IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA—MONROE DIVISION

PHILIP CALLAIS, LLOYD PRICE,)
BRUCE ODELL, ELIZABETH ERSOFF,	
ALBERT CAISSIE, DANIEL WEIR,	
JOYCE LACOUR, CANDY CARROLL	
PEAVY, TANYA WHITNEY, MIKE	
JOHNSON, GROVER JOSEPH REES,	
ROLFE MCCOLLISTER,	
) Case No. 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS
Plaintiffs,	
V.) District Judge David C. Joseph
) Circuit Judge Carl E. Stewart
NANCY LANDRY, IN HER OFFICIAL) District Judge Robert R. Summerhays
CAPACITY AS LOUISIANA	
SECRETARY OF STATE,) Magistrate Judge Kayla D. McClusky
D 0 1)
Defendant.	

THE PARTIES' DESIGNATIONS OF THE 2024 FIRST LEGISLATIVE SESSION

COME NOW Plaintiffs Philip Callais, Lloyd Price, Bruce Odell, Elizabeth Ersoff, Albert Caissie, Daniel Weir, Joyce LaCour, Candy Carroll Peavy, Tanya Whitney, Mike Johnson, Grover Joseph Rees, and Rolfe McCollister (collectively, "Plaintiffs") by and through counsel and designate the following:

January 15, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing		
Start	End	
Attorney General Murrill:		
36:1	37:1	
Attorney General Murrill, Rep. Marcelle:		
43:22	45:14	
Attorney General Murrill:		
48:13	49:7	
Rep. Farnum, Attorney General Murrill:		
52:14	53:15	
Rep. Carter:		
57:11	57:14	
Attorney General Murrill:		

61:20	62:12
Attorney General Murrill:	
62:24	63:5
Attorney General Murrill:	
67:17	67:24
Attorney General Murrill:	
76:12	76:22

January 17, 2024 Senate Floor Session		
Start	End	
Sen. Womack, Sen. Morris:		
3:19	8:6	
Sen. Morris, Sen. Womack:		
8:21	9:8	
Sen. Womack:		
12:4	12:9	
Sen. Carter:		
15:14	17:5	
Sen. Duplessis:		
21:8	21:25	
Sen. Pressly:		
22:7	23:25	

January 18, 2024 House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing		
Start	End	
Sen. Womack:		
5:8	5:12	
Sen. Womack:		
6:25	8:5	
Rep. Marcelle, Sen. Womack:		
9:9	9:18	
Rep. Boyd, Sen. Womack:		
13:6	13:18	
Rep. Beaullieu, Sen. Womack:		
26:12	27:3	
Rep. Beaullieu, Sen. Womack:		
27:21	28:4	

Rep. Lyons:		
75:24	76:21	
Rep. Newell:		
89:8	89:21	
Rep. Marcelle:		
101:08	101:16	
Sen. Womack:		
121:19	122:1	

January 19, 2024 House Floor Session		
Start	End	
Rep. Beaullieu:		
4:15	8:10	
Rep. Amedee, Rep. Beaullieu:		
9:3	9:8	

January 19, 2024 Senate Floor Session				
Start End				
Sen. Morris, Sen. Womack:				
5:14	7:4			
Sen. Cathey:				
8:7	8:18			
Sen. Luneau:				
10:5	10:9			
Sen. Carter:				
10:13	10:17			

Dated this 7th day of April, 2024

PAUL LOY HURD, APLC

/s/ Paul Loy Hurd
Paul Loy Hurd
Louisiana Bar No. 13909
Paul Loy Hurd, APLC
1896 Hudson Circle, Suite 5
Monroe, Louisiana 71201
Tel.: (318) 323-3838
paul@paulhurdlawoffice.com
Attorney for Plaintiffs

GRAVES GARRETT GREIM LLC

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Edward D. Greim Edward D. Greim Missouri Bar No. 54034 Admitted Pro Hac Vice Jackson Tyler Missouri Bar No. 73115 Admitted Pro Hac Vice Matthew Mueller Missouri Bar No. 70263 Admitted Pro Hac Vice Katherine Graves Missouri Bar No. 74671 Admitted Pro Hac Vice GRAVES GARRETT GREIM LLC 1100 Main Street, Suite 2700 Kansas City, Missouri 64105

Tel.: (816) 256-3181 Fax: (816) 256-5958

edgreim@gravesgarrett.com jtyler@gravesgarrett.com mmueller@gravesgarrett.com kgraves@gravesgarrett.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that, on this 7th day of April, 2024, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which gives notice of filing to all counsel of record.

/s/ Edward D. Greim Edward D. Greim



PohlmanUSA® Court Reporting and Litigation Services

House Governmental Affairs Committee Hearing
-Audio Transcription

January 15, 2024

Phillip Callais, et al.

VS.

Nancy Landry

2.5

Page 34

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: That's the one that she looked at though, that she rejected? MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Well, I mean -- and -- and also there have been other plans --REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: -- that have been submitted by plaintiffs to the court. REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And -- and would you say that Act 5 did not meet the redistricting criteria? MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Representative Gadberry --REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: I know. You're not (inaudible 0:43:45) --MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: That is a -- that is a legal matter that is currently the subject of litigation in the Middle District, and again, much more appropriately addressed by our chief legal officer. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. We can let our attorney general handle that one. REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. Thank you. MS. LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. Lowrey. Members, as -- as you all were just -- got a --

got a teaser from Representative Gadberry, we have our

attorney general here with us, Ms. -- Ms. Liz Murrill.

She's going to join us and give us an update on the

2.4

2.0

2.1

Page 36

The last time redistricting, in the 1990s, it -- it was -- when the second majority/minority map was drawn, we ended up in litigation for a decade. So there is no guarantee that when you do this again, we won't still be in litigation. But we are in litigation now.

The District Court judge has conducted a fact-finding mission - that's what will -- what always happens - and made fact findings regarding the map. She issued an injunction. That injunction is not currently in effect for reasons that I can explain to you, but I think the bottom line is it is not currently in effect because the deadlines for the election that it enjoined are -- are over.

The courts, nevertheless, have told us to draw a new map, and they have indicated that we have a deadline to do that or Judge Dick will draw the map for us. So you have an opportunity now to go back and draw the map again. And -- and I think that it is not an easy task because the United States Supreme Court has not made it an easy task. They've given you some directives that seem to be -- to not give you a lot of clear lines for doing your job. I -- I apologize on their behalf for -- but, you know, we tried.

I mean, I am defending that map, and so you won't hear me say that I believe that that map violated

Page 35

litigation. And I see Ms. Murrill has a familiar face with her, so I'd like to welcome back to the House of

Frieman. Welcome, welcome, Mr. Frieman.

MR. FRIEMAN: Thank you, Chair. Thank you,
members. It's -- I'm glad to be back. And sitting on
this side of the table is a familiar place --

Representatives former colleague Representative Larry

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah.

MR. FRIEMAN: -- for myself as well. So thank you for having me.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: If you wouldn't mind, everyone, and introduce yourself for the committee, and then it's all yours.

MS. MURRILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. It's great to be with you today as your new attorney general. I'm Liz Murrill. I also have with me Tom Jones who is the new director of the civil division and has been involved in the litigation. And now, chief deputy -- almost chief deputy, assuming you confirm him, is Larry Frieman. So that'll be before you soon, too.

I -- I -- I want to tell you that redistricting is hard. I'm not going to tell you this is easy. I -- I think that you did a -- you did the best job you could before. We've been in litigation.

Page 37

the redistricting criteria. I'm defending that map, but I will defend your new map if you draw a new map. So, you know, it's an act of the legislature. My job is to defend the work of the legislature, and I will do that to the very best of my ability.

I think that the difficulty is that in the Merrill v. Milligan case, which was the Alabama litigation that preceded ours, the Supreme Court issued an opinion. And it says that in a Section 2 disparate impact claim, which is different really from the work that you did -- you did your work. You did it in good faith. But they can -- they -- the plaintiffs will go to court, and they will make a disparate impact claim, and that's what gets litigated.

That has nothing to do with whether your intent was nefarious or not. Everyone can have had the right intent and followed the rules as they believed they were given to them, and go to court. And the court can still say, "Under Section 2, there's a disparate impact. And because there's a disparate impact, you have to go back and do it again, or I will do it for you."

And that is -- that is the short version of what Judge Dick has held and what has not been overturned by any court that we have brought it before,

Page 42 Page 44 that core retention is the part that the court has given 2 2 the least amount of attention to in this process now, So, you know, the -- the -- the court -- the 3 that once you are trying to redraw the map, I think that judge, whoever that judge may be, has an enormous amount core retention takes -- is -- becomes a less important of control over how much testimony is allowed and by 5 factor under Merrill v. Milligan. whom, and -- and how much time we will have to do that. 6 REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you. That was all very, very compressed when we litigated this right after the map was passed. We have not had REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, 8 Representative Thomas. Representative Marcelle. any other fact finding because we haven't had a trial on 9 9 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Let me the merits. I have raised an objection to that because 10 start by congratulating you. I don't know if I should 10 I think that you are entitled to have a trial on the 11 11 say congratulations or condolences. I'm not really merits, but the courts have not accepted those arguments 12 sure. Congratulations. 12 at this point. 13 MS. MURRILL: Well, I asked for the job, so 13 They have told us to go back and draw the map, 14 14 thank you. and they have given us a deadline. So, you know, I am 15 15 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Let -- let me making the same arguments that I would make on the new 16 16 just go over a couple of things that you said, and -map. But at the -- at the same time, you know, the --17 and so I can be clear in what you're -- what you're 17 the courts haven't given us a lot of safe harbor to go 18 telling us today. Number one, you said you're going to 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. 19 defend the map, Act 5, that they presented because that 20 20 is your job to do so, correct? MS. MURRILL: -- the rest of this case. 21 They've said, "Go do this." 21 MS. MURRILL: Yes. 22 22 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And so --REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So it's -- it -- it 23 MS. MURRILL: I am defending it now. 23 is a fact that we do have six congressional districts in 24 2.4 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Correct. Because Louisiana? That is --25 25 that's -- that's what we hired you to do, to defend us, MS. MURRILL: It is. Page 43 Page 45 1 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- a fact, right? 1 right? And if we pass another map, you'll defend that 2 map as well? 2 Is -- is it also a fact that a third of that -- the 3 3 MS. MURRILL: That's correct. population is African American? 4 4 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: The other thing that MS. MURRILL: Approximately, based on the 5 data. I would also point out that 50 percent are women. 5 I -- I -- I -- I -- I heard you say was this is a 6 I mean, there are other -- there are other population, 6 -- the judge has fact-finding matters. Can you kind of 7 elaborate on what that means? Is that -- that's based you know, and gender and differences -- like, that's why 8 8 upon the testimony that was presented by the plaintiffs; Section 2 has never been -- I mean, it is expressly 9 9 is that accurate? And -- and the -- and the defense, stated in Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act that this 10 10 is not an act of proportionate dividing. That is not obviously, she took both -- both matters into 11 permitted under Section 2. And so we can't just take 11 consideration when she was doing her fact finding. 12 that number and say that's -- that's how we do this, 12 MS. MURRILL: She did. That doesn't mean I 13 13 agree with them. because it's not that simple and that's actually not 14 14 permitted under the law. REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. So --15 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So -- so it's not 15 MS. MURRILL: And I -- and I think that it's 16 permitted to say that we have six congressional 16 also a product of -- this is part of what's frustrating, 17 districts, and of those six congressional districts, we 17 I think, for the legislature when it goes into 18 -- we talk about community interests, I think was one of 18 litigation because people can -- like, experts, for 19 them. So do you believe that all five of the other 19 example, that are hired by the plaintiffs, no matter who 20 districts has all the community interests impacted in 20 they are -- this could happen on the new map. Right? 21 those, and African American districts only should have 21 Those experts can come and testify in court, and the 22 one? 2.2 judge can control that testimony. In our case, it 23 MS. MURRILL: Representative Marcelle, the --23 happened in a very, very short, short turnaround in a 24 the -- the -- the job of drawing the districts is yours. 24 preliminary injunction hearing which is different from a 2.5 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I get it.

25

trial on the merits. We've never had a trial on the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Page 46

MS. MURRILL: It's not mine. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Right. 3 MS. MURRILL: And I -- I am defending what I 4 believe to have been a -- a defensible map. And if you 5 draw a new map, I will defend that map. Judge Dick has 6 put us in a -- in a position -- and the Fifth Circuit, 7 the panel that reviewed that decision, and the whole 8 court, when I asked them to go en banc, by declining to 9 go en banc, have put us in a position of where we are 10 today, where we -- we need to draw a map. So I'm here 11 to tell -- I'm not here to tell you don't draw a map. I 12 mean, I think we do have to draw a map --13 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And -- and --14 MS. MURRILL: -- and I will defend that map. 15 REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: And -- and my final 16 question. I heard Representative Beaullieu talk about 17 two-thirds of the legislature approving this map and --18 and -- and voting for it. Beaullieu. I'm sorry. 19 (Simultaneous speaking.)

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Beaullieu?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I just call you

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: We'll -- we'll --

Beau, so I'm -- I'm trying to get your real name because

(Simultaneous speaking.)

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

Page 48 additional congressional map. And I think what we're

hearing from Judge Kelly Dick is -MS. MURRILL: Shelly Dick.
REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- Shelly Dick is that the map is not fair for the state of Louisiana.
And -- and what I -- what I agree with her on is that if we cannot -- and we had an opportunity to draw this map ourselves and we did not do it as it supports Section 2, in my opinion. I know you gave yours, but this is my opinion. So then we will allow her to draw that map if we can't do that. We can't draw a map right now, right? Is that accurate?

MS. MURRILL: So what will happen if you do not draw a map is that she has set a trial date. It's very, very quick, and we will still be operating under the old map. So we will move forward then with a trial on the -- under the old map. There'll be a trial on the merits, the same record I think that was presented, and Tom can affirm or -- or correct me if I'm wrong, but the -- the record from the preliminary injunction hearing will all go into the -- into the -- into the court record, and we will look at whether we want to have additional testimony. And that trial will move forward.

I -- I don't expect Judge Dick to change her position. I think she will draw a map, and -- and so

Page 47

1 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- I been calling 2 vou Beau 3 REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- we'll work on 4 vou --REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Yes. 5 REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- Representative 6 7 Marcelle. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So Beaullieu -- I 10 always call him Beau. But Beaullieu, I -- I -- I -- I 11 heard him say that two-thirds of the legislature voted 12 for this map. And he's absolutely accurate because the 13 majority of the legislature would support this map 14 because it benefits them. We talked about, you know, 15 our districts and our interests. What I did not hear 16 him say is -- because I sat at that table on the other 17 side and presented a map, and none of the maps that we 18 presented got out of this committee. 19 So it's, you know, it's unfair to say, "Okay, 20 we passed it with the majority of the people," because a 2.1 majority of the people would support us not having an --2.2 an additional African American representation in another 23 district. I get that. But it's not fair to say that 24 those arguments weren't made to -- to support that. I 25 was one of those that made the argument to support an

Page 49

you are getting the first opportunity to do that. I mean, we could have -- in theory, we could have had a trial on the merits, and she could have said, "I don't --" you know, again, "I don't like the old map," and -- or, "I don't like the map that you drew and I'm going to redraw your map." But as a matter of law, you get the first shot at doing that, so.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No. We get the second shot at doing it. Thank you very much, though.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you.

Representative Marcelle. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So a couple of things. So the -- the parallel that the argument has been based on is the -- the case in Alabama; was that the one?

MS. MURRILL: Yeah. The Alabama case was litigated just, you know, a few months ahead of ours, and so it went up to the Supreme Court before ours did. And so we've basically been held -- our case was held in abeyance pending the outcome of that case.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So -- and that was a seven-member district, right?

MS. MURRILL: I believe so.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So -- so they were trying to reach a second district in a seven-member

2.2

factor.

Page 50

state. So would you say, just in your opinion, is it

harder to -- to draw two of six than it is two of seven,

just based on the compactness of the population of that

state? Because wouldn't you say that every state has a

different compactness, there's no two states that are

identical, and maybe it's easier in one state, that

maybe the compactness is -- is much more centrally

located to reach that conclusion. Wouldn't -- would you

agree with that?

2.4

2.1

2.2

state

MS. MURRILL: I -- I would agree with you that every state is different and that -- that our population -- how our population is spread out is -- is different from every other state.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Would -- would you --MS. MURRILL: So our population is -- our population, I think, is relatively close to theirs. I -- they'd probably have a little more population because they still have seven districts. You know, we -- this isn't going to be easy. I -- I didn't -- that's why I started out by saying, "I'm not here to tell you this is an easy job." You have a hard job. Our state is different. Every state is different from each other, and -- and you have to do this based on the facts in our

We have argued in our case that our state is

Page 52

MR. JONES: I'm sorry. My name is Tom Jones. I'm the director of the civil division in the attorney general's office.

The judge has principally based her ruling on Black voting-age population. That's what she's used as the primary criteria. Then the experts take that Black voting-age population, and they're very clever people, and they do very clever things with those numbers. They can persuade you on one side that the Black voting-age population should be analyzed this way, and the other experts can convince you of just the opposite the next day. But Black voting-age population has been the primary criteria for this judge's rulings.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Because you did say something earlier, that -- that race cannot be a determining factor of -- of why you draw maps.

MS. MURRILL: It can't be the predominant

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Isn't that the only reason we're here right now?

MS. MURRILL: You know, we're here because of

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: But isn't that the predominant reason?

MS. MURRILL: -- the court's telling us we

Page 51

different from Alabama with regard to -- so that they -- the fact findings aren't -- can't be the same. We're not the same. Our history isn't the same. Our history of redistricting and redistricting litigation is not the same. And we -- we brought those issues up, and here we are still, so.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I -- I know. I spent the better part of three years going over this. I was on the committee last time and sat through numerous, numerous meetings on -- on this across a period of the three years. Help -- help me understand how the -- the voting-age population factors in when the voting -- the Black voting-age population is lower than the total population in the state. How does that factor in?

MS. MURRILL: You want to take that one?
MR. JONES: Yeah. The -- the judge --

MS. MURRILL: Introduce yourself just quickly again.

19 REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: You're on. You're 20 on.

MR. JONES: The judge here in the Middle District has based her rulings on the Black --

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: If you don't mind, could you kind of speak into the mic a little bit? Or you can pull the mic to you, I believe, as well.

Page 53

have to be here. I mean, I — I think that's part of it. You know, the — I mean, I'm defending the map. I'm going to defend the new map. I — I want you to know, I mean, if you draw a new map, I'm defending that map, so.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I agree.

MS. MURRILL: I'm not going to say that, you know, I mean, I think -- I don't -- I have complaints about how this case was managed, I mean, not by our litigators, not -- you know, I just think that we need -- we should have a trial on the merits. I've always -- I have argued that in court. I have signed off on those pleadings. I still believe that that's true. The courts have told us to do this by a certain date or it's going to be done for us.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I -- I think the circular fashion of -- of the 14th, the 15th Amendment, and this Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is a circle. So it -- it -- it sends you in this race to chase your tail to try and accomplish what you're trying to accomplish. And -- and each one contradicts the other one in the circle. So you end up in this never ending loop of -- of how do you accomplish what we're tasked to do here.

We did look at a lot of maps and -- and, you

Page 54

know, I -- I personally think that the one we passed was -- was a very legal, legitimate map. And -- and -- and we'll do the best we can with what we have. So, appreciate your time today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Farnum. Representative Carter.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I -- because this committee meeting is being viewed by people throughout the state, I think it's important that we be honest and -- and -- and -- and put the whole picture, why we here, how we got here. It seemed to be an impression that the old Judge Dick's begging us, trying to make us do something even though we've done the right thing.

Is it not true that the judge's job, her task, is to look at the law, first the law, the -- the jurisprudence of reapportionment, and look at the -- the -- the -- the statute that's been passed, reapportionment and other criteria that Congress and --has given us, to see if we went about this the right way. She just didn't come up the side to say, "I'm going to make them have another Black district." That is not her job. And -- and -- and she did anything contrary to that, she certainly would have been reversed quite quickly.

Page 56

But the law is pretty much the -- it's the same. So based on that law, that judge says, "Well, y'all either going to do a map, or I'm going to do a map." So -- so he gave us another -- a third time to do the map. Now, if you look at the analysis of the -- of what we done the last time, there was about eight maps that were presented to this House and Government Affairs Committee, but there's only one map, the speaker map, House Bill 1, that was even considered, seriously considered.

I mean, there was some people came to the -to the table and -- and talked about these other maps,
but -- but -- but it was asked by the speaker then -the then speaker who was carrying the House Bill 1, "Did
you look at Section 2 of the Voters Right Act? And did
you try to comply this map with Section 2?" And the
speaker said no.

"Well, did you look at the disparity that this map represents? It's just common sense. If you got a third of the population that is African American and -- and -- and 33 -- over 33 percent, did you look at those -- those figures? You don't have to be the primary criteria, but you got to first look at whether or not it's a -- it's appears to be a fair map and complying with the 14th Amendment, Section 2 and other -- other of

Page 55

But -- but -- but what she did, she looked at the law, and there was -- there was -- there was a request made by motion to -- to -- as to whether or not the plaintiff would succeed on this problem with disparity and what have you if they went to trial. And she pretty much said, after studying the law and studying the facts and what actually took place in this legislature, she decided it would probably succeed. So she asked the legislature to go back and try to do this over again the right way. And the legislature has that opportunity. We could get nothing done, okay?

So now the judge -- it will stay -- the attorney general office -- she -- she expressed that she wanted another map and she -- a better map, she thought, that's more legal. And so she -- she asked the legislature to -- there was a state made by the attorney general's office, and that was granted by the Fifth Circuit.

And because of the Alabama case -- and Alabama is different from -- first of all, Alabama has 26 percent population of African Americans. Louisiana, 33 percent. Alabama has a larger overall population than Louisiana as well. That's why they have seven congressman. But -- but you can't compare Alabama to Louisiana.

Page 57

Supreme Court jurisprudence?" He said no.

He said that he -- he -- he -- he -- this is
his map that he's presenting, and he didn't -- let the
lawyers worry about all this other stuff. This is his
map. So the -- the -- the record -- the record of the
-- and I tried to tell him this because I was asking
questions to this -- to -- on House Bill 1, like
everybody else, "Why this map have a problem?" And so
-- so -- so the legislature knew the map had a problem,
but they wouldn't listen to anybody else.

So while I agree that the -- your representation that race is not the -- the sole factor, the -- the fact is you got to have six divided equally, okay? And -- and if it -- but -- but -- but Section 2 says if you've got a group that is compact, that is compact and that vote certain voting patterns, that you should try to create a map that allow that group to represent a person of their choice. That's all it says. So I asked the speaker, "Did you look at Section 2 and try to come up with a map that does that?" He said, "No, I didn't."

So it's the speaker's and -- and -- and the legislators' testimony in the record that caused them the problem they had when it went to the judge. Had they said, "We looked at Section 2, we tried to comply

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 58

with Section 2 but we couldn't because the Black population is so dispersed in the state. We could not get another district that was compact," they didn't say that, didn't even try. So that's why the state is in the position it's in, not because somebody is out there -- some federal judge is out there trying to make Louisiana have another -- another minority district now.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

However, I do agree that we need to have this opportunity, and it's wonderful to have this opportunity to try to create a map that will comply. Now -- now -and I think that I applaud the governor because I think the governor wants to do the right thing. The new governor wants to do the right thing. He wants to have a map to -- so we can do our own map and not a federal judge. And I support that. And so -- but I don't want to give the impression that federal judge is just a bad, bad monster, is trying to make us do something we shouldn't do. She has to comply with the law.

Now, the Supreme Court has reviewed what the -- the -- the -- the attorney general's office presented there on confection of the state, and it's really -they -- they denied that. It's the United States Supreme Court saying you got to go back and do this map, not just Judge Dick, okay? So -- so we need to accept the fact that the map we had, based on the record, based

Page 60

-- what the Supreme Courts over the years have told us to do? I happened to be on the legislature in '84 to

'92 when we wrote a lot of the reapportion maps. Okay. So this problem been around a long time. So we -- and -- and so we had -- oftentimes, federal judges had to put us on the right track, say, "Okay. Y'all doing good. Y'all working in the right direction, but y'all got to go back and do this over again." And that's what she did.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Judge Carter. Vice-chairman Lyons.

13 VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is it Ms. Murrill?

MS MURRILL: Murrill.

VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Murrill. I'm sorry, sorry. I -- I -- I have a question for you, but before I get into my question, I just wanted to note that as we talk about the Voting Rights Act and -- and the premise of a lot of things that we've done, today is actually the holiday of Martin Luther King Day, today, which his actual birthday is tomorrow. This is -- the observance of it is today. So a lot of us question, you know, as the federal holiday (inaudible 1:14:43) was -- was empty, what have you, is why we're here today.

Page 59

on the testimony presented here in the legislature, based on the debate in the legislature, based on the law, that it was not in compliance.

Now, you can differ. People can differ because they -- they don't like what the law says, maybe, or they want to twist the law. But the fact of the matter is it's not a sustainable map. This map is not sustainable that we have now. And so we have a chance to do that and not offend too many political notions at the same time.

And so I just -- I just want to make that -put that in the record that -- that this is a effort on the part of people of different political interests to try to resolve the issue that had been defined by -- by Supreme Court decision and by federal statute, and -and try to come up with a district that is acceptable.

That's what we're trying to do, you know. And it doesn't mean that you're a bad person or you -- or you got a problem because you supported that last map. It's just that the record did not support -- we didn't get enough input from other people that had concerns about it. We didn't allow people to have -- have -- put their input in. Had we putting three or four maps on the floor and explain why we putting on the floor, that might have been different. Have we tried to do what the

Page 61

So I just want to just remind everyone that one of the things that Martin Luther King did say was there's never a wrong time to do the right thing. So we're here today and we would not have any other, I guess, issue -- he wouldn't. Now we're doing something that we'll be doing to correct where we at and -- and so forth. But my question to you, ma'am, is you alluded to earlier that you want to have a -- preference to have a trial on the merits, that you were requesting -- asking for.

So as a body here, as we're going to be going through this process, can you outline to us in any form necessary that -- to get it across, what were some of those merits? Because I'm assuming when you say the trial on the merits, you mean that the merits of -- of the decision that you may have had difference with, you had other merits that you wanted to talk about or maybe defend in the -- in the fact-finding portion that was not revealed.

MS. MURRILL: So, Representative Lyons, when we went into this litigation right after the legislature completed the map drawing process, we went into a very, very compressed hearing on a motion for a preliminary injunction. That is a different standard. It was very compressed. We did not have the -- the length of time

1.8

Page 62

that we would ordinarily have for a full trial.

2.1

2.1

I believe that -- I mean, this is -- you can blame it on the litigator in me, which is fine, but I believe that it -- that -- that the state and -- and I believe this under the new map that you pass, that we should be entitled to have a trial on the merits -- merits before we are forced to go in and change an act of the legislature. That is just a fundamental premise that I have about acts of the legislature and us being required by the courts to redo them. That -- that -- as a practical matter, we did not have a lot of time, but I have lost -- we lost on that issue.

I mean, we -- we did. Not just me, but the entire litigation team, including the lawyers who represented the legislature or the -- the -- the speaker and the -- the president of the Senate at the time and the secretary of state. We asked to have a trial on the merits set before you were required to go into session, and we offered to do it quickly. So just to be clear, we were not trying to delay. We offered to do it in November. There was another trial set. I mean, we tried to do this quickly so that we could have a complete record upon which whatever the decision was.

And we did not believe that Judge Dick would change her decision, but we still believe that the case

Page 64

you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you,
Representative Lyons. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. Ms. Murrill, if we draw a new map and Judge Dick decides she don't like that one, do we start all over again, or will she immediately draw a map? I don't think she's capable of drawing a map, number one. I just don't think she could do it. But --

MS. MURRILL: She -- I mean, no federal judge does this without a demographer helping. I mean, they're -- she'll appoint -- she will ask for experts. She will ask for the maps to be submitted to her with expert testimony, and then she will -- typically, she's probably going to decide which map to take, but she can tweak those lines. She can decide how to draw the map, how she wants to draw this map based on the input of the experts from both sides. She could appoint her own expert and have that expert assist her in the map-drawing exercise.

And remember, you've been through this before.

A large part of this exercise is done through computer generated maps. So, you know, you put the numbers in, you start changing -- you change the inputs, it spits out a new map. She's going to have to go through that

Page 63

should be before the courts on a complete record. It is not, because we weren't -- we never had a trial on the merits. The courts have told you to go back and draw a map. And they said, "We can have a trial on the merits, but we can do that after you draw a map."

So as a -- I mean, just fundamentally as a lawyer who represents the -- you and defends the laws that you pass, your laws -- if you have a law that you pass, that you feel very strongly about, and the entire legislature has voted for it even though some people may disagree with it, then I will defend your law. And I -- I think that -- that you are entitled and the legislature is entitled to that defense. So that's the point that I was making. I -- I don't think any of these cases should be tried and decided at the preliminary injunction stage. I think we are entitled to a trial on the merits,

And -- but at this point, the courts have told you -- the federal courts have told me and they have told you that we don't get that right now. You -- you get to have this session right now, or Judge Dick is going to draw the map for you. So, you know, I'm not here to say, "Don't draw the map." I'm here to tell you, "Draw the map."

VICE-CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay. Thank -- thank

Page 65

same process that you did, and then — and then we continue. So I — I mean, I can't tell you that the plaintiffs will accept the map that you draw. She has established a timeline for the plaintiffs to amend their petition and challenge that map, and then we will — we will go through the process again to determine whether or not that map is acceptable.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And for four years on this committee previously, I spent hours upon hours looking at this map, all the maps. And I looked at the plaintiff's map, so to speak, that they presented before this group, and I didn't feel like any of those met the criteria. The -- the -- the overriding factor, I guess, was they had gerrymander lines, which is against the Voting Rights Act. So I'm hearing that you said that the map -- that the current map that's been rejected, I guess, by the judge, has it been to the US Supreme Court? Because that's the next step.

MS. MURRILL: It has not. It -- the -- the -- the US Supreme Court can decide whether to take a case or not take a case.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Right.

MS. MURRILL: They have not taken our case.

They took our -- they -- they stayed our case last summer while the Alabama case went forward and was

Page 66

had made a good case for a stay and so they paused our case while they decided that one. But they did something and these -- this is kind of a term of art, but I mean, they granted cert in advance of judgment. That means they actually took our case, and then after they decided the Merrill case, the Alabama case, they just vacated their own grant and sent it back to us.

litigated. They said, "You just wait." They thought we

2.1

2.2

So in a way, they took our case, and then they vacated their own decision to take our case and they sent it back down to the Fifth Circuit and to judge Dick. And so it's — it's back in the hands of the District Court judge who is supervised by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. And so there has been some litigation between August and, really, through the summer since the Merrill case came out all the way through the time that the opinion was issued in November, I think, from the Fifth Circuit where a panel of the Fifth Circuit said, "You need to go draw a map by February 15th."

So they actually suggested we should have done this before — before we legally, really — or — or — or I think it was practically possible to even get it done. But, you know, here you are. I think the governor heeded that call that — that — that demand.

Page 68

for whatever reason, then if they don't like it, I mean, they may -- it may be a perfectly acceptable map for some people. It may be a second majority/minority map that -- that some people like or that some people don't. So there's no guarantee that someone won't, that they -- that the plaintiffs will like the map. But if they -- they can -- so they could continue to challenge it, and now they will have to go and amend their pleadings and we, basically, will start over because it is a new act of the legislature. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: It's going to replace the existing map --MS. MURRILL: It will replace the existing map. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: -- Representative Gadberry

MS. MURRILL: If they do not accept that map

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Well, I mean, along what Representative Farnum -- Farnum was saying earlier, you chase your tail on this thing.

MS. MURRILL: Well, that's why I said it's not easy.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: You comply with one part, and you check another part and it doesn't meet the criteria. So you go back and rework your population or

Page 67

2.4

2.5

I mean, we've had it reviewed by a number of judges.

They have had nothing to say about our arguments. It's been radio silence. And so the only decision that

remains in front of us right now is Judge Dick's.

And — and so Judge Dick has set a timeline for us to have a trial. They did say we get to have a trial, but we don't get to have that trial until after you go through this exercise. And, you know, she will do it for you.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And once we have that trial, we have the opportunity, if she still rejects the map, to appeal that?

MS. MURRILL: If she -- if she rejects the new map?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Or the existing one again.

MS. MURRILL: Well, I mean, if she — if you don't draw a map, then we will be back in front of her for the trial on the merits in very short order and that — that case will continue. If you do draw a map, then the plaintiffs will have to decide whether they wish to challenge that map, whether they accept that map. And if they accept that map, then — then the whole case

should be over.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah.

Page 69

your districts, and that doesn't meet. So you're -- you're constantly going in a circle.

MS. MURRILL: Look, I believe that the United States Supreme Court should give you better instructions. I -- I do. I think that -- that -- that is the argument that we made last summer. And, you know, if -- if you pass a map and somebody else challenges that map, it -- I will make that argument again. I mean, I think that they -- the courts have made this a difficult task for you and -- and so you are doing the best that you can now within the constraints of the rulings of the federal court.

So, you know, it's — it's not an easy task that you have and I believe that the jurisprudence has made it confusing and that the Supreme Court would be well — I mean, you know, in my opinion, that the Supreme Court ought to make its own jurisprudence clearer to those of you who have the job of drawing the maps. I think that's fair.

The constitution makes it clear that it is your job to draw the maps. I believe that it is not correct in terms of the balance of power between the state and federal government, between the constitution, you know, purview of how this should be happening, for the courts to create precedent that makes it impossible

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 74

also said that we had maps, and he pointed out the fact that the -- we as -- and I want -- I think it was Rep. Marcelle that said it. We did not have an opportunity to vote on all maps because all maps were not allowed to come out of this committee.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

There were options upon options to draw a second minority/majority congressional district, and they went all across the state to give minorities an opportunity to vote for their candidate of choice. They were not allowed to come out of this committee. We sat for a month, six hours, at least, a day, listening to the arguments of -- and the -- the makeup of each map and discussing voting -- voting-age population vs. population. So I understand why we still having those questions because we talked about it ad nauseam.

But when you choose not to do right, that is when the process becomes difficult and it -- it seems as though we can't make a headway. But I want to put it on the record that I didn't vote for none of them maps that came out. I didn't vote for any of the maps that Judge Dick had in front of her because they were not maps that were fair and they were not maps that were taking consideration of all of the citizens of this great state that I call home no matter how unfair or how unjust it is to me.

Page 76

Page 77

MS. MURRILL: No. REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: -- or would it automatically go in force above what the constitution says is our duties as representatives? MS. MURRILL: So let me kind of -- let me untangle that a little bit. If you draw a map now, that map will become an act of the legislature and it will supersede the prior act of the legislature. The old map goes away. REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Okay. MS. MURRILL: If -- if you do not draw a map, then the -- the map that you drew before will remain -will be the map, and the plaintiffs will continue to litigate that. We will have a trial on the merits. The -- the record from the preliminary injunction will be, probably, supplemented with some additional testimony. She will issue a new ruling and she will issue a permanent injunction against the map. And then that will be litigated, which is my duty. And so I will continue to carry forth my duty to defend against the

have to approve her map --

If she draws the map herself, then someone could intervene and challenge that map. You know, there are a number of different potential outcomes if she

injunction. That's the process.

Page 75

We still need to look and make sure that Louisiana is a state that it used to be, considering all of her citizens. And thank you for your time, Mr. Chair. I don't have a question for anybody. REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. Let's try and -- and look -- let's try and keep this to questions

for the attorney general. We -- we going to have a time to -- to talk about maps and -- and all that, but if -like to try and stick to any kind of questions out of respect for the attorney general's time. Representative

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Thank you, Mr. 12 13 Chairman. Good morning.

14 MS. MURRILL: Good morning.

Schamerhorn.

15 REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Welcome aboard. MS. MURRILL: Thank you. 16

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: My question is if we do not present a different map, Judge Dick has

threatened to draw her map. Is it not our --

MS. MURRILL: Promised, not threatened.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Well, okay. Is

it not our responsibility as legislators by the -- and protected by the constitution, that our map should be

the one that is approved? Now if she draws her own map, when she does, do we still have to approve -- would we

draws the map. If she draws the map, you know, we could accept that map. You don't get it back. You don't get a second -- you don't get another opportunity to approve her work. The only question is can her work survive the scrutiny of the Fifth Circuit who grades her papers, and potentially, the United States Supreme Court who grades their papers.

And, you know, I think what makes your job a little more complicated is that the prior -- not the -the exact prior map, but the map before that had been pre-cleared, there had been litigation in the past over a majority/minority map that was declared unconstitutional. So, you know, that's why I have never taken the position that our history is -- or at least our recent history is the same in redistricting as Alabama

And I believe that the courts need to make it more clear what your job is so that you can do it properly the first time and we can all avoid the litigation side of this and -- and continue to move forward with -- with an act that -- that, as I believe all your acts are, presumed to be constitutional. That is, you know, that's how I'll approach the next -- the next act that you issue. So I'm not picking and choosing. I mean, I think unless it's very clearly

Page 86 minority district. Thank you. 2 REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. 3 Labry. The -- the board is clear. Members, this is 4 going to conclude our educational meeting this morning. 5 I appreciate you all being here this morning and -- and 6 your attentiveness and your questions. We're going to 7 have a busy week. I ask you all to stay close to your 8 computers. As bills are uploaded, read them, become 9 familiar with them. If you have amendments, please get 10 them to staff as soon as possible. 11 Remember, you also -- if anybody in any --12 from the outside is submitting information or submitting 13 maps, to include shapefiles as well so we can have the 14 -- the equivalency -- block equivalency files so that we 15 can -- we can have that data and -- and get it to staff 16 as -- as soon as possible. But, members, look forward 17 to it. It'll be a fun week. Thank you. 18 MS. BAKER: Move to adjourn? 19 REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yeah. 20 Representative Thomas has moved to adjourn. 21 (Meeting adjourned.) 2.2 23 24 Page 87 1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION 2 I, Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc., 3 do hereby certify that 291001-Audio-1-15-24_HC on HG 4 Affairs Meeting.mp4 was transcribed utilizing computer aided means and the TranscribeMe transcription team. 6 The transcript of the audio mentioned above, 7 having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe, 8 Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full, 9 true, and correct transcription. 10 I further certify that neither I, nor the 11 TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal 12 association with the parties involved or are in any way 13 interested in the outcome thereof. 14 Dated this 12th of March, 2024. 15 16 Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc. 17 18 19 20 2.1 22 23 24 25



PohlmanUSA® Court Reporting and Litigation Services

Louisiana State Senate 1st Special Session-Audio Transcription

January 17, 2024

In Re: Louisiana House Floor/Committee Video

Page 2

MS. MIZELL: Official Journal of the Senate of the state of Louisiana, Second day's proceedings, Tuesday, January 16th, 2024.

2.0

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Hodges moves to dispense the reading of the journal without objection.

MS. MIZELL: Petitions, memorials, and communications, I am in receipt of a letter from the president appointing the parliamentarians, Senator Gregory Miller. Messages from the house, the house is finally passed and asked for concurrence in the following house bills and joint resolutions. House Bill 16. House Bill 8, respectfully submit headed. Michelle Fontenot, Clerk of the House. Introduction of House bills. Senator Talbot now moves for suspension of the rules for the purpose of reading the house bills the first and second time and referring them to Committee.

House Bill 8 by Representative Mike Johnson is an act to Entitled 13 relative to the Supreme Court to provide relative to redistricting Supreme Court Justice districts. It is referred to senate and governmental affairs. House Bill 16 by Representative McFarland is an act to appropriate funds and to make certain reductions from certain sources to be allocated to the designated agencies and purposes in specific amounts for making of supplemental appropriations. Refer to

long, detailed process, achieves several goals.

Page 4

First, as you know and you're aware of,
Congresswoman Julia Letlow is my representative in
Washington, DC. The boundaries in the bill I'm
proposing ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both
unpaired with any other incumbents, and in a
congressional district that should continue to elect a
Republican to Congress for the remainder of this decade.

I have great pride in the work of Congresswoman Letlow

I have great pride in the work of Congresswoman Letlow
and -- that she's accomplished, and this map will ensure
that Louisianans will continue to benefit from her

presence in the halls of the Congress for as long as she decides to continue to serve this great state.

Second. Louisiana has six congressional districts. The map that's proposed bill ensures that four are safe Republican seats. Louisiana Republican presence in the United States' countours has contributed tremendously to the national discourse, and I'm very proud that both Speaker of the US House of Representatives, Mike Johnson, and US House Majority Leader Steve Scalise are both from our great state. This map ensures that two of them will have solidly

Republican districts at home, so they can focus on the national leadership that we need in Washington, DC. The

map that's proposed in this bill ensures conservative

Page 3

finance.

MALE SPEAKER: Oh, Senator O'Connor for an introduction.

MALE SPEAKER 2: (inaudible 0:04:15).

MALE SPEAKER: Oh, okay.

MALE SPEAKER 2: It's okay.

MALE SPEAKER: Never mind. It's -- that zip sound? Senate bills on third reading and final passage.

MS. MIZELL: First bill? Senator Womack now moves for a suspension of the rules for the purpose of calling out of order, Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack. It's an act to amend Title 18 relative to congressional districts to provide for the redistricting of Louisiana's congressional

FEMALE SPEAKER: To provide with respect to positions and offices other than congressional, which are based on congressional districts.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Womack, on your bill. SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I bring Senate Bill Number 8 before you this evening. As you know, Louisiana congressional districts must be drawn, given the Federal Voting Rights Act litigation that is still ongoing in the US District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana. This map in

the bill that I'm introducing, which is the product of a

Page 5

Louisiana and will continue to extend past our boundaries to the nation's capital.

principle is retained by the majority of those in

Third. The corridor that you see on the map that -- that you have on your -- your table, if you'll notice the map runs up Red River, which is barge traffic, commerce. It also has I-49, which is a -- which is -- goes from Lafayette to Shreveport, which is also a corridor for our state that is very important to our commerce. We have a college. We have education along that corridor. We have a presence with ag with our row crop, as well as our cattle industry all up along Red River in those parishes.

A lot of people from that area, the
Natchitoches Parish, as well as Alexandria, use
Alexandria for -- for -- for their healthcare, their
hospitals, and so forth in that area. So finally, the
amounts in the proposed bill responds appropriate to the
ongoing Federal Voting Rights Act in the Middle District
of Louisiana. For those who are unaware, the
congressional amounts that we enacted in 2022 of March
have been the subject of litigation, roughly since the
day -- the 2022 Congressional Redistricting Bill went
into effect. Even before we enacted it.

After a substantial amount of prolonged

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

2.2

Page 6

litigation, the Federal District Court has adhered to its view that the federal law requires that the state

have two congressional districts with a majority of

Black voters. Our secretary of state, attorney general,

and our prior legislative leadership appealed that, but

have yet to succeed. And we are now here because of the

federal court order, that we have to have first

8 opportunity to act. The district court order that we

must have two majority voting-age population districts,

combined with the political impurities I just described,

have largely - largely driven the boundaries of

District Two and District Six on your map, both of which are over 50 percent voting — Black voting age

population.

2.4

Given the state's current demographics, there is not enough high Black population in the southeast portion of Louisiana to create two majority Black districts, and to also comply with the US Constitution one person, one vote requirement. That is the reason why District Two is drawn around Orleans Parish, while District Six includes the Black population of East Baton Rouge Parish and travels up the I-49 quarter to include Black population in Shreveport. While this is a different map than the Plaintiffs' litigation have

common with one another within the district?

SENATOR WOMACK: No, I didn't because it was -- it was -- we had to draw two districts, and that's the only way we could get two districts. One of the ways we could get two districts, and still protect our political interest.

SENATOR MORRIS: Well, one of the things you said earlier was that -- that we had in common the agriculture. You mentioned that. That's a community of interest. So you did consider agriculture as being something that everybody had in common with this district, or?

SENATOR WOMACK: My comment was -- was the fact that it was along that corridor. Ag was along that corridor some -- some -- not so much in that community interest. Just maintaining -- bringing out the fact that I-49 does go through there, and it does encompass your -- your timberland, your ag, your hospitals. Just trying to bring to light some of the positives going up that corridor.

SENATOR MORRIS: So would you -- would you say that the heart of this district is Northeast Louisiana and North Central Louisiana?

SENATOR WOMACK: I wouldn't say the heart of the district is that way, but the way the district -- to

Page 7

accomplishes the political goals I believe that are important for my district, for Louisiana, and for the country.

proposed, this is the only map I reviewed that

While I did not draw these boundaries myself, I carefully considered the number of different map options. I firmly submit that the congressional voting boundaries represented in this bill best achieve the goals of protecting Congresswoman Letlow's seat, maintaining a strong district for Speaker Johnson, as well as Majority Leader Steve Scalise, ensuring four Republican districts, and adhering to the command of the Federal Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. And I ask for favorable passage.

MALE SPEAKER: We have -- we have one question by Senator Morris for --

SENATOR MORRIS: Senator Womack, among the factors that you considered was the community of interest of the district. Something that was considered in coming up with this version of the map that we have before us

SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, this map was strictly drawn from the political aspect of our congressman in -- in office is how it was drawn.

SENATOR MORRIS: Did -- you didn't consider the community of interest of people having something in

Page 9

Page 8

pick up the -- the -- and honor the courts, it had to be drawn like it had to be drawn to pick that up.

SENATOR MORRIS: So the -- is there a heart of the district?

SENATOR WOMACK: If it is, it'll be a small majority of the heart. I don't think it's a — it's a — it — it has a heart of the district, but it had to start somewhere.

SENATOR MORRIS: Do you know what the most populated parish is of Congressional District Five at the current moment?

SENATOR WOMACK: I do not. I hadn't looked at that to -- to prove that myself. I (inaudible 0:08:54) -- could be Ouachita Parish.

SENATOR MORRIS: Right. So Ouachita Parish, which is the most populated parish in Congressional District Five, which you seek to protect for Congresswoman Letlow. Your map cuts Ouachita Parish into various pieces, does it not? And puts a lot of that in Congressman Johnson's District Four, correct?

SENATOR WOMACK: That's true. The way the map is drawn. That's in my bill. That is the way it's drawn.

SENATOR MORRIS: And like you, your – I – I think you indicated that Congresswoman Letlow is your

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

raue iv

congressperson, and -- and it's important to you for her 2 to remain to be your Congresswoman; is that correct? SENATOR WOMACK: Very important. SENATOR MORRIS: Well, under your map, I would 5 be Congressman Johnson's -- in his district, and so 6 would Senator Cathey, and so would Representative 7 Echols; is that correct? 8 SENATOR WOMACK: That would be correct. I 9 don't -- I know -- I've been to your house, but I hadn't 10 been in any of the others, but I think you're correct. 11 SENATOR MORRIS: So that would be important to 12 me; did you know? But -- but this district as it's 13 drawn now, would move Lincoln Parish and Louisiana Tech 14 into Congressman Johnson's district; would it not? 15 SENATOR WOMACK: That's a possibility. 16 SENATOR MORRIS: Well, your map does -- map 17 does put Lincoln Parish -- all of Lincoln Parish into 18 Congressman Johnson's district; does it not? 19 SENATOR WOMACK: It does do that, yes. 20 SENATOR MORRIS: So -- but the district does 21 reach down into Baton Rouge; does it not? 22 SENATOR WOMACK: It does. 23 SENATOR MORRIS: And the district includes 2.4 Tiger Stadium in the district and also Joe Aillet

Stadium at -- in Louisiana Tech in Ruston.

25

25

Page 12

though Louisiana Tech is only 30 mile -- 30, 40 miles away from Congresswoman Letlow's home. SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I agree with that -with that totally, where we had to draw two minority districts. That's -- that's the way the numbers worked out. You've worked with -- with -- with redistricting before, and that's -- that's -- you have to -- you have to work everybody around the best you can. This is --SENATOR MORRIS: Well, as of yesterday before Committee, the map -- my home and Senator Cathey's home, but you amended it to put even more in Congressman Johnson's district; did you not? SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, my understanding that -- that -- that my amendment put you all in Congresswoman Letlow's district. SENATOR MORRIS: In Congressman Johnson's district under the -- under your amendment because it added more Quachita Parish into District Four: did it

Louisiana Tech will be in Congressman Johnson, even

SENATOR WOMACK: My understanding that when we moved that, that it added y'all. I could be wrong on that, but it added y'all.

SENATOR MORRIS: The -- the amendment as I understand it and looked at it in Committee before

Page 11

1 SENATOR WOMACK: In the minority district, in 2 district -- in District Two -- or District Six. 3 SENATOR MORRIS: Isn't it true that Tiger 4 Stadium in your -- on your map is located in Congresswoman Letlow's district? SENATOR WOMACK: Yes. 6 SENATOR MORRIS: And so is Joe Aillet Stadium 8 at Louisiana Tech. 9 SENATOR WOMACK: Not -- not in -- not in that district. She don't go into -- under my map, she 10 11 doesn't go into Ruston. 12 SENATOR MORRIS: Under your map, all of 13 Lincoln Parish is in Congresswoman -- that's Lincoln on 14 the map right there. That's where Ruston is. 15 SENATOR WOMACK: Right. 16 SENATOR MORRIS: And so that is Congresswoman 17 -- that would be -- it's currently Congresswoman 18 Letlow's, but now it's going to be Congressman 19 Johnson's. 20 SENATOR WOMACK: Right. 2.1 SENATOR MORRIS: Okay. Right. 2.2 SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah. 23 SENATOR MORRIS: So they will be in different 24 districts. Tiger Stadium will be in Congresswoman -- I

mean, yeah, Congresswoman Letlow's district, but

Page 13

yesterday, the bill as filed -- but now, under the current version of the bill, I am in Congressman Johnson's district.

SENATOR WOMACK: Okay.

SENATOR MORRIS: Don't you think we should have moved -- included Louisiana Tech and Ouachita Parish in the Northeast Louisiana Congressional District?

SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, it's -- it's a lot of could have, and -- and -- and I regret that it's not, but we also have to look at the other members of Congress, and what we can live with concerning that.

SENATOR MORRIS: If your bill gets out of -off the floor today and goes over to the House, would
you be amenable to amendments that would allow this
district, as long as all the other requisites are -- are
there for -- to comply with the judge's order, and to
comply with, you know, the -- the community of interest
and all the other redistricting principles that we have
to abide by?

SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, I have no problem in that, as long as it -- it -- it -- it meets the requirements of the bill.

SENATOR MORRIS: Thank you, Senator. I appreciate your efforts, and I'm hopeful that we can --

2.1

2.2

Page 14

as if -- assuming the bill does move, that we can perhaps find a resolution that can make everybody, if not absolutely happy, a little happier. Thank you.

2.1

SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Senator Morris.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Stine for the floor.

(Pause.)

SENATOR STINE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of this esteemed chamber, today we stand at a crossroads, burdened with a decision that weighs heavily on each of us. The congressional map before us, a construct far from our ideal, now demands our reluctant endorsement. It pains me, as it does many of you, to navigate these troubled waters not of our own making, but of a heavy-handed, Obama-appointed federal judge, who has regrettably left us little room to maneuver. This map, imperfect as it is, stands as a bulwark protecting not just lines on a map, but the very pillars of our representation in Congress.

It safeguards the positions of pivotal figures, the United States Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and notably, the sole female member of our congressional delegation. Her role is not merely symbolic. She is a lynchpin in the appropriations, education, and workforce committees which are vital to the prosperity and well-being of our state. We are the

Page 16

Despite those concerns, I stand in support of this legislation. It still needs work, it must be amended, but I stand in support of it today, and I speak only for today. I would like to read to you all a statement from Congressman Carter, who currently represents the Second Congressional District. Many of us served with him either when we were in the House, or those of us who served with him in the Senate. Here's a statement.

"My dear friends and colleagues, as I said on the steps of the capital, I will work with anyone who wants to create two majority-minority districts. I am not married to any one map. I have worked tirelessly to help create two majority-minority districts that perform. That's how I know that there may be better ways to create -- to craft both of these districts. There are multiple maps that haven't been reviewed at all. However, the Womack map creates two majority-minority districts, and therefore I am supportive of it. And I urge my former colleagues and friends to vote for it while trying to make both districts stronger with appropriate amendment."

"We do not want to jeopardize this rare opportunity to give African American voters the equal representation they rightly deserve." And that's the

Page 15

guardians of Louisiana's voice on the national stage.

Our decision today, while constrained, is crucial.

It's about more than lines on a map. It's about ensuring our state's continued influence in the halls of power where decisions are made that affect every citizen we represent. So with a heavy heart, but a clear understanding of the stakes, unfortunately, we must pass this map before us instead of giving the pen to a heavy-handed, Obama-appointed federal judge who seeks to enforce her will on the legislature. Into an untenable situation, rather than acting as a co-equal branch of government as laid out in our constitution.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Carter for the floor.

SENATOR CARTER: Thank you, Mr. President,
members. This proposed map by Senator Womack -- well,
let me start with the current district, District Two.
The current African American voting age population in
District Two is currently 58 percent. This map proposed
by Senator Womack reduces it to barely 51 percent, and,
Committee, the bill's author testified that no sort of
performance analysis had been conducted to determine
whether or not District Two continues to consistently
perform as an African American district. There are
serious concerns about this map. There are serious

concerns about this proposal.

Page 17

statement from Congressman Troy Carter. I expressed my concerns. They're serious concerns. It is my expectation and my hope that this bill continue to be worked on, that amendments continue to happen, but today I stand in support. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Jackson for the floor. (Pause.)

SENATOR JACKSON: He tried to cut off my mic. (Pause.)

MALE SPEAKER: Members, you have to talk directly into the mic, unlike in previous times, where you could kind of talk around the mic. You have to literally talk directly into the mic for it to work.

We're going to adjust that for the next --

SENATOR JACKSON: Hello. Okay. Good. (inaudible 0:23:11) was going to have a fit if I wasn't able to speak. I stand in support of this map. I first want to thank Senator Womack, who had the fortitude, regardless of how we got here, but to stand up and do what the last body couldn't do, and that's to come together. But I do stand to say this because I said it in Committee. I reluctantly came to the floor to support this map because my constituents and a lot of our constituents in North Louisiana right now are still experiencing an ice state. That's what I call it

Page 18

because we didn't get snow.

2.1

2.1

And so a lot of them don't even know that we're down here right now passing maps. And so this is the first time in a long time I'm probably going to vote for something that I haven't vetted through my constituency because tonight, myself, Representative Fisher and Representative Morrell will have a Zoom community meeting to catch them up on what they have lost while they were at home, because my legislative assistant was finally able to get to the office and at least send something out to our constituency.

However, at some point, what they did tell me over and over again for the last year, year and a half that we've been going through this process, that they were supportive of fair and equitable maps, and that they knew a fair and equitable — equitable map would be something that created fair representation for all people in the State of Louisiana. I will end with this. I don't think we're in a — in the hands of a heavy-handed judge, but we're in the hands of consequences that the last legislature created in our failure to act. And I say that with a heart of hope that we act today on what is right, on what is just, and what is fair.

I don't believe, and I said this before, any

Page 20

spirit of fairness that they asked me to carry in the last redistricting session. And I want to thank Senator Womack because the mark of a true leader is a leader that not only does what he wants to do, but what's necessary to bring resolve and wholeness to a body that has to work together on a number of issues. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Jackson.

Senator Duplessis for the floor.

SENATOR DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Chairman Womack. I just want to make a few brief comments based on some comments that have been made earlier today. I was not necessarily planning to speak, but I think it's important that I just share a thought or two. It was said that this is much more than just lines on a map, and I agree. It is much more than just lines on a map. We've heard a lot from Chairman Womack and my colleague, Senator Stine about the importance of protecting certain elected officials, but it's about more than lines on a map. It's about the people of this state. It's about one-third of this state going underrepresented for too long.

It's about a federal law called the Voting
Rights Act that has not been interpreted just by one
judge in the Middle District of Louisiana who was
appointed by former president Barack Obama, but also a

Page 19

of my colleagues in this chamber would have it to be that a certain group of people in the State of Louisiana would not be properly represented. I am an American who stands every time the flag is presented. I proudly say one nation under God. And I hope today that in this senate we will stand as one Louisiana under God, because God is for what's just and what's equitable and what helps all people.

There is nothing that says that a second
African American serving in Congress in Louisiana will
not help the masses. Well, if we think that, then we
think that we're less or better than a person based on
race. If anyone in this chamber could articulate a
reason why they believe that any African American that
sits before you today wouldn't go to Congress with the
same zeal and vigor and heart for the people, then maybe
we can say that there's not an African American in this
state that's going to stand in Congress and represent
us.

But I literally do not believe that there's a colleague in here that looks across this chamber at any member of the Black caucus and does not believe that we wouldn't go to Congress and represent Louisiana. And so I stand in support, with reluctancy of having to talk to my constituents after this vote, but with carrying the

Page 21

US Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals that's made up of judges that were appointed by predominantly Republican presidents, and a United States Supreme Court that has already made rulings. That has been made up of justices that were appointed by a majority of Republican presidents, primarily former president Trump. This is not about one judge that was appointed by former president Barack Obama. This is about the people of this state, and one-third of that state, 33 percent, to be exact, being underrepresented.

So I think it's important that we keep the focus on why we're here today. None of us want to be here today. We've been at this for well over two years, and all of us have a level of reluctancy with the maps that are before us. Just like Senator Carter, I'm not thrilled about what's happening to send it to Congressional District Two, and the way that it's lowering the numbers.

Senator Price and I, we coauthored a bill that we felt performed better, but we too are going to support this map because not only have we been ordered to do it by, yes, a judge who was appointed by President Obama, but if we felt like the -- the -- the appellate judges would overrule her, then we'd be right back in court. We're at the end of the road, and I too

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2.4

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

24

25

Page 22

will support this -- this map. Not because I think it's perfect, not because I think it's the best thing that we could do, but because it's time to give people of this state fair representation. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Duplessis. Senator Pressly for the floor.

SENATOR PRESSLY: Thank you, Mr. President, and members. Senators, I rise today in opposition of this bill, and I rise in opposition because I represent a community that's unique and wonderful in many ways, very diverse, and clearly a passionate part of my life in Northwest Louisiana. I believe that Shreveport and Bossier City and the surrounding parishes of De Soto and Red River and Webster are unique from the rest of our state, and I believe that commonalities of -- of interest are important.

I agree with -- with Senator Jackson. I would have no issue whatsoever of having any member of this body, and many others from throughout our state of any background, of any creed, of any race represent our great, wonderful, diverse state in Washington, DC. But I cannot support a map that puts Caddo Parish and portions of my district, which is over 220 miles from here, in a district that will be represented by someone in East Baton Rouge that may or may not have ever even Page 24

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Pressly. The board is clear. Senator Womack, to close on your

SENATOR WOMACK: Colleagues, appreciate the questions and the comments, and I just ask that we move this bill favorable.

MALE SPEAKER: Senator Womack has moved favorable passage of Senate Bill 8. When the machines are open, all those in favor, aye. Those opposed, vote nay. Open the machines. Madam Secretary, open the machines. Go to a machine, members. Senator -- Senator Miguez. There we go. Secretary, close the machines. 27 ayes, 11 nays. The -- the -- the bill is passed. Senator Womack moves of reconsideration. The -- the vote by which the bill was passed. I lay the motion on the table without objection. So ordered.

Page 23

been to Northwest Louisiana, and certainly doesn't understand the rich culture, rich, important uniqueness of our area of the state.

When we look at -- at Louisiana, we often talk about north and south, and that division is true. It's real. I think all of us acknowledge that. The I-10 corridor has unique needs. When you look at -- at the challenges that you face with storms, often you think of hurricanes. In North Louisiana, we think of tornados and ice storms. When you look at the -- the important region of our states and the -- the diverse industries that we have in Northwest Louisiana, Barksdale is vitally important. Certainly, having Barksdale and Fort Johnson now, previously Fort Polk, together in one district is the one positive thing that I see in this map, and I think that is something that we must keep in mind as we continue through this process.

But I am concerned with the important part of -- of this state, Northwest Louisiana, not having the same member of Congress. With having a -- two members of Congress, that has the potential to split our community even further along a -- a -- a -- a -- a -line that's based purely on race, and I'm concerned about that. Therefore, I'm voting no, and I urge you to do the same.

Page 25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION 2 I. Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc.,

3 do hereby certify that

290872-Audio-011724SCHAMB-Edited-Appended.json was

transcribed utilizing computer aided means and the TranscribeMe transcription team.

The transcript of the audio mentioned above. having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe, Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full,

I further certify that neither I, nor the TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal association with the parties involved or are in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

Dated this 8th of March, 2024.

true, and correct transcription.

Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc.



PohlmanUSA® Court Reporting and Litigation Services

House Governmental Affairs - Audio Transcription

January 18, 2024

Phillip Callais, et al.

VS.

Nancy Landry

	2728		
	Page 2		Page 4
1	Representative Larvadain. Vice Chair Lyons.	1	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Johnson.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Present.	2	Representative Larvadain.
3	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Marcelle.	3	REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Here.
4	REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Here.	4	MS. BAKER: Present. Vice Chair Lyons.
5	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Newell.	5	VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Present.
6	REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Here.	6	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Marcelle.
7	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative	7	Representative Newell.
8	Schamerhorn.	8	REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Here.
9	REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Here.	9	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative
10	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Thomas.	10	Schamerhorn.
11	REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Here.	11	REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Here.
12	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Wright.	12	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Thomas.
13	Representative Wyble.	13	REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Here.
14	REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Here.	14	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Wright.
15	MS. BAKER: Present. We have 12 members in a	15	Representative Wyble.
16	quorum.	16	REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Here.
17	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. Baker.	17	MS. BAKER: Present. We have 13 in a quorum.
18	Members, we have one item on the agenda today. It's	18	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. Baker.
19	Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack. Senator Womack is	19	Members, we have one item on our agenda today. That's
20	is delayed this morning, so what we're going to do	20	Senate Bill 8 by Senator Womack. Ms. Lowery, would you
21	until I hear back from Senator Womack, we're going to	21	please read-in the bill?
22	stand at ease until then. So we just ask you all to	22	MS. LOWERY: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.
23	kind of stay nearby.	23	Members, Senator Womack brings Senate Bill Number 8 to
24	We'll give you all some time to to be able	24	provide relative to the redistricting of Louisiana's
25	to get back, but until we hear back from Senator Womack,	25	Congressional District, to provide with respect to
1 2	Page 3 we're going to go ahead and stand at ease. And so just	1 2	Page 5 positions and offices other than congressional based
3	viewer members that are listening online or watching online, just kind of be aware. We are hoping to come	3	upon congressional districts, and to provide related matters.
4	back in at some time later this morning. Thank you all.	4	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Senior Womack, on your
5	(Pause.)	5	bill.
6	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Good afternoon, members,	6	SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	viewing audience. Thank you for your patience. We are	7	Committee members, good evening. Thank you for letting
8	ready to resume our House and Governmental Affairs	8	me come in today and present this bill. As you know,
9	Committee. Today is Thursday, January 18th, 2024. Ms.	9	Louisiana Congressional Districts must be redrawn, given
10	Baker, can you give me an updated roll call, please?	10	the Federal Voting Rights Act litigation that is still
11	MS. BAKER: Chairman Beaullieu.	11	ongoing in the US District Court for the Middle District
12	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Here.	12	of Louisiana. The map and the bill that I'm
13	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Billings.	13	introducing, which is the product of a long, detailed
14	REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Here.	14	process, achieves several goals.
15	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Boyd.	15	First, as you all are aware, Congresswoman
	REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Present.	16	Julia Letlow is my representative in Washington, DC.
16	REFRESENTATIVE BOTD. Flesent.		
16 17	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson.	17	The boundaries in this bill I'm proposing, ensure that
		17 18	The boundaries in this bill I'm proposing, ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any
17	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson.		
17 18	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson. REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present.	18	Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any
17 18 19	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson. REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter.	18 19	Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any other incumbents, and in the congressional district that
17 18 19 20	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson. REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter. Representative Carver.	18 19 20	Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any other incumbents, and in the congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican to Congress for
17 18 19 20 21	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson. REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter. Representative Carver. REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here.	18 19 20 21	Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any other incumbents, and in the congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican to Congress for the remainder of this decade.
17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson. REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter. Representative Carver. REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Farnum.	18 19 20 21 22	Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any other incumbents, and in the congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican to Congress for the remainder of this decade. I have great pride in the work that
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carlson. REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter. Representative Carver. REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here. MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Farnum. REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Here.	18 19 20 21 22 23	Congresswoman Letlow remains both unpaired with any other incumbents, and in the congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican to Congress for the remainder of this decade. I have great pride in the work that Congresswoman Letlow has accomplished, and this map will

Page 6

decides and continues to serve our great state. As you know, Congresswoman Letlow sits on appropriations. She sits on ag, which is a big part of my district.

2.4

Second, the Louisiana 6th Congressional
District. The map and the proposed bill ensures that
four are safe Republican seats. Louisiana's Republican
present in the United States Congress has contributed
tremendously to the national discourse, and I'm very
proud that both Speaker of the US House of
Representatives, Mike Johnson, and US House Majority
Leader Steve Scalise are both from our great state.

This map ensures that the two of them will have solidly Republican districts at home, so they can focus on the national leadership that we need in Washington, DC. The map proposed in this bill ensures that the Conservative principles retained by the majority of those in Louisiana will continue to extend past our boundaries to our nation's capital.

Third, the map that I've presented is — goes along the Red River. It's the I-49 corridor. We have commerce through there. We have a college through there. We have a lot of ag cattlemen as well as farm row crop, and a lot of people up through that corridor comes back to Alexandria using that corridor for their healthcare. Finally, these maps in the proposed bill

Page 8

Constitution one person, one vote requirement. That is the reason why District 2 is drawn around the Orleans Parish and why District 6 includes the Black population of East Baton Rouge Parish and travels up I-49 corridor to include Black population in Shreveport.

While this is a different map than the plaintiffs' litigation have proposed, this is the only map I reviewed that accomplishes the political goals I believe are important for my district, for Louisiana, and for the country.

While I did not draw these boundaries myself, I carefully considered a number of different map options, and I firmly submit the congressional voting boundaries represented in this bill best achieve the goals for protecting Congressman Letlow's seat, maintaining strong districts for Speaker Johnson and Majority Leader Scalise, ensuring four Republican districts, and adhering to the command of the Federal Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Senator

Womack. Representative Marcelle for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Senator

Womack, for presenting this bill. Were -- did you have
the opportunity to view the map that I filed?

Page 7

respond appropriate to the ongoing Federal Voting Rights Act case in the Middle District of Louisiana.

For those who are unaware, the congressional maps that we enacted in March 2022 have been the subject of litigation, roughly since the day the 2022 Congressional Redistricting Bill went into effect and even before we enacted it. After a substantial amount of prolonged litigation, the Federal District Court has adhered to its view that the federal law requires that the state have two congressional districts with a majority of Black voters.

Our secretary of state, attorney general, and our prior legislative leadership appealed, but have yet to succeed, and we are now here because of the Federal Court's order that we have a first opportunity to act.

The District Court's order that we must have two majority Black voting age population districts, combined with the political imperative I just described, have largely driven the boundaries for District 2 and District 6, both of which are over 50 percent Black voting age population.

Given the state's current demographics, there is not enough high -- high enough Black population in the southeast portion of this -- Louisiana to create two majority Black districts, and to also comply with the US

Page 9

SENATOR WOMACK: I -- I reviewed several maps, Representative Marcelle.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: HB5.
SENATOR WOMACK: HB5. I didn't -- I didn't
look at the HB5 --

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Did not.

SENATOR WOMACK: -- per se. I looked at
several maps. One of them could have been that.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Because I
heard you say that you thought that your map was the

best possible route. A pathway to get to what we needed to, first of all, make sure that we get out of the litigation, apply with Section 2, and go about the deviations and the compactness and all of those different things that we needed to do in order to create a second Black seat -- congressional seat. Is that what I heard you say?

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Well, I -- I certainly want to thank you, and I know -- I spoke to you yesterday about putting an amendment on your bill to make sure that we could reduce the parish splits and that we had some conversations, and it's a short period of time. Certainly, I don't know when the amendments are going to be offered up, but I certainly want to go

Page 10 Page 12 down those same lines of -- since I could not get my map very much and thank you for your work. 2 2 through, which I thought was the best path, that I -- I SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative would support this map, with some cleanup done to it. 4 So I -- I just want to make sure that I go on Marcelle. Representative Boyd. 5 the record of saying that I spoke to you. The things 5 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Good afternoon, Senator. 6 that my amendment would do would certainly be to add Red 6 How are you? 7 River Parish to Congressional District 6, and preserving SENATOR WOMACK: Fine, thank you. 8 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: So I agree with Rep 8 the things in Red River community as well. So I want to 9 9 go on the record of saying that I -- I believe that we Marcelle. This is not, in my opinion, the best map that 10 have had several maps that would have gotten us there, 10 I've seen, but I do understand what it took to get here, 11 but I think because of political reasons, we are here 11 and my congressman seems to also be in support of the 12 12 where we are today. map. Therefore, I do plan on supporting the map, 13 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle, 13 hopefully with some amendments. Are you open to an 14 just if I can chime in for a second, so I can let the 14 amendment on this? 15 viewing members know that online there are two different 15 SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, ma'am, once -- once I 16 amendments that -- that will likely be proposed today, 16 see some amendments. 17 and both of those are available online for the -- for 17 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Okay. 18 the viewing public. If we could hold off on those 18 SENATOR WOMACK: You know, we'll look at 19 19 amendments for -- we have a -- a handful of questions on amendments. REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: And then she mentioned 20 the board, Representative Marcelle, and then we'll come 20 21 21 back. Is that okay with you? the parish splits. How many parish splits are they; do 22 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Yes. I just --22 vou know? 23 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Good. 23 SENATOR WOMACK: I think we're 16 at the -- at 2.4 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I just wanted to --2.4 the present time. 25 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: And do you know the 25 to make mention to that why -- why I was asking him some Page 11 Page 13 1 1 of the questions. So when you did this map, you -- you BVAPs for 2 and 6? 2 considered the population deviation. 2 SENATOR WOMACK: I'm sorry? 3 SENATOR WOMACK: Well, we had -- had to -- to 3 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: The BVAPs for 2 and 6, create the two districts, we had to think about the 4 4 do you know what they are right now? 5 population. SENATOR WOMACK: No, I don't. 6 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And the parish REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Okay. Did you have any 6 communication with anybody from -- with community splits as well? 8 SENATOR WOMACK: The parish splits as well. 8 influences on this? Have you met with other groups? 9 9 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So you felt like Who did you meet with to come up with this map? this was the best pathway after you viewed those areas 10 SENATOR WOMACK: I've had several meetings 10 11 11 that we certainly had to do to enact this map. over the period of time with several groups. 12 SENATOR WOMACK: Representative Marcelle, I --12 REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: With community of 13 I -- I want to be -- and -- and I -- I was hoping that 13 interest as well? it -- that covered that in my opening statement, but it 14 14 SENATOR WOMACK: It -- it was hard to -- to -- it -- my map is politically drawn to protect our create communities of interest with this map and -- and 15 16 16 members of Congress as it stands, as well as create the - and still achieve some of the goals that we were 17 two districts, minority district, Black districts. 17 trying to achieve from the congressional, political REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So in your opinion, 18 1.8

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Okay. Again, based on

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative

the map and my conversation with our congressman, if we

can get some things cleared up and straightened up on

SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. Thank you.

it, I would be in support of the bill as well.

Boyd. Representative Newell.

19

20

21

23

24

25

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

your map does two things. It satisfies the Court, and

it also protects the politics, or our congressional

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, ma'am.

SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: -- accurate to say?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay. Thank you

members. Is that -- is that --

Page 26 Page 28 there was another map. There's a lot cleaner map CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. That's what --2 2 because the map that I see goes from Shreveport to Baton that's what I was thinking. That's what I've learned 3 Rouge, which you're just zigzagging. And you picked up through the process, and I just wanted to make sure that 4 Alexandria, you picked up Natchitoches, you picked up your map achieved that. Yeah. DeSoto, but it's more of a political map. The map that 5 SENATOR WOMACK: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. the Democrats pursued, it was a map that we agreed on 6 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: All right. Senator, the 6 7 two majority-minority districts, and this is more of a board's cleared. We're going to go ahead, if you don't 8 8 political map. mind, and -- and take up the amendments right now. Bear 9 9 SENATOR WOMACK: Yeah, I know. with me for two seconds. Senator Marcelle, and -- and REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Okay. Thank you. 10 -- excuse me. Sorry about that promotion, 11 SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you. 11 Representative Marcelle. 12 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Senator Womack, why are 12 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That's okay. 13 13 we here today? What -- what brought us all to this CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And -- and Representative 1 4 special session as it -- as it relates to, you know, 14 Farnum both have amendments. 15 what we're discussing here today? 15 FEMALE SPEAKER 2: Here. This card's in 16 SENATOR WOMACK: The middle courts of the 16 Marcelle's name. 17 district courts brought us here from the Middle 17 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Hold that -- hold 18 District, and said, "Draw a map, or I'll draw a map." 18 that for me. Bear with me. So the first amendment is 19 19 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. how -- is Amendment 68. That is Amendment 60. Give me 20 SENATOR WOMACK: So that's what we've done. 20 a second while it's loading. What amendment is 68? 21 21 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And -- and were you --MS. LOWERY: That is the one offered by 22 does -- does this map achieve that middle court's 22 Representative Farnum. 23 orders? 23 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Farnum, 24 SENATOR WOMACK: It does. 2.4 we're going to take up your amendment first. 25 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. When you were 25 Representative Farnum, on your amendment. Page 27 Page 29 1 drawing the maps, you also took into consideration REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I offer -- does -- do we need to read it 2 incumbency, correct? 2 3 SENATOR WOMACK: Right. 3 4 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. To protect not 4 MS. LOWERY: Certainly. 5 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowery, please just our state, but our national interest as well. SENATOR WOMACK: Our national. 6 6 read-in the amendment. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Is that correct? 7 MS. LOWERY: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. 8 SENATOR WOMACK: Right. 8 Representative Farnum is offering up HCASBA-36268. And 9 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: This is -- this is bigger 9 on page 1, it's going to delete lines 13 through 17, and 10 10 delete pages 2 through 6, and we'll be inserting a new SENATOR WOMACK: It's bigger than just us, and 11 district configuration for the congressional districts 11 12 Louisiana has never been sitting in the poor position 12 for the State of Louisiana. This amendment is available 13 13 online and is available in your packets, members, and 14 14 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: What -- what position contains maps and statistics relevant to the plan. 15 does Congressman Mike Johnson have in the United States 15 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Ms. Lowery. 16 16 House of Representatives? Representative Farnum, on your amendment. 17 SENATOR WOMACK: He's a speaker of the house. 17 REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. 1.8 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. And what about 18 Chairman. So in the -- in the beginning of this 19 19 Congressman Steve Scalise? process, me and my colleagues from Southwest Louisiana 20 SENATOR WOMACK: Majority leader of the house. 20 set out to accomplish making Calcasieu whole. In the 2.1 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. So if we've been 21 history of - of our - our great parish, we've always able to accomplish what the judge has ordered through had one congressman that represented us. And -- and --23 23 your map, and also been able to protect the political and with the current map as presented from Senator 24 24 Womack, it -- it split Calcasieu Parish basically in interest, that is kosher, correct? 25 SENATOR WOMACK: That's exactly. 25 half in population. And -- and with the community of

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Page 74

or COI landmark. So thinking of school districts or 2 hospitals, airports, everything else when you're looking 3 at that metric, all I can speak to -- I can't speak to this amendment. I just saw it. But in terms of landmark place splits, the map that we had proposed had the exact same amount as the enacted map. 6 So that was another metric that, in our 8 process, we were able to hold ourselves accountable to, 9 to making sure our map was as good as or, in most of the instances, better than the enacted map.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: So, Representative Wyble, what we can do -- I know you're a big school board guy. Why don't we get you with them afterwards, and y'all can talk in some details on that?

MS. WENGER: We've got slide decks on this. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Right. No. They have -they have -- they have tons of information.

MS. WENGER: I'd be happy to provide it for us anytime

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Thank -- thank you so much.

22 MS_WENGER: Thank you

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

1

2

4

5

6

9

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.3

24

25

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative

2.4 Wyble. Members, that clears the board. Representative

25 Farnum has a motion on the table to adopt Amendment Set Page 76

to create two majority-Black districts. And performance of those maps that we saw earlier, some that didn't make it through, some that were here, including yours, Senator Womack, some of them perform. Some perform better than others.

But we have to look at the -- the -- the center of this piece, and that is to create those districts that perform. And some of that's going to be for debate and some that's going to be for the -- the clearing pieces to happen as we go forward.

But I just want to put on the record, you know, that I know the senators worked hard on this piece. And that goal is what was in mind, to create these two majority-Black districts and to do it with as much of the criteria as possible to be done to -- to make sure that it -- it -- it is conforming.

And -- and with that being said, I wanted to get that clear of what that message is and what we're doing here, which you remember before we -- we go with this piece. And I wanted to say that, Mr. Chairman, as we go forward in this opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Vice Chairman Lyons. Members, back on the motion, we have a -- a motion by Representative Foreman to adopt -- Farnum to adopt Amendment Set 68. Is there any objections to the

Page 75

68. And objection -- what's that?

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: (inaudible 1:22:44).

3 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Oh, oh. One second,

Members. Vice Chairman Lyons.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I was going to address this -- this to

Representative Farnum on - on your amendment. And

8 after the table was just -- was clear with that

information, now, I -- I just want to say that the past

two years, I've been through every roadshow throughout 11

I was in Calcasieu, and I heard the testimony

there. And I -- I sympathize in it with the individual residents there as they talked about being whole as other communities of interest throughout the state. That was the most impacting testimony that we received throughout this process. And it went on for not only

from our community to your community, everywhere else. And the question remains always - and we don't have an answer for - is: can we draw the perfect map? don't think we ever can draw the perfect map. I don't think that there's ever going to be a situation where

everybody's going to be happy or even whole. But I'm looking at the mission that we have here. And the mission that we have here is that we have Page 77

adoption of that amendment set? Hearing no -- no

2 objection, Amendment Set 68 is -- is hereby adopted. 3 On to the next amendment. We have Amendment

4 Set 70, I believe, Representative Marcelle.

5

Representative Marcelle, on -- on your amendment. REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: That's amendment 6

(inaudible 1:25:52).

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Or Ms. Lowery, would you mind reading that in?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I just missed my objection -- amendment.

MS. LOWERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Marcelle brings Amendment Set HCASB-8362, number 70. This is available, Members, in front of you, and also for members of the public, it's available online

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle, on your amendment.

19 REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. 20 Amendment Number 3 adds River -- the Red River Parish to 21 Congressional District 6, better preserving the Red

River community of interest and the community of

23 interest formed by Red River, Natchitoches, and DeSoto

24 Parishes. It also makes Ouachita Parish whole in 25

Congressional District 5.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

Page 86

Page 88 And if six months or a year from now, the

decision.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Well, her actual order says that the plaintiffs, when they went into Court for a preliminary injunction, never tried on the merits, just a summary proceeding, said that they had carried their burden of showing that the current map violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and that the plaintiffs had a substantial likelihood of making their claim successful, which is that we'll have a second minority district in Louisiana.

But there was no trial on the merits. But the judge essentially said, if we have a trial on the merits, I'm going to rule in favor of the plaintiffs, and I'm going to create a second majority-minority district in Louisiana. That's exactly what this bill is doing right now.

And if our current map goes -- if you do nothing and our current map goes back before Judge Dick, she's going to probably end up doing the same thing. But at least we have a chance to fight for the current map in our state. And no matter how she rules, we have the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal, and we have the US

And, again, everything is at stake, and it seems like we're simply giving it all away right now.

United States Congress is controlled by Democrats, it started in this house, it started and ended in this capital, and that's what will have made it possible. And the citizens of Louisiana, I can tell you, will have a very, very good memory if that occurs. I would respectfully submit that your responsibility is to represent the interests of the substantial majority of Louisiana citizens and not to cave to political pressure. And we're asking you to defeat this legislation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Mr. Alexander. And look just to -- to -- and -- and you got a couple of questions. But just from -- from my standpoint, ${\bf I}$ sat on the committee when we drew the other maps that we all believe were fair, and we believe is representative of the state of Louisiana. The Fifth Circuit sent it back to the federal judge and basically held us hostage that if -- if we don't do it, she's going to do it. And so none of us like the position we're in.

But -- you know, and -- and a little bit to your point, we were elected to serve, and we feel that - that we would prefer to have the lines drawn in this committee than have some Obama-appointed judge drawing the lines for us. And so we don't like it. It's

Page 87

Page 89

We believe that this is worth fighting for. We believe that that balance of power is worth fighting for.

And I would remind the members of this panel that I know, some of whom we helped get elected, along with Governor Landry whom we worked very hard for and who we respect and think he's going to be a great governor, that the citizens of Louisiana worked very tirelessly to get you elected to come here, not to cave in to political pressure, which is it appears to hundreds and hundreds of citizens across the state that that's what you're doing. You're caving in to political pressure, and you're giving in without a fight.

Speaker Mike Johnson has weighed in on this. We heard some testimony earlier that Congressman Johnson apparently was okay with this proposed legislation. That's not our legislation. That's not our understanding at all. In fact, Congressman Johnson specifically said that our current map from 2022 needs a

19 full trial on the merits, with appellate review all the 20 way to the Supreme Court, if necessary, because the 21 issue is so profoundly important to the future of this

republic. I will -- I want to reiterate before I close, 2.3 as I said, people all over the state are watching this

2.4 right now, many of whom voted for you to come here, some 25 of you who were just elected very recently.

21

22

23

24

25

in a lot of our minds. So I -- I appreciate your comments. Thank you. And you do have -- you do have a question. Representative Newell. REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman. I'm troubled by your statements because this is not a process by which one party is losing power, caving into another party. This is a process by which the other 30 percent of the people in this state are trying to get the representation that their population and numbers deserve in Congress. This isn't a caving in or power grab or giving away of power or losing of power of the Republican Party. It's an opportunity for this body to represent

painful to do. And so I feel your sentiment, and -- and

I don't -- I'm not disagreeing with most of what you

said. I mean, it's -- it's -- it's what goes on

all of the people that they supposed to represent in their district, listening to them and giving them the opportunity to vote for someone of their choice, whether that person of their choice is a Black Republican or White Democrat. It's an opportunity for Black people, as some of my colleagues would prefer to be said, but a minority-majority district to have the opportunity to vote for their candidate of choice. And I'm troubled by the way you said your statement. You're very

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 98

was 40, 50 years ago. 2 And so the reason why this is so difficult is 3 because we are moving in the right direction. We don't 4 have concentrated populations of -- of certain 5 minorities or populations of White folks in certain areas. It is spread out throughout the state. Compared 6 7 to Alabama, Alabama has 17 counties that are 8 minority-majority, and they're all contiguous. 9 Louisiana has seven parishes that are minority-majority

and only three are contiguous. That's why this process is so difficult, but here we are without any other options to move forward.

And so I -- I hear what you're saying. I respectfully disagree with the characterization that it's bending to political pressure.

MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: I -- I -- you know me, and you know that I wouldn't do that. But I don't see any other path forward. This is the best of two bad options, and I'm going to always do my job --

MR ALEXANDER: Yeah.

22 REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: -- that's before me.

MR. ALEXANDER: And I understand that.

24 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you.

MR. ALEXANDER: Is there -- is -- is there --

Page 100

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Representative Marcelle. REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Mr. Alexander, I guess it's disheartening for me to sit here in 2024 and hear that we certainly need to keep the power. And if you all do what's right in Louisiana, we're going to lose our thin majority. If we would have done what was right long time ago, you probably wouldn't be in a majority. If Alabama passes what they need to pass and we pass what we need to pass, then, perhaps, we will have a fair and balanced Congress. MR. ALEXANDER: And you'll be in the majority. REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well -- and -- and what's the problem with that, sir? MR. ALEXANDER: Well, there's millions of Americans who have a problem with that. REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And guess what, it's millions of people who have not had an opportunity to have a seat at the table. We have a problem with voter suppression. We have a problem with people thinking that we can't make decisions. And let me say this: on

Page 99

Page 101

1 do you think there's anything that would be -- an option 2 would be to allow our attorney general to argue the 3 constitutionality of our current map in Federal Court, 4 Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal, and Supreme Court? REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Already been done 5 6 twice in the Fifth Circuit and asked of the Supreme Court, and they've refused to do that. And here we lie 8 today. 9 MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: There's never even been a 10

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: There's never even been a trial on the merits, Representative Carlson, on this map
--

REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: That's not our decision.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: -- even in district court.

REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: That -- that is the judge's decision, unfortunately.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: And if you don't do anything, they'll have one.

REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: And if we don't do anything, we'll have a worse map. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you.

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you, sir. I appreciate the interchange.

ideology because they are Black is one way, is certainly crazy, number one.

the other side of the aisle -- on the other side of the

chamber in the Senate. I have colleagues that have some

of the same beliefs that some of you have, right? And

they believe in pro-life. They are African Americans.

I believe in pro-choice. So to say that everybody's

And number two, I really agree with you with something, and that is, send it back to the courts and let Judge Shelly Dick draw the maps. We could then remove --

MR. ALEXANDER: But you -- you agree with me.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I -- I do agree with that because then we could remove all of these different people and these moving parts that everybody -- these political interests because we do deserve two Black congressional seats because where I went to school - it was a Black school, though, Capitol High School - when you divide six into a third, a third into sixth, you get two. And so we deserve two seats, and that's what we deserve. We didn't -- we're not begging for something that we don't deserve. That's what we deserve.

And -- and God forbid, maybe somebody will get elected that feels like you, have the same ideologies as you, but perhaps they won't. People need an opportunity to have their voices heard.

MR. ALEXANDER: I respect that.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And when I send somebody to Congress that feels like you that represents my district, then you do not represent what I believe.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 118

REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Absolutely. And thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm done.

1

2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

1

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

3 MR. HURD: It's absolutely the same. What 4 they held was in the '90s, the federal agency that was 5 telling you, "You had to do it," was the DOJ under 6 Section 5, which itself was later held unconstitutional. 7 The answer is they were wrong. They were 8 unconstitutionally demanding racial districting beyond 9 what the federal courts now recognize as the permissible 10 range of remedy. We may be -- we don't -- I -- I --11 look, I'll give Judge Dick an opportunity. It's not 12 that she's hailed Section 2 applies.

The question is whether or not Section 2 has a constitutional remedy, i.e., I believe that my districting plan that I've handed in and I did it for an -- an example is as close as you can get to a non-racially gerrymandered district and get to two majority-minority districts, and it does. The plaintiff's remedy, Senate Bill 4 and 5, they're both racial gerrymanders and will not stand up to the Fifth Circuit. There are abilities to draw a compact contiguous majority-minority district, second one, in Louisiana. What you're going to do, you're going to enact this.

If I was Judge Dick, I'd look at it and go,

Page 120

Page 121

applies on why this is a -- a -- a ineffective remedy, and I hope -- I hope your good judgment finds another solution.

4 CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you. 5 Representative Phelps, you failed to call, but you 6 didn't say you wanted to speak. Are you trying to speak 7

> REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: Yes, (inaudible 2:19:39).

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: I know you're not on the committee, but you want -- all right. Come on. Let's -- all right. All right. So let's fill this out that says she does want to speak. She's providing information only, not a green card or a red card. So Representative Phelps?

REPRESENTATIVE PHELPS: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I -- I just wanted to mention to maybe some of our new colleagues here when we talk about why we're here. This started from an increase of the population from our census. So I -- and I think that's not -- we haven't heard a lot of that with the audience on the outside. It just was not a mandate to draw a map. So this does go with the 2020, the Census results that resulted in a population increase of African Americans across the state.

Page 119

"I'm sorry. I've got -- already got the judge that 2 wrote the opinion on the Fifth Circuit that says what

3 y'all are about to do is a constitutional gerrymander.

4 Therefore, I can disregard it." Disregard it. It is

null and void. And she's going to draw the plan if you want to remedy an actual remedy. That's why it's exactly the same. You read the opinion, and you'll see they said, "The federal power does not override or force

you to violate the Constitution." Stand up for the Constitution.

Stand up if you want a compact district. Draw the one that makes sense with our traditional districting principles because you can do it. The -the -- the -- the answer is, this is an unconstitutional alternative.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hurd. You -- you -- I think you've been very, very clear on it. The board is clear. We have no more witnesses. Senator Womack, we're going to go ahead and -- and call you back up to -- to close.

MR. HURD: Your Honor, if -- I mean, Your Honor. I apologize. I'd like to -- I've got a copy of that opinion that outlines all the reasons that what you've got is a racial gerrymander. I had an outline of what it -- of -- of the -- each criteria that the judge

Secondly, I hope that there is some passion here about if there were a different population, a White population, and there was so much pushback about creating a district so that everyone would be represented, how that may feel. Just a thought. Thirdly, when I heard Judge Dick's name reference to Obama's judge. I don't know if I've ever heard someone say Trump's judge or Carter's judge or Reagan's judge or whomever. I don't know if we're going to start referencing judges that way, but I hope that we do not do that in this body.

I think we should give all of our elected officials a little bit more respect in that, regardless of what president they were appointed to or from. Thank

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Phelps. The board is clear. Senator Womack, would you come up and close on your bill?

SENATOR WOMACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the committee, we all know why we're here. We were ordered to - to draw a new Black district, and that's what I've done. At the same time, I tried to protect Speaker Johnson, Minority Leader Scalise, and my representative, Congresswoman Letlow. I'm agreeable to the amendment, and we complied with everything the judge

	<u>2736</u>		
	Page 122		Page 124
1	has asked. And I just ask for favorable passage.	1	matters before this committee. Representative Thomas
2	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Senator	2	had made a motion that we adjourn. Look, and as we
3	Senator Womack. Representative Farnum has made a motion	3	adjourn, thank you everyone for your patience. Thank
4	that we adopt Senate Bill 8 as amended. Is there any	4	you everyone for your time. It's been a a great
5	objection? Representative Marcell objects. Ms. Baker	5	debate and and we appreciate you. Meeting adjourned.
6	listen, do we have anybody in an anteroom needs to	6	Thank you all.
7	come in real quick? We have everyone here? Looks like	7	(Meeting adjourned.)
8	everyone's here. Okay. Ms. Baker, would you please	8	(
9	call the role? So let me clarify the vote. A vote of	9	
10	yes moves Senator Womack's bill as amended by	10	
11	Representative Farnum forward. A vote of no leaves it	11	
12	here in the committee. Ms. Baker?	12	
13	MS. BAKER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman.	13	
14	Chairman Beaullieu?	14	
15	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Yes.	15	
16	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Billings?	16	
17	REPRESENTATIVE BILLINGS: Yes.	17	
18	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Boyd?	18	
19	REPRESENTATIVE BOYD: Yes.	19	
20	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Carlson?	20	
21	REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Yes.	21	
22	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Carter?	22	
23	Representative Carver?	23	
24	REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Yes.	24	
25	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Farnum?	25	
	Page 123		Page 125
1	REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes.	1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION
2	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Gadberry?	2	I, Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc.,
3	Yes. Representative Johnson? Representative Larvadain?	3	do hereby certify that
4	Yes. Representative Lyons?	4	291001-Audio-COMBINE-1-18-24_HG_p1-p2.MP3
5	VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Yes.	5	was transcribed utilizing computer aided means and the
6	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Marcelle?	6	TranscribeMe transcription team.
7	Representative Newell?	7	The transcript of the audio mentioned above,
8	REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Not as amended. No,	8	having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe,
9	as amended.	9	Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full,
10	MS. BAKER: No for Representative Marcelle.	10	true, and correct transcription.
11	REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No.	11	I further certify that neither I, nor the
12	MS. BAKER: Representative Newell?	12	TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal
13	REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Yes.	13	association with the parties involved or are in any way
14	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Schamerhorn?	14	interested in the outcome thereof.
15	REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Yes.	15	Dated this 12th of March, 2024.
16	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Thomas?	16	
17	REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Yes.	17	Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc.
18	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Wright?	18	
19	REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT: Yes.	19	
20	MS. BAKER: Yes. Representative Wybel?	20	
21	REPRESENTATIVE WYBEL: Yes.	21	
22	MS. BAKER: Yes. There are 14 yeas and 1 nay.	22	
23	CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Members members have a	23	
24	vote of 14 yeas, 1 nay. Senate Bill 8 is hereby adopted	24	
25	as amended. Reported as amended. There are no other	25	



PohlmanUSA® Court Reporting and Litigation Services

Floor - Audio Transcription January 19, 2024

Phillip Callais, et al.

VS.

Nancy Landry

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 2

Members, I'm bringing you this congressional 2 redistricting map that Senator Womack presented. You've 3 -- you've heard it debated a couple of times. You heard it in -- in committee as well. Yesterday, we added an 5 amendment in committee to Senator Womack's bill. And so my first order of business, even before I make my 6 opening remarks, is going to get this bill in a proper 8 posture. I'd like to offer up an amendment to delete 9 the amendments that we added in committee yesterday. So 10 if you'll check your monitors, it's going to -- or Madam 11 Clerk, would you mind reading in the amendment? 12 THE CLERK: Mr. Speaker and members, 13 Representative Beaullieu, as he's just discussed, is

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

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

offering up a one-page set of amendments. That set is

online. It's set number 83.

22 MR. SPEAKER: I see no questions on the 23 amendment. Representative Marcelle for the floor on the amendment

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you, Mr.

Page 4

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Members, I just ask you to support the removal of the amendment that we added in -- in House and Governmental. Thank you. MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu has offered up an amendment which Representative Farnum objects. All those in favor, vote yea. All those opposed, vote nay. The clerk will open the machine. THE CLERK: (inaudible 0:04:34). MR SPEAKER: Wright, yea. THE CLERK: Emerson, yea. MR. SPEAKER: Emerson, yea. Are you through voting, members? The clerk will close the machine. We have 84 yeas and 16 nays, and amendment passes.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, members, for supporting me on that amendment. You'll bear with me for a second. So, members, I - I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to be with you here today. Two years ago, I sat on the committee that -- that passed the original congressional map after redistricting, and we spent a lot of time going around the state listening to folks from all over our state. And this House, by two -- over two-thirds vote, supported a map that we thought was fair, that we thought was representative of the state of Louisiana.

Representative Beaullieu on the bill.

Page 3

Speaker and Chairman. And thank you, members. On yesterday, we had a pretty, I would say, heated debate in H&G about these amendments, and so I rise in support of removing those amendments. And I had a lot of questions after I got home about why didn't I object to the amendments, but I'd stepped out of the room and so that's the reason for me not objecting to the amendments. I did object to the bill because the amendments had been added.

I know this is the process. I think that the bill was in its best posture when it came over with Representative -- I mean, with Senator Womack, Senate Bill 8. However, I tried to put that bill in a better posture. That matter failed. I know the process. I appreciate the process. And I appreciate the chairman taking that amendment off that I think does us no good to get to a better place where we can get the second congressional district. And I'd ask that you all would support the chairman in removing the amendment that was placed on there on yesterday. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any objections to the adoption of the amendment? Representative Farnum, objection. Would you like to speak on your objection? Representative Beaullieu, would you like to close on your amendment?

Page 5

As Senator Stine said earlier in this week, "It's with a heavy heart that I present to you this other map," but we have to. It's that clear. A federal judge has ordered us to draw an additional minority seat in the state of Louisiana. We have the -- the federal Voting Rights Act litigation is still going on in the US District Court in the Middle District of Louisiana. The map in this bill that I'm presenting is one of a product of long, detailed process with several goals.

First, and as a lot of you are aware, Congresswoman Julia Letlow represents north Louisiana in our nation's capital and serves on both the appropriations and agricultural committees. The boundaries in the bill that I'm presenting ensure that Congresswoman Letlow remains both unimpaired with any other incumbents, and in a congressional district that should continue to elect a Republican Congress for the remainder of this decade.

I have great pride in the work Congresswoman Letlow has accomplished, and this map will ensure that Louisianians will continue to benefit from her presence in the halls of Congress for as long as she decides to continue serving our great state of Louisiana.

Second, of Louisiana's six congressional districts, the map and the proposed bill ensures that

2.3

Page 6

four are safe from — or safe Republican seats.

Louisiana's Republican presence in the United States

Congress has contributed tremendously to the national
discourse, and I'm very proud, and it's remarkable, that
both the speaker of the United States House of
Representatives, Mike Johnson, and the US House majority
leader, Steve Scalise, are both from our great state.

2.0

This map ensures that the two men — the two of them will have solidly Republican districts at home so they can focus on the national leadership that we need in Washington, DC. The map proposed in this bill ensures that the conservative principles retained by the majority of those in Louisiana will continue to extend past our boundaries to our nation's capital.

Finally, the maps in the proposed bill respond appropriately to the ongoing federal litigation, the ongoing federal Voting Rights Act case in the Middle District of Louisiana. For those who are unaware of the background, the congressional maps that we enacted, that I mentioned a second ago, in March of — in March of 2022, have been the subject of litigation roughly since the day the 2022 congressional redistricting bill went into effect, and even before we enacted it. So the suit was filed before we actually enacted the bill.

After a substantial amount of prolonged

-- the reason why District 2 is growing around Orleans

Page 8

-- the reason why District 2 is growing around Orleans Parish, while District 6 includes the Black population of east Baton Rouge Parish and travels up the I-49 corridor and the Red River to include Black population in Shreveport.

While this is a different map than the plaintiffs in the litigation have proposed, this is the only map I reviewed that accomplishes the political goals I believe are important for my district, for Louisiana, and for our country.

While I did not draw these boundaries myself, and I'm bringing the bill to the floor for the -Senator Womack carried through the Senate and through committee yesterday in this House, I firmly submit that the congressional voting boundaries represented in this bill best achieve the goals of protecting Congresswoman Letlow's seat, maintaining strong districts for Speaker Johnson and Majority Leader Scalise, ensuring four Republican districts, and adhering to the command of the federal court in the Middle District of Louisiana.

I submit to you this map, and I'll be happy to take any questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Representative Taylor on a question.

THE CLERK: She waives.

Page 7

litigation, two trips to the Fifth Circuit asking it to reverse it, and a trip to the US Supreme Court, the federal District Court has adhered to its view that the federal law requires that the state have two congressional districts with a majority of Black voters. It's that simple. Our secretary of state, our attorney general, and our prior legislative leadership appealed but have yet to succeed. We are now here because the federal courts order that we have a first opportunity to act.

If we don't act, it is very clear that the federal court will impose the plaintiff's proposed map on our state, and we don't want that. The District Court's order that we must have two majority-Black voting-age population districts, combined with the political imperatives I just described, have largely driven the boundaries for District 2 and District 6, both of which are over 50 percent Black voting-age population, or BVAP as you've heard discussed a lot in committees and may hear with folks discussing today.

Given the state's current demographics, there's not a high enough Black -- Black population in the southeast portion of Louisiana to create two majority-Black districts and to also comply with the US Constitution's one vote, one person requirement. That a Page 9

MR. SPEAKER: She waives. Representative Amedee on a question.

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

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: Yes, ma'am, and to comply with the judge's order.

9 REPRESENTATIVE AMEDEE: Thank you.

10 MR. SPEAKER: Seeing no further questions,

11 Representative Bayham for the floor.

(Pause.)

REPRESENTATIVE BAYHAM: When I ran for the legislature, I had one goal, and that is to give my community a voice. I've studied some of the plans that were submitted by my colleagues here. Representative Wilford Carter had a plan, I believe, that kept St. Bernard Parish intact, and I appreciate that, Representative Carter. I am here to stand up for my community. St. Bernard has never been split into two

congressional districts. We've already been split into two Senate districts. And to be brutally honest, looking at the way these precincts are — and I know every precinct. I've campaigned in every precinct in St. Bernard.

Page 10 Page 12 We have two precincts, for example, that are -- on Senate Bill Number 8. I want to correct from 2 in the 2nd Congressional District. One, Precinct 24, 2 absent to nav 3 gave President Trump 75 percent of the vote. Precinct 3 MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. 4 25 gave President Trump 69 percent of the vote. Those 4 REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: Thank you, Mr. --5 are in the 2nd District. In the 1st District is 5 MALE SPEAKER: Representative Taylor moves for 6 Precinct 44, which gave President Biden 83 percent of 6 a motion to correct her vote. 7 7 the vote. Precinct 45 gave President Biden 85 percent REPRESENTATIVE TAYLOR: Good afternoon. I 8 8 of the vote. It seems like these precincts were just would also like to vote from absent to yea on the 9 9 thrown together like a mechanical claw machine, just amendment. 10 10 MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. grabbing people and dropping them off. 11 Now, I participated in the hearings on the 11 Representative Jackson moves to correct his vote. 12 12 REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Yes. I want to congressional reapportionment where they toured the 13 13 state, and I appreciated the leadership of the House and change my vote from nay to yea. the Senate, the committees in doing this. I took 14 MALE SPEAKER: Without objection. 14 15 advantage of it. I testified. We are being told that 15 REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you. 16 we have to redraw all of this in a period of less than 16 17 17 eight days. That is not how you make sausage. That's 18 how you make a mess. I cannot in good conscience vote 18 19 19 for this bill that divides my community, and I will 20 stand by that for my community. Thank you. 20 2.1 MR. SPEAKER: There's no questions. 21 2.2 REPRESENTATIVE BAYHAM: Thank you. 22 23 MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu to 23 24 24 close on the bill. 25 REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: As a colleague Page 11 Page 13 1 mentioned earlier - sorry, Representative Cox, if I have 1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION 2 to poach you - "Everybody likes to eat sausage, but 2 I. Nathan Pikover, COO of TranscribeMe, Inc., 3 nobody likes to see how it's made." And it's -- it has 3 do hereby certify that 291001-Audio-1-19-24_1es_day5 -4 been painful, and it has been painful for all of us. 4 Cut-Appended was transcribed utilizing computer aided 5 But it's simple. We're under a federal judge's mandate, means and the TranscribeMe transcription team. 6 and this bill is our best attempt to comply with her 6 The transcript of the audio mentioned above, decision. So, members, I ask you to support me in 7 having been transcribed and reviewed by TranscribeMe, 8 voting for this map. Thank you. 8 Inc. to the best of the company's ability, is a full, 9 MR. SPEAKER: Representative Beaullieu moves 9 true, and correct transcription. 10 10 for final passage of the bill. Those in favor, vote I further certify that neither I, nor the 11 11 yea. Those opposed, vote nay. The clerk will open the TranscribeMe, Inc. transcription team, have any personal 12 machine. Vote your machine, members. Members, are you 12 association with the parties involved or are in any way 13 through voting? The clerk will close the machine. We 13 interested in the outcome thereof. have 86 yeas, 16 nays, and the bill is finally passed. 14 14 Dated this 11th of March 2024 15 15 Representative Beaullieu moves to adopt the title, and 16 moves to reconsider the vote for which the bill finally 16 Nathan Pikover, COO TranscribeMe, Inc. 17 passed and lay that motion on the table without 17 18 objection. 18 19 19 MR. SPEAKER: Open the machine for co-authors. 20 20 2.1 MR. SPEAKER: The clerk will close the 2.1 22 2.2 machine. We have ten co-authors. 23 23 MALE SPEAKER: Representative Bagley for a 24 24 motion to move to correct his vote.

25

REPRESENTATIVE BAGLEY: I want to correct on

25



PohlmanUSA® Court Reporting and Litigation Services

Lousiana State Senate 1st Special Session-Audio Transcription

January 19, 2024

In Re: Louisiana House Floor/Committee Video

Page 2 Page 4 in the exact posture that it left the Senate. The House Committee is removed. HGA Committee amendment I move to concur 2 2 SENATOR MORRIS: Yes, sir. I think you with on Senate Bill Number 8. 3 altered the amendment. (Pause.) 4 SENATOR WOMACK: Senator Morris, I'll have to 5 MALE SPEAKER: Gotcha. Members, the summaries 5 -- I'll have to look back and -- and put that together are being passed out right now, so we're just going to 6 for you. Any other questions? 6 7 slow down a little bit. I want to give everybody the SENATOR MORRIS: So you don't know why we put 8 8 chance to see what we're voting on. Avoyelles in Miss Letlow's district? 9 9 (Pause.) SENATOR WOMACK: As I stated earlier, we were 10 MALE SPEAKER: Senator Womack, would you mind 10 -- we were trying to put what we could to -- to give 11 going over the -- I know we've all seen the amendment 11 senator -- Representative Letlow as much North Louisiana 12 once. We -- we know what the bill looks like, but if 12 as we could. So that was what we -- that was what we 13 13 you could just go over some high points on it while done on -- on that amendment. 14 14 SENATOR MORRIS: By -- by trading Avoyelles they're passing this out. Members, if you have a --15 members, if you want to speak, hit your Floor button if 15 for Monroe, we gave her more North Louisiana. 16 anybody would like to come to the Floor to discuss the 16 SENATOR WOMACK: As I understand it, in that 17 bill. I know some members -- make sure that you do 17 bill, I didn't think that -- that your home or Senator 18 18 Cathey or Echols was in the original bill to start with. 19 19 My recollection. (Pause.) 20 SENATOR WOMACK: Okay. They're passing out 20 SENATOR MORRIS: It wasn't in Miss Letlow's 21 the amendments. The -- the way they did lay up the 21 district. 22 House -- I mean, lay up the Senate, it was one district 22 SENATOR WOMACK: Right. 23 change on that amendment. That took in part of 23 SENATOR MORRIS: Would you be shocked if that 2.4 2.4 was not the case, and that we were all in Miss Letlow's Avoyelles Parish. That was the only change, to my 25 knowledge, that was in the -- that was in the new map. 25 district? Page 3 Page 5 1 MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Senate Morris for -- for 1 SENATOR WOMACK: Probably so. But that -- at 2 -- Senator Morris for a question on the bill, and you 2 the -- at the time I put that amendment on. I don't 3 also have your Floor button, so which -- you want to 3 remember the original map having that -- y'all's address 4 question. Let's do question first, please, and then we 4 in her district. SENATOR MORRIS: But you did know that the can do the Floor. Thank you. 5 SENATOR MORRIS: Senator Womack, you said the 6 6 amendment took some more of Ouachita Parish out of 7 only change was -- was taking some of Avoyelles Parish 7 Letlow's, and put it into Johnson's district; you did 8 and putting it in Miss Letlow's district, correct? 8 know that, right? q SENATOR WOMACK: Correct. 9 SENATOR WOMACK: I knew it had to come from SENATOR MORRIS: However, it actually took my 10 10 somewhere

personal home out of Miss Letlow's district, as well as 11 12 Senator Cathey's home precinct, as well as State Rep 13 Echols' home precinct, and put that in Representative 14 Johnson's district; did it not? 15 SENATOR WOMACK: It did. SENATOR MORRIS: So the only thing being done 16 17 was not just Avoyelles Parish, correct? 18 SENATOR WOMACK: I stand to be corrected. 19 You're correct 20 SENATOR MORRIS: Why did we do that for 2.1 Avoyelles Parish? 2.2 SENATOR WOMACK: That was -- that was brought before the -- the -- I'll have to look back. I -- I was 23

-- I was thinking that was a -- a -- a Senate Committee

amendment on that, and that's the way it came out of

24 25

SENATOR MORRIS: Yes, sir. Thank you. MALE SPEAKER: Senator Morris, you have the Floor now for the -- for Senate (inaudible 0:08:19). SENATOR MORRIS: Thank you, Mr. President. We came here to redistrict because there's a chance. It's not absolute, but there's a chance that the judge will rule that our districts that we -- that we completed in the last couple of years will not be declared unconstitutional. That case never went to a final judgment. It hasn't even gone to a full trial on the merits, but yet here we are. So what do we do? We're supposed to redistrict with a lot of principles in mind. Among those include compactness and contiguity. This bill does neither. It's neither contiguous nor compact. We're all supposed to do it and

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 6

consider political subdivisions and communities of interest. So now, by everyone's account, I live in Northeast Louisiana, and now I'm in the same district as Lake Charles. Louisiana Tech, Grambling, and University of Louisiana, Monroe are now in different congressional districts. They're all only 30 miles apart.

Senator Womack said in Committee that what he wanted to do was protect Julia Letlow. She's the only woman in our congressional delegation in this state, she's the only member of appropriations, and she's on the Agriculture Committee. So protecting her district because she has seniority, and because she's a bright, articulate, and effective Congresswoman, that's a very noble and worthwhile goal. And I applaud him for having stated that that is one of the objectives of this bill, but this bill doesn't do that.

This bill puts more votes south of the Mississippi line in the Florida parishes than it does in the northeast corner of the state. Now, I'm not horribly disappointed to be in Congressman Johnson's district because I admire him immensely. It's nothing against him. He — I served with him in the House, and we are friends, and I'm a supporter, and he knows that. It has nothing to do with him. But we didn't do the things that I believe that we should have done. Well,

Page 8

than what Senator Morris just said, and I wholeheartedly agree with everything that he said. You know, I love the Senate, and I love being a member of this body, and I'm excited about the things that we're going to do in this term. I think we're going to do some great things. Unfortunately, today is not one of those days.

What we're doing to Northeast Louisiana with this map is a travesty and a disservice to the only woman that we have serving in our congressional delegation. The only member that we have that sits on the House Appropriations Committee, which controls federal dollars to this state. When we say that this map protects Northeast Louisiana and Congresswoman Letlow, I'll have you know, 50 percent of the votes in Congresswoman Letlow's district now reside within 30 miles of this building. Let that sink in. 30 miles of this building. Look, I can see the writing on the wall, and I know where this is going to go.

And so, look, I'm -- I'm -- I've been around long enough to -- to count, and -- and I know that -- that we can't get to 20, but -- but I just couldn't let this go without standing up for my people and my district and my congresswoman. And so I guess there is one other thing that -- that I do want to say just to put it into perspective. Again, kind of like Senator

Page 7

what did we do?

1.0

2.0

2.2

2.5

It looks like to me we primarily considered race, and we considered the personal interest of a handful of members. There was no reason. The bill, as originally filed, we did not like. It cut my home parish in half. I understand it's got to go through somebody's district, right? A lot of you have your districts, your home parishes cut through, but you didn't have to zigzag it around just so somebody can get a personal stake, who might want to run for Congress, or just wants their parish there because of their personal interest.

I'm not going to be around to run for Congress or anything of the sort in two years, eight years, or ten years. This is about districts and regions that will represent the people of our area, and the lack of compactness is going to effectively disenfranchise, I believe, to a certain degree, the people that I represent. And for these reasons, I urge you to vote against this bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Morris. Senator Cathey to the Floor on the bill.

(Pause.)

SENATOR CATHEY: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, I -- I don't know that I can say any better

Page 9

Morris said, my home, my personal home, which is 35 miles from the Arkansas line, and 65 miles from the Mississippi line will now be in the same congressional district as Fort Polk and McNeese State University and Lake Charles. That's a disservice and a travesty. So with that, I close.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Cathey. Senator Luneau for the Floor.

(Pause.)

SENATOR LUNEAU: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, we -- we did redistricting last year, I'm sure most of you remember that, and it was an utter failure. And there were a lot of us that talked about some of the things that we could have done different to make it different, but it didn't work out that way, so here we are again. And I remember when we redistricted our own district, our Senate districts, Rapides Parish, my home parish, now has six different senators. Six. And I fought that, but I lost on that -- on that -- on that quest. I -- I just couldn't -- couldn't get everybody together.

And they said, "You know, it's going to be great if you have six centers. Then you've got six people coming together." That -- that didn't happen. That's not true. We didn't come together, and it hurt

Page 10

Rapides Parish. And now this map, yet again, has
Rapides Parish divided in half. I guess that's better
than six, but I guess we would have to have every
congressperson from the -- from the state to have six.
It's important that we do these maps, and we do them
correctly, where we establish another minority majority
district. And for that reason, I'm going to support and
I'm going to vote for this map, but like my colleagues
before me, I have to admit we should do better.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Luneau. Senator Carter for the floor.

SENATOR CARTER: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, we have an historic opportunity before us today, and it's an exciting day for the great State of Louisiana. If we concur and accept Senate Bill 8, we get to create two performing African American districts right here in the State of Louisiana. That is historic. That is to be celebrated. I really want to say thank you to everyone in this room. I can't thank you all enough. I appreciate the sincere effort. I appreciate the -- the -- the working late into the evenings that -- I want to thank the staff of the SGA committee and the tireless hours that they have. This is -- this is historic.

I know that it's hard to do anything that's

Page 12

- because they did it last year. And some of them said,
- 2 "We are tired. We're tired of keep doing this." But
- 3 let me tell my friends and my colleagues, to everyone,
- 4 we shall not tire. We shall continue to fight for
- 5 what's right. It is -- this is how we make progress.
- 6 It is not easy, it is challenging, but this is how we
- 7 make progress, and we make progress. We celebrate it.
- 8 We acknowledge it. So thank you to my colleagues.
- 9 Thank you to all of us who engaged in this process.

10 Thank you, Mr. President.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Carter. Senator Womack to close.

SENATOR WOMACK: Members, we all -- we all know what we went through and worked through and tirelessly. Late nights. Many hours. Many hours spent in the drafting room, of trying to help Senator Morris and Senator Cathey in trying to alleviate some of the problems they had. We worked on that. However, congressional, it wasn't working for everybody. So we're here where we're at, and here your bill's before you. I ask that you concur with Senate Bill 8. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Senator Womack.

Senator Womack moves to concur in Senate amendments proposed to House -- to Senate Bill 8. When the

Page 11

perfect, and I know redistricting is the hardest thing that we do of all. This is my second redistricting

- 3 session, and they're very tough, but we came together in
 - a effort to comply with a federal judge's order that
- Louisiana provide equal representation to the African
- 6 Americans in the State of Louisiana, and we have an 7 opportunity to do that. Let's celebrate. Let's be
- 8 happy. Let's be glad this state has an opportunity to
- 9 provide equal representation in our congressional
- leadership right here in the State of Louisiana. Thank
 - you all so much.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

And I also want to thank — I'll be remiss if I didn't thank the — the president, all the members of SGA committee, the — the governor who called this session. We began with the governor addressing us on Dr. King's Day, and here we are celebrating at the end of that week. And it just didn't start at the beginning of this week with Dr. King's Day. It started way back when Dr. King was alive, in a push for a voters' rights act. There's so many hurdles along the way and so many battles. There's so many — so much effort. So much energy.

And when we were in Committee, we heard from many people. From the LDF people to the plaintiffs to all the -- the community people that came to testify

Page 13

machines are open, all those in favor to concur in the Senate amendments will vote aye. All opposed will vote nay. Madam Secretary may open the machines.

SENATOR HENRY: Go to machine, members. Go to machines. Go to machines, members. Close machine, please.

27 yeas, 11 nays, and the motion carries.

Senator Talbot for a motion.

SENATOR TALBOT: Thank you, Mr. President. I make a motion that we adjourn sine die.

SENATOR HENRY: Without objection. Members, if you could have your seat just for a second. Sit down just.

Case 3:24-cv-00122-DCJ-CES-RRS Document 164 Filed 04/07/24 Page 42 of 42 PageID #: 2745

