

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA MAY 14, 2002

The Special Meeting of the Shreveport City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Chairman John David Stewart at 2:38 p.m. in the Government Plaza Chambers, First Floor, 505 Travis Street.

Invocation was given by Reverend James Green.

On Roll Call, the following members were present: Councilmen Huckaby, Stewart, Carmody, Serio, Spigener, Shyne, and Burrell. 7. Absent: None.

The meeting was held pursuant to the following Public Notice:

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SHREVEPORT CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Chairman of the City Council, John David Stewart, hereby calls and provides notice of a special meeting of the Shreveport City Council to be held at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 14, 2002, in the Council Chambers at 505 Travis Street, Louisiana, for the purpose of considering the following matters:

1. Reconsideration of Ordinance 41 of 2002;
2. Motion to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002;
3. Introduction of Ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41 of 2002; and
4. Introduction of Ordinance amending Section 2-27 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to reapportion the several council districts of the City and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

No other business will be transacted.

John David Stewart,
Chairman

May 13, 2002
2:30 p.m.

Chairman Stewart: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for being with us. We appreciate your time and your willingness to come forward and participate. We have some request to speak which do not appear as part of your agenda but we will entertain them shortly.

I would like to read into the record so that we all maintain a basic understanding of some issues. This is a City Council Chamber as I know you understand and the rules of the decorum apply here as they do in other public meetings. The public meeting law applies here in terms of addressing our selves, each other, and those about us in an appropriate and polite fashion. That applies to myself, every member of this Council, the members of the staff and those City employees as well as all citizens.

The specifics that I would ask you to embrace are embodied in a dated letter of December 10, 2001 that I forwarded to the Council members. An excerpting from page 386 in *Roberts Rules and Orders*, there were four points that I would like to leave with us and ask that you in particular help us abide by these. 1. Confining remarks to the merits of the pending question. We follow the agenda in essence and confine our remarks to agenda items. 2. Speaking no more than twice and no longer than ten minutes on the same question on the same day. 3. Refraining from attacking a member's motives. We must speak to the issue, not attacking individuals. And last of those four but not least, 4. refraining from disturbing the assembly. Certainly, the opportunity to express one's opinion is critical, freedom of speech is what it is all about, but please assist us in sending a message to everyone. Those who might consider bringing their businesses here, those who might be considering moving here, those of us who live here, that we can agree, disagree, have differing opinions, come together, share those without there being divisive activities insinuations, comments or any other matters. I know personally and your heart I believe but I certainly know in mine that, that is the right way to do it and we must abide by the laws. I appreciate your taking your valuable time to join us and we will move as rapidly as we can.

Councilman Shyne: I would like to make a statement before we move from this juncture please. Chairman Stewart: I'm happy to have a comment Mr. Shyne.

Councilman Shyne: You all just received instructions from the Chairman on how you need to act. I would like to make this statement, I feel like that this special meeting was ill-conceived, it's illegal, it's an illegitimate act because the purpose of this special meeting was to circumvent rules and regulations of the Charter and to reconsider a person's vote on an ordinance. The Charter says that is illegal and illegitimate, Robert's Rules of Order, says that it is illegal and illegitimate. You cannot vote, go home, and think about what you voted on and then come back or call a special meeting in order to reconsider this vote.

I'm going to ask for the City Attorney to come up. This whole thing was concocted in a dishonest, deceitful, and a racial manner. I don't like it. I don't like being apart of it. It's very divisive. This is more divisive then you expressing yourself as citizens within this community. Don't sit here and listen to holy speech and you buy into all this goodness. If it was so good, we wouldn't be having this special meeting right now to circumvent something that was done and we know that it is legal to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the City Attorney to come forward and I believe he's here. Mr. Attorney, I would like for you to come around and stand at the mic and I would like for you to tell us whether we can reconsider a vote that was done in a previous meeting.

Chairman Stewart: Thank you Mr. Shyne. Mr. LaFitte, would you join us please, at the microphone. Mr. LaFitte, we are happy to have you with us. I believe Mr. Shyne's references to Item 1. *Reconsideration of Ordinance 41 of 2002*.

Mr. LaFitte: You are right. First of all, good afternoon. In connection with a reconsideration of a previous vote, Robert's Rules does of course, address this particular issue. According to Robert's Rules, the 9th Edition which was adopted by this Council in 1998, a motion to reconsider must be brought forward or moved at the time or at the same meeting on which the vote that is being reconsidered is taken. In as much as. . .

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman. I would like for him to hold up at this particular juncture and restate this again so we won't go through all this again, well, you know I didn't really understand. . . Chairman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, let the man speak.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, that's what I'm asking him now. Would you please speak a little bit louder and would you restate what you are saying? Mr. LaFitte: Sure. Certainly. In 1998 the Council adopted the 9th edition of Robert's Rules of Order and that edition of course, addresses the motion to reconsider. In Robert's Rules it does state that a motion to reconsider must be brought forth or made at the time or at the meeting on which the vote that is being reconsidered was brought, that would have been the last Council meeting of course, two weeks ago. Therefore a motion to reconsider Ordinance 41 today would be untimely.

Chairman Stewart: That's consistent with what you expressed to me before? Mr. LaFitte: Exactly.

Chairman Stewart: And ladies and gentlemen, what he speaks of is Item 1. one which is reconsideration of Ordinance 41 of 2002. There are three other issues here, to your knowledge, are any of those out of order or illegal? Mr. LaFitte: No. Chairman Stewart: Thank you very much.

Councilman Shyne: I thought I had the floor, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Stewart: No, sir, I had the floor. Mrs. Spigener and then you, Sir. Chairman Stewart: Would you yield to Mr. Shyne? Councilman Spigener: No.

Chairman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, Mrs. Spigener has yield to you, sir. Please go ahead. Councilman Shyne: Mrs. Spigener, thank you very much but I think I asked for the City Attorney to come up and if you would check the Robert's Rules of Order, I still had the floor at that particular time.

Mr. Chairman, that was what we were trying to tell you on yesterday. Now, I have it here in black and white where the reason for calling this special meeting was to *reconsider*, in the first sheet was to reconsider because someone had supposedly received a petition from somebody in the Black community saying that they were dissatisfied with the district that they in and we found out that it was no truth in that. That, that was a dishonest and a deceitful statement.

Now, it sounds like that I'm very passionate and I am. I'm very passionate because this is a very, very important action that we are taking. We don't even have any business calling this meeting. This is a divisive meeting. Now, if I'm suppose to sit here and act like I'm in Sunday school or at a prayer meeting, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, you have got the wrong person. I'm a very compassionate, I'm very committed, and I'm very focused and I'm into what I'm doing; that is what we said on yesterday. That's what we had been saying, that this is an illegitimate act.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that anything else that you have on the agenda to discuss, at this particular time can wait until a regular meeting. I mean, this is not a life or death situation that we are getting into and if you will remember about two weeks ago we went through a meeting where you came back to another meeting, being smart, and move to reconsider, at that time it was illegal. It was an illegitimate act. I said that at that particular time but no I was looked at as being militant and ugly and didn't know what I was talking about and all out in left field and we went right on through. We passed something on this Council that was illegitimate because we were listening to somebody who did not know what they were talking about and had a personal motive in it and I don't want to be apart of something like that. I said it at that particular time that, that was not right.

I don't mind people expressing their ideas but lets at least do it in a legal way and let's don't concoct and conceive something in an atmosphere, in an environment where dishonesty and deceit is apart of it. I might not have been born this morning, I might have been born in a very rich neighborhood, but I'm smart enough to be able to read and write and that's why it is so important to have people who understand.

Mr. Chairman, I would move at this particular point that we would adjourn this meeting and wait until 3:00 and go into our regular meeting because the purpose of this meeting, by the information that we got out, was so that Councilwoman Spigener could reconsider her vote and it's illegal for her to do that. So Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. *I would move at this particular juncture that we would adjourn this meeting and wait and go into our regular session, seconded by Councilman Huckaby.*

Chairman Stewart: We have a motion and a second. I have question first so that we move to Mr. Attorney for the City of Shreveport, Mr. LaFitte. I was of the impression and still am unless you are going to correct me, that this is a legal meeting. Mr. LaFitte: Yes, sir I believe it is. Chairman Stewart: I was further under the impression---it is, in your opinion?

Mr. LaFitte: It is legal meeting. It was properly noticed and in accordance with the Charter. All that's required to call a special meeting is a majority of the Council.

Chairman Stewart: Thank you. And 2. we still have the issue of the reconsideration of Ordinance No. 41 which is not illegal – which is in fact illegal by virtue if illegal is because you are outside of Robert's Rules of Order. So we should not appropriately consider Item 1. the reconsideration of Ordinance No. 41 of 2002; is that correct? Mr. LaFitte: That's correct, it is untimely.

Councilman Burrell: Going back to something that was stated earlier and maybe I need to put it the form of a question. Is this special meeting for reconsideration of Ordinance 41 or is it for the adoption of new legislation? Because I was under the impression that the meeting that we were having at 12:30 was for reconsideration and if that be the case – if that is not the case I don't think it has been stated properly. Because again, the attorney says that the meeting for the reconsideration is illegal; so, I don't know. Maybe I should ask this question, "Should there be a premise of reconsideration?" Mr. LaFitte: Could you repeat? Councilman Burrell: Should there be a premise upon which we base the meeting – special meeting for reconsideration because it's my understanding that the meeting for reconsideration was actually, this meeting here which is the special meeting was based on the premise of reconsideration. And given the fact that, that is illegal then I'm not sure why we are having a special meeting. Mr. LaFitte: The reconsideration can not be brought forth at this time, as I mentioned earlier because it is in fact untimely. It should have been taken up at the Council meeting when the vote on Ordinance 41 was rendered. There are other items of course, on the agenda other than the motion to reconsider.

Councilman Burrell: But the bases for the special meeting was given in a letter to us which was based on reconsideration. Are we saying then that, something else came out after that other than that schedule that I saw with several things listed that did not elude to reconsideration? Mr. LaFitte: I did not see the letter that was forwarded to you all. All I have been privy to review is the notice of a special meeting as well as the agenda for today. I'm not familiar with the letter that you received.

Councilman Burrell: Well, that's what I'm trying to get a clarification, because there wasn't a letter that was sent for reconsideration, this meeting was suppose to be based on that letter as I understood. Now, if there is a second letter that rescinded the first letter then I think that needs to be made clear to me because I didn't understand that to be the case. Mr. LaFitte: I can't answer that question.

Mr. Thompson: The Chairman of the Council called a special meeting and that was put out in a notice of Special Meeting of the Shreveport City Council which was sent to all Council members and posted 24 hours before the meeting and it says, "Public Notice is hereby given that the Chairman of the City Council, John David Stewart, hereby calls and provides notice of a special meeting of the Shreveport City Council to be held at 2:30 p.m on Tuesday, November [May]14, 2002 in the Council Chambers at 505 Travis Street, Louisiana for the purpose of considering the following matters: (1) Reconsideration of Ordinance 41 of 2002. (2) Motion to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002. (3) Introduction of Ordinance to

repeal Ordinance 41 of 2002 and (4) Introduction of Ordinance amending Section 2-27 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to reapportion the several Council Districts of the City and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. No other business will be transacted. /s/John David Stewart, Chairman.” so, that was the call of the meeting. There were several items that were listed in addition to the reconsideration of Ordinance 41 of 2002.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, so the initial letter that we got for reconsideration which actually was prompted by the person who could call for reconsideration which happened to be either Councilwoman Spigener or Councilwoman Huckaby, myself, Joe Shyne who actually voted for 41, is that correct? Mr. Thompson: Mrs. Spigener asked for the Chairman to call the special meeting. She’s listed several reasons or several things to be considered in her letter and as a result the Chairman actually called the meeting as required by the Charter.

Councilman Burrell: Well maybe that was the letter that I did not receive because the one that I received was actually based upon reconsideration, those other ones were not listed in the letter that I received. Undoubtedly, you received one and was not shared with the rest of us. Mr. Thompson: The letter that I’m referring to is dated, May 10, 2002 to Mr. John David Stewart, reference request for Chairman’s call of the special meeting, “Dear John David: In light of my own misunderstanding of the nature of the vote that was taken on the subject ordinance on Tuesday, May 7, 2002 and the potential that redistricting Plan 18 maybe a violation of Section 4.05 of the City’s Charter, please call a special meeting of the Council to be held at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, May 13, 2002.” This was the first letter and then she listed a number of items to be reconsidered. She then subsequently sent another letter with a lot of these items in it, but it was more than just one item to be on the agenda is the point that I’m trying to make.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, well let me make this point. Undoubtedly that letter then didn’t have to be shared with the rest of the Council members because unless it was noted on there to send to the other Council members, I don’t recognize that letter.

Mr. Thompson: The letter. . . .

Councilman Burrell: It may not be necessary. I’m just saying that I did not receive it. I only saw one and that was the one where she requested the reconsideration. Mr. Thompson: The rules state that the Chairman can call a special meeting, any four members of the Council or the Mayor; so, the Chairman can a meeting for any reason.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, well that was only clarification that I needed because this is the letter that I received and that was the one on redistricting and that was it. So we just wasn’t privy to the other information. Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Stewart: Mr. LaFitte, are your comfortable in your position based on the information you have just heard from Mr. Thompson as well as your prior observations, that for us to move forward and consider Item 2. a motion to rescind, is in fact a legal decision? Mr. LaFitte: Yes, unlike the reconsideration motion, the motion to rescind does not have a time limit to it.

Councilman Spigener: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw item one from the agenda, the motion reconsider Ordinance 41 of 2002. My motion is to remove that from the agenda.

Councilman Shyne: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have a motion on the floor and how are you going to put another motion. I mean, how are you going to sit there and accept another motion? Chairman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, I apologize.

Councilman Spigener: I’m sorry, Mr. Shyne.

Chairman Stewart: We have a motion on the floor and would the Clerk please restate the motion so that we have clarity.

Ms. Lee: The motion I have is *a motion to adjourn the meeting by Councilman Shyne and seconded by Councilman Huckaby.*

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, it’s puzzling to me why we need a special meeting to reconsider an item that we normally reconsider in a regular meeting. You know, if it’s – it’s a little smelly to this. And let’s stop playing games with one another, I mean, this is what divides the city. I mean this is a little smelly to this. I mean, you know, this is no life or death situation. I mean to re-introduce this ordinance is going to delay the redistricting process, anyway.

I don’t want to be apart of a meeting like this. So I would hope that my fellow Council members would understand, let’s don’t get involve in anything like this. Let’s adjourn, go into our regular meeting, then if Councilwoman Spigener would like to introduce this, I don’t have no problem with her introducing this but let’s don’t do this in no hurriedly called special meeting that was based on an illegitimate reason in the beginning for her to reconsider. We all know that’s the main purpose so, let’s don’t play ball with one another. Let’s be fair and up front. Let’s don’t have no hidden agendas. So, I would beg for my colleagues to please, let’s adjourn at this point and let’s go into our regular session and let’s take care of business like it ought to be taken care of. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Burrell: Mr. Chairman, I think a lot of this is still falling on deaf ears. I know we can live to fight another day but I have seen some strange things that has happened on this Council. I have seen a lot of things where there has been total inconsistency between votes and issues.

As I was going back through all the plans again last night I think I found 5 out of 26 that was developed that did not have a majority in the district that we seem to have a problem with in question. That means that 21 out of 26 plans had a majority on there whether that ranged from 1% to I believe it was 6- or 7% percent and that is 21 out of 26 plans had a majority black District in “B”.

Now, where I’m from when you have a situation where it’s very hard , I think that’s an indication that, it is very hard to draw this particular district that is in question without getting a black majority in there. If the tides were turned, I don’t think that, that would be a problem not in any stretch of the imagination. And for us to go in a special meeting which clearly to the public in which I have seen some articles written that try to water the real reasons down and you may say, well your reason is not my reason. That may be true but I think we have been here long enough to know when things are actually concocted and concocted at a disadvantage of a group of people who sit there and hope to get fair treatment and I don’t think that, that’s what we are dealing with here today.

I have had my emotions enough for the last 2 or 3 days after seeing a situation where mixed messages were sent. And unfortunate Councilwoman Spigener, I’m not pointing any fingers, but maybe she missed the cue that was sent as to the way to vote because the reason I’m saying that is, is because I’ve discussed these plans with all of you on here. I spent a week of my time discussing plans with each one of you trying to draw some consensus and it was mighty strange it was one or two of you that really worked with me on that. Not that is was my job but it is my job as a representative of this City, not only of District G but the City of Shreveport that we would not have to come to a situation like this, that was my hope. But that hope failed when at the last hour or the last 24 hours, several additional plans were concocted.

There was a mis-cue on the plan that should have been voted on which actually thrust us into this situation today where we are tearing at each others’ throat and I find that hard to accept because if anybody has sacrifice, I feel personally, I have sacrificed in my district and I have to deal with my constituents in my district based on that but it was for the

common good and the better good of this city. Why can't some of the rest of us do the same thing? We passed a plan, we got a majority, it wasn't down racial lines and here we have a meeting to say, now we need to discuss it, now something is wrong with that. And I know that we don't have a majority to stop this fiasco but it's going to hurt a lot of people out there and I see that we have mixed groups in here. We should be talking for the welfare of everybody that's in here. It's not a black/white issue, it should be a common issue. Unless you tell me that out of all the years that I have been in District G or been in a Council district being represented by white, been represented by black, that they could not represent me. They did. They did because I took the initiative as a citizen to put my complaints out there—matter of fact, you were my first representative. Although I didn't agree with everything that you said but you represented me and I respected you and I worked hard to try to make a difference in neighborhood. Then I had three other — two other black representatives. I was just as hard on them as I was hard on you, no different, but that's a part of the process. But I think we are clearly now dealing with something that border lines on racism and to me that just shouldn't be where we should be, that is not where we should be at this point and time in 2002, Mr. Chairman—that should not be where we should be. So, I'm asking as a last resort that we go on into our regular meeting and move on with the business of the people of this City and stop toying with something that is so volatile.

Councilman Spigener: I think we have a motion that we have to vote on here.

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Huckaby to adjourn the meeting. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Stewart, Carmody, Spigener, and Serio. 4. Ayes: Councilmen Huckaby, Shyne, and Burrell. 3.

1. Reconsideration of Ordinance 41 of 2002.

Councilman Spigener: Mr. Chairman, since we have on the agenda reconsideration of Ordinance 41, I understand probably we have to deal with and I will withdraw item 1. Reconsideration of Ordinance 41 and would ask that this be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Thompson: If there are no objections it will be withdrawn.

Chairman Stewart: No objections it will be withdrawn.

2. Motion to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002.

Motion by Councilman Spigener to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002, seconded by Councilman Stewart.

Councilman Spigener: The reason I have asked for this motion is to create an opportunity for detail review, discussion and debate on Plan 18 by the Council. By restoring the position occupied prior to the vote of last week on Plan 18 and to reach a plan of redistricting appropriate for the City of Shreveport. I request that this motion to rescind be adopted in which I just placed on the table and as indicated in Item 3. on our agenda.

And I would like to make some personal comments to the public. On last Tuesday, I made a hasty and ill-advised decision on Plan 18. Hasty, because I was considering basically District E, my district, which can fit into many of these plans. And as Councilman Burrell stated, there were 26 and all of our Council members did not even see all of the plans.

Also, beside that issue, Section 4.05 of the City Charter, titled, Reapportionment of City Districts, mandates that reapportionment shall, and this is what I'm zeroing in on, to the maximum extent possible preserve the geographic pattern which existed prior to the revision. I do not see that in Plan 18, to try to get this to the maximum extent possible or maybe - - that is what I feel like we need to review. My understanding of the process was that each Council member would have an opportunity to discuss as many of the plans as they saw value in. The plans which would be eliminated and a final plan would be chosen. The procedure would began with District A and that is Councilwoman Huckaby's district and she was, in my thinking, had to have the first in the line of discussion. I thought and it's hard to admit this mistake, that I thought we were throwing out plans there for discussion. When the vote was taken, I knew I was voting on Plan 18, what I did not realize was this was our final vote.

Some Council members had seen all of the plans and had not had the opportunity to discuss them with other Council members and certainly all the public had not seen the 26, yes the 26 plans. When we had the public hearing in my district, there were only 12 plans. So as far as having this discussed in the Council meeting, we had not.

What the public did not have an opportunity to witness was the Council's open dialogue and discussion on any of the plans. Unless we openly discuss and compare the plans the public does not know what our choices are based on. This is not fair to the people of our City. To further confuse the matter, had we wanted questions from the cartographic person that guided us through the process and he was not here.

Additionally, it was called to my attention that Section 4.05 of the City Charter requires reapportionment to preserve the existing geographic patterns of the districts to the maximum extent possible. I don't think we explored that and I do not know that Plan 18 accomplishes that.

Furthermore, we had residents in one district, Councilman Carmody's district, called Councilman Carmody stating that they had a petition to remain in Council District C and were upset that they were being moved to District B. The petition was never delivered however, and I don't know that everyone on that petition was in agreement that it not be delivered. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have asked us to bring this back forward for reconsideration.

Councilman Carmody: I would offer to substitute a motion to suspend the rules to allow for public input. I see that we have a number of persons that have requested to speak. I think it would be remiss of this Council to vote on this before we hear the public. *Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Serio to suspend the Rules to allow for Speakers.*

Councilman Burrell: It is a comment more than a question. Councilwoman Spigener if I would have your list of reasons that you have there, I think I can rebut about 90%, simply because I know the plans, I have read the plans.

And the only reason we did not explore every plan, all 26 because 3 of those plans were made in the last two days. There is no way in "West Jimminy" that all of us are going to get down in two days to review those last plans. Twenty-three plans has been on that computer for, I know that when I came back in town we had 21 and two days later there was 23 on there and I know that we have had since that time at least two weeks to review them. The last three plans were not placed on there until the last two days the reason why we all could not review all 26 plans.

Now, this is another thing that came out of your statements and like I said, you had a number of them I'm sure I can probably dispute most of them. Just out of due respect, maximizing the potential for the new district that we will actually propose and send forward would exactly match what's existing now, that is a fleeting situation.

If you look at 18 and overlay onto our existing districts the way they are now you are going to find that they closely matches other than how the actual precincts in there were shifted and you are going to have that anytime you have a migration of people from one part of town to the other or an influx of people to a different part of town. So, in terms of that

issue I think you are going to find it's almost the same in terms of shape, as the district exist right now. Eighteen is going to be almost a match. That was one of the reasons why I opposed because I wanted it to be re-shifted so that the district that I represent which happens to be District G to get back to some shape similar to the way it was in 1990 before it was torn up. I accepted that for eight years. I campaign in there for eight years. I made relationships in that district for eight years. And let me tell you if District G, knowing my district, it was chopped up like spaghetti in 1990, but you have to accept that and go forward. It looks like a crawfish, if you really look at it.

So in terms of shape, I think we can place emphasis on certain things in here which has very little validity. You are going to have lines that's going to change and some of the other things you have in there, like I said, I could do that, no we are not going to do it at this point, but I don't think that's the basis or should be the basis for us not considering 18 and moving forward.

Councilman Shyne: You know, it's amazing how people can use words in such an eloquent manner to say I don't know, I didn't understand, I don't have no business being up here.

You know, I don't know whether J. Murrell is in the audience or not but if he is, he is a friend of mine and I disagreed with something that was said about Councilwoman Spigener on his program. But I declare if she didn't sit right here and agree with him saying, I didn't know what was going on. Now, if you sit there and believe that she didn't know what was going on, I got a bridge I want to sell you all in Mooretown that goes to the moon.

Now, and about the petition. If I was her I wouldn't even mention anything about a petition because she didn't even see one, don't even know if one was there. If you are going to keep on being dishonest and deceitful, I'm going to began to think that, that is what you are all about. Now, as a reason, I would have at least left that off, cause it was proven on yesterday that it was really no petition, that was an illusion. I guess somebody dreamed up at night and woke up and said, here's a petition.

I don't know why we have to keep on playing these word games and it's in a statement here where, I made the statement that I was more concerned at this juncture about what's better for the City then I was for District F. Because I tell people District F is not my district. District G doesn't belong to an individual. It belong to the people. I serve at the pleasure of the people. It's not mine, I've just been fortunate that the people like the representation I give them, Reverend Green, but it is not my district. And I made the statement and Councilwoman Spigener came right on behind me and said that her concern was more about her district first. Now she is saying she want to do this for the people of the City of Shreveport.

I would hope at this juncture, now I don't have anything against the motion that you made Councilman Carmody, but I can not support it at this particular point. I would support it at the point in the regular meeting because like I said again, this meeting was ill-conceived. It was conceived in an atmosphere of deceit, dishonor and racism; so, I think it's illegitimate. And if you haven't heard that word very often, go in the inner-city you will hear that word, illegitimate. I would hope that you would reconsider at this particular point and say hey look, let's adjourn this meeting and let's go into our regular session and we can ask for people to come forward and speak.

Councilman Spigener: Mr. Chairman, again, I have spoken to you the truth. Mistakes can be made. There are none of us up here that are perfect. I feel that the people of Shreveport deserve a debate on redistricting.

This is an important issue to our City and I think that, that's where we need to go with this and that's why I have made this motion and have asked to have this meeting.

And as far as erroneous information when a Council member calls and says I have gotten this information and someone is upset, I think it is just due process and fairness to allow them to submit whatever. Now, if someone has convinced them not to submit a petition then I can't help that but we are not going there, that's not what we are here for.

As I said, by restoring the position that we were in on last Tuesday, that we voted on last week, and to reach a plan of redistrict appropriate for the City of Shreveport, I just request that we get this back to where we were so we can reconsider.

Councilman Huckaby: You know it really pains my heart to sit here today and see this scenario, because my husband gave his life for this City. It almost brings tears to my eyes. Councilwoman Spigener knows when she was battling with the Wal-mart, he told me he called. He was the only one who went out to lunch. I thought she was doing something so noble. We talked outside. I was so happy and Councilman Burrell had given up what he did not want—his plan, but I thought it was noble of her. And for her to sit here today and say that I voted hastily. I know she's a very intelligent woman. She has the experience of being on this Council. I could easily say, I sat and I voted hastily because I'm the new kid on the block but let's not make excuses. I see the same thing happening today that happened before the "Bull Suit" was filed and I don't like it.

Councilman Burrell: Going back to something Councilwoman Spigener was saying. I guess the reason why I'm harping on it so because we discussed this issue just before we voted on the last plan which was 18 and Councilwoman Spigener, if you remember, you had changed your commitment to a particular plan because you told me at the middle of the week that 18 was your ideal plan because it protected your district more than any of the other plans, that is a fact. On the day of the vote, what I was trying to do was convince you to go with the plan that I had proposed which included a weeks worth of work in trying to get everybody on the same page simply because it was my understanding that everybody had input into this particular plan. Because I took a variation of a plan that already had gone through a number of different Council members and I said, okay, well I tack on what I need to it. So it was just a derivative of something that had already been laid there. I said, okay maybe we have something here we can all go before the people and put forth and we can come up with some consensus rather than fighting about it and on the very day that we voted on a plan was not the plan that I offered, you told me that you was going with another plan, Plan No. 25, which was one of the plans that was actually developed in the last two days after five months of planning. In the last two days you said you were going with that plan. And I said well, how can you go with this plan, it was just produced. I said, I'm not familiar with it. Well, this is the one I'm going with and I was totally shocked when you went back to 18. You know so, we went from 18 to 23 to 25 back to 18. I said, well she got herself something and we can all go with it. And as you know I didn't want 18. It wasn't something that I particularly cared about but I went along for the common good, that's the reason I'm so confused and that's the reason I'm so upset at this point. That now you have gotten what I thought that you wanted because many of the other council members were getting plans that they wanted. Now all of a sudden that plan is not good for you and it just raised a flag in my mind other than for the common good of this city that you cannot accept 18. And being the one who is initiating the reconsideration and the rescission of this, for the life of me, I can not say that, that is an honest answer that you are giving me or the people of this city and I'm sorry but that's just – it just baffles me to no end. I'm sorry, it just does.

Chairman Stewart: Ladies and gentlemen that are among us on the Council, please remember that we address the issue not the person. Please, that is polite and correct.

Councilman Spigener: As I said, when – I thought and – the discussion with how that meeting was going to go, that you were going to call on each Council member and they would have an opportunity to discuss each of these plans, that's

where I thought the debate and the discussion was coming in. I have been here 18 years, seems like that, 8 years and my thinking was we were going to discuss Councilman Huckaby's recommendation, we will go to each person and will discuss those plans and that didn't happen and I don't know if I, well was obviously was confused on the process we were trying to use. I thought we were going to discuss 18, put this out for debate, that we were going to discuss 23, put it out for debate. I knew that Councilman Burrell was not happy with 18. He wasn't because he wasn't happy with the shape it did to his district and I will agree, he has got the most confused looking district in the city. I thought we would go to 25 and discuss that, that didn't happen and that's where I think I have to say that to the people of the City of Shreveport, that's where I made my mistake. I thought we were going to discuss these issues, we didn't.

How you feel about that, whether you believe that or not, is your prerogative. Because you had said to me, each of us – I will go to each of you council members and you will have an opportunity to discuss the plan that you think is best and we, my thinking was we were going to debate these plans, because I knew Councilman Burrell was not particularly happy with 18, he liked 23 and I knew that some of the other plans we had discussed. So, that is what I have to say to the people of the City of Shreveport and if I made a mistake, I think I need to admit it and we need to come back to square one and all of us discuss all of these plans so we come to a meeting of the minds and come up with something that is good for the whole city of Shreveport.

And our work sheet that I displayed yesterday, each of us was given a work sheet to send in saying which of these and there were 23 plans on that one, which of these plans that we liked best. As Councilman Burrell said, half of those plans did not make a difference to the shape of my district. And my district can be easily redesigned but we didn't do was to put this out and debate and let the people of the City of Shreveport see what we were doing.

Chairman Stewart: Thank you Mrs. Spigener. We have a motion and a second in front of us. Those in favor of hearing – could you restate the motion please.

Mr. Thompson: *Motion to suspend the rules to allow persons who have signed up to speak.* Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Huckaby, Stewart, Carmody, Spigener, Serio, and Burrell. 6. Nays: Councilman Shyne. 1.

Craig B. Lee (3500 Milam Street, Shreveport, Louisiana). Interestingly enough before I came here in the ally way I found some sheets. I found some sheets.

You know before 1978 these seats were symbols of oppression and injustice, Klu Klux Klans wears these types of sheets. I said yesterday that I had more respect for David Duke than I do a lot of you because at least David Duke will have the decency to tell you what he truly thinks instead of going behind closed closets.

Let's discuss something here. Now, I'm not a lawyer but I can read. On the letter that Ms. Spigener sent to you, Mr. Stewart, on the 10th there was not a motion to Rescind Ordinance 41. There was a Reconsideration of Ordinance 41 and a Reconsideration of council approval of redistricting Plan 18. There was no motion mentioned here, period.

Now, words make a *motion* big difference because if reconsideration is illegal then you come back with the word but this was not in your original letter. Ms. Spigener, your original letter was this one dated on the 9th which was in reference to something Thomas Carmody told you which we now know is a lie.

Then when this wasn't good enough you come back with one but now your language doesn't match up with what you have on the board because you have *motion to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002* there but here you have *reconsideration of Council approval of Redistricting Plan 18*. Now, the question I would have for you Ms. Spigener, did you do this letter yourself? I know you didn't do this letter yourself because you would have to have a legal background to do this letter. Who helped you concoct this letter, Ms. Spigener?

Now, you talk about the process. If I'm not mistaken when you mentioned Section 4.05, you all spent good money and hired a cartographer (that's the word that you were trying to pronounce, cartographer and a demographer). His name is Gary Joiner. You all paid money for him. As a matter of fact you bull-crapped around for about five or six months so that Mr. Herschel Brown would not be on board.

Chairman Stewart: Mr. Lee, please watch your language., that's all I request.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Stewart, this is how this process works. You said you wanted to have the citizens see how the Council works, this is what happened. You bull-crapped around, that's the truth. You messed around for over five months so that Herschel Brown, our representative, could not be on the contract and from that particular standpoint, now you say: Oh, we got to let everybody discuss it. But let's look at the process. Every district had an opportunity to look at what was going on.

Now when the whole process is over and you come to vote; now, when you say you now make the mistake, now you want to discuss it. You are the representative for your district.

Let me go back into minutes from Council meeting on the 7th. Ms. Spigener you said in the meeting from May the 7th, these are your exact words: "Thank you Mr. Chairman and looking at Plan 18 of course, I guess a little bit different from Mr. Shyne, I am very concerned about my district because the people there have elected me to serve them. We have a portion as one of the speakers alluded to, Precinct 93, it's in Southern Hills, however, it's been represented by Mr. Serio who is from the east side of town and that's okay Mr. Serio, I think you have done a fine job. But what I find is the people are calling me thinking they are in my district much as you have alluded about Stoner Hill. Sometimes people don't know who is representing them and in this particular plan that will put that portion of Southern Hills in District E. And as far as District E is concerned, I think it would be something that I could live with at this point."—that's your exact words, you are not confused about that Ms. Spigener.

Now what got you confused is have your number on that radio and having these Caucasians in Shreveport threaten to kill you, threaten to shut down your business because you done gave up control of this city, supposedly to the Negroes, of course we know that they didn't say that word.

The bottom line here is, again, this Council has not voted on one single issue since either of you have been on this Council that would significantly impact the quality of lives for black folks. In 1996, Ms. Spigener, I guess you were confused then because you voted 7-0 when Mr. Burrell when he brought out the Disparity Study issue but when Bo Williams vetoed it, how did you come back? 4-3: White. In 1997 when the vote came up with the Surety Support Program, which was culturally diversified, initially it passed 7-0 but when it came back up, how did it come back? 4-3. Disparity Study debate in 1998 Councilman Shyne and Councilman Huckaby, did not even want to back the disparity study. We got Councilman Serio sitting up lying saying if the figures were not 25% by last year he would vote for a disparity study. We can't trust you all's word and now you want us to believe that you were confused.

Well, if you take a multiple choice test on ACT or the SAT you can't go back and say, well I meant to put D instead of C. You can't do that. This is almost as retarded as the "hanging chad ballot" in Florida, where I meant to do this or I meant to do that. But what did the federal government do, we'll have to move on. But what did you all do, come up with some more stuff and common sense would tell me if you can not have a legal reconsideration of the ordinance, how could you have now, a consideration of something else. You can't. Why do you want to do it in this meeting? Why don't you

do it in regular meeting? You know why, because you need 5 votes and you know you don't have 5 votes.

This is a sham. You are trying to hood-wink these people. You are trying to bamboozle these folks and at this stage in the ball game we are here today to say, "time out for this foolishness." But I don't know, maybe I should leave these sheets . . .

Mr. Baruti Danku Ajanaku (I live at 6725 Buncombe Road): First of all I would like to begin with a quote from Dick Gregory out of the book *As the Ghetto Turns* " *If this is one nation under God , I would hate to see one under the devil.*"

When somebody haven't been fair with you in 300 years, it should be common sense now to all minority people and black people in Shreveport that it just aint going to happen. We are in trouble and we are not going to be the modern slave laborer for all the new wealth that's coming into this city. Our babies are dying in the street from a lack of opportunity and we are not going to be just satisfied with seeing our big leader preachers and certain politicians moving into gated communities as a sign that we are overcoming when we got grown people working for \$5.35 an hour trying to support a family.

Stevie Wonder told me that he could see that this aint right. You all are going to have share the wealth and stop playing this game and the Mayor is inviting everybody to come on back. If you all rescind this here particular proposal here, we are going throughout the ghettos, we are packing up. You are going to have to get some new slaves.

We are going to have to make our leadership responsible and all the blacks that are here, if your pastor is not here he or she is out of order. This is what Jesus wanted us to do. He didn't mean for us to get our pastors all these big cars and these big anniversary monies and they don't show up when it 's time to speak up for the poor. We are being pimped, from without and within.

As I begin, I'm going to end: *If this is one nation under God, I don't want to see one under the devil.*

Larry English: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask the Council to indulge me in two three minute periods. The first I would like to address as an attorney and the second I would like to address as a citizen and I know at the end of my three minutes, I hope Mr. Shyne, you would give me that opportunity. Chairman Stewart: Your request is two three minute periods.? Mr. English: Yes. Councilman Stewart: Unless there is an objection, It would certainly be appropriate.

Mr. English: First of all let me just say, business ain't going to be the same it's been before. I'm approaching 50 years old and I just ain't been able to get Hilry Huckaby off my mind this last week. We said that when we buried Huck we buried our warrior. And I kept asking myself, what would Huck do?

First of all, it probably wouldn't be no council meeting down here today because Huck would shut it down. Because Huck understood that when people impede upon your rights that you have to stand up and fight and you don't comprise with people about your rights.

Let me get my peoples speech first and then I'll go to the lawyer. Nigger, Kite, Honky, Jew, Jungle Bonny, Spick, Cracker—Race is in this room. And we can look out here under the city of Shreveport and say, well don't insult me by saying, Mr. English, we look out here and we don't bring race into this Chamber or this is the People's chamber but we don't live in this chamber. We live in Lakeside, Allendale, Broadmoor, we live all over the place. Race is at the center of this issue.

I have been coming down to this Chamber now, I'm losing my hair. arguing with you people and every time I come down, I been coming down since I was 29 years old and every time I come down you are nice; you are gracious; you smile in my face; you say *thank you Mr. English for coming down* and then push the bottom against me and say go home. But say what, keep hope alive and come back again. I'm tired. I'm tired. Let me just say, I'm tired and if I was ten years younger and wasn't putting no kids through college right now, I would lay down in the floor and make you all take me out of here today. I feel that strongly about it.

But, here's the game. We come down, we get all emotional, we scream and holler; we do boom, boom, boom and you push the button and say I see you later, come on back again. Ain't going to happen this time.

Now, as a lawyer. Roberts Rules of Order No. 37 says you cannot reconsider a motion unless you do it the same day. It is clear. Now if you've got a special called hearing to reconsider Ordinance No. 41 of 2002 which is declared to be illegal, you then drop down to, okay we can't get that. Okay, you then drop down to, rescinding, Ordinance 41 of 2002. I don't think you can do it.

And let me tell you what's different. Hire your lawyers, and I know what you are going to do, you are going to probably hire a black lawyer to put him on the other side of me because that what you do every time we file a lawsuit but we going to go put this one in front of a judge and we are going to do it within the next 24 hours. And if we lose on this District Court level, we going to the 2nd Circuit and if we lose in the 2nd Circuit, we going to the Supreme Court.

Joe Shyne said the other day: I'm tired. You all I'm reaching 50 years old. I'm being to believe that there ain't no hope for this city. And let me tell you what's insulting about this. You know what's insulting about this is? This city is rapidly moving toward a majority black city. There's nothing going to happen today that's going to change that, but you got people in this city will hold on to the last second rather than do the right thing.

My mother, bless her soul, would say, right just ain't in you and you wouldn't know it if it you woke up, kissed you in the morning and told you I got a cup of coffee for you.

And I promised I wasn't going to get emotional down here but it's okay to get emotional you all, okay.

Councilman Shyne: I appreciate seeing that passion come out in you because I'm the same way. You brought out a couple of good points and that was why I voted against, this particular juncture, folks coming up talking because I know it makes my colleagues, it soothes their conscience for you to come up and talk but you hit it on the head. You wait until they punch that button and you see if you are going to get the same compassion and the same smile, that's what I'm talking about. The end result is going to be against you and that's what you have to understand. That's the most important thing and you hit it on the head, the same person that was glad for you to come up and talk is going to be the first person to push the button to say that you can't get your share of the pie. But you can come up and talk about it. And then go ahead on home, come back next time and we will think about giving you a piece of the pie. When you come back the next time it's going to be the same thing because you are looking at the reason why: Four against three and I guarantee you that it's going to come right down racial lines all the way down, and you hit it on the head, okay.

Mr. English: Mr. Shyne, a point I need you to ask a question because I probably can't direct anything to the attorneys. Rule 35 of the Roberts Rules of Order says that if you are going to rescind a motion you require two-thirds vote of that body. Could you please direct that to the attorneys for a clarification on that, please.

Chairman Stewart: Mr. LaFitte, we have a request from the speaker. Councilman Burrell: Mr Chairman, he said *rescind*, is that the same word. . .

Mr. LaFitte: That's the same thing as repeal. The motion to rescind would in fact require a two-thirds vote if it was not properly noticed. Because the meeting was noticed, it only requires a majority vote and that's Section 34, Paragraph No. 7, I believe, yeah, Paragraph No. 7.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. English, before you sit down, it comes back to the point what I was talking about the shenanigan, dishonesty, and the deceit. This is a specially called meeting; so, boom, you can do it. Regular meeting, no.

Mr. English: I would just say, and I'm going to sit down, I want to thank the Council for indulging me. No matter what happens here today, this has to go to the Justice Department, so I encourage everybody in this meeting, please get up and help us build a record so that we can go to the Justice Department and show what is taking place in this City Council today. So if you haven't not, run out and grab inaudible) because we are going to need that record when we go to the Justice Department.

Herschel Brown (249 W. 77th Street, Shreveport, Louisiana): I am a black demographer, capable and able. I know this business from the top to the bottom, inside and out as well as any of you know the difference between day and night. I'm saying this for this reason, that Plan 18 was the only susceptible plan that the black community accepted.

You, the Council drew 26 plans. Fifteen (15) of the plans were somewhat on the mark, saying that we will look at it and the reason we were looking at the 15 was that they did include the boundary which was set by the black community and the boundaries are Precinct 34, the Hollywood Park area (Hattie Perry Park), Stoner Hill which is Precinct 64. Those are the boundaries of any plan that is going to be drawn in the city of Shreveport. The 15 contained those.

But Plan 18 consisted of Precinct 34 and Precinct 64, the Stoner Hill area, and it also included Little Valencia. Now, some of you may not know where Little Valencia is but if you are traveling north on Youree and you arrive at Kings Highway and Youree Drive, and as you proceed to go north, you look to the right over there and you see the levee, that subdivision over there is Little Valencia. It's about 149 African-American people that live there. At one time they were in Precinct 64 and someone came in and split them and diluted their vote. That is why Plan 18 was critical and was the plan that was picked.

Now, what plan are we going to pick after 18? Because I'm telling you that the black community is not satisfied with any other plans that you have there. Now, I do know, I've looked at 23 but 23 does not include Little Valencia. You can forget about Plan 26. It's not countable because it does not include Precinct 64 which is the Stoner Hill area and it has the population at, I do believe, at 48% black, 51% white and when you look at the VAP the percentage of the black voting age population drops to 41%. So, that is a no win situation and it's a very fair and not an equitable plan. The only plan that was on the table was Plan 18. My question to this Council is, if you vote down Plan 18, where do you go from here?

Now, I'm not going no where. I am the black demographer for the black community. I was going to be a demographer for the City of Shreveport, but the four of you cured that. So, I want you to know that I have in the past filed legal actions against the city of Shreveport and the U. S. Justice Department. It is on record and the four of you, the white city councilmen, you are lending and pending against a lawsuit. I beg of you to do the right thing. Let's keep 18. Now, I have heard some talk, where you want to modify but if you modify, let's make sure it's up rather than down.

James Pannell (3835 Eileen Lane, Shreveport, Louisiana), President of the Shreveport Branch of the NAACP: I have been to this Council so many times until I have lost count, its almost like I'm a Council member.

I have been down here and I've been saying to you all, all along and often times I'm here by myself, I'm saying what you all are doing is not right and at some point people are not going to accept that. I get emotional, I give speeches, I do some of everything.

It is just comforting to me today to be able to come here in a calm and rational voice because I don't have to be. I have told you all that people were going to get tired of what's taking place and you all thought I was lying. And I told you the other day, just like Councilman Huckaby told before his death, you all can tear this city apart and you can have rioting in the streets. Now, I know that you all wish at this point that on some of those 4-3 votes, that was not as crucial as this, you wish you could have just voted at that point, so you would have something to look back at and say, that's not true. I have voted with you all when it was necessary. But it is sad to say, you all can't point to one time that you all have done that and each and every time we have asked you all to do that.

And you know, it just bothers me, Mr. Carmody, you just sit there like you are not in the middle of this and you are probably the only one – you are going to be one of the main ones that come back to this Council and come back to this city and look at what you are going to have to deal with.

Now, the other thing that I am kind of half way concerned about is that we got a lot of people up here that can't run anymore. I don't know if this is something – they are talking about other reasons why things are being concocted, but you all know that if you all force us to go to court, you all can sit here with them smirk looks on you all's face for another two years. So, that's what some people want.

Now, we have talked about plan after plan, after plan, and I sit here yesterday and read numbers after numbers to show you that none of those plans give us, even Plan 18 that we are sitting here discussing, does not give us the guarantee of winning. We don't have the voting age population in any of those plans. But as an organization we decided that we would not slow progress down. We felt that if you all gave us an equal and fighting chance, we would be prepared to fight you all even though we didn't have the numbers. We would fight you all at the ballot box and you all have decided now at this point that the numbers are too close. It's not like we got even numbers. We are still down in the numbers and you are saying that even though I'm turning you loose, the behind in the race, I got to stop this race at this point because I feel you look like you are gaining on us. So I got to stop this race and put you farther back. Time is running short on you all. Time is running short.

Before I leave, I just leave a commercial with you, *NAACP need your memberships*. It's a fight on our hands. You all need to come see us. You need to try to join. Not just black people but white and black people got to live in this city. You all need to join with us, we are not trying to – If black people are governing this city, we need to govern it right. We need better leadership, not just black. We need better leadership than what we have and what we have exhibited here today.

When you come before us and say, the first thing you say out of your mouth is that, there is a warning to us to follow Roberts Rules of Order because you don't want these people to get out of line but you all are the ones, that's out of line, it is not the people.

Rudolph Glass, Jr. (1431 Clay Street, Shreveport): My first statement I want to make is to Mr. John David Stewart. You said last week that one of your reasons for voting the way you did was because you felt like you were threatened by citizens getting up telling you to do the right thing, is not a threat. Someone to tell you that, how they feel about an issue, is not a threat. That's a poor excuse to use to vote the way you did.

Another thing. I understand that the white male has been dominant for many years and just the mere fact that you are going to lose control, scares you, but that's your reason to do what you are doing. I have been dominated for 37 years and I'm still able to maintain. You will be okay.

Council Lady Spigener: The last of your statement that was, as far as District E is concerned I think it would be something that I can live with at this point. Undoubtedly, someone made you believe that you could not live with it.

Ever since I have been coming to Council meetings, everything that would be a positive impact on the black community has been voted down racial line and it has been lost. You speak of diversity and inclusion. Who are you trying to include? This is something I do not understand.

I have an eight-year-old son. During the bombing of the Twin Towers, everybody had flags. We passed through downtown, he wanted to know, daddy what is that flag there? I said, son that's the Confederate flag. He wanted to know what it was. It's a shame that this day and age, that a flag is still flying in the heart of Shreveport. I understand that it use to be t he capitol of the Confederacy back in the day, but this is a different day and time. I try to do everything in my power to make things right for not only my family but everyone else.

I notice your police presence today. I came down here before complaining about I couldn't get police in my neighborhood when something was going on but you are going to tell me, you are fair. You greet me politely when I come up here, I know what's going through your mind. But I tell you what, I'm not a violent person, I hope nobody else is violent

either, but I have been to nursing homes and hospitals and I have seen people reaping what they sowed.

Michael Williams, (2101 Carver Place, Shreveport, Louisiana): I speak before you as a concerned citizen and a businessman. *Pharaoh, you must let our people go.* Our people are tired of being picked on, picked out, to be picked on. The people feel like they are in bondage and you have an opportunity to free them.

I wouldn't slip and waste a moment in history to be remembered and remembered for change in this community. We use a lot of buzz words in this community. All American City. Can't be. It sounds good. Bring the kids home for a job. They use all these good buzz words but all they are, are just words falling on deaf ears. We have an opportunity to do something right and we are going to pass it up. This is so wrong and I'm ashamed and I do believe serving on the Commission for 8 years and as, Chairman, this meeting is illegal, and I agree with the Council, and the attorney that the meeting is illegal.

We govern ourselves by the Roberts Rules of Order and the Charter when we get elected. We raise our hands. We even have the audacity to sit up there and pray. I think that's just going through the motions, again. I think enough have been said about the divisiveness in our community and we are trying to bring this community together because Shreveport is a great city regardless of what you do today. I'm proud to be here, that is why I haven't left. Because I want to make a difference in this community and in this city, but seem like we are still trying to be divided. I would think looking at the audience and seeing a lot of our forefathers and mothers that are sitting here that they wouldn't have to be here, that this battle would be over by now. But work still need to be done.

What s are our children going to say? Look at them in the audience. Young people, black and white, trying to work together but we can't even get it together because we continue to blow up together because we can't work together. This is a time bomb vote and it is about to go off. You have the opportunity, right there in your hands to make a difference and make change. You have that opportunity right here. Your vote is what count—not your mouth not your lip service. We get a lot of that. People are tired and it is way past time to make a difference. People are crying out for help. People are hurting all over this community looking for a job, a home, decency, just to have a place called home.

And you ask people to come to our community and invest and bring jobs, bring your people here and you are still trying to hold people down with your feet down on them; that ain't right. How can you actually go home and look at your family, your kids in the face and sit down here and vote the way you do, and say we just want to get along. Can't be.

We have been trying to get along all our lives. We are not asking for a hand-out, we are just asking for a hand-up. We are just asking for you to vote and do what's right like we have been doing all our lives. We know 4-3, you can do the math. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize it, black/white. They don't add up, racial lines. How would you like to be in our shoes? Been fighting all – since civil rights, voting rights, civil rights, education rights, food rights, housing rights, and we are asking you to vote what's right today. We been fighting all our lives and we would think that all these people been fighting all these years, our forefathers, the shoulders, the many giants that stood before you, before I even was born wouldn't have to be doing this today. We ask that you vote in the spirit of cooperation not confrontation. We didn't come here for that. We come here to do what's right and make Shreveport a better place for all of us to live and raise our children, go to church on Sundays, play in the park. We want the same thing you want out of life for our family, for our children. We don't want crime, we don't want drugs, we don't want drive-by shooting. We don't want that in our neighborhoods. We want the same thing you want. But most of all we want justice and you have that opportunity today. God bless you and God bless America.

Reverend Aziel McLain: Mr. Chairman, if I go over because of the weight of this matter, I trust your merciful indulgence, I may go over beyond three minutes. Chairman Stewart; We will be glad to request an extension, I'm sure.

Reverend McLain, I'm representing the Baptist ministers of Shreveport and vicinity (I live at 3102 Looney Street, Shreveport): I also feel the presences of some people who 30 years ago struggled to make this town fair. I think of my late father, Dr. C. C. McLain, in 1963 the police of the town, with horses inside the church and beat up a local pastor. I think of Sister Ann Brewster, a childhood friend, who came up dead mysteriously, supposedly by suicide. I think of other pastors, Dr. J. R. Rutledge of Evergreen, who stood and said it was time for justice in this community. I would swear that this is not Shreveport, Louisiana. This is Shreveport, South Africa.

I came home after 25 years living away but two cities where I saw the same game played is right here. I lived in New Orleans. When Dutch Moriel was Mayor and had power and the Council was majority black, all of a sudden blacks could not handle a mass city budget so what did they want to do, they wanted to regionalize, water down the power.

I lived in Detroit. When blacks passed a eight-billion dollar bond issue (\$8,000,000,000) our white brothers and sisters got nervous because that was too much money for Negroes to handle. So what did they do, they went to my friend, he is still my friend, Republican John Engler, railroaded a bill through the Legislature which I testified against, one of two black pastors to go to Lansing and say it is wrong and took our school board from us. So the issue in this town is a \$300,000,000 dollars is too much money for persons of color to handle, but history shows wherever black folk had the power we use it fairly and wisely.

I had the highest respect for the City Councilwoman by voting her conviction but all of a sudden, she has amnesia.

I am here for the moral imparity. This town is one of the most religious communities on the face of the earth, 600 churches and yet we are still fighting the civil war, fighting reconstruction and fighting the '60s and it is wrong.

Then there is the fear factor. Maybe my white brothers and sisters fear that if a Blacks get the power, we are going to treat you as you treated us. We are not going to do that because most of us go to somebody's church where the gospel says, love your enemies, pray for those who use you. We are not that kind of people.

And then, why is it that when people of color play the rules. Yes, I am African American, I am also Irish. My roots go back in this country to 1795 in Montgomery County, Georgia to a man that paid \$0.35 cents taxes, on the white side. From the black side, I am a descendent of slaves of Jefferson Parish. What am I saying? I am saying we were taught in civics class to play by the rules. Now, all of a sudden when black folks get to the line, the rules change.

My son took an oath in the Navy, and I am proud of him, in Intelligence, a Petty Officer. He swore allegiance of that flag and the Constitution to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic. He will probably move here, but I think it's unfair when you have armed forces that is 54% black to hash-out this kind of garbage; all of a sudden, the rules change.

The people are not satisfied. You cannot take the attitude. Marie Antoinette during the French Revolution (inaudible) no society, my friends have ever survived within an entrenched underclass, asked the Czar in Russia, asked the Bourbons of France asked the slaves in America and the Civil War. We cannot have this economic apartheid.

Ladies and gentlemen, the war is over. Scarlet O'Hara's is in retirement, Ashley Wilkes has re-married, lets move this town forward of what it can be and what God wants it to be. I am tired of us going to church and I don't know where my colleagues are, black and white, but there has to be a pathetic voice in this town in the tradition of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Christ himself that says, oppression is wrong. It wasn't crackheads, that crucified Christ, it was the powers that be. You have to have sensitivity, amenity after the poor and the oppressed; that's what it is all about. That is what made America what it is. We rebelled against an oppressive King of England.

James Capers (3838 Lufkin Street): I live in Valencia and this thing about the petition coming from my neighborhood and so forth, that is totally false because I am the editor of the Valencia Voice. I am one of many voices, but I am the editor of the Voice.

Our basic concern was, with several meetings for the Mayor well within the last, six months, we have been meeting on the reunification of Stoner Hill, that is one of the most important things to us. Because I live in Stoner Hill, I was raised there and mostly everybody in this room, some of them I met one time in live and was raised by them. And the most important thing, the reunification of Stoner Hill was the fact that we could, how you might say, in some way define our own destiny. It has always been a fact that our district been a part of so many other districts that it wasn't a unified body. With the separation of Valencia from Stoner Hill, that even made it harder for us.

Now, I appreciate Councilman Carmody, our present Councilman now. He has been there to help us with small details, but we have a larger task at hand and through our own definition by defining ourselves in the district, we can do that and that is what we are asking you, Councilman Spigener, if I am not mistaken, I don't want to mis-pronounce your name. You said that you were concerned about those who are in Valencia or other places. We'll we want to be unified with Stoner Hill so you are hearing from a voice from me.

And Councilman Carmody as my Councilman, I am asking you to vote for 18 and I don't know how else to put it. I hear a lot of things here and it makes me sad because we can all fight, but it won't make no difference. We need each other no matter if we are black or if we are white. If the tolls turn this way or that way we are all going to live and we are all going to survive, but to take our mentality for fear and divisive. I read the article this morning. We turn up, the people that is here. You said you wanted to know the voice, you wanted to know what the people think. Everybody is here telling you. How much more do you need to one day---I lived in Los Angeles and saw what happened when the riots happened and everything else. But I was born here and the powers that be sat here and I look at the smirks on people's face and I look at how people react to other people and you don't understand the combustible situation that you are creating. Not just for us, we all are adults can deal with each other, but this passes on to our kids and then the kids are going to grow up at odds with each other. And for what? For what they are going to know, we as adults know that we should maintain ourselves. Fear what? You have no reason to fear with each other. If someone is living in a district, they don't like it, they can move out. Not to say anyone should move, but what I am saying is that, we all have the power and ability and skills to change whatever. I just ask this Council to go with 18 and whatever I can do as an individual, I am going to help to keep it that way.

Councilman Carmody I ask you again as my Councilman, vote yes. Mrs. Spigener, you hear my voice and thank you all.

Councilman Shyne: I would like to request for Attorney Larry English, not Citizen Larry English. I am requesting for Attorney Larry English to return to the podium. Mr. and Mrs. City Attorney, and Mr. Thompson, I was under the impression and maybe Attorney English can clear this up a little bit, you all can help me clear it up. But I was under the impression that in order to repeal an ordinance or a resolution, you had to do it with another one? Mr. LaFitte: You had to do it with, what?

Councilman Shyne: With another ordinance or with another resolution, that was my opinion. I'd like for Attorney English to speak to that and I would like for you all to, since I am not an attorney and 'course Chief, I don't know whether it is illegal, I might practice a little law every now and then up here, but if I do I don't mean any harm, but would you discuss that.

Attorney English: Mr. Chairman, the first question that I have is that indeed we are amending an ordinance that has been passed by this Council and in order to repeal or rescind that ordinance, does it not have to be done by ordinance or resolution, which at that point would require it to be put on the Council's agenda, public notice, a reading and I think and second reading before it can be adopted? Mr. LaFitte: I think that is correct.

Attorney English: And so if that is correct, so the only way, I want to clarify it so that the only way that we can rescind Ordinance No. 41 of 2002 is to put it on the next Council's agenda, correct, and it has to go through the process of passing an ordinance or resolution? Mr. LaFitte: Right or it could, as I mentioned here, it could be done in special meeting with proper notice.

Attorney English: No, I understand you can do it, but the question of it is, there is a process under city government by which an ordinance is passed, am I correct on that one? Mr. LaFitte: Absolutely.

Attorney English: And in order, I think it has be noticed, it has be voted and adopted by the Council and it has to be put on the agenda, it has to be a reading, it has to wait for 2 weeks, am I correct? Mr. LaFitte: Yes. Some ordinances not all, some do require two readings.

Attorney English: I am sorry, some ordinances require? Mr. LaFitte: Some ordinances require two readings.

Attorney English: Some require one and some require two? Mr. LaFitte? Yes, sir.

Attorney English: Which would this require? Mr. LaFitte: To rescind?

Attorney English: Yes. Mr. LaFitte: I believe it would only require one reading according to—one reading.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. English, hold up for one minute.

Councilman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, please just request from the Chair. Councilman Shyne: Okay, well, Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. English to hold up one—since I requested him to come up? Councilman Stewart: Yes, sir.

Councilman Shyne: I wish you would give me that common courtesy instead of just buffalo-ing on through, I would do the same for you. Mr. Attorney, I don't want to actually put you on the spot at this particular juncture and in one way I guess in another way I do. Instead of you saying, I believe, and we wind up in court and find out that all of this is illegitimate and illegal like we did on a Council meeting before if you understand what I am saying, following the buffalo-ing of some people. If you are not sure, I would appreciate if you would say, that the Legal Department would say, Mr. English at this particular point, I am not sure because I am almost sure that what we are getting ready to do is actually, illegal.

Now, I been here a pretty good little while, but Michael, I am not that old. I just started off early. But, I really kind of feel like what we are getting ready to do, I mean to be truthful with you, I don't even have no ordinance outlined in front of me. I mean, I just have a little something here on a piece of paper where it says, *Introduction of Ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41 of 2002* and usually when we get that, we have a Factsheet. I don't even have no Factsheet, so it goes back to what I was saying, these people done rushed so fast to do some shenanigan and God don't like ugliness.

God don't like ugliness. And that is why I said in the beginning, this meeting is illegitimate, it is ill-conceived, and it doesn't have no business—usually we get a Factsheet. I mean, and I don't mean any harm, but Councilman Burrell is really a sticker at—hey look, give me the Factsheet, give me the Factsheet and I don't blame him. So I am saying this time, give me the Factsheet, give me the Factsheet, I don't have no Factsheet on this particular ordinance.

Now, if you are not really sure, if you and Attorney Glass and Clerk/Attorney Arthur Thompson, I wish you all would say at this particular juncture, now, I am not really sure, because I want you all to understand that we plan to go a little bit further because I really think it is illegal and illegitimate on what we are doing and don't listen to the majority, whoever the majority might be. If you are not certain at this particular juncture, let say, I am not certain. We need to maybe postpone this at particular juncture and look into this.

Attorney English: Mr. Shyne, I need to clarify just a couple more questions, if you could indulge me because of the importance of this, because I think the citizens have a right to know. An ordinance has, Ordinance 41 of 2002 has been passed and has been signed by the Mayor, is that correct? Mr. LaFitte: I don't know if it has been signed, but it has been passed.

Attorney English: And under the City Charter, it automatically becomes law within 7 days of the Mayor's signature? Mr. LaFitte: That is correct.

Attorney English: Does the mere Introduction of an ordinance suspends or brings to a halt that process of that 7 days moving that ordinance into law? Mr. LaFitte: No. The mere motion and second will suspend any further action for specific period time and what that period is, I'd have to find.

Attorney English: Is there a particular charter rule or amendment or Robert's Rule of Order that does that, that states that specifically? Mr. LaFitte: As far as the motion and second?

Attorney English: As far as the mere Introduction because we are talking about Introducing a motion to repeal, not repealing that motion, it doesn't mean that it is going to become law and I can't imagine why it would become law. So I guess my question of it is, and I will sit down, if you could just cite to me a specific charter, charter number, or rule, Robert's Rule of Order that says that that mere Introduction of this motion, will at that point, stop the process of the already legally passed ordinance moving into law. Mr. LaFitte: The motion and the second suspends. (Attorney English: I am asking you. . .) I think you are referring two different things.

Attorney English: No, I am asking you for a simple citation. I am asking you for a simple citation. Mr. LaFitte: I would have to get the citation for you, I don't keep a list of citations in my mind.

Attorney English: Mrs. Glass do you know of a particular part of the City Charter or Robert's Rule of Order that would suspend because of the mere Introduction? Mrs. Glass: No.

Attorney English: Thank you, then I am going to state in closing. I think what you are doing here today is illegal and I think you can not do it. You certainly have the right to do the motion to Introduce and whatever, but it does not stop the effect of the ordinance that is already in place. In 7 days it becomes law and at that point you are obligated to send it to the Justice Department. You can always come back, rescind it and send a new one up, but under your laws unless somebody gives me different, you are obligated by law, that that motion to go into law and to send it up to the Justice Department.

Councilman Stewart: There is one thing that is certain, while there is many differences of opinion and that is that we will follow the law. That is the reason we will follow the law, and that is the reason Mr. LaFitte was asked to be here.

Mr. LaFitte: If I may address Mr. English, I think what I was referring to as far as the motion and the second, suspending an action, is on the reconsideration. The Robert's Rules does not address suspension with a rescind, so I am correcting myself on that.

Attorney English: So, are you saying that in effect what you are saying is that, there are no Robert's Rules of Order or City Charter ordinance that would suspend that motion? Mr. LaFitte: That would suspend. . . .?

Attorney English: The previous motion; yes. Mr. LaFitte: Not under the motion to rescind. Robert's Rules only addresses suspension under a motion for reconsideration.

Attorney English: Okay, because we don't have a motion for reconsideration here today, so there would not be a suspension because we are—Mr. LaFitte: Not going to address it.

Councilman Shyne: Let me clear up one thing where it was say that, we always follow the legal avenues. We don't. I was a part of an action where a vote was rescinded at the following meeting and that was illegal. Now, I am not going to sit here and tell you that we don't make mistakes, we don't make errors because we are human and we do, we do.

But now Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a Factsheet. Do we have a Factsheet? I mean, whenever we---Councilman Carmody, I know the City Attorney has his finger up, but I have the floor at this particular time. I would ask for a Factsheet on, usually we get a Factsheet when we are Introducing an ordinance. Is there some reason why we do not have a Factsheet.

Mr. Thompson: This does not directly answer Mr. Shyne's question, but I wanted to clarify what is in front of you. There is the actual ordinance (No. 3) the introduction of ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41, that is an ordinance that is in this folder and also No. 4. Is an ordinance that is in this folder. There is no—I know that you did answer that---Councilman Shyne: I do not have a folder unless some little bird came up here and---Councilman Stewart: Who needs folders? Mr. Thompson: It is at everybody's seat.

Councilman Shyne: Is this it back here? Mr. Thompson: Yes that is it, Mr. Shyne. Councilman Shyne: Mr. Thompson, I will apologize to you.

Mr. Thompson: There is no document No. 2, the motion to rescind. That is just a motion that was made by Mrs. Spigener, but there is no document that you have in front of you, I don't believe on that, issue.

And one thing that Dianne brought to my attention that ought to be brought to your's, if No. 3 and No. 4 are introduced, they can't be voted on until the next meeting. And if No. 2 is defeated or if it is withdrawn and No. 3 is introduced and No. 4 is introduced, then I believe that the City Attorney would agree that No. 18 would be in effect until the next meeting and until some action is taken as it relates to Items 3 and 4.

Councilman Stewart: Mr. LaFitte, does that summarize what you believe to be the facts? Mr. LaFitte: Yes, it does.

Councilman Stewart: Mr. Thompson, thank you very much.

Councilman Spigener: Could Mr. Thompson repeat.

Mr. Thompson: Lets assume that we are not considering Item No. 2 and I am only speaking to Items 3 and 4. If Item 2 is withdrawn or is not adopted then and No. 3 is introduced and No. 4 is introduced then the present Plan 18 would remain in effect until some action is taken on Items 3 and 4. If, however, No. 2 is adopted by the Council, then Plan 18 is rescinded and it would not be in effect any longer.

Councilman Stewart: Does that answer your question? Councilman Spigener: Yes.

Councilman Stewart: Then I sense at this time, Mr. Thompson, that we are at Item 2 which is a motion and a second to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002. Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

Councilman Stewart: We have a motion and a second, is that correct? Councilman Shyne: No. Councilman Stewart: One minute please, I am asking Mr. Thompson. Ms. Lee: Yes, prior to the speakers beginning to speak, there was a motion by Mrs. Spigener which was seconded by yourself on this Item No. 2.

Councilman Stewart: So, we have a motion and a second and we suspended the Rules to receive information, so what is the correct next step, please? Mr. Thompson: You have Item 2 before you that has been properly, there is a motion that is properly before you and a second that is properly before you. It can now either be debated by members of the Council or acted on by members of the Council.

Councilman Stewart: It would seem to me to be appropriate that we hear information from members of the Council. I am happy to entertain any comments at this time from members of the Council.

Councilman Burrell: I can only reiterate again that I think that we are embarking on a path that we shouldn't be embarking on. [Plan]18 is something that was legitimately passed. I think all of the reason that were given why we should rescind, reconsider or any other actions along those lines are inappropriate.

We had our meetings on these different issues. We have had plans that was brought up at the last minute in which I stated earlier, one of the last plans that was brought up, I know my fellow colleague, she was in support of that plan, that was right at the end, that was the last 2 days. So I hardly understand how we did not understand the prior 24 plans up until that point and the 25th plan was the one she was considering voting on the very day that we voted on 18, but decided to vote on 18.

These things to me don't make sense. I was given an education to think in a logical manner, my background is mathematics and statistics and I understand what has taken place here. And I think a lot of us understand, it doesn't take an mathematical genius to understand it either, but I think what we are putting for to the people doesn't make sense even to them, even though they may not understand all of the figures that is in there, but I think they do understand that we are trying to circumvent a process. We are trying to circumvent the will of the people, I think they do understand that part.

And I think we sit here as examples not only to Shreveport, to the world because we are, whether we like it or not for whatever reasons, we have become pretty well international. There is a lot of people know about Shreveport now and they know a lot of things about what is going on here, good and bad. We used to be concerned about, years ago, about the race riot and how it was going to affect Shreveport. This is worse than race riots, but you are doing it in a very legitimate sense because you are using the loopholes in the law in order to get there and that is not right.

Now, I'm asking us again to do the right thing because after this we can't go back and re-track what we've done. I think all of us, from time-to-time have made some concessions. I know in the redistricting process, I've made a heck of a lot of concessions, but hopefully it is to the betterment of our City as a whole. I am asking the rest of you to do the same thing.

We have a plan before us that doesn't present any damage or any threat to this City and I don't know where the threat is, but that is what I feel is taken place. It is this feeling of somehow that we are regressing when in actuality I think we are progressing and we need to take note of that. We need to get away from this thing about whose in charge.

As I said yesterday, we are all in this together. If we are in a boat and we are sinking, if the hole is on my side of the boat, we are going to sink anyway; that's the whole point. So lets help each other get to the other side of this issue and we

can't do it by fighting each other, we are going to tip over.

Councilman Shyne: If you all remember, we got a nice little speech on watch your behavior because this might impact businesses that want to come into Shreveport and your behavior from the standpoint of you talking out loud or clapping or whatever. But you know the behavior, the action that will go forth to the business community that says that the Shreveport City Council votes down racial lines. Now, my name is going to be listed as voting down racial lines, probably other folks will vote down racial lines—that's alright, but if I vote down racial lines then it is something wrong with it.

Now, that's what the business community is going to be looking at. When they come in locate they are going to want to see, are we together. Is this a family atmosphere or is it a pulling apart in this community. Is it dissension? Is there underlying dishonesty, this is what they are going to be looking at not if you are too loud at a city council meeting not if you express your emotions at a city council meeting.

Mr. Thompson, how many votes do we need? Mr. Thompson: Four votes. You only need a simple majority to pass any of these items that are on the agenda.

Councilman Shyne: You only need a simple majority to introduce a motion to rescind an ordinance, is that what I am hearing you say? We are dealing with No. 2, now? I want to make clear so when we go further, I want to make sure that we have from you and the City Attorney. Is this what I'm hearing that, you only need a simple majority in order to introduce an ordinance that will rescind, another ordinance? Mr. LaFitte: What has occurred is the motion to rescind has been moved and seconded and because the meeting was properly noticed, then the vote only requires a majority, that is correct.

Councilman Shyne: Only a simple majority? Mr. LaFitte: That is correct. Councilman Shyne: I want to make sure because I want to make sure that we go on record like some of the speakers have said. We want to make sure that we have this document, so we don't want to say, well I didn't understand, you know how that comes back or I didn't hear or it wasn't made clear. I want to make sure so I appreciate you saying that; so, Mr. Chairman it is back to you.

Councilman Burrell: Clarification. A vote *yes* is for rescinding and a vote *no* is to not rescind? Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

Councilman Stewart: I now speak for myself. I made the statement simply that, I did not support the ordinance that was passed. I did not support it then and I do not support it now. I do not think that it is in the best interest of the City of Shreveport regardless of what your background is, our mine.

I spoke specifically and very simply to the comments that I've had the pleasure of living in Dallas, Tulsa, Chicago, twice in Philadelphia, Ruston, San Antonio, and Shreveport in my life, of 59 years and I've been active at every level whether it was student government and now in politics, that doesn't make me a better person but I do have some perspectives that bring to me what I think is important for this community. We are here to vote, express our feelings. We all have our rights, and I thank you for it. You've taken your time to join us. If there is no other discussion, all those in favor.

Councilman Spigener: In our vote of last Tuesday and in the minor amount and the small amount of discussion that we had, Council member Burrell was not for this plan. He talk about his district being the sacrificial lamb, however, he did say he was willing to make that sacrifice. And what I'm wanting to happen here is that we get these plans that are of interest to our Council members back on a level playing field where we can discuss these plans and come up with a plan that best suits our city. We've heard, about our determining boundaries on districts is not to be based on how many whites are in a district and how many blacks, but it is to, as is stated in the Charter Section 4.05 to our maximum extent possible, we need to preserve the geographical pattern of the district, I think that is what we need to re-examine. And therefore I would ask that we put this back on the table, so to speak, re-evaluate and do from that point what we need to do.

Councilman Burrell: I won't let the last voice put the monkey on my back. I can assure you that this reconsideration has nothing to do with the fact that I don't like Plan 18.

Let me tell you why. Because I did both Plan 18 and 23, so that is the reason I know both plans forward and backwards and that is the reason why I could accept 18 simply because 18 is more reflective of the way the districts are and the City is now than probably any other plan that is in there, so no I won't accept that, from that standpoint.

Twenty-three (23) was only there because I spent a week trying to get other Council members to support one plan because no one else was doing it. It was for the betterment of this City, but I could not get the support there, so, in a democratic process you just go ahead and see if you can get it pushed through, but you can't. So I accepted Plan 18 in lieu of 23, that is the process.

So, I will not accept the responsibility of saying not wanting 18 because if anybody, you know we had 26 plans, no one had said which plan that they worked on. I'll tell you which plan I worked on. It was 18 and 23, so I don't have a problem with that, you know. And it wasn't based on any intentions at all, well yes it was. It was based on several criteria that I thought should be a part of the plan.

Plan 18, let me just be a little more specific. Plan 18 brought Queensborough back together. Right now, Councilman Shyne and myself split Queensborough down the middle just like Stoner Hill. That line goes down Milton Street which is half way between Lakeshore and Greenwood Road in Queensborough, it splits it half in two; 18 brings it back together again.

Also it brings Stoner Hill back into one of the other, District A or District B, that is the basis for that plan. If you look at that and look at the rest of the overall districts, there are pretty much the same. So if any plan is closer other than those two exceptions, it would be Plan 18 so that disputes that argument from that perspective. I just want to set that straight because right now, I feel like the monkey is coming on my back and if the Justice Department is looking for a plan that is close to what it is now, this is the plan; so, Mr. Chairman I have to make that clarification.

Councilman Stewart: Mr. Burrell, clarifications are very important, I appreciate that.

Councilman Carmody: For clarification, could the Administration advise us or not the ordinance has been signed by the Mayor? Mr. Thompson: It has.

Councilman Stewart: The ordinance has been signed by Mayor Hightower. (Mr. Lee: It is law.) We have an attorney here. (Mr. Lee: He ain't doing his job.)

Councilman Carmody: I have a statement, I'm going to make and my statement is not going to go over well, but I am going to make it away.

I didn't support 18, I didn't draw up 18. From the very beginning of this process I've heard persons say, we don't want to be in your district. I don't take it personally, I really don't. As I've said at every one of the public meeting regarding redistricting, I've tried my best to represent everybody that was inside my district as well as people that outside because guess what, although we walk the streets, we hand out push cards in the neighborhoods in which we fall within these lines, our obligation is not just to the people that are right there in our immediate vicinity where we live. It is to the City.

I've heard an awful lot of things said here today that I find offensive, hatefully. To make a statement that you are going to tear the City apart, I don't see where that is any benefit. If anything else, I think that we are suppose to all be here trying to build it up.

I guess pressure brings out people's true side. And if anything under 18, Mr. Burrell, if you are author of 18, that's fine I don't care who drew it up. I could look at it and say that District C is the sacrificial lamb. Big deal. Everything that Mr. Lee pointed out yesterday in Caddo Heights, he feels like I hadn't represented those people fairly (Mr. Lee: That is what they are saying). Thank you Mr. Lee for confirming that.

I hear Mr. Willis and Ms. Smith, Mr. Capers, all say that Stoner Hill needs to be in another district. I heard Mr. Williams say, let my people go, very biblical. After all of this is said and done, we have got to live together, every one of us.

I mean, I am at a point right now where I would like to throw my hands up and walk away from this and say, lets start the whole process all over but we can not do that. Because guess what, I didn't work with just some people on this Council to try to get where we are today. I worked with hopefully all the members of this Council as well as the people out there that wish to express their opinion on the way that this City is headed.

I don't want to sit here and waste any more time on it, I'll be honest with you because this isn't moving the City

forward. In my opinion it is putting it back. I can ascend to 18 and say fine. I'll give you this plan, it is not my plan, it is not what my desire would be, but if what you are telling me is, I'm threatening you Mr. Carmody because if you don't give us 18, there is going to be trouble (nay, nay, nay). That is not what you heard?

I understand that we are all entitled to our opinion, but when it is all said and done, either you working for the betterment of the City together or you are working to pull it apart, period, that is what it is. I'm prepared to vote.

Councilman Burrell: You must have a bad ear. Councilman Stewart: No, I don't have a bad ear, I'm listening to everybody, Mr. Burrell. Please be brief, sometimes we'd like your response.

Councilman Burrell: I just wanted to make a statement in relation to Mr. Carmody. I think we've all tried to work together in many cases, but the statements that the people are making is based on frustration.

It is based on their thoughts and hope that what they saw on the 8th was what we stood and what they saw on the 8th was something that they could live with, and that is all it is.

And the only reason I stated that 18 was my plan just to let you know, I know the plan and it wasn't anything that I offered to them. I was the last one to know that that was the only there were going to vote on. I was the last one to know or else I wouldn't been pushing 23, which looked nothing like 18, I might add, looked absolutely nothing. It looked like what Council woman Spigener said that it should not look like or she was saying that it should look more like, how did she put it, more like the way things are now as close as possible? Councilman Spigener: Maximum extent possible.

Councilman Burrell: Maximum extent possible. But 23 does not because I was looking also at the interest of the people in District G because for 8 years they lived with a monstrosity that was, a district that was completely torn up in 1990 and that was something that you all heard me talk about for 8 solid years that if we ever get back to this juncture, this will be something that I'll leave with them, something that is more compact, something that is not sprawled from Hearne Avenue to Greenwood, Louisiana from South Lakeshore Drive to the north, to Bert Kouns to the south, that is over 2/3rds of the City, if you want to look at it but it is made like a cross. So, from that perspective that is the reason that I felt that I owed it to District G to try to bring some compactness to it, the only reason.

But again finally what you are hearing them say is basic frustration and frustration at a hope that we would be fair and I thought that we were. I don't know of any vote that we have not gone down racial lines that we've gone back and rescinded for 8 solid years. We've got 1 black and 3 whites or 3 whites and 1 black, we went with it. Eight years I know I've been here and we have not.

As I can remember and I tell you there is only a couple of votes that really hit me hard and that was the one where I was trying to develop an institute to try to redevelop the inner city and we had a 7-0 vote and the first time in history, first time in Shreveport voting history (I had Mr. Thompson go back and research it) that a Mayor vetoed a 7-0 Council vote and did turn around and the Council upheld it. Now, that's wrong. Those kind of votes make you really wonder what country you are in. And like I said, a lot of time we kind of sit silently by but some of this stuff just hit you right in the, smack in the face and this is one time it does and it is not right, people. Lets try to get beyond this. And true enough, I sit here in times when we should be bringing up issues, we did not. We should be arguing points, we did not, all we did was push the button simple because it was in our interest.

I think under the circumstances, Councilman Carmody, don't take offense to that and don't use that as a justification for not doing the right thing.

Councilman Shyne: One quick comment, I agree with Councilman Carmody and I think he kind of said, I don't know whether he realize it, it seem like to me he kind of said if hey if Plan 18 will get us moving, lets go ahead on with Plan 18 and I'll vote for it to get it to move. Because if we rescind this, then we go all the way back, it is going to push the elections of and I'm like him, I want to get started. And to be truthfully with you now, Plan 18 really was not Councilman Burrell's idea. Mr. Wills, (Mr. Wills you don't mind me bringing this out do you?) and Ms. Smith and I, actually Plan 4 was the plan that I liked the best because I was concerned about Stoner Hill always coming up with the short end of the stick and I told Mr. Wills and Ms. Smith, I said, look, Plan 18 is a fine plan. I said, Councilwoman Spigener likes this plan because it corrects some inadequacy that was between her district and Councilman Serio's. I said, lets go with this plan. And they said well, Joe, do you think this is a good plan? I said, well, Councilwoman Spigener is a Christian woman and her heart is in the right place and if she thinks it is a good plan, lets go with it. Didn't we go and look into the computer? We looked into the computer and I don't want all of this to be laid on Roy Burrell as he is the big bad wolf because Roy is not the big bad wolf. (Councilman Burrell: I even developed the plan, that. . .)

Let me say this now. Let me relieve a little of that. All of that development of that plan was not Roy's either because it was Pat's idea of straighten it up. My idea had always been, as long as you keep Stoner Hill together, it didn't matter if it was Plan 50, if I'm making any sense. I mean, it could have been Plan 50. I was for any plan that was going to keep Stoner Hill together and that would reflect the racial make-up of this City. And lets don't fool ourselves, we have not gotten to the point where we don't see race. You think I'm kidding, eventually you haven't been seeing the votes that has been going up there. If you think I'm kidding, you wait until you see these votes.

But I think we have reached a point where Councilman Carmody has said that he is ready to move on so if it is Plan 18, he doesn't have no problem with it because he wants to get on the road. Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to vote.

Councilman Spigener: One more comment. We have concentrated on Stoner Hill. We have concentrated on a portion of Queensborough. I have concentrated on a part of Southern Hills and West Shreveport, my district goes all the west up to the interstate, and I'm hearing the objective with Stoner Hill and with some of these other districts or lets don't split precincts. I had precinct in Southern Hills, that was the heart of Southern Hills that was in Councilman Serio's district. The people call me—I would be over there assisting them and my husband would say, that's not your district but because it was so in—not even connected to the other district or to Serio's district. This plan is going to split a precinct in my district, 87, north of Buncombe Road to the interstate so we are still splitting precincts. I don't guess we'll ever get away from that. But anyway if Councilman Carmody—Chairman, if the Council is ready to vote, that is where we are.

Councilman Stewart: I sense that if we are in the appropriate time. For clarity, Mr. Thompson, Madame Clerk, we are on Item 2 which is a *motion to rescind Ordinance 41 of 2002*, is that correct? Mr. Thompson: That is correct. Those who wish to rescind it will vote in the affirmative. Those who wish to uphold it will vote in the negative, is that correct? Mr. Thompson: That is correct. Councilman Stewart: Everybody cast your vote. Councilman Spigener: The motion is to rescind? Councilman Stewart: The motion is to rescind. If you want to rescind, you vote in the affirmative. If you do not, you vote in the negative. *Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Huckaby, Carmody, Shyne and Burrell. 4. Ayes: Councilman Stewart, Spigener and Serio. 3.*

3. Introduction of Ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41 of 2002.

Motion by Councilman Spigener for Introduction of an ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41 of 2002, seconded by Councilman Stewart.

Councilman Stewart: Mr. Thompson, is there a reason to have a vote at this time? Mr. Thompson: Sir? Councilman Stewart: Is there a reason to have that vote, Mrs. Spigener. Mr. Thompson: Is there a reason to vote? I am not sure I understand your. . . Councilman Stewart: I apologize. Ms. Spigener, do you want to vote on this item? (Mr. Lee: Wait a minute). One minute. Item is *Introduction of Ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41 of 2002*, is that something, we have on the agenda, to consider. Mr. Thompson: It is.

Councilman Stewart: And do we have a motion to introduce it? Councilman Spigener: Yes. Councilman Stewart: We have a motion from Mrs. Spigener to Introduce this, is that correct? Mr. Thompson: That is correct. Councilman Stewart: The Chair has seconded it. Mrs. Spigener, Item 3, your comments. Councilman Spigener: I have no comments.

Councilman Shyne: Why we come up with a motion to Introduce this when we just voted down to, the other motion to rescind Ordinance 41? I mean. . . Councilman Stewart: Let us ask the Clerk for guidance here, that is what we need to do.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Thompson, wouldn't that be mute, at this particular point? Councilman Stewart: Mr. Thompson, Mr. LaFitte. Mr. Thompson: We have the City Attorney here, but in my opinion, it is not mute at this time. You would be introducing it and it could be voted on that next meeting, not today, but at the meeting two weeks from today. However, as I explained earlier, Plan 18 would still remain into effect unless some action was taken in the future to adopt a new plan.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Thompson, maybe I am not in a position, but I disagree with you, on that. I mean, it seems like the motion to rescind—actually what we got here then, we have two motions to rescind Ordinance 41. Councilman Stewart: Mr. Thompson, Ms. Glass and Mr. LaFitte, would you guide us here, please.

Councilman Shyne: I mean we have two motions to do what we just got through voting down. Mr. Thompson: I do not disagree that it is two bites at the apple.

Councilman Shyne: Right and we don't, Mr. Chairman, we don't ever do this. I mean we don't ever have two bites at the apple. I mean, this is a part of the shenanigan again with Councilman Carmody. I mean, lets move on with what we got. Councilman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, I certainly understand your question and I have requested twice, clarification and guidance.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, again, I think this is ill-conceived, this is a illegitimate act. I mean we are going to come up with two bites at the apple. And Councilman Carmody, I agree with you, lets go ahead on and vote this down and move on.

Councilwoman Spigener, I am really surprised at you, that you would come back and try to underhand, I mean here I am, I been saying that you are such a Christian and such a fine lady, then you come back. . . (Councilman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, please do not. . .) with a bite at the apple twice. Councilman Stewart: Please do not attack anybody, just state your concern about the issue.

Councilman Shyne: This is not an attack. Don't sit over there and say that I am attacking somebody. This is--- Councilman Stewart: Mr. Shyne, the important issue, none of us should address a person in any fashion. We are to speak to the issue which I think is the. . .

Councilman Shyne: I am speaking to the issue. The issue was brought to the table, by a person. The issue just didn't fly out of the sky and get on the table. The issue was brought to the table by a person. This issue is ill-received, it is an illegal act, so let's vote on it so that we can vote it down. I mean, I'm surprised.

Councilman Stewart: Are we in a situation here, Mr. LaFitte, that we will be legally correct to address Item 3 which is the 3. Introduction of Ordinance to repeal Ordinance 41? Mr. LaFitte: Robert's Rules refers to *rescind* to also be known as *repeal* or *Annul*; so in my mind *rescind* and *repeal* are the same thing.

Councilman Stewart: So are you stating, for clarity, I am not questioning your words that, Item 3 is not appropriate for us to consider? Mr. LaFitte: I believe that that has already been considered as a rescintion, according to Robert's Rules, they are all the same: Rescind, Appeal and Annul.

Councilman Spigener: *I will remove that motion from the table.* Councilman Stewart: Mrs. Spigener has withdrawn that.

4. Introduction of Ordinance amending Section 2-27 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to reapportion the several council districts of the City.

Motion by Councilman Spigener for Introduction of Ordinance amending Section 2-27 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to reapportion the several council districts of the City , seconded by Councilman Stewart.

Councilman Burrell: If I may ask Councilman Spigener, give me some clarification on what this is suppose to do? Councilman Spigener: Well, I am introducing the ordinance and I'm assuming that it would be on the agenda for our next meeting, is that correct Mr. Thompson? Mr. Thompson: That is correct. Councilman Spigener: And we could deal with the issue then.

Councilman Burrell: Which Ordinance, specifically is that because somehow my little sheet must have got away because I don't have that information in my little folder? Introducing which one, Mr. Thompson? Mr. Thompson: *Introduction of Ordinance amending Section 2-27 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to reapportion the several council districts of the City and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.*

Councilman Burrell: Mr. Thompson, is this to start the process over, is that what I am assuming? Mr. Thompson: It is, that would be the intent of this ordinance, in my opinion.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Thompson, what good is the intent? Please explain that to me, what good is the intent to start the process over if with the last vote, it was voted down? Mr. Thompson: I think you a raising a policy issue as to whether or not the Council wants to start the process over again, if they just decided the issue. Whether or not you can technicality do it, I think it is a different matter.

Councilman Serio: And what is your suggestion? Mr. Thompson: As a matter of policy if the Council has decided that Plan 18 is the plan and it should not be repealed or rescinded in any way, then the Council may want to defeat this. That was not the intent of voting in your last vote, I mean I don't know, I can't—I think it is a question you have to decide.

Councilman Serio: I voted against it the last time anyway. Councilman Shyne: I call for the vote. Councilman Stewart: We have a call for the question. Councilman Burrell: I thought I understood what we were doing, but I am confused as hell.

Councilman Shyne: Let's vote it down. A *no* vote, Mr. Burrell. Councilman Serio: Thank you, Mr. Burrell. Councilman Burrell: That's my English. Councilman Shyne: A *no* vote, Mr. Burrell.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote. Councilman Burrell: A clarification. Councilman Stewart: We have a request from Mr. Burrell, unless you would like to withdraw your request.

Councilman Burrell: No, I said that I was confused. That means that I need to understand what I am getting ready to do because all that I thought that we did, undoubted, we didn't do, in the rescintion Mr. Thompson: The only advise that I can give, Mr. Burrell, is you thought you settled the issue the last time, vote *no* now.

Councilman Shyne: Right, lets vote *no* since Pat isn't going to pull it off the table.

Councilman Stewart: Wait a minute. We are just dealing with the issue.

Councilman Burrell: Wait a minute. Councilman Shyne: Vote *no*, Roy.

Councilman Burrell: Lets go with it.

Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Huckaby, Carmody, Shyne and Burrell. 4. Ayes: Councilman

Stewart and Spigener. 2. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Serio. 1.

Councilman Serio: I voted yes and it didn't hit, it was a 3-3 vote. Councilman Stewart: Then let us re-vote on it, recast it ladies and gentlemen.

Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Huckaby, Carmody, Shyne and Burrell. 4. Ayes: Councilman Stewart, Serio, and Spigener. 3.

Adjournment. There being no further business before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

John David Stewart, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council