GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

2022 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, HOUSE FLOOR

VOTE ON SB 744 and SB 745

FEBRUARY 17, 2022

Transcribed by:
Taura J. Vulcano, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242

1 (Transcribed from recorded audio file.)
2 SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come
3 back to order.
4 Members, we have a procedural matter
5 that we need to deal with, and the Chair is
6 going to ask -- well, first off, Senate
7 Bill 347, this was that Captive Insurance Bill
8 that we -- that we passed where we had the
9 Jeopardy moment with the questions. It's been
10 brought to the Chair's attention that there
11 actually are some technical adjustments that are
12 going to have to be made to that bill, so the
13 chair is going to order that the bill be
14 recalled from enrolling. The Chair is also
15 going to strike the enrollment order. And then
16 this is where I'll need unanimous consent -- or
17 I'll need to suspend to do a reconsideration.
18 The Chair is going to ask, without
19 objection, that the body -- actually, we bring
20 the bill back before us. So the Chair is
21 calling the bill back before us. That's Senate
22 Bill 347. And this is on the third reading.
23 The Chair is going to ask, without objection,
24 that the House reconsider the third reading by
25 which Senate Bill 347 was passed.

1 Is there any objection?
2 Hearing none, the Chair declares that
3 the House has reconsidered the third reading of
4 Senate Bill 347, so the bill would be before the
5 body for third reading. The Chair is going to
6 refer the bill to the Committee on Rules,
7 Calendar, and Operations of the House.
8 Representative Hall is recognized to
9 send forth the committee report.
10 The clerk will read.
11 THE CLERK: Representative Hall,
12 Redistricting Committee Report, Senate Bill 744,
13 Realign NC State Districts 2022, SCH22-4
14 Favorable.
15 SPEAKER MOORE: Senate Bill 744 is
16 added to this evening's calendar.
17 THE CLERK: Senate Bill 745, Realign
18 Congressional Districts 2022, CST22-3 Favorable.
19 SPEAKER MOORE: Senate Bill 745 is
20 added to this evening's calendar. Senate Bill
21 744. The clerk will read.
22 THE CLERK: Senators Hise, Newton and
23 Daniel. Senate Bill 744, A Bill to be Entitled
24 an Act to realign the North Carolina Senate
25 District Pursuant to the Order of the

1 North Carolina Supreme Court, Harper vs. Hall.
2 The General Assembly of North Carolina
3 Enacts.
4 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
5 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
6 debate the bill.
7 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, this is
8 the State Senate's proposed map. I did not draw
9 this map, and so I'm not sure how great I will
10 be at answering specific questions about it.
11 But I will say that the information I've been
12 given is the mean-median is within the Supreme
13 Court's prescribed frame and so is the
14 efficiency gap. And so I would ask you to
15 approve the bill.
16 Further discussion? Further debate?
17 If not, the question before the House is the
18 passage of Senate Bill 744 on its second
19 reading. Those in favor will vote aye; those
20 opposed will vote no.
21 The clerk will open the vote.
22 The gentleman from Wayne,
23 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,
24 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
25 Republican members.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
2 Mr. Speaker.
3 The following members have officially
4 designated me to announce a vote on their
5 behalf:
6 Representative Clampitt, aye.
7 Representative McNeeley, aye.
8 Representative Moss, aye.
9 Representative Riddell, aye.
10 Representative Yarborough, no.
11 SPEAKER MOORE: Is Representative Davis
12 off the floor? Okay. Representative Kyle Hall,
13 you're still --
14 The gentleman from Chatham,
15 Representative Reives, the House Minority
16 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
17 votes of the Democratic members.
18 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
19 Mr. Speaker.
20 And the following members have
21 authorized me to enter votes on their behalf:
22 Representative Aycock, no.
23 Representative Ager, no.
24 Representative Alexander, no.
25 Representative Brockman, no.

1 Representative Everett, no.
2 Representative Hunter, no.
3 Representative Insko, no.
4 Representative Lucas, no.
5 Representative Martin, no.
6 Representative Richardson, no.
7 Representative Terry, no.
8 Representative Turner, no.
9 SPEAKER MOORE: Members, the Chair had
10 saw Representative Kyle Hall, so I'd like to
11 give just a minute, since we're being flexible
12 under the COVID rules, for folks to come. So
13 let me -- we're going hang tight. We'll give
14 him an opportunity to record on the vote.
15 And also, Representative Quick. Is
16 Representative Quick off the floor,
17 Representative Reives? I noticed Representative
18 Quick has not voted. If you want to see if he's
19 going to vote or not.
20 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: I'm going to
21 see if I can find him because he was just
22 outside.
23 SPEAKER MOORE: Yeah. We'll hold it
24 open here for a second. I see Representative
25 Hall now. Good for you to show up.

(Pause.)

SPEAKER MOORE: I'm holding it open for you, Representative Quick. Go ahead. I'm not sure where you and Representative Hall were, but I'm glad you came in.

The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

67 having voted in the affirmative, 52 in negative, Senate Bill 744 passes its second reading. It will be read a third time.

THE CLERK: The General Assembly of North Carolina Enacts.

SPEAKER MOORE: Question before the House is the passage of Senate Bill 744 in its third reading. Those in favor will say aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

Those opposed no.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

SPEAKER MOORE: The ayes appear to have it. The ayes do have it. Senate Bill 744 having passed its third reading is ordered enrolled.

Senate Bill 745, the clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senators Hise, Newton and Daniel. Senate Bill 745, a Bill to Be Entitled

1 an Act to Realign the North Carolina
2 Congressional District Pursuant to the Order of
3 the North Carolina Supreme Court in Harper vs.
4 Hall.
5 The General Assembly of North Carolina
6 Enacts.
7 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
8 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
9 debate the bill.
10 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you,
11 Mr. Speaker.
12 Members, the map before you was drawn
13 to comply with the Supreme Court's order, and I
14 believe it does comply with the Supreme Court's
15 order. It contains what we believe will be four
16 of the most highly competitive congressional
17 districts in the country. According to a
18 redistricting expert named Dave Wasserman, there
19 have been only 19 congressional districts in the
20 country drawn during this year's ongoing
21 redistricting cycle with an election result in
22 the Biden-Trump 2020 race with a difference of
23 only 5 percent. So only 19.
24 The map that you have before you today
25 will make North Carolina home to four additional

highly competitive congressional districts. The map scores well within the ranges for measuring mean-median and efficiency gap as announced by the Supreme Court in their opinion. No county in this map is split more than one time, and the map has 21 municipality splits that are not just a town that crosses county lines. So true municipality splits, there were only 21 across this entire congressional map.

Members, I ask for your support.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Durham, Representative Hawkins, is recognized to send forth an amendment.

The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Representative Hawkins moves to amend a bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Durham is recognized to debate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that explanation.

I'd like to put forth an amendment to change these maps to make them what we -- as we see more fair because we believe that North Carolinians deserve free and fair elections.

1 We've talked about that a lot. And, you know,
2 what we saw and the North Carolina Supreme Court
3 found is that the maps don't meet their
4 standards truly.
5 And so we believe that in -- starting
6 in the fall we were given an opportunity to
7 right the wrongs of previously maps, but even in
8 the ones that were reenacted that were just
9 enacted by the Senate and committee and voted on
10 in the Senate, they did not meet what we believe
11 is a good, fair opportunity for North
12 Carolinians.
13 And so this amendment is one that we've
14 consistently talked about since the fall, and so
15 that shows our consistent approach and
16 commitment to bipartisan fairness, but
17 unfortunately, the map we are going to vote on,
18 of course, falls completely short on a
19 required -- what the Court requires. And most
20 importantly, it falls short of what
21 North Carolinians deserve.
22 I'm offering an amendment that would
23 address these concerns and provide voters an
24 opportunity to vote for candidates and
25 elections, again, that are free and fair.

1 This amendment, as analyzed by the
2 Princeton Gerrymandering Project, it received a
3 fairness grade of A. You just don't get much
4 better than that. The Gerrymandering Project
5 analysis found that this amended map will give a
6 partisan advantage of zero percent neither -- of
7 neither Democrats or Republicans would benefit
8 from the map that I'm proposing.
9 The efficiency gaps, as you well may
10 know, they measure how many wasted votes a
11 district could produce, a measure of how stacked
12 the deck for one party over the other a map is.
13 An efficiency gap of more than 8 is considered a
14 red flag. For this map that we're putting
15 forward, it would have an efficiency gap of 5.8
16 that still favors Republicans but falls well
17 within the reasonable parameters. And so we
18 believe that this is a 6-5 with a -- with 3
19 competitive seats.
20 And so one thing that's also good about
21 this amendment is that we that were supposed to
22 split voting districts only when necessary. My
23 amended map would only split voter districts 14
24 times.
25 We were also supposed to make an effort

to draw compact districts guided by the Reock and Polsby-Popper scores. My amended map will score a .45 on the Reock metric. My amended map will score .36 on the Polsby-Popper.

These indicate a more compact map, which would be our goal, which should be everyone's goal in this Assembly. We also wanted to have a map that preserves communities of interest. Those who are on the committee and probably those across this body know that that's something I'm personally passionate about, which this would do.

As Representative Szoka talked about in committee, he pointed out in committee that we have to have these communities of interest together, such as Hoke and Cumberland. It goes past the stats, as he said, and talks about the people. Those people in those communities understand and commute and work in those areas, and they belong together, which this map accomplishes.

This map would ensure that the Triad, one of the major areas that has brought in, I believe, 15,000 jobs recently in this hub for activity, that it would stay together. Again,

1 people work, live and play across those areas,
2 and this map would keep them together. And it
3 would also create a Sand- -- a true Sandhills
4 district. Again, that is pretty consistent with
5 what people across the state want.
6 And so lastly, the upside, of course,
7 of this map is that we have a chance to get this
8 right so that we don't have to litigate
9 throughout the decade. One thing that I know
10 for sure with everyone in this body, especially
11 those who have been around for a while, we want
12 to do this once and for the decade. And so I
13 hope that we can all stand on that premise of
14 moving forward in that direction. We do not
15 need to go through another round of costly
16 litigation. Because if this amendment is moved
17 forward, it will settle it and allow us to have,
18 again, the maps that we want and the ones that
19 people expect of a body such as the
20 North Carolina General Assembly.
21 And then lastly, of course, this will
22 remedy the issue of partisan gerrymandering in
23 our congressional map. And, of course, I vote
24 you -- I ask you to vote yes. And so I hope
25 that my explanation of this amendment is clear,

1 and I hope that you will vote yes because we
2 all, at least in this body in the North Carolina
3 House, know how to work together to solve big
4 things just as we did with our own maps
5 yesterday.
6 Thank you.
7 SPEAKER MOORE: And if -- I would ask,
8 Members, this is on the amendment at this point.
9 If members have their lights on to debate the
10 overall bill, if you'll turn those off, and then
11 we will come back to you on the -- on the
12 overall bill.
13 The gentleman from Caldwell,
14 Representative Hall, is recognized to debate the
15 amendment.
16 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you,
17 Mr. Speaker.
18 Members, I'm going to ask you to oppose
19 the amendment. The amendment would result in
20 five more municipality splits across the map.
21 Additionally, the map that I put before
22 you today, it has more competitive districts
23 than the amendment would, so overall, it's a
24 more competitive map, and I believe it better
25 complies with the Court's order. And therefore

I would respectfully ask you to vote no on the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate on the amendment.

If not, the question before the House is the adoption of Amendment A-1 sent forward by Representative Hawkins. Those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote no.

The clerk will open the vote.

The gentleman from Wayne, Majority Leader Representative Bell, is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the Republican members.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The following members have officially designated me to announce a vote on their behalf:

Representative Clampitt, no.

Representative McNeeley, no.

Representative Moss, no.

Representative Riddell, no.

Representative Yarborough, no.

Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from

1 Chatham, the House Minority Leader,
2 Representative Reives is recognized to announce
3 the proxy votes of the Democratic members.
4 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
5 Mr. Speaker.
6 The following members have authorized
7 me to enter votes on their behalf:
8 Representative Aycock, yes.
9 Representative Ager, aye.
10 Representative Alexander, aye.
11 Representative Brockman, aye.
12 Representative Everett, aye.
13 Representative Hunter, aye.
14 Representative Insko, aye.
15 Representative Lucas, aye
16 Representative Martin, aye.
17 Representative Richardson, aye.
18 Representative Terry, aye.
19 Representative Turner, aye.
20 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
21 machine and record the vote.
22 51 having voted in the affirmative and
23 68 in the negative, the amendment is not
24 adopted.
25 We're now back on debate or discussion

1 on the bill. The lady from Guilford,
2 Representative Harrison, is recognized to debate
3 the bill.
4 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
5 Mr. Speaker.
6 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I --
7 boy, I am -- I'm really not sure how this map is
8 going to pass constitutional muster.
9 And I will address first the Guilford
10 County situation that Representative --
11 Representative Hawkins alluded to.
12 So I appreciate the fact -- and I
13 mentioned this in the committee -- that Guilford
14 is no longer split into three different
15 congressional districts but only two. But these
16 are very problematic splits because it splits
17 Greensboro and Guilford County into two
18 districts that are not at all aligned.
19 One, the western part of the county
20 goes down to Harnett. The eastern part of the
21 county is going down to Cabarrus, running
22 through Davidson and Rowan.
23 It's -- we didn't have a -- we did not
24 have a hearing, a public hearing in Guilford,
25 which I think was a major oversight back in the

1 November draw. We were the biggest city that
2 did not -- Guilford County is the biggest county
3 that didn't have one. But what we heard in the
4 committee meetings or the hearings that were
5 held in Forsyth and in Alamance and then after
6 the map was drawn about how important it was
7 that the Triad stay together. There's so many
8 common interests amongst the two counties of
9 Forsyth and Guilford.
10 This map splits the three major
11 municipalities in that two-county cluster and
12 puts them in three congressional districts. So
13 Winston-Salem and Forsyth are now heading out
14 to -- all the way to Ashe and Watauga,
15 Greensboro is up in Rockingham down to Harnett,
16 and High Point is running down to Cabarrus.
17 This seems unacceptable to me, and I
18 noticed a number of major municipal splits. And
19 maybe there are fewer municipal splits, but they
20 sure are splitting major municipalities in the
21 state.
22 There's also -- the other major splits
23 are the -- sorry, I'm going to need my glasses.
24 My eyes are getting old. Excuse me.
25 So you've got the -- you've got the

1 fast-growing suburbs of Raleigh in southern Wake
2 County. These are Apex, Holly Springs,
3 Fuquay-Varina, and puts them in a district that
4 stretches from Duplin County, extremely rural
5 area, with very different interests. The city
6 of Cary is split. You've got Charlotte split in
7 half, half of it staying -- wholly contained
8 within Mecklenburg, but the other half in a
9 district that stretches into Rutherford County
10 where there are very different interests. The
11 city of Greenville is split in half; Goldsboro
12 is split in half.
13 The Sandhills is problematic.
14 Representative Szoka mentioned this in
15 committee. You've got Fort Bragg in two
16 different congressional districts. You've got
17 the Sandhill district split in two different
18 congressional districts.
19 So I raised this issue in committee,
20 and the response I got was, well, this meets the
21 efficiency gap analysis and mean-median
22 analysis, which are the two metrics of the
23 multiple metrics that were offered by the
24 Supreme Court to use in analyzing the
25 competitiveness of districts.

1 So I took advantage of the recess to
2 get a crash course in metric analysis, and what
3 I found out is that it's -- you can get very
4 different results depending on what you use as
5 the data.
6 And so I guess I have a question for
7 the bill sponsor -- actually, he's managing the
8 bill. He's not the bill sponsor, but maybe he
9 can answer it, if he would yield for a question,
10 please.
11 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Hall,
12 does the gentleman yield a question?
13 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.
14 SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.
15 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
16 And I hope I'm asking this right because I'm
17 still sort of new to understanding the issue.
18 But as I understand it, when you're
19 using these analyses, that it depends on what
20 data you're using. And I'm just wondering what
21 data were you using when you're running these
22 analyses?
23 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: So the data that
24 we were using in running the analysis was an
25 ensemble of 12 elections that was -- that were

1 used by one of the plaintiff's own experts in
2 the lawsuit, and that's one of the reasons we
3 chose to use that because, again, it was the
4 elections that the plaintiff's own expert
5 decided to use.
6 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up?
7 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.
8 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman yields
9 for follow-up question?
10 He yields.
11 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: So you used
12 those 12 races in all of your analyses, those 12
13 races? You didn't just use like one race in one
14 of the -- you used all 12 races in all of the
15 analyses?
16 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Representative
17 Harrison, that's my understanding of how the
18 various metrics were calculated, yes.
19 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: If I can have
20 a follow-up and hopefully --
21 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman yield?
22 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.
23 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And so was it
24 the same D-R split that the General Assembly was
25 using or --

1 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Again, that is my
2 understanding, yes.
3 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Is there any
4 way we can see this analysis?
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I
6 apologize. I was talking --
7 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I'm sorry. I
8 just --
9 SPEAKER MOORE: He'll keep yielding.
10 Go head. Just keep asking him questions.
11 That's fine. He'll tell me when he doesn't want
12 to yield anymore.
13 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.
14 SPEAKER MOORE: Keep going. That's
15 fine.
16 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: So,
17 Representative Harrison, I'm told it's in the
18 stat pack that was handed out in committee, and
19 it should be on your dashboard now.
20 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
21 that. Thank you.
22 If I could continue the debate.
23 SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor.
24 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
25 And I'm close to being finished.

1 So while I appreciate that this was
2 represented as a potential 6-4-4 map, there are
3 some that say that it's really a 10-4 map in a
4 good GOP year. There -- it looks like more on
5 -- from my perspective, it's more like an 8-3-2
6 map even in a good year for Democrats.
7 I will say that David Wasserman -- I
8 appreciate Chair Hall mentioning him earlier in
9 his debate -- that he tweeted that it's still --
10 this map is still quite a gerrymander. In
11 twenty- -- using the 2020 statistics, it would
12 be a 9-5 map but likely 10-4 in 2022. 10-4.
13 That's the same map that got -- the 10-4 split
14 was a map that got struck down as a partisan
15 gerrymander. He calls this map an extreme
16 partisan gerrymander.
17 I don't know how this passes Court
18 muster. I encourage you to vote no.
19 Thank you.
20 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
21 Cumberland, Representative Zsoka,
22 is recognized to debate the bill.
23 REPRESENTATIVE ZSOKA: Thank you,
24 Mr. Speaker.
25 I'm going to repeat some of what I said

in committee for those of you who didn't have the opportunity to hear me.

First of all, this map meets the requirements of the Court. Based on that, I should vote for it. What I feel has happened, though, is that the Court -- the judicial system has become enamored of statics. We're not statics. I don't say welcome Mr. One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six. I call you by your name; likewise, you call me John.

We're trying to -- I feel like we've gone down in -- Alice in Wonderland, down the rabbit hole, and we're in this land where things appear to be one thing and they end up being something else.

I actually have a master's degree in applied statistics, so I do know what I'm talking about when it comes to statistics.

Many of the complaints I've heard about this and the other maps have been about communities of interest. My biggest problem with this map is a community of interest in my community, Fort Bragg. The largest military installation in the world, over 53,000 active-duty service members serving at

1 Fort Bragg each and every day. And you add
2 around 60,000 retirees around that, with their
3 spouses and dependants and everybody else, that
4 is a very large community of interest.
5 The counties, including Cumberland,
6 around us have wanted for years to not be
7 represented by more than one US congressman.
8 We've had up to three congressmen in the past,
9 and they've all done a great job: Richard
10 Hudson; Price, he did a good job. But the fact
11 of the matter is that when you have a community
12 of interest of hundreds of thousands of people
13 centered around a military base, which is the
14 main economic driver for that region of the
15 state, there's a military term for it, it's
16 called "unity of command," one person in charge.
17 We haven't had that unity of effort,
18 that unity of command in the United States
19 Congress. That's what I want. That's what the
20 people in my county want. That's what people in
21 my district want. Yet, in this map we don't see
22 that.
23 We have a map that's compliant with
24 what the Court wants, which is this fasciation
25 with statistics; yet, the people in my community

1 aren't getting what they want because the Court
2 in their big -- and I'm not an attorney, but in
3 their big decision said, well, you have to do
4 all these Polsby-Popper, you have to do this,
5 you have to do that, you have to do the other
6 thing. And somehow this fascination with
7 numbers translates to fairness. I don't believe
8 that for an instant.
9 I think it's a great case of showing
10 judicial overreach and trying to take the
11 humanness out of what we do. Look, I don't
12 agree with everybody in here. I frequently
13 disagree with people on this side of the aisle.
14 I frequently disagree with people on that side
15 of the aisle, because we're human beings; we're
16 not numbers.
17 I'm not going to vote for this map, but
18 it's not because it doesn't meet the Court's
19 criteria, because it does. I spent over 20
20 years in the Army wearing the -- serving my
21 country. I came up here to serve my
22 constituents. I came up here to serve
23 Fort Bragg and those active-duty soldiers who
24 they live in Cumberland county and surrounding
25 counties, but most of them vote other places for

a variety of reasons.

But I feel in my heart of hearts, I'm up here to represent them, to do the best that I can for the Fort Bragg Community, the greater Fort Bragg community, as well as all the civilians, including myself now a civilian, who live in Cumberland County.

My biggest gripe isn't the fact that the map meets the statistics. My biggest gripe is that we've been forced into a map which just doesn't relate to reality. It doesn't relate to my reality where I live, where the people I represent live. We're forced to this, and it's completely compliant.

So you should vote for this map. I just can't. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Robeson, Representative Graham, is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members, I'll be brief. I just want to convey some of the same sentiments that's been heard today. But I think my constituents down in the Sandhills would be very disappointed if I

1 didn't stand here and advocate for Sandhills to
2 have representation that looks like the
3 Sandhills.
4 You know, for too long the counties
5 down in Sandhills -- and if you want to look at
6 your map, you can figure that out -- which is a
7 diverse part of our state: white, black,
8 American Indian, Hispanic, just a great cultural
9 base down in that area. But you know what, for
10 years the Sandhills have been sliced, diced,
11 packed to where we don't even understand, you
12 know, who are we, what are we now in terms of
13 the political arena.
14 But I can tell you this, folks down in
15 Sandhills, they have good common sense. I'm not
16 going to talk to you about statistics. I'm
17 going to talk to you about the will of our
18 people, not just my culture. I'm talking about
19 the people in those rural communities want
20 someone who can understood their need,
21 understand their desires, understand their
22 economy, understand their culture, and that's
23 all they're asking for.
24 And here again, we have an opportunity
25 to do something good for the Sandhills of this

state. You know, we're talking about farmers. We're talking about business owners who want a representative who can relate to their needs, and this does not do that. Now, this is common sense.

You know, Sandhills has been split towards Charlotte. What does the Sandhills have in common with Charlotte? No disrespect for the folks in Charlotte. But now we're looking at Sandhills being split again, going up to Davidson County and Union County. I have no problems with those counties. Davidson is a beautiful county. Union county is a thriving county, and folks who represent that county do a good job representing them on this floor. But the Sandhills are the Sandhills: farming communities, rural communities, hardworking people who want representation.

You know, I had an understanding last evening that we were trying to move in that direction and giving the Sandhills respectability in terms of a region of our state, and then we come back here today, and I just heard that, you know, we potentially could look at 10-4 congressional makeup.

1 Ladies and gentlemen, North Carolina is
2 not a 10-4 state. We are a purple state. Last
3 night it was 7-5-2. Now it's 10-4. I don't
4 know where we're getting that math from, but
5 it's not fair to the Sandhills.
6 You know, folks don't worry about this
7 constitutional stuff that we're talking about up
8 here. They worry about those core values,
9 family issues. Forget the constitution when it
10 comes to the farmer out there working on the
11 farm or the person working in that factory
12 trying to make ends meet. They want someone
13 that they can trust and someone that can
14 represent them in a meaningful way.
15 We have hardly -- and we've just talked
16 about this -- no communities of interests,
17 neighborhoods of interest or counties of
18 interest. It's clustered together. So, you
19 know, over the years -- and this is my second
20 time going through redistricting. We've seen
21 what we've gone through in the past ten years:
22 court battle, court battle, disagreements over
23 the years. We know what unites us. Our
24 cultures unite us. Our interests unite us. And
25 what we have before us today is very

1 disrespectful to the Sandhills portion of our
2 state. It's like you're irrelevant. You don't
3 matter. We'd rather have you cracked and packed
4 and sent in different directions. So I'm not
5 going to support this.
6 One of the reasons -- another thing
7 that is very important to me is my culture and
8 having someone that's going to fight in
9 Washington for Lumbee recognition. For
10 125 years we've been fighting and getting lip
11 service, and I think it's time for that to end.
12 Ladies and gentlemen, you know, the
13 Sandhills has voted historically for Republicans
14 and Democrats. I'm standing here as a Democrat
15 in my district, Robeson County. Donald Trump
16 won my district. I won my district. And some
17 of your other representatives here, some of you
18 -- some of your constituents voted for Obama,
19 but then they turned around and voted for you.
20 I'll call out my good friend here,
21 Representative Pierce, over in Scotland County.
22 Folks in Scotland County and Hoke County voted
23 for him but voted for Senator Tillis. So, you
24 know, our folks know and understand how to cast
25 a vote, and I think it's unfair that we would

1 stand here today breaking up our communities of
2 interest. And that's -- that's not -- that's
3 not good for our state; it's not good for our
4 communities.
5 And I would say to you, let's go back
6 to -- let's go back to the drawing table. Let's
7 do this over. We should do that. We should do
8 that because rural communities understand rural
9 communities. People understand each other. And
10 I would ask you, let's not support this. It's
11 not fair. It does the Sandhills communities an
12 injustice, and I think we deserve better than
13 that. And I think the will of the people needs
14 to be heard today, and this is not the will of
15 the people.
16 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
17 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
18 Further debate?
19 If not, the question before the House
20 is the passage of Senate Bill 745 on its second
21 reading. Those in favor will vote aye; those
22 opposed will vote no.
23 The clerk will open the vote.
24 The gentleman from Wayne,
25 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,

is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the Republican members.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The following members have officially designated me to announce a vote on their behalf:

Representative Clampitt, aye.

Representative McNeeley, aye.

Representative Moss, aye.

Representative Riddell, aye.

Representative Yarborough, aye.

Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Chatham, Representative Reives, the House Minority Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the Democratic members.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The following members have allowed me to enter votes on their behalf:

Representative Aycock, no.

Representative Ager, no.

Representative Alexander, no.

Representative Brockman, no.

Representative Everett, no.

Representative Hunter, no.

Representative Insko, no.

Representative Lucas, no.

Representative Martin, no.

Representative Richardson, no.

Representative Terry, no.

Representative Turner, no.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

66 having voted in the affirmative and 53 in the negative, Senate Bill 745 passed its second reading and will be read a third time.

THE CLERK: The General Assembly of North Carolina Enacts.

SPEAKER MOORE: The question before the House is the passage of Senate Bill 745 on its third reading. Those in favor will say, aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER MOORE: Those opposed, no.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

SPEAKER MOORE: The ayes appear to have it. The ayes do it. Senate Bill 745, having passed its third reading, is ordered enrolled.

Stand at ease momentarily.

(Recess.)

SPEAKER MOORE: I want to take a moment -- the staff's not here, but if the body would give me a few moments. I think it's appropriate to recognize and -- well, I see Erika back -- I see a couple back in the back. I just want to tell you the hours and hours of work that our central staff, the clerk's office, of course, the sergeant-at-arms, but our central staff have been putting in working through this process, both in the first round and then this latest round, under a very tight deadline that we were given to work through that, to really undertake, to have a process that went before us.

And I would submit that whether you voted for the maps or not or liked them, you got to respect the hardworking staff that we have who put the hours in to do this. I would ask my colleagues to join me in showing our appreciation to our staff for their hard work.

(Applause.)

SPEAKER MOORE: So we have -- we have concluded our business at this time. It is -- and so now in terms of the process, these maps

will be submitted to the Court tomorrow, well in time for the deadline that was put in place. And the Chair is informed by all of the -- by staff and by the individuals that all the maps have scored and met the criteria that the Court laid out, so those will all be put in. So we'll be awaiting any response there.

But we will remain in session, but with -- I don't know of anything that would be calendared for next week. We'll go back to the same process where if something -- if it does appear that this General Assembly needs to take up any action that we give sufficient notice for everyone. But, frankly, I don't see anything happening next week. But I just -- we're in sort of some new territory here, folks, so we'll just have to see what happens, but that's the -- that's the plan. So there's no more business to do this evening or this week, but we will -- and we'll see where we are next week.

But I do want to thank -- I do want to thank every member of this House. I know that this process has been -- the hours have been long here, the process is tough. It can be very tedious. And, inherently, these can be

difficult subjects to discuss. And I certainly want to thank members on both sides of the aisle for the candor and the ability to disagree without being disagreeable when that was but to work together, and I'm extremely proud of the way the State House maps passed on a strong bipartisan basis yesterday, but just very proud of all the members of this House and this General Assembly. And I just want each one -- each and every one of you to know I appreciate what you do in your service to the State of North Carolina.

So with that we'll go to notices and announcements. If the body would please come to order, we have some notices and announcements.

(Notices and announcements not transcribed by reporter.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF BURKE

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR, do hereby certify that the transcription of the recorded General Assembly of North Carolina 2022 Legislative Session, House Floor vote on SB 744 and SB 745, held on February 17, 2022, was taken down by me stenographically to the best of my ability and thereafter transcribed under my supervision; and that the foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true and accurate transcription of said recording.

Signed this the 19th day of February 2022.

Taura J. Vulcano

TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR