UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION

MARILYN MARIE MONTEILH, : DOCKET NO. 65-10912

:

Plaintiff,

vs. : January 23, 2008

:

SCHOOL BOARD OF ST. LANDRY PARISH, :

:

Defendant. : Lafayette, Louisiana

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE TUCKER L. MELANCON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

APPEARANCES: MARION OVERTON WHITE

Law Office of Marion O. White

511 E. Landry St. Opelousas, LA 70570

LISA M. TAYLOR

U.S. Dept. of Justice Civil Rights Division

601 D. St. N.W.

Washington, DC 20580

ADAM GERARD CASWELL Attorney at Law P.O. Box 1600 Eunice, LA 70535

REPORTED BY: LARAE BOURQUE, RPR, CRR

United States Court Reporter 800 Lafayette Street, Ste. 3103

Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

PROCEEDINGS

2 (Call to order of the court.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

All right. The matter before the Court this afternoon is Civil Action Number 65-10912, Monteilh vs. the St. Landry

Parish School Board.

Before we start today, I would like the record to reflect that since the Court ordered the St. Landry Parish School Board to place a copy of the minutes of all proceedings conducted in court on the school board's website, I have received numerous telephone calls and letters from parents and concerned citizens of St. Landry Parish about the desegregation case and matters concerning the school system not necessarily related to the case.

Depending on the nature of the inquiry, I have tried to answer the letters and return the telephone calls I received.

However, as a result of the sheer volume of inquiries that I have been receiving, I will no longer be in a position to respond to telephone calls or letters.

All future inquiries by parents and concerned citizens, including letters, should be directed to the United States

Department of Justice or the United States Attorney of the Western District of Louisiana.

At this time I would ask that the attorney for the United States identify herself for the record.

MS. TAYLOR: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Lisa Taylor

1 representing the United States with offices in Washington, D.C. 2 THE COURT: And, Ms. Taylor, I am aware from a call that was made by Ms. Vincent to my chambers today that she's ill, 3 4 I believe, and will not be here. 5 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. She is actually as we 6 speak at a doctor's appointment, and if she's able, she will come 7 in a little bit later, but she may not be available. 8 THE COURT: Should the Court expect anyone else from 9 the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District to 10 attend? 11 MS. TAYLOR: No, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: And I do not see -- and if I've missed him, 13 forgive me -- Mr. White, the attorney for the original 14 plaintiffs. Do you know whether or not he's coming? I don't see 15 him in the courtroom. MS. TAYLOR: I have not spoken with him recently. 16 17 tried to call and leave a message, but I don't know whether he's 18 planning to attend or not, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Well, I'm sure, Ms. Jordan, he got a notice 20 of this fixing. 21 THE CLERK: Absolutely. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Well, perhaps he'll show up and 23

we'll just see what happens when we see what happens.

Parish School Board identify himself for the record.

Next I'd ask that the attorney for the St. Landry

24

25

1 MR. CASWELL: Yes, Your Honor. Gerard Caswell for the 2 St. Landry Parish School Board. 3 THE COURT: And then I would ask that the members of 4 the St. Landry Parish School Board, starting with the president 5 and the vice-president, to identify themselves and the district 6 they represent. 7 MR. MILLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Miller 8 representing District 3, Opelousas. I'm currently serving as 9 President of the St. Landry Parish School Board. As I look 10 around, all members are present and accounted for. 11 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. MR. BOSS: Your Honor, Kyle Boss, Vice-President 12 13 representing District 8. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. And we'll just start first 15 here. MR. CARRIERE: Your Honor, Ronald Carriere, District 6, 16 17 St. Landry Parish School Board. 18 MR. DEVILLE: Your Honor, Dillard Deville representing 19 District 4. 20 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, Roger Young, District 11. 21 MR. WYBLE: Your Honor, Huey Wyble, District 7. MR. STANDBERRY: Anthony Standberry, District 1. 22 23 MR. RICHARD: Your Honor, Quincy Richard, District 10. 24 MR. BUDDEN: Your Honor, Marx Budden, District 5.

MR. FRUGE: Your Honor, Harry Fruge representing

25

1 District 13. 2 MR. RICHARD: Good afternoon. Scott Richard, 3 District 9. 4 MS. FRANK: Your Honor, Josie Frank representing 5 District 12. 6 MS. EAGLIN: Your Honor, Elinor Nacoste-Eaglin 7 representing District 2. 8 THE COURT: Now, Superintendent Nassif, if you would 9 identify yourself for the record and go ahead and identify those 10 members of your senior staff who are present. 11 SUPERINTENDENT NASSIF: Your Honor, Michael Nassif, 12 Superintendent of Schools, St. Landry Parish School Board. the corner we have Mr. Clifton Carmon, Director of Title I 13 14 Programs; Mr. Randy Manuel, Director of Finance; Mr. Rusty Moody, 15 Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Maintenance; Joseph Cassimere, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction; Mr. Darrell 16 17 Brown, Supervisor of Child Welfare and Attendance; Ms. Mary 18 Doucet, Coordinator of Special Education in the audience; Dr. Joe 19 Guillory, Coordinator of Special Education; Mr. Chris Herzog; and 20 I think that's all, Your Honor. Thank you. 2.1 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 22

The Court scheduled this conference to address the presiding judge's perception as it relates to this soon to be 43-year-old school desegregation case that the St. Landry Parish School Board has been for the past year dysfunctional and to

23

24

25

determine what, if any, progress the school board has made in addressing the Green factors that remain in the case since our last conference on December the $6^{\rm th}$, 2007.

My great and sincere concern is that the St. Landry
Parish School Board, while its members play political games among
themselves, is allowing the case after six years of truly
significant progress to stagnate, and that such action or
inaction will shortly result in the United States Department of
Justice and/or the original plaintiffs asking the Court for
further relief to compel the school system to comply with its
obligations under the United States Constitution and the orders
of this Court.

The irony of the present situation from the judge's perspective, having presided over the case since February the 2nd, 2000, is that it is not matters of race that brought the case to a standstill. Rather, it is politics, pure and simple politics.

I don't know if Superintendent Nassif is a leader capable of bringing this case to an end or not. The board may have made a mistake, but by a nine to four vote, you, the school board, hired him on July 18th, 2007.

As I recall, one of the provisions the school board insisted upon being in the superintendent's contract was that he make every reasonable effort to bring this desegregation case to a conclusion. I do know from reading the minutes of your

meetings that since Superintendent Nassif was hired, he has received little or no support from the board as it relates to this case.

Based on the school board's action, or inaction rather, over the last six months, I suspect Superintendent Nassif couldn't get seven votes to determine the time of day if determining the correct time of day had anything to do with this case.

The St. Landry Parish School System has major issues that need to be resolved and resolved now, not only issues related to this case, but issues related to the quality of education of the young people of your parish, the quality of the facilities and conditions that those young people are being educated in which spill over into the desegregation case.

I submit that if the 13 of you on the school board were asked individually why you ran for your office, each one of you would say to help the children of the parish and to improve the quality of education and to make St. Landry a better place.

As the judge presiding over this case for the past seven years, I would question such a response based on the board's actions, deeds and inaction over the past year, and I say shame on you as a board.

I assure the 13 of you that the turmoil in the school system and in your parish that is being occasioned by the board's inaction on matters related to this desegregation case, if your

political games continue, are running the risk of destroying public education in St. Landry Parish as it is and as it has been known.

One doesn't have to be a rocket scientist to see what has occurred in several urban school systems in our state, but this is what the school board is putting at risk in this case. If that happens and you have continued middle class flight from the school system, black and white, I suspect you will try to pass the blame to the federal government in Washington, D.C., and/or to the federal judge in Lafayette, but I don't know how you will live with yourselves, face your constituents, your children or your grandchildren.

With literally thousands of man-hours invested by school board personnel, the lawyers in the case and the Court, as well as millions of taxpayer dollars that have been spent in the last six years, it grieves me, and it should grieve each of you, that the school board's backsliding, by its actions and inactions over the last year, has lost the presumption of good faith in this case and that, as of today, January the 23rd, 2008, the St. Landry Parish School System is no closer to achieving unitary status in the remaining *Green* factors than it was when I had the occasion to meet with the school board in this very courtroom on March the 14th, 2001. Again, I say shame on you as a board.

Ms. Taylor, turning to the *Green* factors that remain in this case, assuming by its future action that the St. Landry

Parish School Board is willing to try and is able to reestablish the good faith requirement that is a prerequisite for any school system attaining unitary status before the government and/or the original plaintiffs are forced to put it on my plate, where do we stand, first of all, on quality of education from the government's perspective? And if you'd come to the lectern as you address each of these points.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And, again, to refresh the school board members' memory, those of whom need to have it refreshed on quality of education, there was a motion that was filed here by the school board that the Court held I'm going to say at least a year — and I could be wrong, but I think it's over a year before I denied as moot as it relates to this *Green* factor, and the big issue was the disproportionality issue.

And then, of course, since then and since these minutes have been placed on the website, we've had a lot of feedback about children, students with special needs. So where are we on the disproportionality -- or quality of education rather? You just tell me where we are.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. The United States would agree with your comments. We're actually further away from unitary status than we were a couple of years ago.

Specifically we have received recent reports from parents and actually had a parents meeting last night at Park

Vista Elementary to express some concerns about the special education in the system.

We received complaints specifically -- let's see if I can get my notes -- such as these about one student who is legally blind and has not been getting any special education services. It's as if they pretended that the blindness does not exist.

Another child who is autistic has been known to escape from the school campus without any supervision and has also returned home with several bruises on his body which have not been explained by the school officials.

It's gotten to the point for that instance that the parent thought it was no longer safe to have her child at the school and she has withdrawn her child permanently from the system.

There's another instance of a child being left behind by the school bus. The child has autism and the parents describe the child as having the state of mind of a two-year-old. So not only was this child a special needs child, but the child did not have the wherewithal to identify where she was or how she could get home, and the only way that this became evident was by the parent not receiving the child and the bus driver had no explanation.

There are several reports that we received last night.

There are too many to go over, but these are just examples of

what we consider to be egregious noncompliance of not only
quality of education within this case, but obviously some

concerns about other federal law. And so as we had indicated in

December, we have referred this to the Department of Education,

Office of Civil Rights, for review. As well we will continue to

look closely at this situation.

THE COURT: Now, Ms. Taylor, let me ask you because I don't want to confuse the issue, and I suspect that everybody in this room understands the distinction between what I perceive you have just been talking about.

These are children, students, with special needs, and we're not necessarily talking about the issue of the disproportionality between the African-American and Caucasian students that was the subject that's been going on in this case going back I'm going to say at least two years.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. That is just the beginning of our concerns.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand.

MS. TAYLOR: So there is a distinction.

THE COURT: This would be a follow-up -- if I could interrupt you here -- on the order that I gave the government the last time to investigate the issue that came to my first attention I think with a child with Aspergers Disease.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I said, go ahead, I want this

investigated, and this is the follow-up on that investigation; is that correct?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. TAYLOR: In addition to that, we did -- we had some trouble having the school district comply with this Court's order in September and as a result had to have a second order issued in December to actually address the specific case of a child at Port Barre Elementary. And today the United States went to visit the school property and we continue to have some concerns about the quality of that facility as an accommodation for that one particular child.

I was able to take a sample just as a demonstrative aid here, Your Honor, and this is a piece of property. The building where this child is who has special needs, that building is actually falling apart, and all you have to do is touch it and the building -- parts of the building will come off.

In addition to that, there are some mold problems there which could obviously exacerbate the concerns of this particular child. So that relates to our inquiry, and we have notified the school district right before this proceeding and expect it to be addressed.

THE COURT: Well, I have entered -- I gave a verbal order, then I gave a written order, and, you know, the next thing for me to do is to start bringing people in and putting them in

jail. I mean, I expected them to address it. I don't know what lever you've got that I don't have, but I'm really upset.

And, Superintendent Nassif, I've got to look you in the eye right now and tell you that because I said that in this court several months ago. I gave a direct order, and based on the information I received from you, I thought it was a done deal and it was in good enough shape. And I would have assumed -- and maybe I was wrong -- that you went out there and looked at it and said it passed muster.

If Ms. Taylor is close to being right, I don't know how in the world you could have said that. I don't know how you could have said that, sir. And that has nothing to do with the 13 of these — or at least seven of them supporting you because they haven't done anything to support you, but this is a separate issue. That's a direct order from a United States District Judge. And, you know, Presidents aren't above the law or an order of the court and a superintendent of a school system certainly isn't. I don't know how else to tell you, but that grieves me greatly, and maybe you'll want to address it when you get the opportunity, but I expect — Ms. Taylor, I want — you know, despite anything the superintendent might say here in court today, I want to know what's going on. I want an every three day report out of you from what they're doing over there.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's enough of this.

And, Mr. Nassif, if you can't get the support you need as a superintendent -- you're facing me right now. I'm looking at you and then I'll go to the president and then the vice-president, and if there's individual board members, I'll go get them, too, but I don't know how else to do this. I mean, this is not a little thing. This is the law of the country. It's not even about this case.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, if I may approach, I do have some pictures as well that will document the building and I'll share that. May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MS. TAYLOR: To be fair, Your Honor, they have in fact rehabbed the interior parts of the building, but the concern is that the exterior part is falling apart, and, in fact, due to the quality of the exterior, the mold issue could in fact adversely affect the students that it's meant to protect.

THE COURT: Well, I'm just going to say the three photographs you just gave to me -- and I don't know if you intended them to be placed in the record or not, but if they're anywhere close to being an accurate depiction of what's on the ground, this is pathetic, just pathetic.

Do you want that in the record or not?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Caswell, is there any objection to this being introduced here today as Government 1

1 with the date of this hearing, those three photographs in globo? 2 MR. CASWELL: I have no grounds for an objection, Your 3 Honor. THE COURT: All right. Admitted without objection, 4 5 Ms. Jordan. 6 MS. TAYLOR: To continue our concerns, Your Honor, as 7 you previously mentioned, we have an ongoing concern about the 8 disproportionality of students of color being identified as in 9 need of special services. 10 As I understand it, the district is required to provide 11 a report to the United States, which we have not received, that 12 is given to them by the state to track whether or not this has 13 been addressed based upon the information that the state 14 provides. 15 THE COURT: Wait. I'm sorry. There's a report they 16 owe the government now? 17 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: When was that report due? 19 MS. TAYLOR: It's usually given from the state to the 20 district in October. 21 THE COURT: And so you have to assume, unless you're 22 told otherwise -- and we'll give them an opportunity to tell us 23 otherwise -- that the state must have received -- done what it

usually does and the school district must have gotten it and just

24

25

didn't turn it over to you?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. At this point we don't know what the status of it is, but we do have some outstanding concerns, particularly as we heard anecdotal evidence from school officials, principals and teachers about students that they believe did not -- should not have been identified as special -- in need of special services that were because of their race. So at this point we're continuing to inquire into that to see whether or not these people will come forward to address --

THE COURT: Mr. Caswell, can you enlighten me and Ms. Taylor? You've got the superintendent here and, gosh knows, you've got a ton of central office personnel here. Where is that report?

MR. CASWELL: Your Honor, I was just inquiring of the superintendent. I believe the report was actually issued by the state department to the district in November. In fact,

Mr. Nassif advises me that at one of our meetings he presented it to the board and it is part of our minutes and record. It was an oversight that the actual report was not given to Ms. Taylor, and it will be in her hands no later than tomorrow, if not today.

MS. TAYLOR: Which brings me to my -- I'm not sure what point I'm on, but I guess the idea is that when the state provides a report, I believe it's the school district's obligation to assess it and to make recommendations based upon that assessment. That is not possible because they have yet to designate someone to specifically address this concern as they

1 have promised over the past few months.

THE COURT: Well, you know -- and, again, it's kind of like -- I don't even know how to say it. We're all in the same courtroom.

The great thing about this lady taking everything down and now that it's going on the website, everybody in your parish can read it, but there's a historical record made here. We've discussed this time and again. And I remember the first meeting that Superintendent Nassif came on and I remember one of the things I said. I knew he had a plan. I said, I look forward to the board acting on it, whatever they were going to do.

Then I read all the hoorah in the paper and from your minutes about -- I'm not even going to call it attempts to get that resolved because I don't know what it was, the activity or inactivity that's gone on about that, but I know that the previous administration had a plan. I'm sure it's still sitting there somewhere.

And I addressed this December the 6th. I think,

Superintendent Nassif -- and I'm just going to flat tell you. I

don't care what the school board wants right now. I'm ordering

you to get this office dead center and that's an order in this

case. If they won't vote for you to do something, you've got an

order from the federal judge. You just go do it.

Do you understand, sir?

SUPERINTENDENT NASSIF: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And I hope the school board understands that. I mean, the whole thing is going to hell in a handbasket and y'all are sitting up there doing whatever you're doing. I do not understand that, ladies and gentlemen. You want to know why I said it's not about the children? It's not about the children right now.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor. I'm sorry.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. And so at this point you specifically asked me to address areas of concern relating to quality of education. I can continue with the *Green* factors or we can proceed in another manner.

THE COURT: I want -- let me just -- I want to go with the *Green* factors, but as it relates to this investigation that I ordered that you've got going, now you're referring this over to the Department of Education, right? This is the Department of Education. It's nothing do with the Justice Department and it's because -- is that right?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. It's a separate federal entity.

THE COURT: And that's because apparently -- and I say apparently because I don't know -- the school system, besides violation of orders in this case as it relates to this case and that *Green* factor of quality of education, is apparently violating other federal laws.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. The IDEA, the ADA and

1 perhaps some other special education laws.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, the next *Green* factor I have I think would probably be personnel because that's another one that's been sitting out there forever. And I know it's a big issue. We've gone through it with the teachers. It would be real interesting to me -- and, in fact, I make that -- I want to know. We just got a late filing of the Hinds County report. That was received in my office yesterday.

When was that due, Ms. Taylor?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. That was due in September.

THE COURT: We got that yesterday or I got my copy yesterday, but at any rate...

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, at this time we still remain concerned about the assignment of principals.

THE COURT: But, again, where I was going with that,

Ms. Taylor, is I know we've -- I would like to know -- and I

don't know if the Hinds County report that's currently being

filed still -- and, Mr. Caswell, I'll ask you if you know, and if

you don't, maybe Superintendent Nassif or whoever is in charge of

that, but the teacher -- the ratio that we were operating under

before the faculty was signed off on with a plus or minus

ten percent that we had under Singleton, is that covered in this

report?

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir. It's the very first thing in

the report.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I can't wait to see how that's going, and I'm sure the government will look on that with interest, too, but to go back to where you were headed, this issue of principals, now this was one that very candidly -- and the school board should remember it. It's in the record here.

I told them two conferences ago or three conferences ago that we had gotten the easy *Green* factors out of the way. The heavy lifting -- my words -- were these other *Green* factors, the most difficult being the student assignment and facilities, but these other ones are a lot more difficult than transportation and extracurricular. Those are the ones you usually knock off first.

Part of the heavy lifting was you have in your parish, based on the government's assertions and the information that's been submitted to the Court, African-American principals or Caucasian principals at schools that have been historically African-American or were historically African-American or Caucasian schools.

And I made the point -- I said this in this courtroom. It does not matter that you may even have more African-American principals than you have Caucasian principals because it was real close and it's been back and forth maybe. The idea is if you have African-Americans at historically African-American schools and Caucasians at historically Caucasian serving as principals,

1 | that's against the law, period.

Now, Ms. Taylor, have I said that as succinctly as I could or succinctly enough?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Have I misstated what the government's view and the original plaintiff's view is?

MS. TAYLOR: No, you have not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And this is an issue that we've been discussing for about two years, and we were trying to give the school system the opportunity to get through a few other issues before we came down to the principal issue. Isn't that true?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. And, in fact, given that they're taking such a long time, it may be in the interest of justice for the United States to pick the principals and where they should be assigned. We are reluctant to do that because we expect the administrators to know what's best for their school system, but if they fail to do so, then we can do that for them.

order, Mr. Nassif, Superintendent Nassif. I'm going to order you to go through your roster of principals, to consult with Mr. Caswell and whatever other members of your senior staff, and you go ahead and you place the bodies that will be compliant with the law that make the most educational sense.

The first thing you've got to be is constitutional.

The next thing you've got to do is make sure that it makes

educational sense, and then make sure Mr. Caswell, in his view, that it meets constitutional muster. You and your senior staff figure out who ought to go where and then you make that recommendation to this school board. If you can't get seven votes, I'll let Ms. Taylor do it. They'll pick the principals for the school board if they want to sit on it, if they don't have the guts to do what the law calls for.

But I want that done, Superintendent Nassif. I want that to be presented to the board in its March meeting so the principals for next year will know where they're going to be, and if they don't like it, they can't take the change or if it's too much of a change at the stage of their career and they want to retire, they can let you know hopefully timely enough and you can get other principals if that's what it takes.

Now, you know, I said something at the last meeting here on December 6th. I hate it. And those of you on the school board who have gotten to know me over the last seven years, you know this isn't the way I've operated in this case even though I've been accused of being high-handed and a bunch of other things by a lot of folks, but, by God, enough is enough. It's over with. If y'all can't do it, I'm going to do it.

And like I said at the last meeting, this is back to the future. We're going back to the 70's, what federal judges had to do in school board cases and desegregation cases. You want to see? I'll show you. And if you can get seven of you to

1 go vote to appeal, go appeal and go spend about 18 months and how 2 many thousands of dollars paying Mr. Caswell and come on back 3 here and then do what I told you to do. You can do that because 4 this is not new law. This is hornbook stuff. This is stuff that 5 most of the rest of the country can't even believe is going on anymore. I mean, I don't understand. 6 7 Go ahead, Ms. Taylor. 8 MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. And just previously 9 before I reported to the Court, I did receive a complaint about 10 the board's interference with hiring which has been an issue that 11 we have addressed recently in the past. The complaint was that 12 the board was attempting to develop a description of the hiring 13 position and then pick the person for the hiring position. 14 THE COURT: Wait. Excuse me. You said this -- how is that coming about? Was this an individual board member? 15 16 MS. TAYLOR: No. This was a non board member, non 17 school official who was aware of this, attended a board meeting 18 and was aware of what was going on. Now, to be fair to 19 Mr. Caswell, he did stop it, but our concern is one of intent. 20 THE COURT: Okay. But wait. Help me again because I'm 21 missing something here. We've got a non board member that 22 reported to the government that something was going on? 23

MS. TAYLOR: Yes.

24

25

THE COURT: What was the report?

MS. TAYLOR: The report was that the board was

1 attempting to hire the director of disproportionality.

THE COURT: And the issue that we've addressed, I'm -- maybe you can be more specific for me so I can see where they were running afoul and Mr. Caswell stopped them.

MS. TAYLOR: Sure. Yes, Your Honor.

My understanding -- and I didn't have a lot of time to discuss this, but my understanding was that Mr. Nassif was not involved in the process, but there was this committee that was created to kind of devise descriptions for the job without Mr. Nassif.

THE COURT: I'm familiar with that issue. I'm familiar with that issue and, you know, it's -- I'm familiar with the issue.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And let me say this. What I think that's about, school board members — and I'll just say it. You all are doing whatever political shenanigans you're doing, and as a result of that, it's a spillover effect on the whole system, the central office.

I cannot imagine how demoralizing it must be to the professional educators in your parish right now -- the principals, the teachers and the other people that work with the kids, where the rubber meets the road -- to watch the 13 of you act and interact and what's been going on.

And I will tell you the reason I'm not going to be

doing anymore telephone calls and letters, I'm getting too many
of them. They're reading what's going on here in court. I think
they're reading the minutes of your meetings.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: And that's all I have for personnel assignment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's talk about the next thing -- or the next two things actually because I have said before because of the -- and I said that on the record in this proceeding. It's all in black and white and I suspect posted on the school board's website now.

Because of the geography and demography of St. Landry Parish, the size of the parish and where the people are, that the two hardest *Green* factors, student assignment and facilities, were inextricably intertwined. And you will recall, members of the school board, and if you don't, you can go read it in the official minutes of one of these status conferences, that I appointed a committee that was equally divided, Caucasian and African-American, to come up with a plan as it relates to facilities and student assignment and to talk about which schools would be closed -- get that, so if nobody heard that the last time, some schools are going to be closed -- and where new schools would be built.

And what I did with that, that committee got the plan to me. It made absolute sense to me. And these are people

whose, in the judge's view, integrity is beyond reproach who know your parish and love your parish, but know your parish and have integrity.

And while nothing is perfect -- I mean, we can't tell exactly where the growth is going to be 15 years from now. Of course, the way it's going, some federal judge after me still might be presiding.

And all of this was going on when I thought we might have gotten a chance to get out of here relatively soon and get this case over with, but that plan was developed. It was submitted to the Court. I looked at it. I thought it was a great plan. I thought in my view it met constitutional muster.

As I told you at one of these status conferences, I turned it over to the government and the government was going to look at it to check on the constitutional issues. And then my plan after that happened, after the government did that, if there were any issues that they needed to raise, they would get it back to me and I'd get it to that committee.

The committee would look at it, I would look at it, and once that had been worked out between the committee and the government, it would go to the school board attorney for the superintendent and his senior staff to look at to see what kind of educational sense it made. Then it would be presented to the school board, and if the school board didn't like it, they could come up with another plan, their own plan that would be

constitutional and hopefully educationally sound. Constitutional is the operative word.

And then if it did, that would be great. We'd have that plan. If it didn't come up with a plan and it didn't adopt the plan that Superintendent Nassif and his committee had reviewed and tweaked with the government and the other lawyers in this case, then I'd just tell you where the schools are going to be. I'll tell you which ones are going to be closed because the government is going to come put it on my plate and I'm going to do my job. The board may not do its, but I'm going to do mine under the oath I took, that same oath we all took when we got our offices.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, at this point we have all the information we need.

THE COURT: That's what I want to know. Where the heck is the plan now?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. In thirty days you'll have a response. And, in fact, to that end, the United States has delivered copies of maps which we'll need to do one of the following. We expect there to be some elementary school consolidation, some attendance zone adjustment, construction of new schools and closure of schools.

And we have these maps here for the school district as well as for the Court and other parties, the committee, to review

to determine whether or not the plan is consistent with the desegregation obligations.

THE COURT: All right. Now, let me ask you, the map that you've got here, that's after you've reviewed the plan that the committee submitted to you or that I submitted to you on behalf of the committee?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor, but it does not reflect the plan because at this point we have to go back to look at the capacity information that we received from the district in December, but we did want to provide the maps to the Court if the Court would like them.

THE COURT: Well, you know what? Until it's a final product, Ms. Taylor, I suspect not. This file is bigger than Dallas already and I don't need anything else in it until we need to look at it and it's final.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And if you want to leave a copy to give to the committee that I appointed, I'll be happy to do that.

MS. TAYLOR: I've taken care of that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Good. But, again, what I want the school board to know and the record in this case to reflect, there's been a lot of time spent on this already, ladies and gentlemen of the school board.

Like I told you, I mean, this is going on I think -- and, again, I don't want to misspeak here. At least a year ago I

think I had -- I advised the board at one of these meetings.

Ms. Taylor, am I close on that?

MS. TAYLOR: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Caswell, am I close on that time frame?

MR. CASWELL: (Nodding head.)

THE COURT: Mr. Caswell nods yes. Okay.

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So there's been a lot of man-hours, and I say that generically at the risk of sounding like a sexist, but man-hours that's gone into this. And as I said the last time we discussed it on the record, if the board, seven of you, can't go with the plan that the superintendent, after it goes through this process, presents to you, if you come up with a plan and it's constitutional, that's fine. Y'all do it.

And, again, I'm not even going to venture to guess what will be possible going forward. You couldn't have done it any time in the last year, but maybe going forward you could, but it's got to be constitutional.

So this is not the end to all, it's a start, and hopefully the wisdom of at least a majority of the board, seven of you, whoever's ox wasn't getting gored too badly, or if you could just think bigger than your school district and whatever might happen to a school in your district, but for the good of the parish, for the good of education of the parish you could muster seven votes, it would probably be a great start. Now, is

that politically possible? Who knows.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. As it relates to facilities, we remain concerned about the school district failing to have a district-wide systematic assessment of its facilities.

What I mean by that was in June and July the district had requested that we approve certain QZAB funds, and we had asked them at that time to prioritize the needs of their schools and what needed to be fixed and when, and at that time they omitted several schools which now it's been brought to our attention that they do need in fact to be fixed.

So our concern is that they seem to be not looking forward in terms of addressing the facilities concerns and including things like the M to M program, so that if you in fact enroll these students, that you have a place to teach them.

We've received some complaints of overcrowding and other things that could have been remedied had we known about it earlier on.

THE COURT: Well, you know, that doesn't -- and, like I say, I've been presiding over this case since 2000. We used to have these meetings before we came into court with the whole school board -- and some of the members on this board were there and they remember and they served as president. I used to have these meetings just with the president and the superintendent and his senior staff and the lawyers in the case in my chambers.

And these very issues about trying to think a little

bit ahead as you -- you just don't react to a situation. And, you know, there's some terrible conditions going on right now in the school system that have cropped up -- I'm going to say cropped up -- because of M to M. Now, M to M is getting blamed for it, but that's not fair. Now, they can say whatever they want, but the result is it's just poor planning, it's not being done properly, and this is not like we just started talking about this.

And, again, I can understand when there's a change of administration, there could be a breakdown in some communications, especially the way the change occurred over the last year, but reports not getting turned in on time, not knowing you're supposed to do certain things, not doing certain things that have been orders of this Court going back to the early 70's or late 60's, I don't understand that, but the M to M and the overcrowding -- I mean, I had -- and I had a meeting with a group of really nice group of people from Beau Chene High School about their track recently. I mean, it's just pathetic that we're in that situation right now.

And I will tell you this. It wasn't that way two years ago. It wasn't that way two years ago. I've been here long enough. I've seen it long enough. I don't -- it's a synergistic effect right now, members of the board. It's snowballing. It's like that snowball coming down. The further it gets, the bigger it gets and the faster it rolls, and that's what's happening to

your school system right now. That's what I meant when I said you're running the risk right now. You are the leaders. You're the people's representatives. You're running the risk of losing public education in your parish.

You can turn this parish into -- and I don't need to mention them by name. You know who I'm talking about, other parish school systems where you've got no public support. You've got a great private school system, you know, systems within the parish. You can make that happen in your school system there and there won't be a middle class African-American or Caucasian kid that will go to your school that can get out. They just won't because they want to take care of their kids, and if they don't perceive that they're getting taken care of -- I wish you would have been in that meeting with me with those people from Beau Chene. I wish you would have been with me. Now, what am I to tell those people?

And, of course, it's real fashionable to blame the judge for everything or blame the government in Washington, the Justice Department. It doesn't make it true. It might be politically expedient for those of you who are facing the people, but when the people that are reading what's going on in this courtroom and listening to what Ms. Taylor is saying here and reading your school board minutes — I'm sorry I'm so frustrated, but you betcha I'm frustrated. And I know I'm not the only one. I know I'm not the only one.

MS. TAYLOR: And the other thing related to facilities and capacity, I learned from some of the principals that while they had a significant increase in their populations or student populations, they didn't receive any teachers. So, for instance, one school had 300 extra students and had no extra support staff or teachers. So the other problem with this is if you're adding students —

THE COURT: Excuse me. You said one school got 300 extra kids, students, but they got the same amount of teachers that they had the year before?

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. Another school said the same thing. They got 90 extra kids, no teachers.

So obviously our concern is that the purpose of the M to M program is to ensure that we have quality education at the receiving and the sending schools, but if the receiving schools are getting extra bodies without extra support, then it's undermining the intent of the program.

We have just become aware of this. We expect to work with the district to address this in terms of ensuring that the receiving end receives adequate support.

THE COURT: Well, Superintendent Nassif, I know you've had your share of central office personnel issues since you came on your tenure, and I've already said you haven't had any support in my view from the record and reading the school board meeting minutes, any cooperation as it relates to issues in this case

from the school board or at least seven of them. You couldn't get seven of them on anything, but I don't understand how you can have 300 more kids at one school in one year than the year before and not give any more teachers.

I mean, I don't know where the breakdown is there, but I will look at you and say you're the boss. If it's happening on your watch and if that's a fact, I don't know -- you know, I don't know how you can explain that. Maybe there's a good explanation, but, you know, you wonder why the people in the parish are losing faith?

MS. TAYLOR: At this point, Your Honor, I think we've said all of our concerns. We would like to make the Court aware that we have an ongoing investigation at one of the schools regarding racial harassment. We are working with the U.S. Attorney's Office and they are conducting inquiries into that. This is at Krotz Springs Elementary.

THE COURT: The United States Attorney for the district is. We don't have anybody other than that, but that's ongoing.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I would like to have a report. If you could let Mr. Washington know I would like to have a report as to the status of that. Certainly I'm not trying to rush him, but I'd like -- within 30 days of this date I'd like to know exactly where it is. If they're finished, that's great. If they're not finished and it's still ongoing, I'd like to know.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Caswell, are there any issues that you would like to address that came up in Ms. Taylor's presentation? Is there anything else from your client's perspective that you would want to tell the Court or state for the record?

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir. I would like to address some of those because I want to make sure that all of our perspective comes out.

With regard to quality of education and in particular the issue that is the reason the Court ruled ultimately that the motion that we filed on the issue of quality of education was premature, that being disproportionality — and I think the Court is aware of this. I'm pretty sure Ms. Taylor is aware of it, but I want to make sure it's in the record, and that is certainly the ongoing dispute over appointing someone to handle disproportionality lasted a while and there was, for lack of a better term, a long dispute about that.

However, at the last board meeting that was conducted in January, the board did approve to allow the superintendent to advertise for a coordinator of disproportionality. That is being done. That position was created. That was part of the dispute I think that Ms. Taylor alluded to that I stepped in about about whether a committee could actually name a person.

THE COURT: Well, let me interrupt you because what I

just ordered Mr. Nassif to do, you're saying, Judge, the school board already gave him the authority to do that.

MR. CASWELL: Well, what they did is they allowed him the authority to advertise for the position. In fact, what I was fixing to ask the Court was a clarification on your order because your order was to get it done irrespective of whether the board will let you do it or not.

And I needed a clarification for the school board and for Mr. Nassif on is that an order that he appoint someone to that position, because as of right now, the board did authorize the position to be a coordinator of disproportionality and authorized the advertisement for that position so that people will apply. There will be an interview process and there will ultimately be a recommendation by the committee to the superintendent and then a recommendation by the superintendent to the board for that appointment.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Caswell, let me interrupt you because -- and you have to refresh my memory because, one, it's not that good, and, two, I've still got Evangeline over there and we've got a little different situation.

And these are very old procedures that were in place prior to my being assigned to this or that case, but the routine under the previous orders of earlier judges in this case, how would it work? The school board authorizes advertisement. The interview process is conducted. The superintendent appoints a

committee to do the interviews and whatever else, and then after that, the superintendent picks from the people who have been interviewed.

MR. CASWELL: Well, actually the interview committee itself makes a recommendation to the superintendent based on their having conducted the interviews. The superintendent then goes along with that recommendation or doesn't, but ultimately he makes a recommendation to the board of one of the applicants who was interviewed and then the board determines whether or not to follow the superintendent's recommendation or not.

THE COURT: All right. Now, that's by order of this Court or not?

MR. CASWELL: That's the process that's been in place by a very old order of this Court, that for administrative positions they would be advertised and they would be handled in that fashion.

THE COURT: Well, if you're asking for a clarification of what I told the superintendent earlier, whether anybody in this room believes it -- and I don't -- right at this point I don't really care what anybody believes. I don't care about running the St. Landry Parish School System.

So if they have -- the 13 or at least seven of them -- and I didn't know that yet because if I've gotten the minutes from the January meeting, I haven't read them yet. I don't think I've gotten them, but maybe I have and just haven't read them.

If they've authorized him to go forward, I don't care about ordering him to do anything other than follow the normal process that was set, Superintendent Nassif, by earlier orders of earlier judges. And then if there's a mix-up or a mess-up on that, then I'll just enter a written order.

And, Mr. Caswell, you let me know. I want you to report to me. You're their lawyer, but I just want you to be the transporter of the information that it didn't happen or, Judge, it has happened because usually what I know about this case before I read the minutes is what I see when I get occasion to read the newspaper from Opelousas online. And I don't always read it. In fact, recently it got so depressing that I try not to read it frankly.

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir. And I will do so. I will keep you advised of what happens in that process because I know that has been approved and that's in the works.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, again, my point is I don't want to go -- I'm not going to go one inch further than I'm required to go because the school board won't do what they're supposed to do or the superintendent doesn't do what he's supposed to do.

MR. CASWELL: Yes, sir.

And, of course, Mr. Nassif does have and has presented a plan on how to deal with disproportionality that ultimately, when this particular employee is designated and selected and

approved by the board, they will begin to address disproportionality.

On the next Green factor --

THE COURT: Wait a minute, Mr. Caswell. Again, we've talked about this plan in this courtroom before. I mean, I didn't know what it was, but the plan that he has gotten together -- and, you know, I know -- I don't remember what my source of information is. It's somebody at LSU or somebody did something and maybe I read about it in the paper. I don't know.

Has this plan been discussed with the government and the original plaintiffs, and have they said, yeah, if y'all adopt that, it looks like it will address our concern or not?

MR. CASWELL: It has definitely been shared with Ms. Taylor. I don't know if --

THE COURT: Because if it doesn't meet muster,

Mr. Caswell, we're just spinning our wheels, you know, because
then they'll say, no, it doesn't work, Judge, and they'll file a
motion and we'll have a hearing and I'll have to decide that,
too.

MR. CASWELL: It has been presented to Ms. Taylor.

MS. TAYLOR: That is correct, Your Honor, but as late as today I learned that they actually had a plan in place two years ago that they haven't followed through with. So now that I have this information, I'd like to look at what they're trying to currently implement and see whether or not they've made any

assessment about whether it's effective and what they can do to make it effective.

THE COURT: Well, now the plan of two years ago that you say wasn't followed through on I do remember because we've been talking about this for a couple of years. There was a plan that was developed. In fact, Mr. Franz Marshall got involved and he tried to refer the people in the previous administration over to Rapides Parish because they had implemented a plan that seemed to work and it was signed off on or something. Is that the plan you're talking about or another plan?

MS. TAYLOR: Actually there's another plan. I was informed by the principal -- and this particular principal said they never did any training, any follow-through. So she thinks the plan may be -- this is coming from a principal, of course. She thinks the plan may be in fact effective if they fully implement it.

I only say that because I just learned that today. So based upon that, I do have some concerns which may lead the United States to hire its own special education expert to facilitate the implementation of a plan that addresses both issues we discussed earlier, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, you know, Ms. Taylor, I want you and the government -- and I expect you to do just like I'll do.

You'll follow the oath you took to make sure the constitution is followed and the orders of this Court are complied with, but this

is what I was saying, school board members. I can remember being in this courtroom and saying we're in the red zone. Don't fumble the ball. We're on the one yard line.

And, you see, we're getting ready to go back and undo all of this, all of this, and we're going to get the government to have to appoint an expert to do something that's been sitting in file thirteen for two years or whatever the heck it was. Now, if that doesn't break your heart, you don't have a heart.

Now, Mr. Caswell, the only thing I'll say, I expect the superintendent will follow through on the authority. He'll follow the procedure of the previous orders of the Court, previous judge, however we got to be where we are. The person will be recommended and somebody will be hired and this plan is in place, but it would be foolish to go implement the plan until Ms. Taylor and Mr. White -- and, by the way, the record should reflect that I think Mr. White came in about -- I'm going to say five to ten minutes ago -- have a chance to look at it --

MR. CASWELL: I understand that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- and make any adjustments.

So, in other words, just because we hire somebody, the school board hires somebody, and just because they've got this plan, it's not done until it's done.

And I would think just because of the -- I'm going to call it acrimony because that's a good word -- that's arisen in the case over this issue and how longstanding it is, once all of

that is done, I want the school board and the government and the original plaintiffs to file a joint motion, Judge, you go ahead and accept this plan, you go ahead and accept it, so we're all on the same page. And if we can't make it a joint motion, then we'll let whoever the proponent is — and I suspect it would be the school board. We'll have a hearing on it and the government will object or the original plaintiff will object or whoever and then we'll just let the judge decide it. Now, I can't imagine I'll have to do that, but if I have to, I will.

And, Ms. Taylor, if you have to hire an expert and you go spend some more of our tax dollars, do it, and if it turns out it's not absolutely necessary, I know you're not going to spend any money you don't need to, but I'm encouraging you to do just what I know you and Mr. Marshall and everybody in your department do, make sure we follow the law here.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Caswell.

MR. CASWELL: On the next *Green* factor I want to address, Your Honor, with regard to principal assignments, I want to point out two things. And I understand the Court's order with regard to making recommendations to the board by the March meeting.

In previous discussions with Ms. Taylor and with the Court, we had discussions about the fact that this plan that the committee has that ultimately I'm going to see once the

government completely reviews it and gets it back to the Court and the Court gets it to me, we had discussions about one of the factors that was involved, and our delay in doing so is that if in fact there were schools slated for closure in that plan that were in fact schools that were of concern to the Court and to Justice with regard to the principal assignment, that it would be appropriate not to implement a change at a school that was slated for closure because there may be some attrition of the very principals affected.

In addition, most recently I had contact with Ms. Taylor asking her for the Justice Department's definition of a school that is racially identifiable by its principal. In other words, we want to know what the rule of thumb is so we know exactly what schools we need to address before we make the recommendation to the board. And I know she's got that and she agreed by e-mail to me that it was a good idea that Justice do that with us.

And so those are some things that are out there that I call to the Court's attention because we're looking at doing this in March. That's my purpose in doing so.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Taylor, you rise. There's something you'd like to address?

MS. TAYLOR: I do, Your Honor. I think the attorney, Mr. Caswell, is aware that the schools in question are not involved in the schools being discussed in the reorganization

1 | plan. That's my first point.

THE COURT: Wait. He may or may not be if he hasn't seen the plan unless you've told him that.

MS. TAYLOR: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: And if you haven't told him before, you're telling him now.

MS. TAYLOR: For the record this is not going to be an issue for the reorganization plan and that will be evident in 30 days, but the second point I'd like to make is I have identified five to seven schools that have been targeted that really would assist us in assigning principals in a manner that would further desegregation and they are pretty evident.

THE COURT: And, again, I don't think you have to be a rocket scientist to figure out some of them. I mean, I know your parish pretty well, and I would suspect -- and let me just guess two schools, just pick out of the hat like Krotz Springs, like probably Arnaudville. I suspect they've never had -- now, I might be wrong, and Mr. Caswell or Mr. Nassif or anybody on the school board, correct me if I'm wrong, but they've probably never had an African-American principal.

MS. TAYLOR: Creswell, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I just picked two of them off the top. And I know the parish, but I may not know it near -- I don't know it near as well as most of the people from St. Landry Parish in this room I'm sure, but, again, I expect, Ms. Taylor,

just so Mr. Caswell -- and he's here in good faith trying to make sure he doesn't lead Mr. Nassif or Superintendent Nassif off a cliff, so when he goes to the school board, if they have the wisdom to follow his recommendation, it's not you putting it on my plate so I get to name those principals or say, government, you go name them. We couldn't figure it out. You go pick them.

And, again, the reason — and I want to reiterate this, Mr. Caswell, and so the school board members know and anybody here who may have an interest in it. There will be some principals that are reaching that portion of their career where they've been comfortable wherever they've been for eons and they're not going to want to be transferred. I understand and respect that.

It will have nothing to do with race. It will have nothing to do with anything other than convenience and comfort. I understand that, but because this case will be 43 years old shortly and because we're trying — and if the school board won't try with me, I'm going to get this thing done.

So if it just comes up at that part of their career and if it's time for them to retire, that's fine, they can retire, but it won't put Superintendent Nassif in a bind. Hopefully they wouldn't do that. They'd think more of the children in the parish. If they know they're going to get moved by April, they can — you know, if it's done by March and notified by April, they can let him know that they're going to retire and he can

start filling in the slots because you don't just get a principal like that, not a good one. I know that.

So, Ms. Taylor, I want you to cooperate with Mr. Caswell on that so he knows exactly where the ball is. And, again, if the school board -- and, Mr. Caswell, make sure you're clear. Superintendent Nassif, make sure you're clear, and, members of the school board, make sure you're clear.

When Superintendent Nassif comes up with a recommendation to you, if you can't get seven votes because it's one of the schools in your district or one of the people you don't want moved or they don't want moved and you don't have the guts to take the political heat for it because that's what it will amount to, then let me do it. I'll do it.

Go ahead.

MR. CASWELL: That's fine. We just want to make sure that that's clear so we address it appropriately. And that's the only comments I have concerning the *Green* factors that came up that I needed clarification or comment upon, Your Honor. I understand that with regard to that actual committee report, that the government will respond in 30 days. So we'll know something before long on that.

THE COURT: All right. And, again, I'll repeat,
Mr. Caswell, for you and for your superintendent and your board
members. These are the two heavies, student assignment and
facilities. We always knew this was going to be the heavy.

And I'm going to reiterate what I said. The board as of this juncture and as of today's date doesn't have good faith. They are under no presumption of good faith. They've got to by their future actions reestablish that, and if they don't, then I fully expect Ms. Taylor, Mr. White or one combination of them to say, Judge, they won't do it. You do it. Then I'll do it.

Now, Mr. White, you missed a good portion of this meeting. I'd like to say it would have been a pleasant meeting. It hasn't been pleasant for me. I suspect it hasn't been pleasant for anybody else, but this would be the opportunity for you to make any comments.

And I realize you've got one hand, at least one hand, maybe both of them, tied behind your back because you haven't heard what was said here earlier, but if you'd like to say anything, now would be your opportunity if you have any other issues that the Court need to consider at this time.

MR. WHITE: Your Honor, all we'd like to say is we apologize for not being here, and I think I'm fully apprised of what issues were brought before the Court. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me just say this,
Mr. White. I don't know why you were late, but knowing you, I
assume you had a good reason and you don't have to explain to me.
So I appreciate that. That apology wasn't necessary.

All right. You know, I don't even know if this is the right thing, but it can't be the wrong thing. I don't know what

your -- you 13 on this school board, what your spiritual or religious convictions in your heart of hearts are. That's not my business, but I'll tell you one thing. I remember when I was appointed mediator in the East Baton Rouge Parish school desegregation case by the court over there. I issued a statement and I said that those of you who believe in prayer, please pray for us, and those of you who don't believe in prayer, send us good energy, and those of you who don't believe in either, just wish us luck.

I would ask the 13 of you when you go home tonight and you look at your spouse or you look at your children, your grandchildren, to reflect on why it is that you thought you wanted to be on the school board. Reflect on what's been said here in this case, in this courtroom here today, not just by the judge, but by the Department of Justice attorney, and understand the whole system is at risk here.

Pray for your fellow board members if you believe in it, if you believe in prayer. If you don't believe in prayer, do the best you can to look in your heart to try to be a team player for the good of your parish and the good of the kids and put all this political stuff behind you.

You know, y'all are at bat right now. It's your time. You're making what this parish is going to be, your parish is going to be ten, fifteen, twenty, fifty years from now right now. It's much bigger than just this case. I mean, your parish is at

a wonderful time right now with the economic growth. This is ridiculous. And for those of you on the board who I may have offended today or anybody else out there, I don't mean to offend anyone, but I'm offended for all the time that's been invested in this case, all the money, and I'm frustrated and I know that showed. We're in recess. (Status conference adjourned.)

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
3	LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION
4	
5	MARILYN MARIE MONTEILH :
6	vs. : DOCKET NUMBER 65-10912
7	SCHOOL BOARD OF ST. LANDRY PARISH :
8	
9	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
10	I, LaRae E. Bourque, Official Court Reporter for the
11	United States District Court, Western District of Louisiana,
12	do hereby certify that the foregoing 49 pages are a true and
13	accurate transcript of the proceedings had in this matter,
14	as hereabove set forth, and that I have no interest of any
15	nature whatsoever regarding the ultimate disposition of this
16	litigation.
17	I further certify that the transcript fees and format
18	comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial
19	Conference of the United States.
20	
21	
22	
23	LARAE E. BOURQUE, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
24	
25	