UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

MEETING

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1995

THE COMMISSION MET IN ROOM 540, 624 9TH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C., AT 9:30 A.M., MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON, PRESIDING.

PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON
CRUZ REYNOSO, VICE CHAIRPERSON
CARL A. ANDERSON
ARTHUR A. FLETCHER, VIA TELEPHONE
ROBERT P. GEORGE
CONSTANCE HORNER
RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH, VIA TELEPHONE
CHARLES PEI WANG
MARY K. MATHEWS, STAFF DIRECTOR

STAFF:

CONNER BALL BARBARA BROOKS FRANKLIN CHOW JAMES CUNNINGHAM EDWARD DARDEN PAMELA DUNSTON GEORGE HARBISON CAROL LEE HURLEY WILLIAM LEE REGINALD MARTIN STEPHANIE MOORE JACQUELINE L. JOHNSON CHARLES RIVERA MIGUEL SAPP ANTHONY WELLS, SR. AUDREY WRIGHT NADJA ZALOKAR

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

ASSISTANTS:

RONALD BROWN
THOMAS GRAY
DENNIS TETI
KRISHNA TOOLSIE

NEAL R. GROSS

INDEX

Approval of Agenda 8
Approval of Minutes of July 14, 1995 Meeting 9
Announcements 9
Staff Director's Report 16
SAC Chair Conference Followup105
Miami Hearing Briefing106
State Advisory Committee Appointments for Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia (interim), Illinois, Maine, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee (interim), Virginia (interim), and West Virginia175
Fiture Agenda Items

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (9:40 a.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Fletcher 3 4 and Redenbaugh are on the phone. Is that correct? 5 Hello? His line is busy? 6 Madam Chair, while we're MR. REYNOSO: 7 waiting for them to come on the line, I just wanted to 8 indicate that I had a very hard time when I was on the 9 phone the last time. I don't know if we should experiment with some of those new fangled --10 Telemonitors? 11 MR. GEORGE: 12 MR. REYNOSO: No, I had in mind -- well, 13 what happens is that the mikes don't pick up our 14 voices and there are new fangled gadgets that you can 15 just wear on your neck and so the mike is always near 16 you and you can move around and all that and that way 17 the person on the phone can hear. I had a very hard 18 time following you on the discussion. 19 you when you've been on the phone? Any problems? 20 21 MR. WANG: 22 noise.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about the rest of

Sometimes there's background

MR. GEORGE: My problem has not been a problem of being able to hear. It's been other things. The problem I've had is it cuts in and out.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

23

24

I'll miss blocks where there's just nothing coming through. It's happened twice.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could the staff look into the technology associated with this? Maybe the Vice Chair can advise you. I don't know what this piece of technology is, and see if we can improve the transmission.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Now is Commissioner Redenbaugh on? Well, I'm assuming they will be on. Could I get a move to approve the agenda, unless somebody has some changes or something.

I would suggest that when our colleagues come on we might reopen -- I have two matters to add, if it seems appropriate. One, maybe it will be included at the end of the report from the Staff Director, but I'd like to have a report on the meeting dates and whether or not any of us got back to the staff with any conflicts. I just keep getting calls for meetings and so on, so I want to firm up those meeting dates. And two, I'll have a resolution to present. It's being prepared now, I take it, commending the First Lady for the position she's taken in the meeting in China in protection of the rights of women to bear children and

1	the rights of a family. So that will be distributed
2	later on.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where do you want this
4	in the agenda or do you care?
5.	MR. REYNOSO: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we then put
7	it last if there's no difference?
8	MS. HORNER: Madam Chair, there's an issue
9	on which I'd like to suggest the Commission send a
10	letter. I don't know whether that needs to be added
11	to the agenda. It has to do with the Montgomery
12	County French language opportunity for Asian-American
13	students.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we can do is the
15	one that the Vice Chair has we can do on the Staff
16	Director's report. We've already taken some action on
17	that. This is a new subject, so why don't we make it
18	a separate item and then why don't we do that, after
19	we do the SAC appointments, if that's all right?
20	Ms. HORNER: Sure.
21	. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have
22	anything else they'd like to add to the agenda?
23	MR. GEORGE: This is not so much an
24	addition to the agenda as a procedural recommendation.
25	In working with transcripts in the past a couple of

21

22

23

24

25

things occurred to me that might just be helpful as a matter of policy. One, could we take a roll of the Commissioners at the beginning so it's clear on the transcript record, after we've long forgotten our experience of who is present? And I'd like to request as a general matter on substantive votes on substantive matters as opposed to merely procedural matters like motions to adjourn and approval of the minutes and so forth, that we go ahead and poll the Commissioners, even though it takes a little extra time, so that the votes and abstentions would be recorded rather than simply recorded as a chorus of

MS. HORNER: That's a good idea.

"ayes" where it would be unclear where people stand.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: On the first one, I don't see any problem. On the second item, I don't see any problem in doing it, except that procedurally we are not required to do that unless the Commissioners on each occasion indicate that they do want to be polled. However, if everybody wants to be polled, it's fine with me. I don't care.

MR. GEORGE: It's only for substantive, not for approval of the minutes or adjourn the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll resolve the

_	dispute over what is substantive and what is
2	procedural.
3	MR. GEORGE: The Chairman makes the
4	decision and then we would be left with it's really
5.	the recommendation of you. If we want to be polled,
6	we can do what we always do, say let's be polled.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, I can see
8	nightmares.
9	MS. HORNER: Maybe we should make a
10	decision to be polled.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's what I mean.
12	MS. HORNER: Unless we decide
13	affirmatively not to be polled for some reason. It
14	seems to me it's a pretty easy thing to do.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now the decision
16	is, the recommendation is that we poll ourselves by
17	naming everybody and unless we take a vote not to poll
18	ourselves
19	MR. GEORGE: Well, this is getting more
20	complicated than I thought. This is really a
21	recommendation to the Chairman.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we would
23	you mind doing this? When you feel the need or any
24	Commissioner feels the need to have a recorded vote of
25	exactly who voted on an issue, simply say so. Say on

1	that one I'd like to have any Commissioner who we
2	can keep doing it the way we're doing it and if you
3	feel the need, not you personally, but any
4	Commissioner, feel the need to say I would like to
5	have a poll, then let's just do it, agree that we will
6	do it.
7	MR. REYNOSO: It seems to me that that
8	makes sense, without any implication that somehow
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because I don't want
10	to be in a position of deciding that something is
11	substantive or procedural and have a big argument
12	about whether it is substantive or procedural. I
13	would rather, if you don't mind, if you just do it
14	that way, any time you want us to poll, you or any
15	other Commissioner, just say so. We'll do it. Okay?
16	All right. Now any other items for the
17	agenda? Okay,if there are no other items for the
18	agenda, could somebody move the approval of the
19	agenda, as amended.
20	MR. GEORGE: So moved.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
22	MS. HORNER: Second.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor, say
24	"aye"?
25	(AYES.)

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? Somebody
2	said something. Oh, I see.
3	The approval of the minutes of July 14th
4	is the next item of business. Could I get a motion?
5	MS. HORNER: So moved.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second?
7	MR. GEORGE: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion? All
9	in favor say "aye"?
10	(AYES.)
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? Minutes are
12	approved.
13	Are there any announcements? Staff
14	Director, do you have any announcements?
15	MS. MATHEWS: I do Madam Chairperson.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, then please
17	proceed.
18	MS. MATHEWS: I wanted to inform the
19	Commission that our Senate Appropriations
20	Subcommittee, this is the subcommittee on Commerce,
21	Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies,
22	held a markup session on the Fiscal 96 appropriations
23	yesterday. We were informed by the Subcommittee Staff
24	that the Commission was indicated in this
25	marked up bill at \$9 million and that is the current

1	fiscal year appropriation. It is \$500,000 more than
2	the full House vote for the upcoming year and we have
3	learned this morning that the full Senate
4	Appropriations Committee will go to mark up next
5	Tuesday.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thanks.
7	MR. REYNOSO: Does that mean that the
8	prediction would now be that we come out with \$9
9	rather than \$8.5? What about the implications of \$8.5
10	million, but we really don't know that that's going to
11	be approved.
12	MS. MATHEWS: It's too soon, I think, to
13	say where we will end up because the next step,
14	assuming it goes to a Senate vote and assuming this
15	number is retained throughout that process, then there
16	will be a House-Senate conference and it's hard to
17	predict how that would turn out at this point.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, any other
19	announcements?
20	MS. HORNER: Do we have Commissioner
21	Redenbaugh on?
22	MR. REDENBAUGH: I think so.
23	(Laughter.)
24	MR. REDENBAUGH: However, I've been on
25	several times before.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good morning, Russell.
2	MR. REDENBAUGH: Good morning, Mary.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you have any items
4	you'd like to add to the agenda? Before you came on
5.	the Commissioners agreed to add an item concerning the
6	Montgomery County, Maryland, some language issue
7	involving schools which we will hear more about when
8	the item is added and we discuss it. We agreed to add
9	that.
10	And we also agreed that the Vice Chair has
11	a resolution concerning the Chinese, the meeting in
12	China and we agreed that since we already discussed
13	that before in past resolutions, we will discuss that
14	in the Staff Director's Report.
15	We also agreed that when you came on if
16	you had something you wanted to add, you would add
17	that.
18	MR. REDENBAUGH: Well, thank you. The
19	Chicago Asian Report, that's on the agenda now, right?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which?
21	. MR. REDENBAUGH: The SAC Report from
22	Chicago?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, SAC Report,
24	Illinois. No, no, there are no SAC Reports on the
25	there's SAC appointments, but we don't have any SAC

1	reports on today.
2	MR. REDENBAUGH: Okay, I'm speaking I'd
3	like to place it on the agenda as a discussion item.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, you want to
5	discuss the SAC Report from Illinois? Is that what
6	you said?
7	MR. REDENBAUGH: Yes, the Illinois it's
8	previously published.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, one that's already
10	published. Okay.
11	MR. REDENBAUGH: I just have a question,
12	some discussion about that particular report.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we do that
14	under the Staff Director's Report too, if you have no
15	objection?
16	MR. REDENBAUGH: That would be fine with
17	me.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right,
19	Commissioner Anderson?
20	MR. ANDERSON: Maybe I'm tardy in raising
21	this matter
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, you are.
23	MR. ANDERSON: But I would like to discuss
24	a possible briefing topic and I thought perhaps we
25	could do that under the Staff Director's Report so we

1	don't need to amend the agenda.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Briefing,
3	possible briefing topic. All right, yes.
4	MR. WANG: I have a question of the Staff
5	Director. Is there any possibility of potential gap
6	of fiscal year if the budget is not adopted?
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Closed down.
8	MR. WANG: We will have like a furlough
9	situation? We had it before. It seems like we're
10	moving into one potentially.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well
12	MR. GEORGE: We call them sabbaticals.
13	(Laughter.)
14	MS. HORNER: You get half pay, right?
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Staff Director?
17	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, we have been evaluating
18	the possibilities and the point that you've made is a
19	possibility and while it is very difficult to predict,
20	we're doing the right thing which is looking at all
21	the various possibilities so that we will be prepared
22	and planning with that in mind.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Haven't you gotten
24	guidance from OMB, I mean all the agencies in the
25	government?

1	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: To prepare for close
3	down?
4	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, all agencies were
5	issued instructions from OMB and from the Office of
6	Personnel Management on this issue.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Before, as you pointed
8	out, Charles, that there have been predictions of
9	close down and the Commission at one time didn't have
10	a budget, we RIF'd and everything else and it was very
11	painful. But this year it seems like it's more likely
12	than before. So we can hope not, but we're prepared?
13	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, we are prepared.
14	MS. HORNER: When is our October what
15	do we have scheduled in October?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We have a meeting
17	MS. MATHEWS: We have an October 6th
18	Commission meeting.
19	MS. HORNER: So that meeting then would
20	become subject to a decision as to whether it can or
21	should occur.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
23	MS. HORNER: Should we be prepared for
24	that?
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We should be prepared

1	for the eventuality that we will not have a meeting in
2	October and if this drags on into November, we won't
3	have a hearing.
4	MS. HORNER: We don't have a hearing
5	scheduled for October?
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, right. All right,
7	do you have any other announcements, Staff Director?
8	MS. MATHEWS: I do not.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Does anyone
10	else have any announcements? I don't have any.
11	Let's go then to the Staff Director's
12	Report. We have a colloquy between the Staff Director
13	and Mr. George and when they're finished the colloquy,
14	we'll proceed.
15	MR. GEORGE: All right.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We don't know what
17	you're talking about.
18	(Laughter.)
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going now to the
20	Staff Director's Report and first, Staff Director, is
21	there anything you want to tell us before we go to the
22	items that we added? Are there any questions about
23	anything else that's in the Staff Director's Report?
24	MS. HORNER: I'll have a few questions,
25	but I'll wait.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you want to ask staff questions or what? You just made announcements.

Commissioner Horner?

MS. HORNER: Yes, the Civil Rights Journal, according to the report, that is due out by the end of September and I gather ready to go, I don't know what it's contents are, who's writing for it, what kind of articles it's going to include and I wonder if you could give us a briefing on that.

MS. MATHEWS: I don't actually have documents in front of me, Commissioner Horner, so I can give you a general update. But we did have, I believe at some point in the past, a discussion on possible authors of articles and so -- and issues, it was quite some time back. We did do that.

It is a publication that has a variety of features. You probably remember that the Commission used to do a magazine and I believe the last issue that was published was 1989 and the current design of the magazine includes, in addition to articles by various authors, it includes other departments such as a department we're calling viewpoints, where there will be pages facing each other and pieces written like a point-counterpoint.

MS. HORNER: Who is writing and on what

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

subject for this issue?

MS. MATHEWS: For this issue the subject is, I believe it's Affirmative Action and it's Abigail Thernstrom and a gentleman named Laughlin McDonald.

I wonder if you can give me a minute because Charles Rivera is here and he might have and he does have some helpful information. going to continue with departments here, since I've started on that and go back to the authors for the other portion of the magazine. There's also a department called Yesterday which looks at a past issue that was in the civil rights area that might not have received a lot of credit, but it's worthy of remembering. And the issue that's going to be in this first piece is the legacy of Arthur Schlomberg. There's a department entitled Close Up which is going to have a piece written by Chancellor Change Lin Tien of the University of California and I'm sorry I was incorrect -- excuse me, you wanted to ask something? HORNER: I'm interested in just MS.

subjects and authors.

I do not -- like I said, I MS. MATHEWS: was not prepared to present this, so I do not have a lot of material here.

MS. HORNER: Just subjects and authors.

1	MS. MATHEWS: Okay. I'm giving you as
2	much as I have right now. I mean I can give you
3	several ways I can handle this. I can call you after
4	the meeting
5	MS. HORNER: No, no. That's okay.
6	MS. MATHEWS: Okay. The viewpoints piece
7	I said I thought it was Affirmative Action. I want to
8	correct that. It's on voting rights, but the two
9	authors were ones that I did mention.
10	There's book review pieces and I'm sorry
11	I do not have the details on that, but there are
12.	several of those that were reviewed. There's a little
13	section on media and it's discussing television and
14	the issue of the model minority.
15	There's a section on the ERIC documents
16	that are put out by the Department of Education that
17	are sort of summary pieces of various important issues
18	in Civil Rights and that we have picked several just
19	to highlight to demonstrate the value of this
20	Department of Education resource for individuals.
21	The articles per se and here's something,
22	there's an article on organized hate in America by
23	Joseph Florry, Sr.
24	MS. HORNER: Who is he?
25	MR. RIVERA: He's senior investigator for
ı	

1	Klan watch.
2	Ms. HORNER: Thank you.
3	Ms. MATHEWS: Charlie, if you
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner,
5	why can't we just give you a list of the articles and
6	the authors and files and anything else you want
7	rather than having them go down the list unless you
8	have some action item?
9	MS. HORNER: I have no action item. I
10	have a great curiosity, since I know this is ready to
11	go and all I want very simply is and I don't know
12	whether Charlie could give this to us, is just a tick
13	off of title, subject, I mean not title, but subject,
14	author and basically orientation, you know, like this
15	guy is a professor who has followed this or Klan
16	Watch, whatever, and if there are only maybe six or
17	seven articles, I think we can do that in about 90
18	seconds.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Charlie, read the
20	articles and the titles of people.
21	MR. RIVERA: The articles include
22	organized hate in America, as the Staff Director
23	pointed out
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me interrupt you,
25	first. Is it indeed true that this thing is going to

-1	be ready for whatever time you said:
2	MS. HORNER: September, late September?
3	MS. MATHEWS: We are working on it and it
4	is not imminently going to the printer, but it will be
5	soon.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, go ahead,
7	Charlie.
8	MR. RIVERA: Yeah, well the first article
9	is a status report on hate activity and white
LO	supremacy groups in the United States. This was
Lı	written before the Oklahoma City bombing and it has a
L2	side bar by Rabbi Cooper with the Wiesenthal Center,
L3	I believe it is in California on bigotry.
L4	There's a piece by two immigration
L5	scholars, one with the Carnegie Endowment, one at
16	Washington University in St. Louis on immigration,
L7	civil rights, the linkage between those two things.
L8	There's a cover story by Ellis Coes, a <u>Newsweek</u> editor
L9	on counting by race in the census and issues that that
20	raises, based on the fact that it was an issue that
21	you focused on in one of your piece.
22	There's a piece on the Americans With
23	Disabilities Act, five years after it was passed.
4	There's a piece on
25	CHATRDERSON BERRY: Welcome Commissioner

1	Fletcher, excuse me for interrupting.
2	We are having Charlie Rivera read the
3	titles and the authors
. 4	MR. FLETCHER: You'll have to say it
5	louder.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're having Charlie
7	Rivera read the titles and the authors of the first
8	issue of the <u>Civil Rights Journal</u> which is in
9	preparation. He's doing that now. That's what's
10	going on right now.
11	MR. FLETCHER: Sorry my phone was tied up.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we know you've
13	got these major issues to deal with and with a
14	campaign like this going on, so we appreciate your
15	being with us.
16	MR. FLETCHER: I was on the phone with
17	· Senator Packwood discussing the elements of sexual
18	harassment.
19	(Laughter.)
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe he'll finally
21	get it, but you're a little late in explaining it.
22	(Laughter.)
23	Charlie, go ahead and read.
24	MR. GEORGE: If I might interrupt and say
25	that now all the Commissioners are present.

+	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Everybody nere is,
2	everybody is here now.
3	Okay, go ahead.
4	MR. RIVERA: As I was saying, there's an
5	article on ADA, written by one of the staffers who was
6	involved in drafting the original legislation.
7	There's an article on improving of teaching civic
8	virtues in schools by Ernest Lefever. There's an
9	article on philanthropy, the linkage between
10	philanthropy and civil rights. And there is an
11	article that we still are dealing with on educational
12	issues affecting minority children in schools that we
13	hope to have finished very quickly. The I think
14	that about does it.
15	MS. HORNER: Can I ask who wrote the
16	article on philanthropy and civil rights?
17	MR. RIVERA: Robert Bothwell. He is head
18	of the Center for Philanthropy.
19	Ms. HORNER: Right.
20	MR. RIVERA: We tried to get the new
21	president of Independent Sector and she just had too
22	much on her platter to do it.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
24	MS. HORNER: I have other questions of the
25	Staff Director's Report.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
2	MS. HORNER: I noticed that one person who
3	was subpoenaed for the New York mini-hearing didn't
4	show up. Who was that?
5	MS. MATHEWS: I'm trying to remember the
6	name of the organization.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Stephanie, who was the
.8	guy's name?
9	MS. MOORE: Farnstock Company, Eric
10	Shames.
11	MS. HORNER: And do we know why he didn't
12	show up?
13	MS. MOORE: He said when he did not show
14	up, the U.S. Attorney was ordered to handle the
15	situation and did. He has fully complied.
16	MS. HORNER: Well, he was ordered to show
17	up what do we do in an event like that?
18	Ms. MOORE: We could either conduct
19	another hearing or we could simply have, as we did,
20	have the U.S. Attorney make clear to Mr. Shames that
21	the Commission expects compliance with subpoenas to
22	appear and force him or compel him to comply earlier
23	· with the document request.
24	MS. HORNER: Okay, thanks. I think that's

all I have.

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MATHEWS: We've had some and you know.

from the briefing we had before the Commissioners that

we had some very good outside advice, given that this

is a new issue for the Commission in terms of a new

mandate.

We had these experts come before us, the variety of individuals some months ago and this is designed to address a general premise of the civil rights issue. It's not designed to go through any specific area. We have a lot of options in the future to do other PSAs that might be more specific in nature. I think we all agree the general topic would be good to start off with and it's a conversational tone which is also designed to be easy and hopefully people who would listen would actually take it in, rather than a more formal approach and it's targeted to individuals who listen to a particular type of The cost would be about \$10,000. The design in terms of the play between the various types of music that people refer to and prefer, versus the issue of not discriminating against other individuals, I thought was a very effective way to get the message across.

MS. HORNER: Who is producing it and is it a sole source contract?

1	MS. MATHEWS: There's a company that we
2	have gone to. It's a company that actually has helped
3	the Department of Justice put out a PSA on the ADA and
4	was very effective. I cannot recall the name offhand.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does Charlie remember?
6	MR. RIVERA: Unfortunately, no.
7	MS. HORNER: I frankly doubt the name
8	would mean anything to me, but I'm just trying to get
9	a since these are going to be on-going, I'm just
10	trying to get a feel for how we're going about doing
11	it. So eventually, I would like to know the name, but
12	it's not
13	MR. RIVERA: It's an acronym, so this is
14	not going to be very helpful, MMBA.
15	(Laughter.)
16	MS. HORNER: Thank you. Okay.
17	MR. RIVERA: Margolies, Mitchell, Burns
18	and Associates.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What do the
20	Commissioners think about this PSA idea?
21	. ` MR. FLETCHER: Madam Chair?
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
23	MR. FLETCHER: That's a radio?
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, do you want me to
25	sing it?

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 (Laughter.) 2 MR. FLETCHER: When you read it, you don't 3 hear the song. Let me hear somebody read it. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's not exactly my kind of music, but it's music all the same. I'm Mary 5 6 Chapin Carpenter. This is a message about making 7 choices. You can always choose between your Beethoven and Bo Diddley. There's supposed to be two Ds in Bo 8 9 Diddley, by the way. But don't choose between people 10 because of their race, age, gender or disability. We 11 probably should say religion too, because that's in our mandate. That's discrimination and it's against 12 the law. someone you know, you can call this number:

13 If discrimination happens to you or to 14 15 552-6843 because discrimination is just out of tune 16 with America. This is brought to you from the folks

17 of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and this good 18 station.

> MS. HORNER: What is Mary Chapin Carpenter's degree of authority today?

> CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, Mary Chapin Carpenter is --

> > MS. HORNER: I don't know.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: She's almost an icon in country music.

NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. FLETCHER: Madam Chair?
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
3	MR. FLETCHER: Does Charlie know or either
4	the staff director know whether the hot button words
5	in that were arrived out through a focus session or
6	something or did they pull them out of the air?
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Focus session?
8	MR. FLETCHER: Yes. Normally, when they
9	decide on certain words in an ad of that nature, it's
10	often the product of some focus session to find out
11	how people react and responded to the emotional hot
12	buttons in the ad.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, that's one of
14	the questions I was going to raise if no one did, was
15	whether we wanted the staff to use focus groups to try
16	out messages before we used them or not. That was a
17	question I was going to raise.
18	MR. GEORGE: I think we've got a great
19	focus group right here.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where?
21	MR. GEORGE: I think we should try it out
22	before the Commissioners.
23	(Laughter.)
24	MR. GEORGE: We're the focus group. We're
25	cheap, much cheaper.
	NEW D. ODGGG

MR. RIVERA: If I could just provide some

guidance. The firm we went to is a professional advertising firm that has done these before with great success, for private and federal agencies. They have conducted focus groups. They did conduct a small focus group, but not of the kind that does sampling and brings people in from different parts of the country, different socio-economic levels and that kind of thing and the reason was the Commissioners wanted a very fast thing done for dissemination over the radio stations before the end of the fiscal year. And given the limitations of funds, we weighed all the alternatives and decided to go with this particular group. We think it's a very good one and it reflects some things they've done with great success.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Perhaps we could -- oh, Commissioner George.

MR. GEORGE: I wanted to stay on the PSA, but to change the subject within that. Can I do that now or do you want to close this up?

MR. REYNOSO: I don't have strong feelings on the wording. I thought to have the first one be a very general one and as an experiment for us, it's probably a good idea and then we'll probably start getting a feel for listener reaction and that sort of thing once we succeed in getting it on the air. So I

staff tell us how much that would cost and how you do

ı	1
1	that and get some idea about it. How about that, Mr.
2	Fletcher?
3	MR. FLETCHER: Uh
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you think we should
5	do it at all?
6	MR. FLETCHER: You keep fading out. Maybe
7	we need another hookup.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can't hear me.
9	Well, I can hear you.
10	MR. FLETCHER: Well, your voice keeps
11	cutting off. I'm not able to hear the complete
12	thought.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, well, let's try
14	another hookup here and see what happens.
15	Commissioner George, are you still on this
16	part of the point? He has something on PSA, but not
17	this.
18	MR. GEORGE: Well, my reaction is similar
19	to Cruz's. It's hard to judge the merits of this, I
20	find, when you don't have any other alternatives to
21	compare it to. That's generally been my practice,
22	looking at different kinds of advertising. But
23	there's a certain rationale behind this that makes
24	sense.
٠,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Obviously, tensions are heating up because

1	of lots of different reasons. Every night on the
2	television we see a new reason. And I think it might
3	be the better part of wisdom for us to keep a certain
4	prudence in mind in terms of how we initiate these
5	PSAs, so while I think it's a very soft message that's
6	coming out, it might not be the best idea to have what
7	I call a hard-hitting message at this time.
8	The question is what kind of audience do
9	you want to get and you get a different audience, a
10	hard hitting message than you do with a soft message.
11	So
12	MR. FLETCHER: Madam Chair?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Mr. Fletcher.
14	MR. FLETCHER: Are you hearing me?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I can hear you.
16	MR. FLETCHER: Can you get me another
17	hookup? I'm not hearing half the meeting.
18	You and Commissioner Redenbaugh, they both
19	need another hookup.
20	MR. GEORGE: So my disposition would be to
21	go forward with this and if we move forward in this
22	whole project, then to over time look at a variety and
23	have somebody come and tell us this is the kind of
24	audience you're going to hit with this kind of a
25	message. This is who you will reach with this kind of

Į

noted the importance of including religion on the list and I

A final point on the distribution and I did not raise this one with Mary, although I should have, and it's just a concern that I hope we will

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	well now.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We have a motion from
3	Commissioner Horner that we go ahead and approve this
4	PSA. Did we have a second?
5	MR. ANDERSON: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, any further
7	discussion?
8	MR: REDENBAUGH: Yes, Madam Chair?
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
10	Redenbaugh.
11	MR. REDENBAUGH: I'm prepared to vote for
12	this so this is a question in general and not about
13	this particular PSA and that is have we or will we
14	adapt a criteria for assessing whether or not the PSAs
15	in general and any particular PSA, specifically, is
16	effective and if so, what are those criteria?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So how will we
18	get feedback, that's a question.
19	MR. REDENBAUGH: How will we know if this
20	is the wrong thing or the right thing?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If it worked or didn't
22	work. Is that the question?
23	MR. REDENBAUGH: Exactly.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: One of the customers
25	that we identified was reached and all that other

1	Redenbaugh language that you use all the time
2	MR. REDENBAUGH: Right.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't know the
5	answer to that, but I think that you're quite right
6	that we should build that in somehow in the process.
7	MR. GEORGE: I have one thought about it.
8	My understanding is that radio and I could be
9	wrong, please correct me, if I am that radio
10	stations have to play a certain number of public
11	service announcements by law or regulation, but they
12	get to choose which ones to play. I think one
13	indicator of success would be whether ours is being
14	chosen, the disc jockeys and radio people themselves
15	
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So one measure would
17	be however crude, would be, whether anybody plays it.
18.	MR. GEORGE: I don't know how that's
19	registered and we end up knowing whether they have
20	played it or not. I don't know.
21	MR. RIVERA: Excuse me, can I respond to
22	that?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Sure.
24	MR. RIVERA: The thing that is important

Fletcher.

1	MR. FLETCHER: I didn't get to hear the
2	distribution list, who it's going to?
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who is this going to?
4	MS. MATHEWS: It's going to 1,200 country
5	and western stations.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: This one is going to
7	country and western stations.
8	MR. GEORGE: Future ones will go to
9	others.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Future ones will go to
11	others.
12	MR. FLETCHER: I would just add it may not
13	be appropriate at this time, but I will just add that
14	I find that traveling back and forth across the
15	country that college radio stations have tremendous
16	audiences beyond the student body, particularly those
17	that have call in shows and of course most of those
18	college stations are nonprofits, but I can assure you
19	that based on experiences I'm having right now, that's
20	a tremendous audience and I would guess that many of
21	those college radio stations would like to be on the
22	distribution list.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I bet they would. My
24	students would. Anyway, all right so we have a motion
25	to approve the use of this particular PSA.

1	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madame Chair.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I would just like
4	to say before we leave this topic, first I think we
5	ought to vote on all of them, because I think all the
6	commissioners are supportive of this project. I think
7	if we have a good consensus of the direction we're
8	moving in, I think that's just good for the project.
9	Secondly, I think Commissioner Wang's
LO	suggestion, I took it to be a suggestion, is a good
L1	one. I think we ought to follow up on it. That is,
L2	if we are going to come out with different PSAs, there
13	could be consistency with a tag line, whatever that
14	tag line is, heartbeat of America or whatever, I mean
15	it's a very
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Folks, it's a U.S.
17	civil rights group.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: From your folks, not
19	your father's civil rights.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Ah shucks.
21	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'll give you a
22	little banjo theme music.
23	I think we ought to give some thought to -
24	·
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: A tag line.

	1
1	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: A tag line that
2	has a consistent theme that runs through all of these.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we ask staff to
4	include that in the deliberations over this subject.
5	Okay. All in favor of the motion,
6	indicate by saying aye.
7	Opposed?
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Could we roll call
9	it, Madame Chair?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. We have a new
11	procedure, Commissioners Redenbaugh and Fletcher. We
12	have now decided without any objection after a
13	spirited mini-debate, that when a commissioner would
14	like a roll call vote on a question, the commissioner
15	can so indicate and then we'll have a roll call vote.
16	So I only have a roll, so I'll just do it
17	in terms of I don't know the alphabet so
18	Commissioner Reynoso.
19	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson.
21	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Fletcher.
23	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Aye.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Aye.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner.
2	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Aye.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
4	Redenbaugh.
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Wang.
7	COMMISSIONER WANG: Aye.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And I vote yes.
9	So it's unanimous.
10	Now, under the staff director's report,
11	while everybody else was discussing what they want on
12	the agenda, I forgot to mention myself, so I'm tardy,
13	that I wanted to briefly discuss the follow-up to our
14	Los Angeles hearing, which is an item we have done
15	before. It's a project we have already finished, so
16	it's an ongoing item.
17	What I wanted to suggest was that we might
18	agree to have a mini-hearing in Los Angeles, I know we
19	have revisited this issue before, as a result of the
20	latest incidents that have occurred in Los Angeles and
21	the tape of Mr. Fuhrman and all the fallout from that,
22	in regard to the police and community relations.
23	One part of our Los Angeles hearing
24	concerned police and community relations. I don't see
25	how we could complete the report on it, given what has

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

happened and the fallout there, which everyone I hear from in Los Angeles tells me is very serious, without going out and taking another look at police and community relations in Los Angeles.

In connection with the Fuhrman tapes, I also wanted to ask if the commissioners would be willing to send a letter to Janet Reno, asking her to investigate the expressions that Mr. Fuhrman made. At least the statements that he made about things that he had done to fabricate evidence and to do all sorts of things, which if he did them, would undermine respect for the police. I was hoping that the commissioners would be willing to at least ask Ms. Reno if she would look into them.

I asked the staff director to -- I had told her to pass these around to you. It's very If you could look that over while you mull. I'll read it so that We'll just take a minute. Commissioner Fletcher and Commissioner Redenbaugh can hear it while we're doing this.

It's a letter to Janet Reno. "Dear Mr. Reno: The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was deeply disturbed by the expressions of racial bigotry and police misconduct evidenced in the tape comments of retired Los Angeles police detective Mark

Thank you, Madam This looks very good to me. Let me say that when I raised earlier the question of a briefing, it was also regarding this matter. So I want to address

I have a question and then I also have a comment. The question is, and I'm familiar in a

> NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

20

21

24

I think that maybe it's an obvious point, but I think we should say something about it is not our intent to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

24

. 25

It's

about

But he on the

the

And

1	idea.
2	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're not trying to
4	and we agree that that's what we should do. Yes.
5	Commissioner Redenbaugh had a comment.
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. I support
7	this letter fully. I have a larger concern. I'm not
8	sure if this letter should include that or not, but
9	let me get it on the table.
10	I am not only deeply disturbed by the
11	Fuhrman tapes, but by the allegations of police
12	misconduct in Philadelphia in this same area, of
13	evidence. More than allegations in fact. So my
14	concern is that there's a widespread pattern in
15	practice here. I am not sure how to move with it, but
16	I wouldn't want us to limit our concern merely to the
17	L.A to these reports from L.A.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
19	Redenbaugh.
20	Commissioner, are you going to address his
21	point or make a different point?
22	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes. I was going to
23	address Mr. Redenbaugh's point.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Commissioner
25	George.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes, Mr. Redenbaugh,
I think it would be valuable in a letter. We might
very well want to do more in a letter to specifically
focus on the Fuhrman tapes and on the specific
incidents as the Chairman has indicated in the letter
that he refers to, and request a Federal investigation
into those specific incidents. If those incidents
occurred, then the civil rights of Americans were
violated in those specific incidents. As the letter
says, beyond that, it raises the problems of promoting

racial disharmony and distrust and so forth and so on.

Now as I understand it, Commissioner Anderson is proposing a more general hearing that would go to what Mr. Redenbaugh has called a pattern and practice across the country. It might be at that time as we gather information from people who might testify at that hearing or briefing, whatever it's going to be, which might include police officers and judges and jurists and lawyers who have been involved, and perhaps academics with expertise, we could then go on to ask for more things.

But I think that it's important that where we have specific incidents that we know if true are civil rights violations, that we ask for an investigation of those specific incidents, rather than

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, let me say

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

what I would like to propose. I support this letter and think we should go forward with it. What I would like to see is for us to have a briefing. I would see it as preliminary to a hearing, a mini-hearing in Los Angeles.

But what I would really like to do is bring in six to nine experienced law enforcement personnel, at the city and maybe Federal levels, although I'm not sure about the Federal level.

I would like to have an extensive briefing with them, discussion with them, to really probe the extent of this problem, its character, how it develops. Not so much from the academician side or the advocate side, but from officers who have been on the force for 20 years, 25 years, and really sit down with them and talk about what is going on here and the extent of it and the pervasiveness of it. There are a number of police organizations that I think we could go to, to find that kind of expertise.

I think that would help us a great deal in preparing a mini-hearing in Los Angeles on this thing. So we get to know much more thoroughly of what's out there, the extent of it, and how it develops.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, since I have no trepidation at all about thinking that staff can do

everything, it occurs to me that they ought to be able to put together a briefing in October since we don't have a hearing in October, assuming we're open.

about, that Charlie and his crew could put that together just in a snap for October, get some police people in to talk about this issue. Then we could think about a mini-hearing maybe in March or something. I am just thinking about dates on which we are not already doing something else. That seems to me about the earliest one possible as a follow-up.

I just think that on the Los Angeles idea, before we could finish our report, since this has police community relations as a big part of it, people would find it incongruous that we didn't follow up on this thing, which is probably going to be an issue at least I'd say for the 18 months or so. So for that reason was why I was making the suggestion about the mini-hearing.

But I think you are quite right, that a briefing, and this is a nation-wide problem. There is evidence that it happens in a lot of places or things like that happen in a lot of places and not just in Los Angeles or even Philadelphia.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: If I could just be

clear. I mean what brought it to my mind was one of the -- I think it was the CBS news coverage of this a week or so ago, and they interviewed of course a squad captain or a station chief saying of course there's no problem here. Then they interviewed two brothers who had both been on the force say 20 and 25 years, both Afro-American. They said look, this goes on all the time. It's pervasive and you're kidding yourself if you don't think it's a problem.

Those are the kind of guys that I would say we ought to have at the briefing. We should not have the union representatives or the deputy police chiefs or whatever. But I would say we should try to, even if they are retired or recently retired, we should try to get guys who have been on forces for lengthy periods of time that can really sit down and talk to us without looking over their shoulder as to what this is going to do to their contract or something like that. That's what I had in mind for this.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner Horner.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'd like to get back to the letter for a moment. It has been suggested that Mark Fuhrman is not a reliable person. I'd like

_	
1	COMMISSIONER WANG: Madam Chair, just on
2	that paragraph. I'd like to suggest to restore the
3	confidence, I guess if we can just say what
4	confidence. Confidence towards
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you mean what kind
6	of confidence? Restore confidence in the justice
7	system or the law system. Confidence in the justice
8	system, how about that?
9	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The administration
10	of justice.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Administration of
12	justice.
13	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Madam Chair.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Mr. Fletcher.
15	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I would recommend
16	create confidence rather than restore.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Gotcha.
18	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: A leap of faith
19	there. I'll do my best.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about to initiate,
21	no. To restore.
22	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Ensure.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about ensure.
24	Ensure, that's better.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: And perhaps it could
	NEAL P. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We could put a hood

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	over them, like they do on television or a scrambled
2	signal.
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Probably not a good
4	thing for us to do.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Putting on a hood,
6	right.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Since I can't think
8	of any practical way to do that, but if anybody can
9	think of a practical way, I'd like to.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I was only kidding.
11	I did not mean placing a hood on anyone, for the
12	record.
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Short of some system
14	of anonymity, and if anybody can think of a way, I
15	mean I'm really serious. If you can think of a way to
16	get anonymous testimony that would be lawful for us to
17	do, I'd like to do it because I think it's so
18	important that we put people in a position to be able
19	to speak freely.
20	Short of that though, I think the idea of
21	having retired police officers with plenty of
22	experience would be the best way to get genuine no-
23	holds barred authentic testimony.
24	COMMISSIONER WANG: Did we do that in the
25	Mt. Pleasant hearing? We did that somewhere. Do you

1	remember?
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Were there retired
3	people in the Mt. Pleasant hearing? Anybody remember?
4	COMMISSIONER WANG: We had someone who
5	would not give us their name.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's right. We had
7	people who didn't want to be identified.
8.	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: What did we do in
9	that case?
10	MS. MATHEWS: They had a bandanna over
11.	their face.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, they had a
13	bandanna over their face.
14	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So there's a
15	precedent for this.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. We did it in Mt.
17	Pleasant.
18	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I don't know if
19	police officers would like to wear bandannas.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we do the
21	following. Why don't we have a motion or why don't we
22	agree to send the letter as edited and to have a
23	briefing as soon as the staff can organize it,
24	hopefully in October.
25	Do we want to agree to have a mini beauting

Do we want to agree to have a mini-hearing

after that in L.A. or to just consider having a mini-

. 25

observers.

have seen patterns of activity. There are sometimes, it's in Los Angeles, the Police Commission. There are folk who have served on it for many years who may not be on it now, who might be willing to speak. There are attorneys who handle police malpractice cases who have seen maybe 10 or 20 or 30, so it's not just one incident, that might have some observations for us. And of course some community groups have been long

So I don't disagree with the resolution.

Retired police officers or others that can help educate us on the pattern and practice. But I'm just suggesting that I think it's an excellent idea to have retired police officers, particularly those of color.

There was an article in the L.A. Times shortly after this, citing several police, African-American and other minority police officers saying, we don't know why everybody seems to be surprised.

Now I confess that I have yet to run into anybody in the Latino or African-American community that was surprised. But certainly the mayor and others have expressed great surprise and shock. But those officers were quoted as saying look, this is routine stuff.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And there was an

for not having these people there.

25

So the idea of

having lawyers and advocacy groups causes me some concern about -- not in a moral sense, but in the other sense, the integrity of exactly what we could get out of the thing.

If we really focus pretty much on people who have been in the system who are not in an adversarial role of any kind, but can just tell us what they have observed. That is a concern. If it goes the other way, I am perfectly happy, but --

Mt. Pleasant hearing, as I recall, was that the police officials, the union person, was not concerned to defend the police behavior. As a matter of fact, if I recall correctly, he said that a lot of these things happen because the police are not trained well enough, and that they need more training and nobody gives them enough training.

So in other words, he didn't defend the notion that none of it happens. He was more than willing to say that it does, but attributed it to a lack of training.

We must keep in mind that however we do this, there will be people who will complain that we haven't given their side of whatever it is.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I understand.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Whatever we do. So if
2	we have all police officers and if they say problems
3	happen, there will be some people who say you should
4	have had somebody come to say that there aren't any
5	problems. Somebody else will say you should have had
6	advocacy groups.
7	I'm pretty much satisfied if we can get
8	enough police people to come, to have them talk to us.
9	With that, after discussion, is that okay?
10	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Sure?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can we vote on that
12	motion? The motion is the letter and the briefing.
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Call the roll.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh call the roll.
15	Commissioner Reynoso.
16	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Aye.
17	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson.
19	· COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Fletcher
21	said yes. Commissioner George.
22	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Aye.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner.
24	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Aye.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner

1	Redenbaugh.
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Wang.
4	COMMISSIONER WANG: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: There he is. Okay,
6	that one has passed unanimously.
7	Now, on the question of a mini-hearing for
8	L.A., can I get somebody to move that we do it?
9	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: So moved.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second?
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Second.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Any further
13	discussion?
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, until
15	I see the witness list, the content of the subpoenas,
16	and the subject matter agenda, I'd like to withhold a
17	positive vote on that. So I am going to vote no in
18	the near term and to recommend to my fellow
19	commissioners that on a subject this extremely
20	sensitive, that it would be the responsibility of the
21	Commission, not just of the staff, to construct, to
22	approve the construction or approve alternative
23	constructions of this hearing.
24	. I recognize the necessity of the
25	Commission to rise to this occasion, but I think we

need to be doing it without the typical anxiety levels about what it's going to be. I know we have scheduled in October and November the Mississippi hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: November.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: November, and we have one meeting between now and then at which we could discuss the design of that hearing. We know it's been established for the City of Greenwood. We don't know why there and why not elsewhere. We do not know who is coming and so on, and what the subject matter content would be.

so I am going to vote no on this proposal now, but would be happy to consider such a proposal after seeing a broad parameter outline of what witnesses we would invite, such that everyone we would invite would be on there, not that everyone on the list would come or would ultimately be selected. What subjects we intend to raise, and generally, what line of questioning. And also what we would be requesting through the subpoena power.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any further discussion before we vote?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, I would.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Mr. Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You know we went

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

to Los Angeles twice. We went soon after the riots.

Then we went to the hearings. I supported that. I

thought we had to go there quickly. I think we have

to go there again in a mini-hearing.

Although there are obviously real dangers with going there at this period of time, with what may happen, what may not happen, so I think we have to have more commissioner involvement over this hearing, the timing of it, the parameters of it, the panels, et cetera, than we may have had for other hearings.

So I guess I'm halfway where Connie is coming from so that I am prepared to support it, but I think only on the understanding that I would expect that there be much more commissioner input in terms of formulating the hearing, the timing of it, et cetera.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we would set a time later. We're not going to -- what we are doing now is saying that conceptually we agree that before we can do the Los Angeles report, we at least need to go do a clean-up again on this.

I kept thinking as you talked though, that something else will happen after we do -- well anyway, the hope is that we would be at the point then where we could write the report and get it out. So we wouldn't be setting a time for it.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we'd be doing is agreeing What conceptually that in fact we do need to do another run at Los Angeles before we finish the report. the idea. We'd come back to the commissioners again about when we're going to have it. Maybe we can decide that after we have the police briefing. Maybe something else will come up. See if we open, we're open when all that. But at least if we understand that what this means is that you can't do a report about police community relations without

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

something else in there in L.A.

motion, if I can. I move that the staff prepare for the Commission's consideration a design for such a hearing at a date to be determined, and that the staff as soon as they can present us with such a design, including who would be invited, what would be the line of questioning, and what would be the content of the subpoenas, so that we can consider it at the next meeting after the staff makes it available.

COMMISSIONER WANG: There's a motion on the floor.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: There's a motion on

Madam Chair, I am suggesting for this hearing a different procedure. The reason I am suggesting is that if we agree in concept and then must vote no in order to prevent an ill-design in our view or some commissioners' view, an ill-designed hearing from going forward, we may have insufficient votes to prevent.

> NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of

whereas if we withhold our support for such a hearing until we see a hearing we think will be useful, then it's a inferment (phonetic) to the question. Do we wish to have this particular hearing or do we wish to be placed in a posture of attempting to muster support for preventing a particular hearing. Frankly, it's placing the burden of responsibility by my resolution more on the Commission than is typically the case.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well then I am inclined to withdraw my motion, and to say that we should not plan to have a hearing.

Because if commissioners want to take the occasion for the proposal for this hearing to retract the policy commitment that is made both in our administrative instructions, by regulations, and that this Commission reaffirmed recently in another meeting, that it is the responsibility of the staff to receive our suggestions for witnesses, to then devise the agenda after we've had a proposal which we've approved, and that that's a staff responsibility, not a commissioner responsibility.

So if the occasion of my motion is an occasion to change that, then I simply withdraw the motion and think that we should wait until after the

police briefing and discuss this later, and decide whether we really want to do a hearing or not. Because I didn't have in mind changing all the procedures. I was just simply trying to get a hearing conceptually done on L.A.

Yes, Commissioner George.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I have a compromise.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The compromise would be to postpone the vote this time either way, and ask the staff to prepare an analytical document as to why we should have a hearing. It would make the case, in view of the new circumstances, the new developments, and give an idea of what the scope of the hearing would be. It would not identify particular witnesses, but give us categories of where witnesses would be drawn from, and how the drawing of those witnesses would enable us to accomplish the goals that justify having them in a hearing in the first place.

So it's not a hearing design, but an analytical statement of why we need a hearing. Then if the commissioners agree yes, we vote yes, we'll have a hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Fletcher.

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Is there a motion

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	on the floor or are we discussing one?
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, it was a motion
3	on the floor to approve the concept of having a mini-
4	hearing. Why don't we just have a vote on the motion.
5.	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I'd appreciate
6	that.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That we agree to have
8	a mini-hearing in L.A. at a date to be decided later
9	on by the Commission, and with the understanding that
10	as usual, we will get a proposal from the staff as to
11	the scope of the hearing and all the other things that
12	the staff are supposed to do before we have a hearing.
13	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Is this an
14	amendment to the motion that's on the floor?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No. It's the same
16	motion. I'm just explaining it. The same motion.
17	Can you hear me?
18	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yes. I think so.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's the same motion
20	I made in the first place, that we have a mini-hearing
21	in L.A. on the question of police and community
22	relations before we finish this L.A. report. That was
23	my original motion. It's the same motion that was
24	seconded. So why don't we vote on it and then see
25	what else happens.

1	I call for the question. All those in
2	favor of the motion to have a mini hearing in L.A.
3	indicate by saying aye.
4	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Do a roll call,
5	please.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do a roll call. Okay.
7	Reynoso.
8	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Aye.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anderson.
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Fletcher.
12	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: George.
14	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Horner.
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: No.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Redenbaugh.
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Wang.
20	COMMISSIONER WANG: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Berry, Yes. So it's
22	four to four. We don't have a mini-hearing in L.A.
23	So we'll just move onto the next item on the agenda.
24	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Madam Chair.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Mr. Fletcher.
1	

police.

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: When it's time to put that item together as to whether we are going to be involved in any kind of hearing where police are concerned, I would like to make sure that if staff who puts it together point out that we have in our files, in our library, information that indicates that a vast majority of the nation's race riots started with

police brutality and the misuse of power by the

What we are seeing as we end this century is the same thing. Now either we do what the Congress created us to do or we throw in the towel. This is not the time to dance away from the most critical problem in this country. I want the record to show that I said that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I might remind commissioners too that the Commission did a report on police practices and civil rights after hearings that took place all over this country, in cities all over this country. That was the year before I came on the Commission. The report came out finally while I was on the Commission, in 1982 I think it was.

Commissioners might read that report on police practices and civil rights. They will be perhaps surprised, or perhaps they already know that

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Okay. The next item.
2	MS. MATHEWS: Madam Chair, I have a
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, the budget on the
4	staff. You received a copy of the FY 1997 budget
5	estimate, which is what we forward to OMB. This
6	happens every year. This is the first stage in the
7	budget request process. We need a formal vote by the
. 8	commissioners on this budget proposal.
9	It is based on proposals that the
10	Commission already approved, which are project
11	proposals, and now it's put into numbers.
12	So could I have a motion to approve the
13	budget request?
14	COMMISSIONER WANG: So approved.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second?
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Second.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion?
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, I
19	understand from Ron Brown, he got it only yesterday
20	afternoon. I haven't looked at it. Am I wrong?
21	MS. MATHEWS: Well, Commissioner Horner,
22	it was given out with the Miami briefing books, which
23	were distributed Tuesday.
24	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Tuesday, and I
25	arrived back in town late Wednesday night. So that

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. prepared to vote today. I intend to vote no because

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any other discussion? Yes.

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

24

25

I

	VIOLI CIMIR REINODO. MCIT, as I anacistana
2	it this is all really preliminary. It's going to OMB.
3	There will be discussions with them. It seems to me
4	that we ought to go forward with what we think we
5	need. Obviously there will be compromises even before
6	it gets to the Congress.
7	I understand what you are saying, but as
8	I understand it, this is sort of like a formal
9	requirement for us, where we state what our druthers
10	are.
11	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Do we not, Madam
12	Chair, do we accept OMB's mark and testify on behalf
13	of it or do we not?
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We can or can not.
15	We've had an argument about that for 20 years.
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Meaning that
17	conceivably you could choose to testify in support of
18	this particular budget.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If you wanted to.
20	COMMISSIONER HORNER: If we wanted you to
21	or you wanted to, and we didn't attempt to muster five
22	votes to ask you not to.
23	So it seems to me, Cruz, it really is a
24	serious statement, to be taken as a serious statement
25	of our desiderata (phonetic) to the Congress.

of smell out here as a result of running around the

`25

country, going from campus to campus, and ghetto to ghetto, and up to talk to the powers that be, that there's a general agreement. It's not just in the press. There's a general agreement that the toughest problem facing America right now is race.

This is the agency that's put in business to deal with that. It is just kind of curious to me at this stage in the game for us not to be putting the strongest foot forward that we possibly can.

Congress is going to cut us back, but if we can validly justify and validate and point out what we need and make a full court press to get it, I think that's what we ought to do.

But I yield to your better judgement. But let me assure you that I am down in Alabama right now. Let me assure you that there's some uneasiness, serious uneasiness about this nation's racial plight right now.

I keep getting asked questions about what is the role of the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights at this critical hour in our history. And for us not to go, I've got to say it again, for us not to go for broke, validate it every inch of the way, for us not to go for broke at this time, to arm ourselves with the resources that we need to do what the so-called

1	Commission founders had in mind, to me is backing away
2	from the problem.
. 3	That's my position. I'll vote for any
4	budget you want me to, but that's my position.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Is everybody
6	ready for the vote on this point on this?
7	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I'm ready for the
8	question.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
10	the budget proposal indicate by saying aye.
11	·· Nos?
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Call it.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George
14	wants a roll call vote. Reynoso.
15	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anderson.
17	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Fletcher.
19	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Aye.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: George.
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Aye.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Horner.
23	COMMISSIONER HORNER: No.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Redenbaugh.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
	NEAL R. GROSS

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Wang.
2	COMMISSIONER WANG: Aye.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Berry, aye. It passes
4	one, two, three, four, five, six to two.
5	Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Madam Chair.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I need to leave
9	the call shortly. Could I take my agenda item up now?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh okay, sure. Go
11	right ahead.
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: It's really a
13	procedural or a process question not a content
14	question. When the small task force that I chaired
15	reviewed and revised the process by which the
16	Commission prepares and approves the work product of
17	the SACs, at that time we modified the process in a
18	way that would require that the AIs be rewritten to
19	reflect that.
20	I think there has been an oversight in
21	that that probably has not been done. This came to my
22	attention as a consequence of the publication of the
23	Illinois SAC civil rights issues facing Asian
24	Americans. So I'd just like to make the request that
25	the AIs be updated to reflect the process which we put

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

that the --

- 1	
2	process that we approved.
3	Specifically what called it to my
4	attention was that this work product of the Illinois
5	SAC was published not strictly in compliance with that
6	new process, but in compliance with the AIs, as they
7	have not been rewritten.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I see. Okay. Well,
9	staff director, you heard the discussion.
10	MS. MATHEWS: I did, Madam Chairperson.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You will see to it
12	that the AIs are reviewed to make sure that the
13	process is consistent with whatever it is.
14	MS. MATHEWS: We will follow up on that
15	issue.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
17	Redenbaugh, don't leave yet. I need you for
18	something.
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, it just
20	occurred to me why it is that I didn't, since I had an
21	extra 45 minutes this morning, review the budget
22	materials. The answer was that it was not on the
23	agenda. A vote on the budget was not on the agenda.
24	That is why I just left it with the Miami materials,
25	as an informational memo to be looked at later. I am

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH:

The

Yes.

1	budget process.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we usually ask is
3	if you have any objections; call and let us know.
4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: And why did you
5	change the procedure this time?
6	MS. MATHEWS: We were having a meeting so
7	closely in conjunction with the completion of it, it
8	seemed to make sense.
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well that's an
10	accidental function of timing that seems to me it
11	should not be determinative of whether we vote on
12	something or not.
13	MS. MATHEWS: All I am trying to indicate.
14	is the Commission has not requested a vote on the
15	budget per se. We have done a mail process where it's
16	been if you object, please do contact the staff
17	director.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George.
19	Oh I'm sorry, Commissioner Wang, you had your hand up.
20	COMMISSIONER WANG: Just to remind you of
21	another item which we don't have on the agenda, which
22	is our response to the SAC recommendations.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Isn't that on here?
24	That's on here. That's the next item.
25	COMMISSIONER WANG: Okay.

I'm sure it wasn't intentional.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	going to next.
2	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Oh I see.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
.4	Redenbaugh, are you back?
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. I am.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I have two items here
7	that I need you for. One is calendar. Are you happy
8	with the calendar dates?
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Am I?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm sorry.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm asking if everyone
13	is happy. We're trying to conclude the calendar.
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, these
15	are the original dates? There hasn't been a more
16	recent one?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. The idea is
18	can we go with this calendar? Anybody got any other
19	concerns?
20	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yes, ma'am. I just
21	want it firmed up.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right?
23	COMMISSIONER HORNER: It's all right with
24	me.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Redenbaugh, I can't hear you.
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have no
3	problem.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The second
5	thing I want you for is this resolution that the Vice
6	Chair has on the First Lady's trip to China.
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Will you read it,
9	please?
10	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yes. I had a draft.
11	We revised it, the Chair having reminded me that some
12	matters were outside of our jurisdiction. So I'll
13	read the second draft, which is the draft that I am
14	proposing.
15	U.S. Commission of Civil Rights
16	Resolution. Whereas on her current trip to the
17	People's Republic of China as the head of the American
18	delegation to the U.N. Fourth World Conference on
19	Women, First Lady Hilary Rodham Clinton spoke out
20	against human rights violations against women of all
21	nations.
22	And whereas the First Lady's criticism of
23	those nations which violated women's rights was
24	courageous, unequivocal and uncompromising.
25	And whereas the First Lady's comments were

And whereas the First Lady's comments were

1	an endorsement
2	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Excuse me, Cruz.
3	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I'm sorry.
4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I have a different
5	version.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: You've got the
7	earlier one. Here's the
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm sorry.
9	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I'll continue.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't you read it
11	again.
12	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's short.
14	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Whereas on her
15	current trip to the People's Republic of China as the
16	head of the American delegation to the U.N. Fourth
17	World Conference on Women, First Lady Hilary Rodham
18	Clinton spoke out against human rights violations
19	against women of all nations.
20	And whereas the First Lady's criticism of
21	those nations which violated women's rights was
22	courageous, unequivocal and uncompromising.
23	And whereas the First Lady's comments were
24	an endorsement of the traditional American family
25	values and the right of women to be free from state-

sponsored legislation or practices which deny their rights, and whereas the host country of the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women is one of those countries which is one of the most flagrant and persistent in denying women their basic human rights to reproduce, now be it resolved that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights hereby commends the First Lady for her outspoken and courageous defense of the basic human rights to which all women, regardless of nationality, are entitled. End of resolution.

I must say that both here, and I'll be speaking on the Advisory Committee, I had affirmative feelings today. So often we are expressing concerns. It seemed to be appropriate on an occasion to say what was done was right. We had discussed U.N. problems with this conference beforehand, so I thought that since one, we had participated, and two, I thought the speech that the First Lady delivered was particularly potent, that this would be appropriate for us.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second?

COMMISSIONER WANG: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Discussion.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Cruz, what made the First Lady's speech so strong was the specific nature of what she said. I would like to ask you why you

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

changed your resolution from the earlier draft, which mentions not forcing women to undergo involuntary sterilizations, abortions and other measures in the name of family planning, and made it a more bland and general statement.

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I have the original draft. The Chair reminded me that we in this Commission are proscribed, as I understand it, to deal specifically with issues of abortion, but we can express a more general concern. That is why I changed it.

You are right that it was particularly dramatic because she was specific, but apparently we must be more general in our response. So that's the reason.

able to vote for this. Maybe when I hear my fellow commissioners I will. I have one reservation about it that I simply want to put on the table. That is the use of the word courageous rather than the word politic. In fact in all honesty, I do not believe the First Lady engaged in an act of courage, no matter how correct and proper her speech was.

It was an act designed to, in my view, address an important substantive issue and also

1	address a political constituency the President needs
2	for reelection. So I have trouble with the word
3	courageous as inflated.
4	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I have no objection
5	to cutting out. I'm just looking at it. It seems to
6	me that the spirit is still there without the word
7	courageous.
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Thank you.
9	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Was outspoken in
10	defense of. Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any other comment?
12	Commissioner Wang.
13	COMMISSIONER WANG: My concern about
14	paragraph number four, if I could suggest we move a
15	more general rather than just reproductive.
16	I think you heard the argument from China
17	all the time that we have 1.2 billion people, what do
18	you want us to do? Do you want us to have more
19	babies? Do you want us to have more children? We
20	will give it to you more.
21	That has become irresponsible. If they
22	continue to increase so we've got to find a way to
23	help them. So I think if we not to dwell on this, but
24	to just say about the general human rights.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You mean say is among

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So you are suggesting

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	whereas those is one of those countries which is
2	among the most flagrant and persistent in denying
3	human rights. Basic human rights period?
4	COMMISSIONER WANG: Yes. Exactly. I
5	would go with that.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you want a
7	response to that.
8	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yes. It seems to me
9	that nobody has a quarrel with the efforts of a nation
10	to control population growth. Indeed, so much of the
11	efforts of the U.N. has been to helping nations
12	control population growth.
13	The issue here is how you do it. All the
14	studies indicate that education, though it takes
15	longer, that education, betterment in the economic and
16	particularly educational quality of women has been a
17	very effective way of controlling that.
18	The objection here has been to the method.
19	I guess I am reluctant to accept the suggestion as to
20	the fourth paragraph.
21	COMMISSIONER WANG: Am I allowed to
22	proceed?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll recognize you.
24	Go ahead. Sure.
25	COMMISSIONER WANG: The method is not the

government, it's the people, it's the culture.

	1
1	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Charles, I heard
3	you.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Fletcher.
5	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yes.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hold on just one
7	second. Commissioner Anderson was talking. You
8	couldn't hear him.
9	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Oh I'm sorry.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hold on just one
11	second.
12	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you, Madam
13	Chair. I must say I am gaining a better appreciation
14	as to why Congress in its wisdom has precluded us from
15	discussing the issue of abortion.
16	However, with that observation let me just
17	say that I have talked with witnesses of what has
18	occurred in China on these matters. I read the
19	personal testimonies of women who have been subjected
20	to these things. I have seen the pictures of infants
21	that are being treated under these policies. From my
22	own standpoint, I can think of very few things that
23	would be more abhorrent.
24	So whether the First Lady's comments were
25	courageous or politic. I think a wise man once said

urageous or politic, I think a wise man

NEAL R. GROSS

that ideas have consequences. So that any time we can speak out against this, I think we should.

I must say that there are probably aspects of Chinese culture and the tradition which lend itself to these kinds of practices, but again, what is going on there is being sponsored, it is being enforced by the government I think far beyond what would be reflective of the culture. That is why you have so many really in my view political refugees from that country, who are being subjected to this one child per couple policy.

So I would support keeping in even the watered down language. Frankly, I don't see that it would violate our statute for us to say, commend the First Lady here, nations which force women to undergo coercive measures in the name of family planning. I don't see retaining that language from the original draft as violating our mandate. So I would recommend that we keep that. But I would support encouraging this kind of action by the part of our government.

On the original draft I saw, I had jotted down at the end of the last paragraph, which I don't think is changed, adding after the words "are entitled", the phrase "and urges continuing action by the government of the United States to further those

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH'S ASSISTANT: He
2	stepped away. I will grab him.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I want him to vote.
4	Mr. George.
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Thanks. I am going
6	to vote no on this, although, Cruz, I think that much
7	of what you say in here is valuable and I agree with
8	it.
9	I have been following this conference from
10	the first very closely. I have commented on it
11	extensively in the public media. I believe it was
12	outrageous for the United Nations to hold a conference
13	on the rights of women in China. I believe it was
14	wrong for the Clinton Administration to send our
15	delegation there. I particularly disapprove of the
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Excuse me,
17	Robbie. Have we voted?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to vote
19	now. We're waiting for you.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I'm saying why I'm
21	going to be a no vote.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: May I be
23	indulged and ask that my vote be taken now.
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Russell, this will
25	take me three seconds. I promise I'll

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to vote in
2	two seconds. Two seconds.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: All right.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Go ahead,
5	Rob.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Finally, if the
7	delegation was to go and if the First Lady was to go,
8	although very much of what she said was right and
9	good, I would have thought it necessary that the
LO	statement be even stronger and more unequivocal in its
11	denunciation of Chinese atrocities against women.
L2	Therefore I am going to vote no, while sympathizing
L3	with much of the sentiment Cruz has expressed. Thank
L4	you.
L5	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Just with respect to
L6	the resolution, if the seconder, and I forget who the
L7	seconder was.
18	COMMISSIONER WANG: I seconded.
ا9	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Well, I think that we
20	really ought to leave the words "to reproduce" on the
21	fourth. I think it would be proper to add the words
22	"and urge this continued action by the U.S. respecting
23	those rights" at the end.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But not the other
25	part.

2 part. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Carl, because 4 we'd have to have a long discussion about it. 5 COMMISSIONER HORNER: And drop courage 6 COMMISSIONER WANG: And drop courage 7 yes. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we're going 9 vote on this resolution. 10 Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you head 11 Can you hear me?	geous. geous,
4 we'd have to have a long discussion about it. 5 COMMISSIONER HORNER: And drop courage 6 COMMISSIONER WANG: And drop courage 7 yes. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we're going 9 vote on this resolution. 10 Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hear	geous. geous,
COMMISSIONER HORNER: And drop courage COMMISSIONER WANG: And drop courage yes. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we're goi vote on this resolution. Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hea	reous, ing to
COMMISSIONER WANG: And drop courage yes. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we're goi vote on this resolution. Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hea	reous, ing to
yes. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we're goi vote on this resolution. Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hea	ing to
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we're goi vote on this resolution. Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hea	-
yote on this resolution. Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hea	-
Commissioner Redenbaugh, can you hea	ır me?
	ir me?
Can you hear me?	
11	
12 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH'S ASSIS	TANT:
Commissioner Redenbaugh has just left again.	
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Tell him I want h	im to
vote.	
16 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH'S ASSISTANT	: He
said that he votes yes.	
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. You ha	ve to
have him say that himself, Stella.	
COMMISSIONER HORNER: While she's ge	tting
him, maybe we could do our poll.	
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. The rest	of us
can vote. Are we doing a poll? Yes, okay.	
Vice Chair.	
VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Aye.	

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson.
1	
2	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Fletcher.
4	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner.
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Aye.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
10	Redenbaugh we'll come back to him.
11	Commissioner Wang.
12	COMMISSIONER WANG: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Berry,
14	yes. Okay the motion passes. We will have
15	Commissioner Redenbaugh when he comes back on the
16	phone.
17	COMMISSIONER WANG: Can I just add, just
18	for the sake of argument or whatever. I have only one
19	daughter. I have no son.
20	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I must say that the
21	address didn't go to the phenomena that you are
22	talking about, which is a very serious phenomenon
23	promulgated, as you indicate, by the people,
24	particularly the rural people. That is not part of
25	the government efforts. So the speech and this

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Madam Chair.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

25

Staff

Yes, Commissioner CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Fletcher. COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I am going to have to leave you in 20 minutes. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In 20 minutes? 5 COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yes. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, I'll move 8 it up fast. Fast. We want you on the Miami hearing 9 briefing. COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: All right. 10 11 MS. MATHEWS: The first issue that we explored was whether or not the Commission can use 12 funding from the private sector to support SAC 13 The answer to that is no, it is not 14 activities. The main reasons are the 15 legally permissible. legislative mandate on advisory committees and the 16 17 requirement that they be funded by the government. Secondly, the importance of the Commission maintaining 18 19 its independence. 20 The next issue was whether or not there 21 are any legal bars to the SACs, creating executive 22 The staff response on that is that the committees. 23 SACs could indeed form subcommittees to perform special projects. 24 25 Next, whether the SACs could use

17

19

21

20

22 23

24

25

conference calls for SAC meetings, and the answer is regulatory long we abide by the as as yes, requirements that provide for public access. use a telephonic hook-up, that we have a speaker phone so that the public can indeed hear the proceeding. Procedures and further information to that effect have been forwarded to the regional directors.

Following that, we looked at whether or not SAC meetings could be advertised electronically. The answer to that question was yes, that can be done. However, we learned at the SAC meeting through some discussion that not all the SAC members have electronic mail, nor do they all have even a computer.

there's a variety of information exchange, communication exchange procedures that we will probably have to continue to use, but we can explore this electronic information. It could be certainly provided for access to the public in terms of further information about upcoming SAC meetings.

Following that we looked at whether or not the regional offices could be equipped with toll-free telephone lines. This is an item we are still researching. The answer in general is yes, but the cost is an issue that we need to explore further. cost would be determined on the volume of calls.

wanted to wait to see how the appropriation process went in terms of next fiscal year, to see how this cost once it's fully researched would match up with the appropriation amount that we receive.

We also looked at whether or not public service announcements could be developed on the functions of a SAC. That was a suggestion made. Obviously that's an issue that we are still exploring. We are looking at issues like whether or not SACs could be mentioned as the tag line, whether we could have even a member of our state advisory committee be the spokesperson for this particular type of PSA within their state. So there are some creative ideas the staff is looking at on that issue.

SAC meetings and trying to have a meeting in states that haven't had a meeting in quite some time, we addressed that immediately following the SAC Chair Conference. You probably noted when you saw the upcoming list for SAC meetings for September, there are 23 SAC meetings scheduled to take place this month.

Following that, we looked at whether or not a guide could be developed on the use of student interns by the regional offices. We indeed can use student interns. A guide and additional instructions

_	
1	have already been given to the regions on that issue.
2	The last item is the
3	VICE CHAIR'REYNOSO: Can the students
4	interns be used as the U.S. Government official?
5	MS. MATHEWS: They would be employees of
6	the Commission on Civil Rights, yes.
7	The last issue I wanted to mention is the
8	request the SAC chairs made for a White House
9	conference on civil rights. We made some inquiry of
10	commissioners as to suggestions you might have, and
11	. have still not received a lot of input. We received
12	I believe just one suggestion so far. So I would pose
13	that as my final point for the Commission discussion.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Vice Chair.
15	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I have one question.
16	Has the staff done any further work on the suggestion
17	coming from that conference that maybe we have sort of
18	a regional responsibility for each of the
19	commissioners for the SACS? Has anything further been
20	discussed in that regard?
21	MS. MATHEWS: We have not pursued that one
22	issue further. The items I mentioned here are the
23	progress to date. We will be looking into that.
24	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Thank you.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now the White House,
	NEW D ODGG

I think it's important that we have that report. It will be in the record, and the SACs get the record of what we do here at the meeting so that they can know that we have discussed this.

But there was the item of the White House conference. What we agreed to do was say that commissioners would give their suggestions for what might be included in such a conference so that we could decide whether we wanted one and whether we wanted to endorse their recommendation. But we have never taken that up. As the staff director just told us, she only got the suggestions from one person about what might be taken up.

What is your will concerning this SAC chair suggestion about a White House conference? Shall we continue to defer it and think about it or does someone want to have some kind of action?

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, I'd like to suggest that we continue to defer it until such time as we recognize that the environment is right for such a recommendation. I think we will know if and when that time arrives.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So well then we'll just leave it at that. Any other questions about the staff director's report on the SAC Chair

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

So I sent over a copy of the questions, since this was

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

something that they were going to make a public announcement about so that they could see we were not asking these people for their membership lists.

thing vou must The other commissioners is that every time the Commission has a hearing on a topic which is very hot in a particular environment, this has been true throughout the history of the Commission, there may be heightened tensions around the activities of commissioners. There has been some concern expressed, police department in Miami, as a result of certain representations that have been made about the Commission coming down there.

This is not unusual. It has happened in the past whenever the Commission has had a hearing and it's a hot subject and people are concerned about it. It's not anything to be -- we should just be very sensitive in terms of how we conduct ourselves, what we do, how aware we are of where we are and what we're doing. I just call that to your attention.

You have a briefing book. We could either go through it or you could ask questions about it or what is your wish. How would you like to proceed?

Yes, Commissioner Horner.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, I don't know how the commissioners will want to proceed, so

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

I'm not addressing that question. However, I would like to address the question of whether it is the case that subpoenas are not requesting names of members of organizations.

The reason I ask that question is that the subpoenas demand any document, including computer generated printouts. Now that's rather comprehensive. Any document, including computer generated printouts may include therefore any document which is a computer generated printout of names of lists of members of organizations.

I am also extremely concerned that the subpoenas request draft proposals by individuals. I am not sure why it is that an individual's draft proposal is any business of this Commission. I would assume that what we want are public documents which are part of the public discussion. I would like to hear -- I don't know what the remedy is for what I think is an improperly worded subpoena, if our intention is to exclude any membership lists in the request.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where is this improperly worded subpoena that you are referring to?

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Exhibit A, Subpoena

Duces Tecum, nos. -- I can tell you it appears on

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okav. I just wanted

1	to find it so I can read it.
2	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I can get the
3	briefing book.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because I have the
5	subpoena that I was asked about by the press, and it
6	doesn't say anything like that. If it's in your
7	briefing book, it may be a planned so if I could
8	know which
9	MS. MOORE: Robert Ross.
10	COMMISSIONER HORNER: How do you spell
11	that last name?
12	MS. MOORE: R-O-S-S.
13	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
15	MS. MOORE: If I may, you must read
16	further to understand the nature of the document that
17	is being requested. It is not requesting any computer
18	generated printout. It goes on to say regarding the
19	cost or other impact, economic or non-economic of
20	immigration to the United States, Florida, or to
21	cities or counties of Florida. So it's not requesting
22	anything with respect to membership lists.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The sentence by
24	itself. Why don't you bring it around and let me read
25	it.

whether we should ask for drafts, that's a separate But I first want to lay to rest this . allegation that the Commission is asking people for

I am glad to hear that and I would like to move to the question of the appropriateness, propriety of asking for such broad documentation, including draft proposals. understand how it could be the business of the Federal Government, unless there is a criminal action under

NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

7

21

22

23

24

1	consideration, to ask anybody for any draft proposal.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And Commissioner
3	Horner, the sentence that I have just read does not
4	state what you have said it stated. I will read it
5	again.
6	"Any document including, but not limited
7	to, reports, studies, memoranda, policy statements,
8	press releases, computer generated printouts and any
9	other writings containing a list of any and all data
LO	upon which the Florida 187 Committee has relied in
L1	drafting its proposed measure initiative bill, a
L2	constitutional amendment."
L3	All the thing asks for is this is a public
L4	initiative bill or constitutional amendment. It's not
L5	a private bill. It is asking not for a draft of any
L6	writings. It is asking for data which was used to
L7	produce the draft. That's all it's asking for.
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madam Chair, the
19	language I am reading, number one, asks for "copies of
20	all other drafts or variations thereto, prepared by or
21	on behalf of", presumably by someone else not named,
22	of the Florida 187 Committee.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where are you reading?
24	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I am reading from
25	Exhibit A.

MISSIONER HORNER: Number one. It
drafts.
RPERSON BERRY: Yes. That is of the
ent.
MISSIONER HORNER: No. It says
MISSIONER GEORGE: Yes. It's of the
ent, I think.
MISSIONER HORNER: Drafts, yes, drafts.
re to sit here today and speculate to
ld I like to propose and to write out
rafts in my hand, and subsequently
/+ think I want to do that a dwaft of
't think I want to do that, a draft of
be subject to subpoena here.
be subject to subpoena here.
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling.
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling. MOORE: If I may respond briefly,
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling. MOORE: If I may respond briefly, ener. All witnesses are advised, as is
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling. MOORE: If I may respond briefly, mer. All witnesses are advised, as is tice, that they may bring along with
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling. MOORE: If I may respond briefly, mer. All witnesses are advised, as is tice, that they may bring along with ring, counsel to object to any of the
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling. MOORE: If I may respond briefly, mer. All witnesses are advised, as is tice, that they may bring along with ring, counsel to object to any of the ies.
be subject to subpoena here. I think it is considerably chilling. MOORE: If I may respond briefly, mer. All witnesses are advised, as is tice, that they may bring along with ring, counsel to object to any of the ies. MISSIONER HORNER: Do they hire a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	give you rough drafts, I don't think we should
2	subpoena rough drafts. Surely we leave it open to
3	individuals to provide information for the record,
4	should they choose.
5	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I.
6	suppose that's a matter of policy perhaps for us to
7	decide. But legally speaking and in terms of
8	discovery, the absolutely most routine matter in the
9	world.
10	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm sorry. I
11	couldn't hear what you said.
12	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: It's the most routine
13	matter in the world to ask for drafts, to ask for
14	notes, to ask for all that that was evolved in the
15	final product. So at least in terms of what is
16	normally done in court, it is absolutely routine.
17	COMMISSIONER HORNER: This is not a court.
18	This is a Federal agency.
19	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: No, no. I
20	understand. But in here I think we have some of the
21	same concern. How did they finally end up with this
22	certain wording, and an analysis of the discussions of
23	how they ended up with that certain notion that that
24	was a good public policy for the State of Florida, I
25	should think would be perfectly routine.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: I am with the ACLU

on this I quess.

ACLU has objected to what we're doing? I talked to them last night. They were told that we were doing all sorts of things that we are not in fact doing, including the most serious one that they were concerned about is that we were asking for people's membership lists.

They said how dare you ask them to list their members. I said, "Who told you that? I'll send you a copy of the doggone subpoena." The Commission would never do that.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Was the allegation made that they were never asked for lists or that they were never asked in the subpoena for lists?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The allegation was that we had subpoenaed the membership lists of all of these organizations that are against immigration, because the Commission is on a hatchet mission to go to Florida to kill the anti-immigration movement, which is the ludicrous thing I've ever heard in my life. That we were a bunch of liberal Democrats who were coming down to Florida to kill.

I said, do you know who is on the Civil

1	Rights Commission?
2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Were they talking
3	about the commissioners or staff?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I said, Commissioner
5	Horner, that leading liberal, Commissioner Anderson,
6	Commissioner George.
7	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Madame Chair?
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, it is
9	not these commissioners who have determined who
10	have, you know, decided on the contents of this
11	subpoena. And therefore, it is entirely appropriate
12	to speculate that the subpoena was not generated by
1,3	four Republicans and Independents.
14	(Laughter.)
15	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Madame Chair?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
17	Fletcher?
18	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I think the record
19	will show that the transcriber is there, right?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
21	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I think the record
22	pretty well shows where the Commission stands now.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay.
24	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Both you and
25	Connie are on the record, and I think that's what is
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

And so, I mean, I would be surprised to hear that. At the same time, and I want to be careful what I say, somebody who was very sensitive and perhaps not an attorney or not versed in civil rights law, I think could read paragraphs one, four and seven — or perhaps three as well — and with a very broad

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

23

24

interpretation of those paragraphs, but I think a very broad, maybe careless interpretation, or a paranoid interpretation, or a layman's interpretation could result in that. So, I can see how that might be a question of do we have to produce these computer — because I think if you look at — you know, you look at number seven, it's a computer printed — generated print out and all data upon which the Florida 187 Committee has relied in drafting its proposed measure.

You could say that part of the data was a determination of the strength of the movement, which in some way could be measured by the membership list of the committee sponsoring the amendment. Now, that's stretching, but I think with that kind of stretching you can raise the question of are we demanding membership lists, or should that be included.

But I would not think that the Chair of this Commission would knowingly sign a subpoena that said that political organizations would have to provide membership lists. At the same time, I must say that having looked at this subpoena, I would be

NEAL R. GROSS

· 7

out.

very concerned that a political organization -- and I use the word broadly in terms of public policy -- a committee that's going to propose an amendment to a state constitution or other kind of referendum or

drafts of their proposal.

I can see that that -- I mean, that kind of work product would be very sensitive. I mean, I've been involved in initiative campaigns, and I'm sure others of us have, and where you would like to have the previous drafts with whatever penciled out or whatever put in and whatever's -- whoever's initials on the penciled drafts -- what goes in and what goes

initiative would be required to submit copies of

You know, that's highly sensitive, and I think we ought to think long and hard before we ask a political organization to furnish that kind of information to a government agency. And the same thing is -- you know, what kind of considerations are causing you to take a particular position or does this include advertising strategy behind memoranda on advertising or polling or --

So, I mean, I'm troubled by the subpoena, and I can see how in good faith we would want to have some of these things. But I can also understand how

referring to	re	fe	rr	ing	to
--------------	----	----	----	-----	----

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so, the -- I talked to the people at the ACLU and told them that the Commission was not asking for any membership list. I didn't know whether this reporter's statements were accurate. I mean. maybe nobody said that at the ACLU. And they said yes, they had been alerted that the Commission was subpoenaing membership lists, and that they would of course be very concerned about that.

But they knew that I knew better than that, and so they were puzzled as to why I would do such a thing. But they simply told the complainant that they would explore it, and they didn't make any kind of statement that they were going to do anything to us, and that they would explore it.

I shared with them a copy of the subpoena to the person who they identified as complaining, and then they agreed that it didn't ask for the membership lists, and we did not discuss any of these other But they said -- or matters -- but they said that they would get back to me if they had any other concerns. And that was the end of this conversation.

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: And how long ago was that conversation?

> CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That was last night.

	1
1	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Last night?
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: About 8:00 last night.
3	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: So you do expect
4	them to get back to you?
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If they have any
6	concerns. I haven't heard any yet. I've been
7	available. I gave them my number at home, and I've
8	been there, except for going out to run before I came
9	here today. And so I haven't heard from them yet.
10	And if I do hear from them, I'll try to address
11	whatever their concerns are.
12	But they weren't they said they didn't
13	you know, they thought we were asking for
14	membership lists, and they knew also that the
15	Commission statute precludes us from asking for
16	membership lists, so they didn't understand why we
17	were doing it or whether we were.
18	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: So is it fair to
19	assume that they will be at the hearing monitoring us?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I would assume that
21	somebody will come. I'm sure a lot of people will be
22	there monitoring us. The unfortunate thing is that
23	commissioners know that we planned to have this
24	hearing a long time ago before these people started
25	talking about proposition whatever it is. But

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Department, is that not right?

I would say that as far as I'm concerned, matters of public record and public documents are certainly fair game. But I just wonder how much -- what kind of documents of a more confidential nature really we should be looking at.

And we might come out differently on that question applied to those organizations at that earlier time than we would on this given, you know, the circumstances and the potential for violence and the history of violence, etc., etc.

I mean, it would be one concern for me. But again, here I'm very troubled by the fact that we're looking at a committee that's getting ready to have a political campaign in a state which, regardless of how we feel about the issues, I mean, is not something that goes back to the kind of violence that we saw in the 60's in those states, but is something entirely different.

And I must say that I'm very troubled by it. I don't know how to say it any differently, but I think it raises a real First Amendment issue in a number of ways.

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I'm going back

13

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into my historical file right now. What did the courts do when -- I think it was in Alabama where I am now -- when the -- there was a petition for all the membership of the NAACP down here -- didn't that happen?

Right, CHAIRPERSON BERRY: we were discussing that earlier, and we were saying that the court decision of course was you cannot ask for membership lists of these organizations. And we have a provision in our statute which says that when we're making investigations, we cannot ask for membership And the allegation made to the ACLU was that lists. we were violating that condition of the statute and the court decision and civil liberties in general by asking for a membership list.

That was the allegation that this group or somebody apparently made.

COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Yeah, I just wanted to make sure the record shows that we were -we are aware, at least you and the Council are aware, that at one time, the NAACP and the Urban League and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference -- an effort was made to get their membership, and the court said no, no, no.

> CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.

But I am concerned that this kind of a subpoena is over broad in that it requires or demands the production of internal materials by people who are organizing politically. If I believed, or if we had reason to believe, or if it's being put to us that the Florida 187 committee has organized itself to deprive citizens of Florida or people in Florida of their civil rights, then I might, out of a concern to ensure that civil rights laws are enforced, be willing to go with something this broad.

But I don't think that's the allegation that's being made against these people. In fact, I'm not sure again, although I would not support their initiative, that it would be fair to call them antiimmigration. It probably includes plenty of people

> NEAL R. GROSS **COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes,

I just don't know, because I haven't read Florida -- Proposition 187. But I don't have any reason at all to think that it's an organization that's organized to deprive people of their civil rights. And therefore, I think we should considerably more circumspect in our demands of them. I'm perfectly happy to demand a copy of their initiative, copies of press releases, other public documents, but I don't think we should ask for their internal memoranda and stuff that's related to their internal strategizing and considerations of politics.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

COMMISSIONER REYNOSO: I'm sorry. Madame Chair, I agree that we ought to be sensitive in subpoenaing internal memoranda of any organization. I can't run a judgement on this subpoena, because it's indicated by the staff very often the subpoena follows a discussion where the person might have already provided all this. But it's our practice,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

stop

But I must say that with respect to 187 in California and perhaps in Florida, it's not just what the initiative said. The initiative said, among other things, that undocumented would no longer be entitled to welfare. Well, they were never entitled to welfare. It was an absolutely — in my point of view, an absolutely false premise and false statement, and the campaign run on falsehoods.

And in California, the Latino community interpreted this as an anti-Latino initiative, not just an anti-undocumented initiative. And that created tensions and continues to create tensions to this day. And I'm sure that it will not change. The proponents of the initiative, including the Governor, have been considered enemies of the Latino people in California.

And if that's the perception, right or wrong, that's going to create tensions in California; and I'm sure the same thing is happening in Florida.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I would assume though that your comments -- those of you who commented on the subpoenas -- that your comments are not limited to the Proposition 187 organization, but that you feel that the subpoenas which were also

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

22

23

24

25

this as being a fishing expedition or a persecution or oppressive whether our intentions are good or not.

And they can't simply, I think, look at the makeup of the Commission and see that it's divided between liberals and conservatives unless we had confidence that divisions within the staff politically reflected that same breakdown. I frankly doubt that they do. So you know, I think we should just be more circumspect.

I'm not saying we shouldn't ask for materials, just a little narrower.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, who wants to say

something?

COMMISSIONER HORNER: If we -- if the subpoenas are all consistent in their language and all internal documents and preliminary asking for proposals, then it strikes me that it's disingenuous to a assert that they -- that these demands for such materials are pursuant to conversations with individual witnesses. Either they're all consistent or they're tailored to each witness. But they can't be both unless it happens to be the case that every witnesses volunteered of one preliminary and draft materials.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no, no, that is not what I said. Now let me make clear what I said. The organizations on the other side -- political organizations is what I was referring to, not every witness -- and there is an organization that Mr. Soto, I think is the witness, which was against one of these measures concerning -- or supporting

And his subpoena reads almost like the one for this organization that we're discussing. And I could ask Deputy General Counsel -- was his subpoena also based on discussions with him?

immigrants in one of these measures.

MS. MOORE: Well, yes; it was.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.

MS. MOORE: And it is possible for both situations to exist. Based on our interviews, the actual language of the inquiry if virtually identical. If witness A offered to give drafts, then the language asking for the draft is identical to witness B, who also volunteered to give drafts. But each inquiry to those particular witnesses may be very different based on what they're doing and what we're interested in.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: I haven't had a chance to look at these press reports yet, but it strikes me as odd that someone would volunteer to give

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Let me --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

This issue will undoubtedly come up again, or even form a subcommittee on which I would hope that the Vice Chair would serve to look at -- seriously consider the question forward the come Commission with some sort of a proposal.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

20

22

Likewise, if there's some members on the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

so.

1	Hill who are concerned, and there's probably going to
2	get some now get some phone calls make sure that
3	that transcript is available to them and we've got it
4	down in Florida so it's very clear that we ask for
5	nobody's membership.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, we'll do
7	that.
8	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: All right.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is there anything to
.10	vote on here before Commissioner Fletcher leaves? I
11	don't see anything to vote on.
12	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Don't know yet.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to get the
14	memorandum from the staff.
15	COMMISSIONER REYNOSO: Good luck with
16	those 12,000 people.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good luck with the
18	12,000, yes.
19	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: I've been doing
20	pretty good, crew.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: There's 50,000 of
23	them down here.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are they primitive
25	Baptists or are they missionary Baptists?

1	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: There's 50,000 of
2	them down here, but they could only get 12,000 in the
3	arena to hear me, so I've got to preach a real good
4	sermon.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I see. Okay, well
6	thank you very much.
7	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: Sermon on
8	affirmative action.
9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think I have a
ro	motion on the table with
11	COMMISSIONER FLETCHER: All right.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So since it's on the
13	table, I will withdraw that motion and simply satisfy
14	myself with putting on the record that I believe that
15	there are genuine civil liberties concerns that have
16	been raised by the scope of the subpoena.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we'll get a memo
18	on the subpoena issue.
19	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
21	· Anderson?
22	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I suspect, having
23	read one of the press accounts in a Florida paper,
24	there's two related issues here. One is, if we're
25	requiring the production of many documents from an

organization, we may not be getting a printed out membership list, but we may be getting documents which reveal the names of many members, some of whom have provided analysis, comments, views, in the expectation that their comments would be confidential.

I think one of the leaders of one of these organizations, and I'm not sure who, indicated that organizers and supporters of 187 in California had received many death threats. Now, I'm sure there's some on the other side that may have received death threats as well. But the point is, this is somewhat serious.

And I don't think that we should necessarily walk into this hearing next week with the idea that sometime in the future we are going to have an academic or calm discussion of our subpoena procedures. I mean, the real possibility exists that — unless we've heard to the contrary already — that one or two of these organizations are going to walk in and say you're going to get these five or six documents and you're not going to get the rest.

And we're going to be confronted with an issue of whether we're going to enforce the subpoena or not. And so, I think that we would be well advised to get whatever memoranda of analysis we're going to

Because you know, we've had this before in one of the -- I think when we went to Los Angeles there was a question of whether somebody was comply with the subpoena in terms of documents or appearance, and we had to make a decision as to what we were going to do to respond to that. And so I think we ought to have a heads up on the fact that that's a possibility, it seems to me.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me try to reassure commissioners by saying that first of all, it is my interpretation of the statute that we would not accept anything and will announce to the witnesses that we would not accept anything from them that would make it possible for us to reconstruct any number of their members that would in any way indirectly or directly violate the statutory admonition that we should not get membership lists.

so I would not want them to give us anything that would make that possible. Also, we might -- we sent a confidentiality statement to witnesses in New York who were concerned about documents. They were very quiet about it and didn't

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We can accept anything

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4	1
1	we want.
2	COMMISSIONER HORNER: For instance, I
3	still strongly oppose the solicitation or acceptance
4	of proposals and so on. Would we assume that names
5	would be blotted out from those documents?
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We don't want the
7	names. We're not interested in the names.
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: In other words, if
9	a memo says to so and so from so and so?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We don't care about
11	the so and so.
12	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Can the witnesses be
13	instructed prior to their submitting this in a timely
14	fashion so that they can blot those names out?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we in the fax
16	that I'm proposing that the staff send to them as they
17	did in the New York case, they could simply say to
18	them we don't want submissions that make it possible
19	for us to identify the persons who are members or who
20	of the organization. That's not our intent, that's
21	not what we want to do, we're not interested in that.
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Now what is our
23	intent? Suppose some
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You mean
25	COMMISSIONER HORNER: member would send
11	

to read them to the press or give them to anybody. It's so that when we write a report, rather than having as we've had in the past practically nothing to write a report from, we will have materials and documents without having to go back somewhere and get something from somebody to be able to write reports.

The intent is not to -- nobody intends to get up and say well you submitted this or somebody thought that, and nobody wants any identification. We're not an enforcement agency at all.

enforcing, or if we were in some sort of tort litigation or something, then I could see trying to go into work product in the way that's being proposed. But it's precisely because we're not, it seems to me, that we should ask for the group — from the group what its public positions are, what it has put out publicly.

I wouldn't object to asking a person who's testifying before us why that's the public position and for an explanation. But I'm very uneasy about internal communication between people who are operating politically between — reflecting the cogitations and strategizing of people who have organized themselves politically.

people might be concerned if they thought so, and we ought to be sensitive to that, yes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

24

-- I mean, I don't think it should be a concern.

of preliminary proposals, internal documents, -- in other words, non-publicly -- documents which are not yet public, that we will decline from enforcing the subpoena for those documents.

I think if we did that, we would reassure potential witnesses about our good faith. Entirely diffuse what I speculate what might be a severe attack upon the undertaking. And nonetheless, permit those witnesses who sincerely wish to voluntarily provide documents to do so. No one will stop them from mailing us documents.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair?

COMMISSIONER REYNOSO: Madame Chair, the request has been made that we state that as a matter of policy. Since that is not our policy, it seems to be an improper statement to make at this time until we reconsider the policy.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we cannot do it at any time because the Commission has the power and the authority and the responsibility to very often subpoena documents which have not yet been made public. We have subpoenaed documents from the White House that were not made public and that the White House did not want to make available to us.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: That's a government

agency.	not	а	private	
udciic y ,	1100	•		

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we've subpoenaed all kinds of documents from all sorts of places. We've subpoenaed documents from the Wall Street firms that they didn't want to give to us that were not public documents.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, they are publicly incorporated.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But we cannot make a blanket statement that the Commission will not subpoen documents which have not been made public until we think through what we mean by that and how far that goes. And I don't think we can do it at this meeting, and I also want to reiterate the whole purpose of this exercise at the hearing is fact finding.

Fact finding requires that you find facts and that you find more than superficial statements that people would like to make about a subject. And on the question of immigration, we're interested in why people take the positions they take. And we're not interested in them as individuals or trying to defame them or trying to hold them up to a program, and we don't even care what their names are.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Ask them why they

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

1	There weren't any I don't see any defaming. There
2	were no I mean,
3	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Right, and nor did
4	we ask
5	COMMISSIONER WANG: But we disagreed,
6	right? We have a disagreement, but that disagreement
7	reflects our different views and different beliefs.
8	So that I mean, in no way I think discourage him
9	from continuing doing what he believe he want to do.
10	And he continue to move forward in his belief of what
11	is the best for the state of California.
12	COMMISSIONER HORNER: And we should do
13	exactly that.
14	COMMISSIONER WANG: Yeah, so that's why I
15	don't think your concern is a I mean, a necessary
16	one. Because here, again, from this finding fact
17	finding, in my memory of sitting on the Commission, we
18	have never, in any shape or form, discouraged or kind
19	of tried to change anyone's opinion. We agree that we
20	disagree. That's the best we can describe.
21	And the group, after testifying after
22	giving up their view, would not change their view
23	because they come to the Civil Rights Commission
24	hearing and all the sudden going back and they're
25	going to be a different organization. They still will

do whatever they believe in, continue to do what they're doing.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Would you like a private letter to a friend to be subpoenaed by the United States --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think that just because it's -- I mean, I know if Commissioner Fletcher were on, he'd tell me to be quiet. But for the record, because we are going to give this transcript to people, I want to point out that there is nothing in this subpoena that says anything about anything that isn't done officially by the committee.

It says drafts or other variations thereto prepared by or on behalf of the Florida 187 committee. It does not say by individuals who are involved in the Florida committee or somebody who may be a member, or somebody who has some unauthorized piece of paper that they throw on the table, and that we want you to sweep all this up and give it to us.

It says by or on behalf of the committee, and those are terms of art. And if it's not by the committee, and if it's not on behalf of the committee, nobody's asking for it. And that is clear from the subpoena. Yes?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, that might

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	depend if I can just question a little further
2	about it maybe that allays my concerns all
3	together. Now, does by the committee mean having been
4	approved by the committee?
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, by the committee.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So that if you have
7	an internal document that goes from one officer to
8	another officer recommending a strategy or a change,
9	that would not be included?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No.
11	Perhaps one that is not by the committee. It says
12	"drafts or other variations thereto prepared by or on
13	behalf of the committee." That's what it says, a
14	draft. Counsel has pointed that out to me again, but
15	that's what it says.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I know. Hang on.
17	No. I think this might be very helpful. The "by the
18	committee" thing means things that have been
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: By the committee.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: by the committee,
21	approved by the committee. In other words
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Prepared by the
23	committee.
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Prepared by the
25	committee.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Or on behalf of the
2	committee.
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: All right. That
4	means an internal document from, just so I can be very-
5	clear
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: From Joe to John.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Joe to John,
8	saying "We've got a lot of strength in the Northern
9	Panhandle."
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nobody cares about
11	that.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. That's not
13	being discovered here.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We don't care about
15	that.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So the only drafts,
17	it seems
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are by and on behalf
19	of the committee.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The committee. And,
21	reading it again here, they would be drafts of the
22	initiative itself.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Initiative bill or
24	constitutional amendment.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. Not drafts of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	memoranda.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No. It doesn't even
3	say that.
4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: What is a proposal?
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Counsel just pointed
6	that out to me that it doesn't say that.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: It all depends on
8	how broadly you interpret the term "by." And if we
9	interpret it strictly as you're interpreting it, then
10	my concerns are largely allayed, I think.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's the intent.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Now, I wonder if
13	that's not clear to these people.
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Perhaps one question
15	would clarify it. A proposed regulation produced by
16	the committee
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where are you looking?
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm looking at
19	Number 3 under Exhibit A. Any document
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Has to be produced by
21	or on behalf of the committee.
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: So someone who
23	the committee obviously is a group of individuals. I
24	don't know how many people are in this.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't know either.

1	COMMISSIONER HORNER: It might be 1,000.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't know.
3	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Because we don't
4	know what their structure is. We don't know whether
5	it's a formal or informal structure.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
7	COMMISSIONER HORNER: And, therefore, it
8	may be you've got someone puts forward a proposal and
9	mails it in to the committee and says, "I'm producing
LΟ	this on behalf of the committee" and it's a proposed
L1	regulation. And the committee then accepts that, "the
12	committee" being perhaps the three people in an office
13	that day or the secretary or the chairman,
14	self-designated or other, accepts it. Well, I'm just
15	asking: What is
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner,
17	the committee knows itself what its structure is and
18	what its approval processes are. And it knows when
19	something is by it or on behalf of it, which is all
20	we're asking them to produce.
21	COMMISSIONER HORNER: How can a proposed
22	regulation be a regulation of the committee if it is
23	only proposed and has not been approved by the
24	committee? So I think we are asking for preliminary
25	and later rejected ideas.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No. These are those
2	that are proposed by the committee.
3	COMMISSIONER HORNER: To the public.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Not proposed within
6	the committee to itself.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right.
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: So we are not
10	looking for any documents that do what Cruz suggested
11	earlier, reveal internal thinking, but not public
12	position.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: These may reveal
14	internal thinking.
15	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, they're also
16	public if they're approved.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No, no. If the
18	committee sets up, general committee, sets up a
19	subcommittee to draft something, it seems to me that
20	this subpoena would include that original draft, even
21	though the general committee might not accept it and
22	make some changes before they finally present it if
23	they have the same procedure in Florida as we do in
24	California to say the attorney general.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: That's very chilling

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	of honest political deliberation.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But they know what
3	their proposals they know what their "by or on
4	behalf of the committee" is. And that's what they
5	will give us. And if they don't give it to us, then
6	it's not by and on behalf of the committee. We
7	certainly aren't going to go out there and try to find
8	out whether it is or not.
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Three people in a
10	living room. Write it down and propose it.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It depends on what the
12	committee structure calls "by or on behalf of the
13	committee." That's up to them. And each committee
14	may have a different structure.
15	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, this is not a
16	policy. It would apply to any organization we wanted
17	to interrogate.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?
19	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm hesitating to
20	prolong this, but if you look at the paragraph
21	numbered 7, it seems to me that it goes beyond that.
22	But maybe it's my reading of it.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, Paragraph Number
24	7 says clearly "of any writings upon which the
25	committee has relied in drafting its proposed measure,

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, you're speaking in favor of clarity of the subpoena. Nobody would argue against that.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Director.
2	I don't know. Should I
3	commissioners about whether Mary, I need
ا؛	commissioners whether you are interested
5	police protection during the hearing.
5	suggested by the police department down the
7	may want to consider it. And I leave that
3	discretion as to whether you wish or not:
ı	1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ι don't know. Should I ask the ssioners about whether -- Mary, I need to ask the ssioners whether you are interested in having e protection during the hearing. It has been sted by the police department down there that you ant to consider it. And I leave that up to your

COMMISSIONER HORNER: What have they told you or the staff about that? Why have they said anything?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, part of it is in the nature of security that one should not discuss in an open meeting just because I'm told that you're not supposed to discuss the details, just that they have some reasons for concern and wondered if we were interested in protection, just because the issue is --

COMMISSIONER WANG: Madam Chair, do we usually have marshals? We always have marshals; right?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We have marshals, but they're saying, in addition to that, do commissioners

> COMMISSIONER WANG: I see.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- feel the need,

74	staff. Yes?
2	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are we going to be
3	discussing police conduct at this meeting?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's a good
-5	question. My own view is I'll just take my chances.
e	We can revisit that, but you can think about it and
7	decide if you want to. It's available for anybody
8	that wants it.
9	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I
۲d	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes?
L1	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are they talking
12	individually or are they talking
L3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Individually.
L4	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: in the
۱5	meetings?
Le	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Individual.
ا7	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, maybe and
.8	I hate to prolong this meeting, but it might be worth
.9	at the end of it to go into executive session for a
0	few minutes and discuss it.
	GUATERERON DEPREN

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we do that.

Okay. Why don't we do the SAC? And then we'll have

-- oh, we've got Commissioner's Horner's issues.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The State Advisory

Committee appointments for Arkansas, Delaware,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

22

23

24

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Take note of that,
2	Staff Director.
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. With those
5	comments, all in favor say aye.
6	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "Ayes.")
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed.
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now the
10	Illinois. We'll take them one by one, the ones that
11	are left. Illinois, Commissioner George?
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes. Thank you,
13	Madam Chair.
14	Illinois, the two members have been
15	separated. I couldn't find the reason for the
16	separation. It said "Our policy is now," and it's
17	fallen in most of these cases to give the reason for
18	the separation. It's possible that I just couldn't
19	find it, staring right at it.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Let's see if I
21	can find this one.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that policy to give
23	the reason for separation or was it the policy that if
24	the person didn't want to be separated they could
25	anneal?

1	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I thought it was
2	both. No, it's not?
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Policy is that the
4	person can, if they do not want to be removed they can
.5	appeal to the Commission to ask to be retained.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I'm sure that's
7	true, the second half is true, but I think that our
8	policy was to give a statement of the reasons for the
9	separation. And some of these do give statements of
10	the reasons.
11	Could we have the Staff Director ask Carol
12	Lee?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that true?
14	. STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madam
15	Chairperson?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't mind being
17	wrong.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: There is a little
19	
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: It happens so
21	rarely, huh?
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, once 1,000
23	years.
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: There's an
25	annotation that is typically put on one of these
	NEAL P. CDOCC

4	summary sheets when individual members previously with
2	the SAC have withdrawn and it was inadvertently not on
3	this. But the answer to your question is that one of
4	these members moved to another state and, therefore,
5	was not eligible to continue. And the other member
6	did not want to be reappointed.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes. Well, my
8	experience was that we have been told that pursuant to
9	some good. So we can just record those two.
10	On the North Dakota?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go right ahead.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Six members have
13	been separated. I think it's probably the same
14	oversight.
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: This is North
16	Dakota?
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: North Dakota. Does
19	anybody know anything about North Dakota?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And what was the third
22	one?
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The third was
24	Oklahoma. That's a different issue.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. North Dakota
	NEW B OBOOK

SAC has been appointed, in this case with 11 members,

뷔	during the period of the 2-year appointment process a
2	member or two will withdraw or resign. And that's
3	what happened in this case.
4	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. Further on
5	Oklahoma, I think to meet the partisan balance on the
6	committee, we need to appoint another Republican or
7	Independent.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm not looking at
9	that. I'm looking someplace else. Okay.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: What is their
11	requirement on that type of balance?
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think it's the
13	same as for us as the Commission, no more than half,
14	50 percent, as members. No? Am I wrong? Is that
15	right?
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: No, it's not that
17	strict.
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Oh, sorry Then I
19	withdraw.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: They don't have
21	the same rules.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What was the one about
25	North Dakota? Two members didn't want reappointment.
- 1	

1	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: And where was it?
4	I believe you. I just don't
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where does it say
4	that?
.5	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Towards the end.
đ	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Personnel actions.
4	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: On the memo, but
8	towards the end of the memo. What's the section?
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: "Personnel Actions
10	Requested."
1	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: "Personnel
12	Actions Requested."
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. I'm looking
14	in the wrong place.
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: It's before the
1	Chairperson.
1	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: V.
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could somebody show it
20	to Commissioner George?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. It's Page
22	2 of the report at V.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Oh, okay. I see.
24	I think it has been our practice, whether or not I was
25	right about its being a required practice, to follow

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes. Madam Chair, for those who don't live in the Washington area -- I don't know whether we still have Russ and Art. I guess Russ and Art are both off the phone. Recently a decision was made by the Montgomery County Board of Education to deny access to a French language immersion program to two elementary school students.

The two students were denied access explicitly because each of them had one Asian parent and one Caucasian parent. Because each had one Asian parent, they were viewed as valuable to the or necessary to the provision of a sufficient number of Asian origin students in their home base school. And, therefore, although they otherwise would have been reportedly admitted to this program, they were not.

This was raised to the level of the board of education, which affirmed the earlier decision.

That strikes me as being a quota. And I know the Commission is on record as being against quotas. Therefore, I would like to ask for the Commission to agree to ask staff to prepare a letter to the Montgomery County Board of Education saying that this is unfair to these two young girls just because one of their parents is of Asian origins.

It's not a big matter. It's going on all

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1	over the country. But I think we can take a stand.
2	· CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. Madam
4	Chair, I wonder if we might ask for a staff report on
5	that because I know in
6	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Sure, absolutely.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: San
8	Francisco we have had some of the same debates.
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I agree.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: And then it
11	. turns out that it's
12	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Actually
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: actually a
14	different sort of issue. So I'd just like to I'd
15	feel more comfortable having a staff report.
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I absolutely agree
17	with you and would do the same if I weren't closer to
18	this.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well, let's ask
20	the staff to give us a memo on it so that we can
21	consider it for a vote next time or see what we do for
22	it, see if there's a motion.
23	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have any
25	other future agenda items or anything else that you
- 1	

to have the Solicitor tell us that it's okay to into executive session here for a few minutes. can't leave yet, Commissioner George. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	to discuss at this time?
to have the Solicitor tell us that it's okay to into executive session here for a few minutes. can't leave yet, Commissioner George. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	(No response.)
into executive session here for a few minutes. can't leave yet, Commissioner George. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If not, then we need
can't leave yet, Commissioner George. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter reces from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and w back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	Solicitor tell us that it's okay to go
COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter reces from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and w back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	ive session here for a few minutes. You
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter reces from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and w back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	yet, Commissioner George.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whate you'd like. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want to
COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter reces from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and w back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	
11 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want 12 do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish 14 go into executive session in order to discuss 15 sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is 16 personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. 18 reconvene in executive session and w 19 back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on 24 record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do whatever
do that? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Why would I want to
go into executive session in order to discuss sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	
sensitive matter, personnel matter. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Solicitor, we wish to
COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session and 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	ecutive session in order to discuss a
personnel matter in a sense. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter recess from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	atter, personnel matter.
(Whereupon, the foregoing matter recession open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, it is a
from open session at 1:10 p.m. reconvene in executive session and w back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	atter in a sense.
reconvene in executive session and we back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter recessed
back on the record in open session 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	from open session at 1:10 p.m. to
22 1:23 p.m.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	reconvene in executive session and went
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	back on the record in open session at
record. I think what we usually do is we recess.	1:23 p.m.)
	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we go back on the
that what we usually do so that if we/re at	think what we usually do is we recess. Is
- I we le de	we usually do, so that if we're at the

1	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes, you're
2	right. You're right.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let's recess this
4	meeting, then, for that purpose only. Is that clearly
5	understood? No one intends to do some thing other
6	that has anything to do with anything else. It's just
7	for purposes of hearing. Okay?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Can we
10	adjourn? All right. We'll adjourn.
11	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
12	concluded at 1:26 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	·
19	•
20	·
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
1	