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SPEAKER MOORE: The bill will be temporarily displaced.

Let's go to Senate Bill 739. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senators Hise, Daniel, and Newton, Senate Bill 739, the bill will be entitled Senate Redistricting Plan 2021 SBK-7. The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts.

SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from
Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members, this is the State Senate proposed map that was drawn in the State Senate committee. I'll tell the members that the Senate has passed our state House map this morning and have not made any changes. And historically, the bodies have not changed each other's maps in terms of the State House and State Senate, and so I would ask you to approve this map.

I'll speak briefly to the merits of
this map. And I think one of the best pieces of information about this map is that they were able to really limit the split of municipalities in this map to 10. That's 10 total municipality splits out of 552 in North Carolina, or 1.8 percent of municipalities across the state. Additionally, there were a couple of Democratic amendments that were accepted into the map. And so ultimately I would ask the members to vote yes on the state Senate map. SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question before the House is the adoption -- or the passage, rather, of Senate Bill 739 on second reading. Those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the vote.

Representative Brody. Representative Saine.

Brody aye.
The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

64 having voted in the affirmative and 48 in the negative, Senate Bill 739 passed the second reading and will be read a third time. THE CLERK: The General Assembly of

North Carolina enacts.
SPEAKER MOORE: The question before the House is the passage of Senate Bill 739 on third reading. Those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the vote.

Representative Gill. The chair sees Representative Baker. Representative Autry wish to vote.

Is Representative Gill on the floor?
There she is. Okay.
Saine. Saine aye.
The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

65 having voted in the affirmative and 49 in the negative, Senate Bill 739 passes its third reading and the bill was ordered enrolled. Senate Bill 740, the clerk will read.

Sorry. Senate Bill 740 is back before the body.

And actually, before the gentleman debates, the chair would like to extend the courtesy to the gallery on motion of the gentleman from Forsyth county, Representative Zenger. The chair is happy to extend the
courtesies to the gallery to Cheryl Key, Allison Duncan, and their students who are here with us from the Redeemer School. Would y'all please stand so we can recognize you and welcome you. Thanks for being with us today.

Also on motion of Representative Meyer of Orange county, the chair is happy to extend the courtesy of the gallery to Mebane city council member Sean Ewing. Sean, would you please stand. Thanks for being with us here today, sir.

The gentleman from Caldwell,
Representative Hall, has the floor to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members, I've said this before in this process, and I'm going to say it again because I think it's important and it bears repeating, and that is that the 2021 redistricting process that has been undertaken by this body is a historic process. We have an unprecedented amount of transparency in this process with every single district that was drawn done so in full public view with live audio and live video in the
committee room.
We also made the unprecedented and
historic decision to voluntarily not use election data in the drawing of these maps.

Maps have been being drawn by this state by this body for literally hundreds of years, and that has never happened voluntarily until now. When our committees adopted criteria to say we're not going to use election data, we're going to focus on traditional redistricting criteria. We're going to look at things like keeping counties whole, keeping municipalities whole, not splitting precincts or VTDs. And the result that you see of that is the maps that we've had before this body and the congressional map that you have before you now.

> I will say that I have been
disappointed about the lack of involvement of the Democrats in drawing congressional maps in our committee room. Senate Democrats submitted proposed congressional maps, they spent time in the committee room drawing, and as far as I know, none of our members, unfortunately, participated in that process, although I have learned that there's apparently an amendment
this morning that $I$ just learned about, but I think that it's essentially an amendment that was drafted by Senate Democrats.

Members, after the map itself that's before you today, I'll mention that the House and Senate have filed the same map. I filed the same map that you see before you today in the Senate, but for procedural purposes, we're using the map that was passed over by the Senate.

The map before you, and the one that I filed, were both drafted in the Senate committee room, and I drew a separate map that was posted for the public to view before our public comment, but I ultimately decided that the map drawn in the Senate committee was a better map because, among other reasons, it splits fewer municipalities.

Also, we heard from public comment that it was important to keep the finger counties, as they're called, in the northeast together, so I advocated with the Senate chairs that change be made, and it was, and therefore $I$ felt that the map drawn in the Senate committee was ultimately the best member-submitted map that I saw.

As I did with our State House map, I am
going to briefly go through the criteria the committee adopted and how it corresponds with the proposed map that's before you today.

The first thing we tried to do was keep counties whole. Within the map, where counties could be kept whole, they are. In total, there are only 11 counties split, and that's done for equalizing population across the map, which, of course, is tougher to do because for congress you have to have zero deviation. You don't have that plus or minus 5 percent that you do on the State House and State Senate maps.

One of our criteria was to not split VTDs. And again, this is important. It's important to understand context. In 2011, there were many, many VTD splits across the map. In this map, there are only 24 total VTD splits for a statewide for a congressional map, 24 VTD splits, that's it, across the entire map.

This map honors municipal boundaries. Again, another very important note about this map is that there are only two total municipal splits in the entire congressional map. If you spent any time at all over in that committee room drafting, you know how hard that is to do.

There are only two municipalities split in the entire congressional map, and that's Charlotte and that's Greensboro. Charlotte has to be split, it's got too much population, so we already have to have one in the map no matter what we do. And there's only one more across the entire map, and that's Greensboro, and still yet over 90 percent of the city of Greensboro remains in one district. That is an incredible feat for a congressional map.

Of course, we -- every district in this
map is contiguous. We looked at compactness. And again, despite not having an algorithm to use or somebody else using an algorithm, the map contains compact districts. And of course, we did not consider racial data. And as I said earlier, for the first time in the history of this state, we did not use election data. Members, the process that we've gone through has been a transparent one. Election data has not been used. Only tried traditional redistricting criteria has been used. And as I told you, the map before you only splits one more municipality that you absolutely have to anyway under this map. There are two total
municipality splits, very few VTD splits. However you measure this thing under our criteria, this is a great map that meets our criteria that the committee adopted. I hope you'll support this map.

SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Reives is recognized to send forth amendment AST-73. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Representative Reives moves to amend the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
Chatham, Representative Reives, is recognized to debate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
Mr. Speaker.
And again, I will have to repeat, I don't think the lack of submissions on

Democrats' part would indicate a lack of desire to be a part of the process. I would bet there's some Democrats that would have loved to have had more opportunity in the process, and I don't think that that opportunity comes from sitting and drawing maps that may not be considered. That is my opinion.

With that being said, the amendment
that we are offering today was offered in the senate, so it has been in public view for a couple of weeks now. People have had a chance to look at it, they've had a chance to talk about it, to analyze it.

So because none of us are using partisan data or anything of that sort, we have to depend on what outside groups have looked at. One of those groups is the Princeton Gerrymandering Project. And the congressional map that we're being asked to vote on today rated an $F$ with that particular process. Specifically, they cite that there's a 21.4 percent Republican partisan bias which measures how much Republicans would overperform on this map in a 50/50 race statewide. That clearly would indicate that there is a partisan bias to this congressional map.

The map -- the amendment that I'm presenting would get a fairness grade of $A$. Benefits neither party; it is completely fair. An analysis from the website FiveThirtyEight indicates that the congressional map that is being submitted by the senate results in ten seats leaning wards Republican,
one very competitive seat, and three seats that lean towards Democrats. That generates an efficiency gap of 20.1 percent favoring

Republicans which is the difference -- an efficiency gap is the difference between each party's wasted votes. 8 percent is considered a bad sign.

On the other hand, this amendment would result in six Republican-leaning seats, four Democratic-leaning seats, and four highly competitive seats, more reflecting of what North Carolina looks like today. And this map would only have a 5.8 percent efficiency gap. So in the sense of what we're trying to do and what we're trying to present -- and I think you can feel good about voting for this amendment because this is a congressional map that came from the Senate, so it's not a situation where the House has been involved. And I know that guys like to vote against the Senate, so this would be a great opportunity to show the Senate that they did the wrong thing here, and I would ask that you support the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does
the gentleman from Guilford, Representative Quick, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: To debate the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: I stand in support of the amendment. As a representative from Guilford county, I sat here and heard some very curious congratulatory remarks about keeping counties whole when the third largest county in North Carolina was split into three districts on the original bill.

Guilford county has enough citizens to be two-thirds of a congressional district by itself and deserves to have representation that focuses on the issues of the third largest county in this state.

This amendment would keep Guilford county whole, and I ask you to support the amendment on behalf of the citizens of the third largest county in the state of North Carolina. SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Caldwell, Representative Hall, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: To debate the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, as I previously said about the amendment, I didn't see it until just a few minutes ago when I came in and sat down, so, of course, I haven't had time to sit down and analyze the map, but in the limited time that I have had, I already notice, right off the bat, that this map would split the finger counties in the northeast that we heard so much about from public comment wanting to keep those together. It splits more municipalities. Again, the map that I have before you splits only two municipalities across the state. And this amendment would split more counties.

So again, in a very limited amount of time, we can clearly see that this map, the amendment, that is, does not comply as well with our criteria as our base map does, and I would ask you to vote down the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question before the

House is the adoption of Amendment A1 sent forward by Representative Reives. Those in favor of the amendment will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the vote.

The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

47 having voted in the affirmative and 67 in the negative, the amendment is not adopted.

For what purpose does the lady from Guilford, Representative Harrison, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't want to repeat too much of what I said on Tuesday about the public process, but I know we keep bragging about the great public process and transparency that went on with redistricting, but $I$ think the public did not feel like it was a very friendly public process, nor did they feel it was very accessible, nor
did they feel that it was very transparent. The public hearings, we heard some strong -- first of all, we didn't have a public hearing in Guilford county, the third largest county in the state. Those individuals felt strongly about how the Guilford county map should look went to Forsyth and Alamance and other places and online to make their comments heard. And what we heard resoundingly was keep Guilford county whole, keep the Piedmont Triad whole. It's the Piedmont Triad. It's High Point. It's Greensboro. It's Winston-Salem.

I heard Senator Daniel say yesterday, when he was talking about the fifth district in Wake county, this is where the constituents there worship, play, commute and work together. Well, that's the same thing that you would say about the Piedmont Triad, that there's no real justification for splitting up that county.

It's crazy how one part of it runs from downtown Greensboro to the Tennessee border, picks up Virginia Fox's precinct Blowing Rock. And I curiously notice the only thing that that district has in common is my great
grandfather Julian Price, the Jefferson Standard building, he hired the architect for that, that's in downtown Greensboro. The district runs by his house in Fisher Park and then it goes out to Price Park in Blowing Rock which used to be his land, but it's now part of the national park service, but there is very little in common about this proposed Congressional District 11.

And you have this other part that goes from eastern Greensboro, and some of the smaller municipalities in the county, down to Harnett and Lee, and then the other part goes down through Davie and Cabarrus, and there's just very little in common with these areas.

And I think -- I think this particular congressional grouping is the worst example of not keeping communities of interest together or keeping municipalities together.

And furthermore, it's worth noting, I know we had some dispute about the necessity of compliance with the Voting Rights Act and the ruling in Covington, but I think that the splitting up of the African American populations in Guilford county into three different
congressional districts is really problematical, and we were warned of that by the lawyers early on in August, at the very first public hearing, that we needed to take into account these populations when we were drawing these maps. We neither did a racial voting polarization study, nor did we draw these VRA districts first, and I think that's going to be a problem for us.

There's some statistics -- I can't
verify that only -- that 90 percent of
Greensboro feels whole. I don't feel like it feels very whole, but I will say the county doesn't feel very whole. We've got 60 percent of it in one district, 26 percent in another district, and then 14 percent in another district. And I think the cracking of the African American vote is a real problem.

I know that there are other urban counties that were split up and the same thing happened with African American population in those counties, and those were more necessary because of their populations, but we did not need to split up Guilford county.

So we heard very strong public commentary not to split it up before we drew the
maps and then after the maps were drawn, people came and told us to please keep the Piedmont Triad whole and then we seemed to have ignored that public comment. I feel like this was very arbitrary about how the public comment was important in drawing some congressional districts but not in others, but, boy, they did not listen to the public comment when they were drawing the Guilford county districts.

I made the point which I thought was interesting when $I$ was reviewing the comments that we had -- that had been made on the days that we heard about the congressional district hearing which I think was Monday, a week ago, which I think are very telling. And I will note that these were bipartisan comments. We heard from Republicans and Democrats. We heard from retirees. I remember there was a farmer in Alamance county who spoke, a retired sheriff. These were some of the comments that they made about the congressional map: Ludicrous, racially unfair, grossly partisan, disconnected, scary, undemocratic, dishonest, confusing. That is something that I am not proud of, and I can't believe any of us would be
proud of in voting for this map today.
This is a gross gerrymander. It
appears to be a very gross partisan gerrymander. It looks like we have violated the Voting Rights Act in drawing these districts. This is wrong. We can do better. I urge you to vote no. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Guilford, Representative Quick, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: Joining in with my colleague from Guilford county and agreeing with everything that she just said, I also would like to keep this body reminded of an earlier court's warning and chastising of us about targeting African Americans with surgical precision.

I think a reasonable argument can be made in Greensboro and Guilford county that the African American population there again feels targeted with surgical precision, and I would
ask that you vote no.
SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Durham, Representative Hawkins, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: I want to thank all my colleagues for their remarks. And I just want to add on three specifics pieces specifically for the Watauga to Guilford county congressional draw.

What is going to stick out to people for this, and this is, again, reasons that I join my colleagues in asking you to vote no and reconsider, is that it seems deliberate that those places were -- especially Greensboro was chose to be split and there was a deliberate choice on who to double-bunk.

And so if you look at the
[unintelligible] from Caldwell and, you know, maneuvering into Watauga county to go get Appalachian State and Blowing Rock, that was a deliberate draw so that on the other side of it,
in Guilford county, that particular congressional member was double-bunked with someone else. And so those intentional
decisions, those surgical precisions are going to stick out to voters. And again, I hope that we are not having to redraw multiple times this decade, but decisions like that are going to lead us down that path.

Secondly, the largest county in the state that borders Durham county, Wake county was split multiple times. Wake county, I think we all know, has the ability to hold at least one congressional district on its own and then the remainder of it can be placed alongside other counties that are less populated. In this, it seems like there was -- the way that this was drawn allows for the illusion of the impact of that county and one would only have to draw the direct correlation that is done for partisan reasons. And again, just sharing reasons why we should vote no and reconsider because, again, we don't want to have do this multiple times.

And lastly, and this was in some of the questioning in committee with the senator that
was presenting, that with the use of criteria, it seemed that Wake was placed inconsistently, but sometimes it seemed like it was strategic depending on what district was -- district was being drawn.

And so as a legislator, I want to be able to walk my constituents through this map and tell them sort of how decisions were made, and when $I$ can't have a consistent answer on how the criteria were weighed district by district or do we use the same sort of weight and system in ranking as we went across the state, if I can't have that conversation with them and you can't walk your constituent through that in how that criteria was used, then this map is not worth the paper it was printed on.

And so I want to make sure that, again, the goal is is that as a member of the redistricting committee, we want to do this once, and we will revisit it in 2030, but when those -- the things that I've just outlined are just crystal clear to the majority of us, we need to make sure that we think about this, take our time, slow down, and make better maps.

And so I ask you to join with my
colleagues in voting no, but as always, to chairmen, thank you for your hard work.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does
the gentleman from Chatham, Representative Reives, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you.
I think all of us agree on one thing, that the most important result of this vote is that folks have faith in this process, that voters walk out of here and feel like they were represented, that they had their views heard, had concerns made clear, and that they feel like that they're in a situation where they have fair maps.

I think that we can look at outside groups that look to these maps and say that there are probably going to be a lot of voters who feel like that's not what happened.

I think to look at the congressional map and see what results, according to experts that have looked at this map, a map that gives
us ten Republican seats, three Democratic seats, one very competitive seat to me is fairly unbelievable if you say that that represents North Carolina. A map that splits up Wake, Meck, Guilford in the ways that it does I think, again, is fairly unbelievable that people are going to think that that's a fair map. We had a group from Duke that looked at this map, and they ran tens of thousands of computer simulations. And according to their simulations, they found that this congressional map was a statistical anomaly. They made tens of thousands of maps just following our criteria, not using racial data, not using partisan data, and after running tens of thousands of simulations, all of those maps that they were running generally elected fewer Republicans than the version that's presented to us today.

That means something, and that should mean something beyond worrying about who gets what advantage or anything of that sort, but it should mean something in the sense of whatever process we had, whatever intent there was, that we shouldn't want a map that has those type of
problems and has that type of reflection.
The amendment I offered before actually split fewer voter districts. Instead of 24 , it split 14; made the districts more compact, with Reock scores of 45 compared to 42; Polsby-Popper of 36 compared to 30; kept communities of interest together; created a Sandhills congressional district for those of us that are originally from down that way understand how important that is. Again, gave Guilford what it would feel would be true representation.

So ultimately what $I$ would say is we've got an opportunity just to do things better. House maps are done. Senate maps are done. The congressional map's a whole different ball game. And I would say out of the three maps, what you have seen from outside analysis is the congressional map seems to be the worse at doing the things that people are concerned about. And that has nothing to do with process, that has nothing to do with intent. Ultimately, it's about final result. And because of that final result, this is something we need to go back and revisit.

All of us are tired of looking at maps.

All of us are tired of going through this. I understand that, but I think it would be good as one of the accomplishments that we have coming out of this biennium is to serve notice to the rest of the country that this can get done in the right way. We have led on other issues. This would be an outstanding issue for us to lead on, and I think we're missing that opportunity. And I don't know why we're missing that opportunity. I don't know why we're not taking it, but we're not, but I really, really, really personally, I know, would love to see us move in a different direction, change the way that we do things and try to be better.

Again, going back to the amendment that was offered, that amendment still allowed for a Republican advantage. You can still draw maps that have a Republican advantage without presenting this type of advantage which is going to make the most considerate of us raise an eyebrow in concern, so please consider voting no.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Caldwell, Representative Hall, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Debate the bill a second time.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, I'm a bit -- I'm taken aback when I hear folks say that the Democrats wish that they had more involvement in this process.

I've been here when the maps were drawn outside of this building and they were brought in and you were essentially shown what the map was going to look like and we just voted on it. And that's the way things were done for probably 150 years or so under mostly Democrats, but then, of course, Republicans for the first part -- or the last decade. You didn't have much input. You certainly didn't have the ability to sit down in public and draw maps with members of both parties.

That didn't happen this time around. As we've said, and as everyone knows, we voluntarily chose to do it out in public and not use election data even though the law doesn't require us to do that. We chose to do that because that's the right thing to do. We did
that. This body did that. None of the -- none of the previous bodies in the last 150 or 200 years. This general assembly chose to do that.

And that committee room has been open since October 6th. I've been in there most of the time since October 6th, and so I know who was there, and I didn't see a whole lot of my friends on the Democratic side, and that's unfortunate because in 2019 I did. When we drew those maps in 2019, you saw a lot of computer terminals where Democrats and Republicans were sitting there together. In fact, I got to know some of you that I didn't know very well through that process. That was available to everybody this time around. And I don't know why some didn't -- some chose not to do that. I've got some suspicions, but again, I don't question people's intent.

We don't have a proposed alternative congressional map from House Democrats, and so ultimately it's a process argument that's being made. And we've heard a whole lot also about outcomes and these outside groups in the way that they rated these maps. I've intentionally
not looked at any of that stuff. I'm not considering political data, electoral data in the drafting of these maps, so I have no idea what their outcome is going to be.

But ultimately, if you have a process where you don't consider election data, a process that's done out in the open, in video with full audio for the world to see and you only consider traditional criteria, like keeping cities and counties whole, and if you still don't like the outcome of what comes out of that, perhaps the problem is not the process or these maps. Perhaps the problem is your ideas.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate.

For what purpose does the lady from Pitt, Representative Smith, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I would rise to ask a question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Of --
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Of the bill
sponsor.
SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Hall, does the gentleman yield?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: My question is can you clarify that last statement because I'm confused now. The very last statement that you made about the ideas, so can you just clarify that for me.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I will do my best to clarify.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I appreciate it.
REPRESENTATIVE HALL: And what I said was this is the most transparent process in the history of this state. We voluntarily did not use election data. I do not know the outcome of these maps, but if you don't like that outcome, again, perhaps the problem is not the process of this, perhaps it's not the maps themselves, but perhaps it's the ideas that you're putting forth to the public.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Okay. Can I please debate the bill, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Okay. So I'm breathing because that's important. I just want to make sure that we're clear. There's been so
many options of things being put forth to this body throughout this entire session and they have been ignored, and so to hear someone get up and praise themselves for the work they've done independently versus working collectively is already a red flag.

It appears that there's an attack on the African American vote, but there's no concern for that. It's important to know that people are supposed to elect us and not the other way around, but we see where we're headed.

When I look at these congressional maps, when I look at the house maps, all of them -- all of them reek of just -- they stink because there's something wrong with them. I've been hearing so much about transparency. If we truly had transparency when we had those meetings ahead of time, with no maps that we wasted the people's time, we would have had those meetings after these maps, but we know what we would have heard. People don't want gerrymandering; that's what we have. People don't want us packing; that's what we're doing. People don't want to separate individuals of the same interest; that's what we're doing. But we
have so many individuals who feel like they're the only ones that's right.

So to go into a room and to draw a map that you're going to vote down and to stand on the floor and begin to say everything that I receive was at the last minute. Well, that's really what's happened this entire session. From the budget on down, everything was a last minute, and now we're going to say I am so disappointed in Democrats because of the lack of participation at the last minute. That's what we've been experiencing. That's unfortunate, and to go back and say we're working across aisles, that is untrue.

So if we're going to really listen to the people, we should be listening to the people. Transparency of having a camera in a room, that you're not doing the work in that room and you're doing that work in another room and then you come into this room and say, oh, here it is, that's not good.

So I urge everyone to please make sure that we vote these down, and then we need to make sure the people do what they need to do to vote on individuals who want to be a voice and
represent them and listen to them and make sure that we're representing the people. It is not about us. It's about the people. Thank you. Please vote no.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Guilford, Representative Quick, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: To speak to the bill a second time.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: With all due respect to my friend, Mr. Chairman, in a state with 36 percent of registered voters are Democrats approximately, 33 percent of registered voters are unaffiliated approximately, and 30 percent are registered Republican approximately, and yet a congressional map has the probability of electing ten Republicans and three Democrats, I don't think it's an idea problem. I think it's a map-drawing problem. And I wonder how many Republicans -- you criticize Democrats for not drawing maps. How many Republicans actually drew maps? Please vote no for this map.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question before the House is the passage of Senate Bill 740 on second reading. Those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the vote.

The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

65 having voted in the affirmative and 49 in the negative, Senate Bill 740 passes its second reading and will be read a third time.

THE CLERK: General Assembly of
North Carolina enacts.
SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question before the House is the passage of Senate Bill 740 on third reading. Those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the vote.

The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

65 having voted in the affirmative and 49 in the negative, Senate Bill 740 passes its third reading and the bill is ordered enrolled.
(Transcription from audio recording
stopped at 44:51 and continued again at 46:37.) SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the lady from Guilford, Representative Harrison, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I would like to be recorded as an aye on the Reives amendment on Senate Bill 740, please.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady will be recorded as having voted aye on the Reives amendment.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Mecklenburg, Representative Autry, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE AUTRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as voting aye on Amendment A1 for Senate Bill 740, please.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman will also be recorded as having voted aye on Amendment A1.

For what purpose does the lady from Wake, Representative Dahle, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE DAHLE: I would like to object to the last bill being added to the calendar...
(Transcription from audio recording stopped at 47:14.)
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