additional minority-majority, an additional black District and I get tongue-tied continuing trying to make sure I'm getting majority before minority. This now Black District within the Shreveport-Bossier area is to configure the first six districts with a low of 69 percent and a high of almost 75 percent. That's not right.

[02:40:16]

Representative Seabaugh said on the floor of the day that in 2006 when I ran for Mayor of the city of Shreveport that I managed to win that race despite the fact that the city itself was not majority black and that was an example of how it is that we don't necessarily need to have majority black districts in order to be able to get black representatives. My response to that being and it is now that running for Mayor of a city that was racially even not only made me a better candidate. It made me a better mayor because my clear understanding was that I was looking to represent the entirety of the city and not just

simply one particular community. Running from districts that are not racially packed, not just in Shreveport Bossier but throughout the entirety of the state makes us better Representatives. So while I can't do anything about the other 88% of the state that House Bills 21, 23 and 24 fit, I'm asking you, I'm asking my delegation, I'm asking the entirety of the legislature to at least allow us to be a place where we're not sending people here from racially extreme districts and with that Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would ask for your favorable support on both House Bills 23, and 24 if I'm able to be able to make that dual request.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Glover so this makes three instruments now that, that essentially you have mirrored as in your words about 88% of House Bill 14, is that correct?

CEDRICGLOVER: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So it seems to me that you agree with 88% of the map.

CEDRIC GLOVER: No, I do not.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So you don't agree with the bills you filed.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I agree with the fact that I've filed these bills in an effort to try and accomplish a fairer composition of 12% of the state of Louisiana and any effort to try and interject myself into the other 88% gives me no basis to be able to hold on to anybody else's support anywhere else even though who may agree with me, but because they have already gone through their individual as well as regional process with you and the other leadership to get to the agreement that they have that I know that from a political standpoint I don't have any chance of being able to go in and re-argue that process. As I've said before and I'll say now, if you have in fact with their help, support and cooperation kind of like Speaker Tucker back in 2011 if you have in fact packed their districts with compositions that are upwards of two-thirds, the 70-plus percent black or white then that is wrong. It should not have been done. It does not serve the interests of that individual district and more importantly it does not serve the interest of the state of Louisiana and puts us in a position to where we end up being bound to and very much limited by something I've said quite often, that is vote your District. You come from a 70 plus percent white district, you're going to come

here and you're going to have a political obligation to give very little interest in credence to the arguments and perspectives and the viewpoints of people who happen to be of the opposite race and the same for those of us who are black, who come from similar positive districts and so to the extent that that has happened across other areas, that's wrong. It should not have happened, but I accept the fact that I can't look to try and correct those, but if I had to finally to do so I would certainly be open to and support.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand but just to clarify so are you asking us to pass these maps?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Yes. I am.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, so you want us to pass -- you're asking us to pass maps that you don't believe are fair.

CEDRIC GLOVER: As I said earlier recognizing that what we've done is managed to achieve a fairer composition of the area that I represent and that I'm from and was able and felt comfortable going and challenging the folks who are in District 1 through 11 and 23, which is the majority of northwest Louisiana, and saying to those folks that I don't think it's the right way to do this.

[02:45:02]

You may disagree with me. You may not like the fact that I'm doing it, but because I'm from that area and I represent those folks and we've come from common communities of interest, then I'm willing to fight that battle. I'm not willing to go and fight the others and what it does represent is an increase because that number went from 15 in 1991 and didn't stop at 20 as was the intent of the committee at that time based on an 11 to 3 vote of the committee and in fact went from 15 to 12. My asking in this instance in terms of my willingness to sign my name and cast my vote in favor is for it to go from 29 to third. That's far less than what it should be but I'm not going to allow as I've said previously the perfect to become the enemy of at best would be described as marginal progress.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So I guess what you're saying is you -- I'm not going to rehash that it'll end in another long statement. Do you -- you talked about not having these very high districts one or the other. Does your bill accomplish that?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Not entirely. No, it does not.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Because I'm noticing again like I point out the other day, in both maps

I'm seeing 70% numbers in the white pop and some of these districts.

CEDRIC GLOVER: All right. This is far from perfect. The only thing this seeks to do is to say unpacked District I through VI where you've come to one community. All six of those districts are largely based amongst the 237,000 people of Cattle Parish. A Parish that has a racial composition of 56.1% black peat a city that's probably has a similar racial composition. Within that you've drawn six districts with a low of 69 and a high of 74. That doesn't serve the interest.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Do you know your high is 74 as well?

CEDRIC GLVOER: Again, I got -- not perfect but what it does do is create the opportunity for there to be at least an additional majority black District which entered X8 an additional perspective that had the map that came out of this Committee in April of 1991 going forward. You never would have ended up with how District IV with a composition that would have allowed C.O. Simpkins to get elected and C.O. Simpkins had gotten elected, then I never would have gotten elected either.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You were reliving some
2 history about your election in Shreveport. You were
3 mayor, correct?
4 CEDRIC GLOVER: That's correct.
5 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: When did you serve?
6 CEDRIC GLOVER: From November of 2006 to December
7 of 2014?
8 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, you said you made
9 the statement that when you were elected, it was a
10 majority White, you said --
11 CEDRIC GLOVER: About 50/50.
12 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, what was your
13 margin of Victory?
14 CEDRIC GLOVER: First time around 56:54, about
15 56-46, 54-46.
16 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Would you agree with me
17 then that there is like crossover voting in
18 Shreveport?
19 CEDRIC GLOVER: Yes.
20 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. Mr. Pro
21 Tempore, question.
22 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 Do want to pay you back as we said, even follow along
24 with the redistricting process, is that fair to say?
25

CEDRIC GLOVER: I attended the Roadshow in my region.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Let me ask the question you've been following since we got here.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: The follow along with the committee.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Following, it was in fact, the committee hearings of when you all started this process that prompted me to believe that I would offer some legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: So you were here when demographer that worked with Representative Jenkins said that in my area that that was the best that we could do as far as minority representation. He agreed with me.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Your area being -

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Baton Rouge, that area in the bottom southeast corner of the state.

CEDRIC GLOVER: You're asking me to accept the expert testimony of somebody who was not my witness.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: I'm asking you if you heard him testify since you were following along introspect.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I don't agree with his testimony.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Do you have some better evidence to contradict him?

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not -- how would I know that's why 88% of bill there was a Speaker's thing.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: But do have anything to contradict him?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Except the fact that this is the fourth time I've been through one of these processes and I know that political considerations ultimately may end up tramping what's best in terms of how it is that we can figure.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Do you think that Everest Jenkins as witness have political considerations that he would testify something construed to be?

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not accepting his testimony as I would offer in advance of supporting a House Bill 21, House Bill 23 --

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: But some of this bill which is this is bill.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Correct.

[02:50:01]

CEDRIC GLOVER: His testimony is not relevant to any aspect of my view.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: It's not relevant?

CEDRIC GLOVER: No.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Okay, even though we're discussing the very area that you drew that's the same.

CEDRIC GLOVER: No. That's why I didn't ask him to come and be with me to present this bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Okay, do you believe in that the State Democratic Party would hire somebody who would give untruthful evidence. Are you inaccurate?

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not here to give a thought or opinion about that but I've not asked him to come and be a part of either supporting or opposing or assisting with this legislation

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure, and then --

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not appearing here before you today as a Democrat.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: No I get it. Now let's talk about unpacking elsewhere in the state. Which of your colleagues have come into you've had conversations with that they're willing to unpack their District?

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not here to talk about any discussion that I've had with any of my other colleagues around the state about their areas on their districts.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Have they come to you?

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not here to attack them.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: I'm not asking you to attack them.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not here to shoot them. That's why I have come with the approach that I'll take to say as Trish started when we had this initial conversation what is the starting point for your bill as I'm starting with the speaker's bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure. Do you have talked to any of your colleagues about the map that you want to do for their districts?

CEDRIC GLOVER: It's the same one that they've already signed off in voting for and supporting.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: But you had no conversations with it. If you're taking your map seriously as this chamber can pass this bill out and this be the map for Louisiana and you're serious about that, you haven't had a conversation with them about minority representation in their areas. I find that very hard to believe.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Well, what you should believe is that what's relevant to this conversation as what I said earlier and that is I disagree with the balance of the bill, but I know that it's not politically

1 practical to attempt to try and fix those things
2 because that's a much higher hurdle than the one I'm
3 trying to get over right now.
4 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: I understand that.
5 CEDRIC GLOVER: Willing to accept limitations,
6 those inadequacies and whatever and concerns I may
7 have because I don't want to end up trying to fix
8 problems in areas where I do not have standing as
9 either a member from that region or as a member of
10 this committee to try and fix. And so that's why my
11 remedy in this particular instance, in terms of what
12 I'm willing to vote for and attest to and stand
13 behind is limited to --
14 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: But you're unwilling to
15 engage any of your colleagues to do the same thing
16 across the state?
17 CEDRIC GLOVER: Oh, certainly I am.
18 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: But you didn't.
19 CEDRIC GLOVER: Well, I've had conversations.
20 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: That's what I asked you
21 said --
22 CEDRIC GLOVER: But you know conversations have
23 varied. Some folks are happy. Some are not. Now if
24 you really want me to tell you what some of them have
25 said and that is they have been pertinent of the job

and enticed to and supporting things that they may not agree with or like because of the fact that they want to end up with their districts being threatened.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: So but then they're happy with the district they're getting and they don't want to be threatened with being changed.

[OVERLAY]

That doesn't make any sense.

CEDRIC GLOVER: The political reality --

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: That's illogical.

CEDRIC GLOVER: They have come to the conclusion that what they have before them is the best that it is going to get. They don't want to be any worse and so they're willing to go forward but I don't want to re-litigate that on there but then I'm willing to do.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Representative Glover, it takes extreme numbers on that because if you've been watching this process you've actually see the Chairman make amendment after amendment after amendment not only for Republican members but for Democrats members and Black caucus. That's happened, so everybody has had an opportunity to improve their districts.

CEDRIC GLOVER: If you asked me about the conversation out there, Mr. Magee --

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: I'm asking what you know.

CEDRIC GLOVER: You may not like what those conversations are, but I'm telling you what they --

CEDRIC GLOVER: No, I hear you but I'm saying the logic of it doesn't make any sense.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Don't tell me what.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: I'm not telling you what you heard. I believe you heard that but I'm saying you've also seen the process and you've also seen people's districts changed.

[OVERLAY]

CEDRIC GLOVER: I've seen the performative aspects of this process.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: The performative, okay. So you had conversations but nobody is willing to go on the record with you or work with you to do what you've done in northwest Louisiana across the state. Do you have a meeting where you said, hey guys I've got an idea. Let's unpack our districts. And they said, no or they said yes, let's do it. I'll work with you.

CEDRIC GLOVER: There are those who recognized the fact that as a result of the 2020 census that the state of Louisiana is fully one-third African-

American. They believed that the House of Representatives should fully reflect that.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Let me ask -- I'll tell you people come conversations I may have, Representative but it's not what we're talking about, Representative Glover.

CEDRIC GLOVER: What that would mean is an additional from 29 to 35.

REPRESENTATIV MAGEE: Sure. That's not the conversation we're having. That's not the conversation we're having.

[02:55:13]

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm telling about you about the conversations that I've had.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: No, I saw you asked about though. I'll take conversation I had -- was broach about unpacking their districts and they pushed back and said I do not want you to do that.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not understanding.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: You think that didn't take place.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Again.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: That members were approached about unpacking their districts and they rejected the opportunity or the option to.

1 CEDRIC GLOVER: I would not think that any
2 especially African-American member of the body would
3 look at you and say that I want a 75% Black district
4 or I want a 70% district. Some of them may hey --
5 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: No, that's not the issue.
6 Everybody is like taxes. Everybody will agree that
7 they don't want to be taxed or that we need taxes,
8 but they don't want to participate in so I will agree
9 that everybody will say, oh, I don't want 75, but
10 let's move this precinct. No, no, don't touch that
11 precinct. That's where the rubber hit the road in
12 this conversation. We all have theories about how
13 things should be but then you actually have to do it
14 on the paper and that's where the pushback comes
15 CEDRIC GLOVER: That leads to the problem that
16 many of the people who have come before you and this
17 committee and testified to and that is what it
18 amounts to is a process by which the politicians pick
19 their people as opposed to the people picking --
20 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: And I agree with you on
21 that. I didn't do that, that's my math is terrible
22 does not reflect that.
23 CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm not talking. I have no --
24 would you not had any converse or conversation about
25 you, your math or your region.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure, but you follow along, that's been savage rolling in all the conversations so you know that.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I can't attest to that.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure. Well, I mean I would like to avail of myself of the big verse of the entire map myself and file a bill but I don't think that's really a possibility for anybody.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Well, you're a member of the committee. I'm not.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: But you're proposing to redraw the entire state. You are.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I'm proposing to redraw 12% of the state and leave 88% as you all already have signed off and agreed to.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure, and I don't dispute that part but what I'm saying is when somebody puts their name on a sheet of paper, they're taking ownership of the entire thing and it'd be great. It would be convenient if I said, I only want, -- I'll file an HB 2 next year and I only want to take credit for the first two lines. Everything else is on everybody else. That's not my problem. I don't think that's the way this game works.

[OVERLAY]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Hey, hey, we're going to let each other talk and we're going to finish our sentences and we're going to work. Okay. We're going to both of you are all going to respect each other and finish the conversation.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure. The process I wanted to game in and he's always interjected for other members of committee who I like to interject as well. I said what I meant by the game is the process. We would all love the opportunity to take a portion of our bills and claim ownership of just three lines of it, but we don't. When you have your name on the paper, you take ownership of the entirety of the thing and what I'm hearing from you is you don't want to which I think is the best of both worlds. We all want that. I mean I would love to say that I only take ownership of this park is because I know this part. I love this part. Everything else you're on your own, but I just think this patently unfair.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Here's what ownership means. And here's what political reality means for me. You pass this bill out of here, 21, 23 or 24 while I am greatly troubled by the vast majority of them. I'm going to vote for it on the floor. Now I'm going to ask other members to vote for it on the floor and I

will tell them as I have said before, this is not a perfect bill. It should be better. I agree that much be better.

[OVERLAY]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Let him finish Representative Magee.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Because I'm not in a position to make it fully better or completely better or as better as it should be I'm not going to allow the fact that we have gone through this process and agreed to at least make the adjustment that I have sought just as we went from none to 5 to 10 to 15 to 27 to 29. It is not a bridge too far to go from 29 to 30 and now that we've gotten there and we have the ability to do so while it's not perfect I am going to vote for it. I'm going to ask you all to vote for it, and I'm willing to engage in a debate and a dialogue with anybody else who says that we shouldn't vote for.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure.

CEDRIC GLOVER: To see if I can't change their mind or at least prevent them from persuading others.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Thank you for that. I think it's a good approach.

CEDRIC GLOVER: But it is if we end up approving this and we end up at 30 instead of staying at 29.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure. I understand and look, I supported the unpacking of East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge into East Feliciana and I thought that was a good approach. So, I mean, I'm not against unpacking districts. I think it's hard and difficult, and I think it's unrealistic is to do it at the last minute and change things at the very last second but anyway.

[03:00:06]

CEDRIC GLOVER: When did 14 become available to the rest of us?

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: It was filed and pre-filed. It was done the way it was supposed to be.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Sunday the day before.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Yeah, according to normal process. Thank you. Mr. Chairman.

CEDRIC GLOVER: You said we had time that Sunday?

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Our special session started Monday or Tuesday? Monday. And it was filed?

FEMALE 1: Tuesday.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Tuesday. It was filed on Monday.

CEDRIC GLOVER: And committee presentation was when?

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: We came to committee -- so the ninth.

CEDRIC GLOVER: And [PH 03:00:59] Tris, when did I call to ask to draft a bill?

FEMALE 1: Let me go back and check

CEDRIC GLOVER: But Mr. Magee, we're talking about a span of at most a week between the opportunity that I first had chance to put my eyes on the entirety of 14. In fact, I specifically remember the young man behind you. What's your name, young man?

JOHN: My name is John.

CEDRIC GLOVER: What's your last name?

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Hold on. We are not going to gaze the public in this. We just not.

CEDRIC GLOVER: But he's a staff.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: I mean he is a staff but he's not on the mic and he's not --

CEDRIC GLOVER: The young John, the young man, who called me on -- I'm trying to put him officially into the records of the House of Representatives. Young John called me at a point to where we had convened and it was clear that the committee was

1 going to meet and the process going forward in terms
2 of the fourth time was simply was going to be to
3 advance the bill on its readings so it could be
4 scheduled and heard. And so I made the decision at
5 that point to return back to Shreveport. But the call
6 was made that before the bill goes public, we want to
7 offer you the opportunity to come up and meet with
8 Chairman Stefanski to be able to take a look at what
9 has been done. Just in case there are any changes
10 that you want to make.
11 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Yeah, to give input.
12 CEDRIC GLOVER: To give input. What day was that?
13 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Hold on. You're not
14 getting engaged in a conversation. You're not on the
15 microphone. Okay. We don't know. There was a call.
16 There was courtesy that I extended to every single
17 member of this body on multiple occasions to come and
18 interact with me and give your input on the bill.
19 CEDRIC GLOVER: What day was that?
20 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Day would have been
21 before the special session started.
22 CEDRIC GLOVER: No, it was not.
23 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Yes, it was because
24 the bill was filed.
25

CEDRIC GLOVER: No. We're talking about the day that he called and said before the bill is published and post it where it is available for us to look at the entire bill was the entirety of the bill available to be viewed prior to that point.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Absolutely. If you would have wanted to come and had that conversation with me. But did you come?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Well, no. Because I told you my conversation with you was very simple and that is, I'm not looking to come in and safeguard any area of my district. I'm not asking you to pursue any specific agenda. I'm asking you to come up with 105 districts that are not racially packed either black or white.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And t that was a conversation we had well over a year ago, I believe.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Correct.

[02:59:56]

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And Additionally, I had like I've explained through this entire process, I took your statement into consideration as well as the number of your colleagues.

CEDRIC GLOVER: But now I understand I'm offering this within the context of what Mr. Magee has said.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Okay.

CEDRIC GLOVER: It was not until at some point after which was the first week of the special session that that call came before you publish the bill and we were able to see the entirety of it, all 105 districts. And so it was only after that point which is after the start of a special session that the entirety of House Bill 14 was available for us as members and as the public to not come to your office and sit with you as you thumb through it with a copy or to put something up on the screen but to be able to print a copy, sit with it, go through it and analyze it district by district. That was not until after the actual start of the special session. Am I wrong in that statement Mr. Chairman?

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: You're not but let me ask you this.

CEDRIC GLOVER: So, it goes back to what it is that Mr. Magee has stated about the fact that there should have been all of this time available to be able to peruse through House Bill 14 to see what it did to Terrebonne and every place else across the State and be in a position to go and caucus with my fellow members and offer to them some sort of a strategy that will not only look to try and unpack my

regions but the entirety of the State. That expectation is not realistic nor is it based in fact.

[03:05:09]

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: over the past year have you ever ask me to meet and I decline that?

CEDRIC GLOVER: No. Because my request of you was simple. Don't do to all 105 districts what it is that you've done to Districts 1 through 6.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: I understand that.

CEDRIC GLOVER: But you did just the opposite of that with 136 and potentially throughout the rest of the State.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And I would make an argument that the narrative you have said, specifically regarding a few of the districts that you have referenced are well above 70% in your bill that you're asking us.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Without question. Again, because I've not spent last year plus doing this as you have that I've not been able to go in and figure out how to effectively unpack those districts. I've given you three options on how to effectively unpack Districts 1 through 6.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Sure, I heard you. Royce do you have a question?

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you. I have a real serious problem with this conversation that's going on right now. I think it's completely off base. I don't really know the worst to put together to describe it to be honest with you. The criteria that we adopted Mayor Glover last year that will serve as guidance for our development of these maps. Not sure if you had a chance to read it but I'm sure staff would have advised you of the criteria that we use to help us in developing these maps. Was there anywhere in the criteria that said that you had to personally need and have a conversation with other members of this body in terms of developing a map?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Not to my knowledge.

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Was there any criteria or requirement that you have to get agreement from any other members in terms of a map that you put forward?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Not to my knowledge and recollection.

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Despite the fact that the Chairman has spent countless hours putting in the work with staff and despite the fact that he has been working on this for a long period of time, was any member in anyway prohibited from filing a bill at any

1 particular time whether it was a year ago or whether
2 it was yesterday?
3 CEDRIC GLOVER: No, not at all.
4 VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: So, that leads me to my
5 next question, which is this idea of the fact that
6 you brought a proposal that essentially mirrored 88%
7 of what this committee already supported and you made
8 some minor, I wouldn't call them minor. You made some
9 changes in your area to respect what the work that
10 the Chairman had done, to respect what the committee
11 had already adopted, to respect the fact that you
12 hadn't had conversations with the whole body but you
13 said you were going to focus on your area. How is
14 that any different than other members who have
15 brought amendments on the house floor to make changes
16 here or there? Were those same questions asked to
17 members who brought amendments just saying, well,
18 we're just going to make these amendments in our area
19 we got to worked out. With the questions raised that
20 pro speaker pro tempore just ask you, were those
21 questions raised? Had they got a hold of meetings
22 with the whole body that they're going to just adopt
23 it without meeting with 105 members. Weren't all same
24 questions asked?
25

CEDRIC GLOVER: I could not imagine that they were

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Okay. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Thank you Mr. Vice chair. That clears the board. You have some cards Representative Glover that would like to testify? Katie Bernhardt with Louisiana Democratic Party Lafayette had a card and support would like to speak. Ms. Bernhardt? Also, pulling out the card in support not wishing to speak Peter Robbins Brown, Louisiana, Progress action and then Edgar Cage with Together Louisiana. Ms. Bernhardt?

KATIE BERNHARDT: Hi, Katie Bernhardt with Louisiana Democratic Party. First of all, I just want to say thank you very much for your efforts here. I think that it's so important to the people of Louisiana to know that there were options in place for more fair representation. And I know there's a lot of subjectivity and objectivity in what they're exactly means under these circumstances which are both politically complex and factually complex given the nature of this process. But as I've mentioned before concerning other bills, we get quite a number of calls and concerns from Members across the State. This area in particular Caddo and Bossier is one that

1 we have been reached out to by our State Central
2 Committee members and activist and general citizens
3 that it's very concerning especially in areas where
4 the population has frequently elected African-
5 American mayors and we see elected officials at all
6 levels coming from our minority communities. And what
7 looks like the potential to have more minority
8 representation and legislature but we don't. And so I
9 think that this is a really valuable opportunity to
10 take a second look and have alternates in place which
11 could truly represent the people of that area.
12 [03:10:05]
13 I'd like to note that we've had the opportunity
14 to study both voter segregation and racial
15 segregation as far as Louisiana is concerned, and we
16 have some of the highest in the country. So, I was
17 quite surprised to find out that Louisiana ranks
18 number one in voter segregation, meaning that our
19 communities live very, very separately. And some of
20 us may know that just by our own hometowns that we
21 have geographic boundaries that separate our
22 communities, and it is a reality. I wish that as some
23 of our members and I have discussed, I wish that in
24 2022, we are coming to this building to discuss
25 something other than race. But the reality is that

1 racial identity defines a lot of our lives in
2 Louisiana to this day, and having adequate
3 representation here is incredibly important to our
4 minority communities. So, I just wanted to point out
5 that this is a wonderful alternative to provide more,
6 more representation for communities of interest that
7 they greatly desire to have a voice here at the
8 Capitol.
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Ms.
10 Bernhardt. I don't have any questions.
11 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Representative Glover,
12 did, have any of the representatives of these, of the
13 northwest corner expressed any concern about
14 communities of interest being affected based on these
15 amendments?
16 CEDRIC GLOVER: Certainly. I specifically had a
17 conversation with my good friend, Representative
18 Dodie Horton about that, and that, specifically, she
19 indicated that based upon two things, one, the growth
20 in the population of Bossier Parish and specifically
21 that Barksdale Air Force Base happens to be situated
22 within the confines of Bossier Parish. I would note
23 that Barksdale in and of itself is neither Bossier or
24 Shreveport. It's certainly not Bossier City. It sits
25 in Bossier Parish, but it even has its own separate

zip code. So, if you write a letter to Barksdale, you don't write it to Bossier City. You write it to BAFB, or Barksdal Air Force Base, and its zip code as opposed to Bossier being 71112 and 71111. Barksdale's zip code is 71110. And it is, in fact, also a land, 23, 22,000 acres that was purchased back in 1929 by a general obligation bond issue --

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And I don't mean to cut you, but she, so she had some issues with the communities of interest?

CEDRIC GLOVER: But based on, but based on Barksdale, and I'm, and I'm giving you this context.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Okay.

CEDRIC GLOVER: To help you understand that Barksdale is in Bossier.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Yeah, and I listen to your speech on the House floor very attentively and that you are taking light of that quite well, and I've heard you say that. Yes, sir.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Yes. And so, as a part of that discussion, from my perspective, as a resident of West Shreveport, but as the son of an Air Force veteran who got to Shreveport via Barksdale and who could only buy a home in 1959 in certain parts of Shreveport, Barksdale is as much a part of my

1 community of interest as it is of Representative
2 Horton's, Representative Crews, or anybody else for
3 that matter.
4 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Were there any
5 CEDRIC GLOVER: So, I respect that, that
6 contention. It's just simply something I think is not
7 superior to the unpacking of these districts.
8 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Understand. Where,
9 where there any other representatives from that
10 region who expressed some concern about the
11 communities of interest being affected?
12 CEDRIC GLOVER: Oh, I'm sure that I've had some
13 folks on the Caddo side that believe that there
14 should not be the ability for certain parts of the
15 city to be represented by other representatives. I
16 don't know if that was an indication of party or race
17 or gender or what have you. But, again.
18 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: There were some
19 concerns with the delegation on communities of
20 interest.
21 CEDRIC GLOVER: There were concerns from the
22 delegation regarding what the reconfiguration of our
23 districts would amount to if we racially unpack them.
24 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Understand.
25

CEDRIC GLOVER: Again, issues and argument that do not trump in anyway, in fact, probably should not be considered in many respects, account for why it is that the Voters Rights Act itself was needed. And specifically, provisions of Section 2 that would tell you that, you know, if you acknowledge that you will have a representative, then what you will not be allowed to do is to relegate him to the black side of town and give him a 90% black district.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: So, and again, Representative Glover, I do, like, I don't want to get into a big debate with it. But, I mean, I have to say something about your comment about members feeling threatened or coerced or whatever combination of words that you used. I do take offense to that because I've been involved in a lot of those conversations and there was no threats that ever came from, from me, you know. And so, I don't want to, I don't want to get into it and I don't want to go and get into an argument about our colleagues.

[03:15:00]

But, I just want to put on the record from my standpoint that does not exist and did not exist in this process. And, actually, I went above and beyond to try to accommodate as many members as I could

because, at the end of the day, we represent our districts and you are the best person to be able to tell me what your region needs. In your case, obviously you're not satisfied with how that has come out, and I understand that. But, but for the vast majority of our colleagues, I attempted and I think I accomplished that.

CEDRIC GLOVER: May I respond, Mr. Chairman?

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: I'll allow you to respond. Then, I'm going to ask you to please close. Yes, sir. Go ahead.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope that you know that up until that exchange with Ms. Magee, I had not broach that line of comment or discussion at any point, either in my original committee presentation of House Bill 21, my floor presentation of House Bill 21, or my amendments on House Bill 14 that would have made it the same as House Bill 21, or on any comments that I made about House Bills 23 or 24 from that point. It was the attempt to try and I guess somehow put me in the posture of being responsible as Vice-Chairman Duplessis indicated of having the responsibility and the obligation of having gone through out the entirety of the state and gotten into discussions with other people and other

1 delegations and what have you about the makeup and
2 compositions of their district and asking me if about
3 what it is that those folks may have told me that we
4 even crossed into that area.
5 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: I understand. I
6 understand.
7 CEDRIC GLOVER: So, that, once that wall was
8 pierced, then I'm going to tell you the truth as has
9 been conveyed to me. Now, whether or not that
10 actually is the truth, I don't know that to be the
11 case. I do know that there are folks who said to me
12 specifically that the reason as to why they are going
13 along and voting for this bill is that because if
14 they did not, that their districts were threatened,
15 and that they managed to be able to come to an
16 agreement with you about what to do about their
17 districts that was contingent upon them not bucking
18 what was going to be the line of comment coming from
19 you as the chairman and from the leadership of the
20 body. And so, so now that we've gone there, I want to
21 just go ahead and be perfectly clear. Yes.
22 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Sure.
23 CEDRIC GLOVER: In fact, that's part of reason as
24 to why some people told me.
25 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And I wouldn't.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I can be with you on your amendment, but I can't be with you in voting against the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And I would make an argument.

CEDRIC GLOVER: That's going to put at risk what it is that I have managed to be able to secure as an agreement and an understanding what the chairman, the speaker and the leadership of the House.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: And I would make an argument that there is probably several members who didn't support the bill, who got everything they wanted in their map and they're perfectly happy with it. And you could go talk to them about any of those conversations and it's, some of the things even not existed.

CEDRIC GLOVER: But, Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: But, regardless, go ahead and close, Representative Glover.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I was not a party to those conversations. I was asked about conversations that I had. You asked me. I'm going to tell you what was said.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Representative Magee asked you, but I made a statement. But, go ahead and close Representative Glover.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I appreciate the time that you all have given me to appear before you. Again, as I said on the floor, I'm a big boy, more ways than one. So, I know how to read a floor and how to read a committee. And so, in terms of the action that's going to follow from here, I have no doubt that that has already been predetermined. But just as was the case in April of 1991, when the best that this committee believed they could do in terms of fairly unpacking the districts across the state was 20 numbers in total, which at that point, I think, amounted to about 18% of the population or the number of house districts, that argument didn't thankfully end here because had it, had it ended here, then my predecessor never would have gotten here, and then I never would have gotten here. And I would offer to you that the voice, the viewpoints, the perspective, the leadership, that the late Honorable Dr. C.O. Simpkins brought to this body was something that was needed. It was relevant. It was appropriate. And it helped make Louisiana a better place. Him coming here

opened up the opportunity for me to be here. And if I'm not here making the argument that I am before you today, then there's another individual out there who's from the Shreveport area, and there's potentially others from around this state, who won't come here and constitute the majority and manage to be able to take whatever it is that you feel the additional presence may take from you. What they do bring is a perspective, an attitude, an insight, an understanding, an opinion, a perspective that is a part of Louisiana.

[03:20:11]

And as we have all often said, some of us more often than others, more so than the Senate or any other body, the State Supreme Court, the PSC, or anything else that's constituted statewide. This is supposed to be the people's house. And if it is the people's house, then it needs to be a microcosm of what this state is. In order for that to happen, we have to go through this process because it was a step down that road for a brief 12-year period of time after the Civil War. But because of race, that right and opportunity was taken away and because of gender, for many of us that didn't change until decades later. It took the federal government to change it.

1 I'm asking us, unlike in every other instance, with
2 the exception of the two that took us from 27 to 29,
3 I think that happened by consensus agreement of this
4 body. Let's do it ourselves, because otherwise we end
5 up once again having to defend that which is very
6 difficult to defend. And that is why is it, why is it
7 in a Parish that is 56% black Bossier Parish within a
8 decade has gone from 27% black to 37% black. An area
9 that more than well made the case a decade ago for
10 why it is that it needs to be more representative in
11 terms of its legislative delegation, but did not
12 happen because of political considerations. In more
13 compelling cases, we sit here before us today, and we
14 refuse to accept the reality as it appears before.
15 The decision to do that means that those of us who
16 are affected by that decision have no option but to
17 seek relief wherever it may come. And it puts us in a
18 posture as a state and as a body of yet once again
19 having a set of circumstances where we fail to act
20 and lead when the opportunity presented itself. So,
21 with that, Mr. Chairman, and you tell me how we
22 handle both 22 and 23 at the same time, because -
23 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: We're going to take
24 them up one at a time as per the rules.
25

CEDRIC GLOVER: I get a chance to have a phone call with Mr. Magee again, then I would welcome that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, look, I gave you an opportunity to present both bills. I'm going to give you that option, but I'd like to take the action, see if there's an action on 23. Then we'll move on to 24, see if there's an action on that, if you would so choose to waive your opening and everything, okay. So, members, what's the pleasure of the committee on House Bill 23?

FEMALE: In favor.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, there's been a motion to move favorable. The chair makes a substitute motion to voluntarily defer. Ms. Ammersbach will call the role. A vote yes is to voluntarily defer the bill. A vote no is to keep the bill in committee and we would go to the prior motion. Ms. Ammersbach, please call the role.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Vice Chairman Duplessis?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Bouie?

REPRESENTATIVE BOUIE: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Wilford Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Deshotel?

REPRESENTATIVE DESHOTEL: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Barnum?

REPRESENTATIVE BARNUM: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges? Yes. Representative Horton? Yes. Representative Ivey?

REPRESENTATIVE IVEY: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Jenkins?

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Mike Johnson? Yes. Representative LaCombe? Representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE LYONS: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee?

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Ten yays, seven nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Ten yays, seven nays. The House Bill 23 is voluntarily deferred House Bill 24. Representative Glover?

CEDRIC GLOVER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, I think we have had a very thorough discussion of this matter. I'm willing to go back through it again if asked to. As I tell people, you got to be really careful. I'm a country boy, been from the Cooper Road. We're kind of suburban rules, grew up raising sheets and hogs and horses. So, you got to be careful when you're wrestling with a pig.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Not, my words.

CEDRIC GLOVER: The pig will enjoy it and you'll both get dirty. So, I'm more than willing to go back and restate all of which has been said, but I respect the fact that you all have been here for over a year engaged in this process. You have given me a thorough and fair hearing, and I would simply ask that you apply everything that has been said and stated with regard to House Bill 23 to House Bill 24.

[03:25:11]

The only difference between these two bills is that unlike House Bill 21, instead of changing the

1 configuration of House Bill 5, it changes the
2 configuration of I'm sorry, House District 5, it
3 changed the configuration of House District 1. One
4 Bill 23 places me as a resident of House District 1.
5 And House Bill 24 keeps me within House District 4.
6 But beyond that, they are both the same. They
7 represent an effort to unpack districts that are
8 packed by race and give us a more representation of
9 my region and would increase the total number of
10 majority black districts for the House of
11 Representatives from 29 to 30, which is still five
12 shy of what would represent the one-third of the
13 total population that we as African Americans
14 represent at the State of Louisiana.
15 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Filling out a card in
16 support, and I wishing to speak Peter Robins Brown,
17 Louisiana Progression, filling out a card in support,
18 and I wishing to speak at your case with together
19 Louisiana. There's a question for Representative
20 Carter.
21 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Thank you Mr.
22 Chairman. This bill is pretty much the same amendment
23 you had on the floor. One of your amendments. And of
24 course, it placed you in District 1 and the District
25 1 representative came and opposed the opposition was

1 led, and I noticed on all the amendments, and I'm not
2 from Bossier Parish. I don't know how you all get
3 along one another over there, but I noticed on all
4 the amendments, all the white representatives voted
5 was against it, all the black representatives for it.
6 So, whenever you have a situation where you have
7 6711. I have them in the districts and you make a
8 decision solely on racial lines as in these
9 amendments. These amendments were made on racial
10 lines and the House pretty much followed the
11 leadership of the race that opposed it or the race
12 that supported your amendments. And that's a problem
13 with this state that doesn't lend us a favorable
14 image because the easiest thing to do is look at your
15 numbers and try to do even though it offends some
16 white colleagues or some black colleagues to try to
17 be close to that number as you possibly can get. Now,
18 I was here when Representative Jenkins had a young
19 man from the Democratic Party, the demographer, but I
20 had never spoke to him before that time and I did not
21 get the impression that there's only possible to
22 create 29 districts because I'm not a demographer,
23 but I can look at the maps and look at populations
24 and districts and see that I could create more than
25 29 districts. And I recall when I was here in 1990,

there was a big discussion about the creation of district. I think we end up having like 25 districts or 20 districts.

CEDRIC GLOVER: 27.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: 27. Then you created some districts between 2000 and 2011. 2011 created two districts. I don't know, I think you created a district after 2002 I think one district. But anyway, there's been a steady progress after the Voters Rights Act and after the United States Supreme Court cases to move toward parity of population black and white in this state and that should be the paramount challenge. And I thought when we passed this method to do this reapportion, it sounded really good and made it look real good nationwide because we said we're going to look at the Voters Right Act, Section 2. So, you look at safety section to serve Section 2 you're saying that I'm going to try to create districts to be consistent with the population, is that what you're saying and not defend fan of protective class of people.

[03:30:02]

But we didn't do that. I mean, we didn't intend to do it or the result, it's certainly is not there, and this -- your amendments, your bills present the

1 strongest argument against the success of House Bill
2 14 in the court. It's going to be very difficult for
3 a trial judge to sit there and hear that you had an
4 opportunity in that just area, I'm not even looking
5 at the whole state. I think some other demographers
6 probably looking at other parts of the state, and I'm
7 not in this to complain about the part of state. The
8 fact of the matter is, I was real satisfied with my
9 district, but I'm the only democrat in probably five
10 parishes where I come from. I'm the only black
11 representative in probably five, six, seven parishes.
12 So, I'm starting on an island, but I can understand
13 people all lead to Baton Rouge area, or the Monroe
14 area, Caddo area, Bossier that have population and
15 have contributed greatly to this body. Going back to
16 reconstruction, those populations from those areas
17 contribute. The only reason why I stopped
18 contributing because they cut the deal with Hayes and
19 took the federal troops out, and all of them left.
20 So, that showed race, it was only purely because of
21 race, they even not here. So, at some point, some
22 nice gentlemen, because of the effort of Martin
23 Luther King and got the attention of LBJ, he's the
24 only one who could have passed the Voters Right Act.
25 I don't think no other president, even Kennedy could

have passed. LBJ passed it. And he is from right down here, okay, in a solve. So, my point is, don't you find that when we make decisions based on race, we usually make the wrong decision.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: When we make a decision based on race, it opens us up, of criticism by the courts and everybody else. So, the question is why is it we got to have the courts tell us what to do? Now, I don't know what has be gone there were. For the most part, black folks' voter against the bill, I think 22, 5 of them voted for us, something like that. But if you just don't look at race, you look at numbers. You come to the mic and say, "Well, I'm against this because all other whites are against it," or "I'm for this because all the other blacks are for it." I voted oftentimes I make a decision inconsistent with the black caucus or the democratic party. Every session I find a bill that I have to go along with, with my republican colleagues. So, it's not all about what party it is, or what race you are, but not pass your amendment, put the question squarely to the courts. Are we going to allow racial decision to determine to make up the house representative of the State of Louisiana? Because

that's exactly what we'd be doing. Whether you can only create 30 districts, we know we can create 30, to create 34, 35. I saw a bill that created 32 black districts. No one pursued that bill, but it's not a bill, a submission by the Power Coalition that created 32 black districts. Unfortunately, we didn't have time because when you're dealing with and I can understand what you're saying. I had plenty awful opportunity to come visit and I was treated fairly, and the chairman was courteous to me. He dealt with my issues. As far as my area is concerned, I'm fine, but I have a bigger responsibility than just my area, and that's why all these people in your area have a bigger responsibility in keeping that district the same. We have to make the whole state look better, and you're trying to make a contribution to help the state be more consistent with its numbers, and I appreciate that. I think we're going to see you again in court. You'll be the witness. Thank you.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Carter. Members, what's the pledge of the committee?

CEDRIC GLOVER: May I answer?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure.

CEDRIC GLOVER: I promise to be brief, because this is something I have. It reminded me that I guess, consciously I have avoided acknowledging or stating over the course of my life, certainly my public one.

[03:34:59]

That's a term that in hearing Judge Carter's questions and comments throughout this process, he's referenced protected class or protected classes. I'm not a lawyer, but I'm knowledgeable of what the Voters Rights Act does and what it contains and how it evolved and what have you. Being that I was born three days before it was signed in the law, I was blessed to be a beneficiary of yet and the Civil Rights Act and a whole generation of folks who came before me. So, when growing up in 1970s and '80s Supreme Court, especially being amongst the biggest folks in my class, the idea of seeing myself through the lens of a protected class was something that never ever really I connected with because physically, there was nothing I ever had to fear so I didn't need to be protected from bullies or anybody else. I could take care of that business myself and kind of like the pig and enjoyed it as well. Then, in terms of any other engagement, I felt that I had an

1 opinion or a thought or an idea or a stand. I felt
2 more than capable of being able to effectively
3 express myself and either have my idea rise or fall
4 based on this merit, and not necessarily be driven
5 and dictated by the color of my skin. But the truth
6 of the matter is that I've gotten older, and I listen
7 to the wisdom of people like Judge Carter. It helps
8 me understand exactly why that legal concept actually
9 ended up having to be institutionalize of protective
10 classes, because absent that designation, the
11 willingness of the larger community, the dominant
12 community, the majority community is to not do what's
13 right or what's fair or what's proper and ultimately
14 what's constitutional on behalf of those folks who
15 end up having that designation. So, the fact that we
16 as Judge Carter just said, had representation until
17 the federal troops were taken out, then none. We got
18 it in trickles, but we're still on that path of
19 trying to get it to what it ought to be. And Mr.
20 Chairman, that's what this represents is a step
21 trying to get us to where it is that we ought to be.
22 We've never gotten there before except maybe in few
23 instances without some sort of external force and
24 push to get us there. This is an effort to try and
25 help us get a little bit closer to being able to look

after those folks that we otherwise would not give consideration to, and with that, I ask for your favorable passage.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: What's the motion of the committee? Mr. Vice Chair has made a motion that we move House Bill 24 favorable. The chair is making the substitute motion to voluntarily defer. Ms. Ammersbach will call the roll. A vote yes is to voluntarily defer the bill, a vote no, we will move onto the original motion. Ms. [INDISCERNIBLE 03:38:02].

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Vice chairman Duplessis?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Bouie?

REPRESENTATIVE BOUIE: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Wilford Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Deshotel? Representative Barnum?

REPRESENTATIVE BARNUM: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges?

REPRESENTATIVE HODGES: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Horton?

REPRESENTATIVE HORTON: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Ivey? Representative Jenkins? No. Representative Mike Johnson? Yes. Representative LaCombe? No. Representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE LYONS: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee?

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Yes.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: No.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: No. Nine yays, seven nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Nine yays, seven nays. and the bill is voluntarily deferred. Members, that concludes our agenda. This is going to be the last committee meeting we have so I do want to take special attention and thank staff. None of these could have been possible. Even regardless if you got your map from somebody else and adopted it, it could

not be possible without the staff that we've had and we've had unbelievable staff who had stayed very long hours to make sure that we can do our duties and have this process work. Ms. Patricia Lowrey-Dufour has worked extensively with myself and I know other members, and I cannot thank her enough for the work, absolutely. Ms. Lorie Luke is our staff attorney, has spent many, many long hours as well working. The only person who could beat me into the office every morning, Ms. Ammersbach. Ms. Ammersbach has worked extremely hard during this process. Then we recruited two other attorneys from other committees to help us because of the work. Both Catherine [PH 03:39:51] Zoran and Andy Smith, and so, I want to thank both of them publicly for the work that they've done.

CEDRIC GLOVER: Mr. Chairman, for history's sake, can we read young James' full name into the record?

[03:40:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, his name is -- who is my committee clerk who I was going to get to, John Harrington, our committee clerk from the Great City of Crowley, Louisiana, whose grandfather was a city judge for a long time, very respected member of our committee and we're very lucky to have John as our committee clerk as well. With that said, I think I've

1 covered everybody. Representative Carter makes a
2 motion that we adjourn without objection.
3 [03:40:26]
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSPERFECT

I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that the document "F895607-la-house-on-demand-video_0216_22_HG-3" is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate transcription from English to English.

Anders Nelson
Project Manager

April 27, 2022