#### U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

MEETING

Friday, May 10, 1996

The Commission convened in the Main Conference Room, on the Fifth Floor of 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, COMMISSIONER

ROBERT P. GEORGE, COMMISSIONER

A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM, JR., COMMISSIONER

CONSTANCE HORNER, COMMISSIONER

YVONNE Y. LEE, COMMISSIONER (via telephone)

RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH, COMMISSIONER

MARY K. MATHEWS, STAFF DIRECTOR

**LIBRARY** 

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

# **STAFF PRESENT:**

BARBARA BROOKS

KI-TAEK CHUN

JAMES S. CUNNINGHAM

PAMELA A. DUNSTON

VERONIQUE PLUVIOSE-FENTON

GERRY M. HALL

GEORGE M. HARBISON

CAROL-LEE HURLEY

JACQUELINE J. JOHNSON

STEPHANIE Y. MOORE, General Counsel

CHARLES RIVERA

MIGUEL SAPP, Parliamentarian

ANTHONY K. WELLS, SR.

AUDREY WRIGHT

# **COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:**

ADERSON FRANCOIS

DEEANA JANG

CHARLOTTE PONTICELLI

WILLIAM L. SAUNDERS, JR.

KRISHNA TOOLSIE

# AGENDA

Approval of Agenda	•	•	•	•	•	•	4
Approval of Minutes of April 12, 1996	Μe	eet	ir	ıg	•	•	4
Announcements	•	•	•	•	•	•	5
Staff Director's Report	•	•	•	•	•	•	8
Letter from SAC Chair in California .	•	•	•	•	•	•	25
Commission's Subpoena Power	•	•	•	•	•	1	.04
Future Agenda Items	_		_	_		2	202

# P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2	(9:45 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The meeting is called
4	to order. The first item on the agenda is the
5	approval of the agenda. Could I have a motion or
6	COMMISSIONER HORNER: So moved.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, any discussion?
9	All in favor, indicate by saying "aye."
10	ALL: Aye.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So ordered. The next
14	item is the approval of the minutes of the April 12,
15	1996 meeting. Could I have a motion?
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: So moved.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second anybody?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion?
20	Discussion? All in favor, indicate by saying "aye."
21	ALL: Aye.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
23	(No response.)
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So ordered. The next
25	item is announcements. Staff Director, do you have
1	NEAL R. GROSS

announcements? You always have an announcement. 1 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: And I do -- I do 2 again today have some announcements. I first wanted 3 to mention that the 1996 funding measure for the 4 Commission was passed by Congress and enacted in late 5 April. 6 It included an amount of \$8.75 million for 7 the Commission on Civil Rights for this fiscal year. 8 9 The next funding issue I want to indicate is the Fiscal 1997 appropriation request. We have 10 just delivered to the Appropriations Committees the 11 Commission's appropriation request package 12 materials, which is following up on Commission 13 decisions made at the last Commission meeting. 14 15 And we'll have copies. This was just prepared, so we'll have copies mailed to each 16 17 Commissioner next week, early next week. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: May I know the 18 amount? 19 20 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Well, this was the amount that we announced one or two Commission 21 22 meetings ago: \$11.4 million. 23 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Eleven-four? 24 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes. This is the result of the request we made last fall to the OMB and 25

Τ	the pass-back from the Administration. And the amount
2	that was included, it's the same amount included in
3	the President's budget book, which was submitted to
4	the Hill, I believe, about a month ago.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you finished
6	Commissioner Redenbaugh?
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You're just pondering?
9	
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. I was just
11	trying to add up all the zeros, as unaccustomed as I
12	am to large sums.
13	(Laughter.)
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner?
15	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Mary answered my
16	question.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh.
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I wanted to know
19	whether the Administration had sought the same amount.
20	And it had.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. All right,
22	any other announcements, Staff Director?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: I only have one
24	other, Madame Chairperson. The Administration has
25	indicated their support for the Commission's

1	reauthorization.
2	And our reauthorization bill package will
3	be forwarded to the Hill next week.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So they're not
5	opposed to our reauthorization?
6	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
8	Horner?
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, have
10	we seen this package, we, the Commissioners?
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: This is the
12	package the Commissioners I'm sorry, if I could
13	respond, Madame Chair?
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead.
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: This is the
16	package that the Commissioners voted on at an earlier
17	meeting and agreed to:
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay. And as I
19	recall, it didn't make any changes or something, I
20	don't remember exactly. That was a long time ago.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right. Do
22	you have any other announcements? That's it?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Right.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does any Commissioner
25	have any announcements about anything more?

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Then we'll go
3	to the Staff Director's report. One of the things we
4	need to do under the Staff Director's report is to
5	come up with a date for the hearing in Los Angeles.
6	At the last meeting, we voted to have
7	Commissioner Anderson and Commissioner I mean, Vice
8	Chair Reynoso be the two Commissioners on a bipartisan
9	basis who would conduct the hearing.
10	So, I guess it means that it has to be
11	done on a day when Commissioner Anderson and
12	Commissioner and Vice Chair Cruz Reynoso can do it.
13	I mean, that's essential.
14	And then if anybody else wants to go, then
15	that's fine. But the whole idea of a mini-hearing is
16	how many people have to show up. And we only need two
17	Commissioners if they're each from different parties.
18	And the date that the Staff Director just
19	handed me that's been suggested, because of some
20	calendar, something I don't know about, is August 22nd
21	and 23rd.
22	So, I guess the query is either are you
23	both available on that day or not?
24:-	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It's impossible
25	for me, Madame Chair, on the 22nd and 23rd. I don't

1	know if that means we have to look to September or
2	what, but
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we have to find
4	a mutually agreeable date. Do you have any dates in
5	September? I think this is important enough we ought
6	to wrap it up.
7	Do you have any times in September that
8	you could do it, Commissioner, and how are you in
9	September?
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think I have
11	some dates in September, but my calendar my more
12	complete calendar is in my briefcase in my car, so
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you have any ideas
14	about September, Staff Director?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, my
16	suggestion would be the week after Labor Day. But I
17	don't know if that would be problematic for the
18	Commissioners or not.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that problematic
20	for you, Commissioner Anderson and Vice Chair Reynoso?
21	
22	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Would we be
23	speaking of the fifth and the sixth or the week after?
24	
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anytime that week

1	between the third and the seventh is the week after
2	Labor Day. And then we could go to the next week if
3	that week doesn't fit.
4	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The fifth would be
5	impossible for me.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. How about the
7	next week?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: If we could do
9	it the 12th and 13th. It's suggested as two days,
10	right?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: If we could do
13	it the 12th and 13th
14	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I could do it.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You could too?
16	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I believe I can,
17	yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. Well if
19	that's the case, then why don't we just lock that in?
20	Because I know people's calendars, by this time,
21	September is getting pretty tight.
22	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair?
24 -	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so that would be
25	the 12th and the 13th in Los Angeles for Commissioner
	NEAL D. ODGGG

Anderson and Vice Chair Reynoso, and any 1 Commissioners who choose to participate. Yes. 2 Commissioner Horner? 3 COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, before 4 we lock it in, the agenda, to me, looks incredibly 5 large for a two-day hearing. And I'm concerned that 6 we may have a series of sort of superficial litmus 7 tests on various subjects without the opportunity for 8 depth or pinning things down. 9 It's my understanding that the hearing is 10 intended as an update, I know. So that should make it 11 superficially 12 easier things and to do 13 satisfactorily. But I wonder if we ought not to ask the 14 staff to narrow the agenda somewhat. And also, I have 15 not seen a list of proposed witnesses, and I wonder if 16 such exists at this time. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, the answer to the last question is we don't prepare witness lists 19 until after Commissioners have seen the agenda and get 20 21 some response because it would be foolhardy, at best -COMMISSIONER HORNER: 22 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- to have witnesses. 24 And Commissioners are supposed to -- they have an

1	opportunity to suggest witnesses before anybody sees
2	a witness list.
3	So, we can't do the witness list until
4	after we figure out the agenda.
5	COMMISSIONER HORNER: That means we can't
6	see the witness list before the Commissioners approve
7	the holding of a hearing?
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, we decided that
9	and reaffirmed it by a vote of the Commission on a
10	motion introduced by Vice Chair Reynoso several months
11	ago when the same subject came up.
12	And the Commission, by a majority vote,
13	reaffirmed that Commission policy and practice is that
14	the staff is responsible for preparing the witness
15	list and giving it to the Commissioners in advance of
16	the hearing after taking into account the suggestions
17	made by Commissioners as well as witnesses who are
18	collected by the staff.
19	And that is a Staff function which they
20	must do. And that is not a requirement before we
21	agree to have a hearing. We reaffirmed that if I
22	am I correct?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes, that's
24	correct.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Somebody refresh my

recollection. 1 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: About three 2 3 months ago. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that the way this 4 5 would go is we see the agenda, we've agreed to have a hearing, a mini-hearing. We've said who's going to 6 conduct it. We can talk about the agenda. 7 And then we will suggest witnesses, and 8 9 then the staff will come up with witnesses. And then we'll get a witness list. That's the way that's done. 10 11 And the agenda itself, I'm open to 12 discussion by Commissioners of the agenda. But if you have any response, Staff Director, before we discuss 13 it, or if there's anything you want to say -- do you 14 15 want to say anything, discuss it? 16 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: I'm not sure, Madame Chair, I could add anything to the discussion 17 18 other than what you have indicated. 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair? 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madame Chair, 21 my only -- I went over the agenda, and I thought it 22 was doable if the panels are small panels. That is, 23 if we just have a couple of people testifying, say for 24 an hour and a half, then -- then we have a chance to

ask a lot of questions.

If we have a panel the way we've done 1 sometimes with five witnesses, each one takes ten 2 minutes, then we're rushed and we aren't able to get 3 into depth. So, I'm concerned about that. It just --4 it seems to me it's doable if we limit the panels. 5 That would be a maximum of 6 hopefully only two. Then we have a chance to ask the 7 in-depth questions. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 9 That's COMMISSIONER HORNER: my 10 perception. And that would be fine with me if the 11 Staff Director thinks that with a limited number of 12 witnesses, we can get the proper information on these 13 issues. 14 It seems VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. 15 to me we did have testimony on most of these matters 16 in the L.A. hearing. So -- we wouldn't need a whole 17 array of witnesses, it seems to me. If we can limit 18 the number of witnesses, then I think it's doable. 19 BERRY: Commissioner CHAIRPERSON 20 21 Redenbaugh had his hand up. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, I have the 22 same concern that it is a very, very full two days. 23 And I understand there's been a request from the 24

Western Region to add another topic.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, I was going to 1 suggest we discuss that after we resolve this part. 2 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I don't see how 3 to do that in two days, you know? I think we need to 4 5 shrink it down somehow. And I'm not -- I'm not proposing which are 6 the things we should exclude, but it does look like a 7 8 big bite. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I think that --9 10 and we'll get a response from the Staff Director in a minute. But I think that if what the Vice Chair has 11 12 said is what is intended, that these are updates since 13 these topics were discussed before, and what you're 14 doing is getting two or three witnesses to update so 15 that we're not out of date when we do the report, and 16 then consider whatever new matter there is, then I could see where it might be done. 17 But we'll have to ask the Staff Director, 18 19 is that what is intended or is that doable after 20 hearing this discussion? 21 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, I 22 was actually glad to hear some of these comments 23 because the staff, in our discussion prior 24 preparing this outline of the hearing, had the premise 25 that there would be a few witnesses at each panel to

allow for more dialogue and more questioning than we 1 might have had in some of our hearings where they were 2 not the follow-up hearing. 3 And I personally think that this is very 4 doable and a very good outline. 5 And besides, there CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 6 will be fewer Commissioners maybe. 7 (Laughter.) 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner? 9 COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I just 10 want to make sure that the staff believes that it can 11 12 resist pressures from groups that want to be represented in such an important venue. 13 In other words, if you will have only, 14 say, three -- three people testifying and eight 15 organizations, governmental or non-governmental, 16 feeling that they are important enough to want some 17 input, and then given the need for balance across the 18 array of points of view, can you both achieve balance 19 in points of view and satisfy the need to accommodate 20 the range of groups that will have they have a 21 significant point of view to express and constrain the 22 numbers for each of these categories? 23 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair? 24~

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, please.

STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: I am confident, 1 Commissioner Horner, that we can achieve balance and 2 representation of various points of view with a small 3 number of witnesses. 4 Any organization or individual who wants 5 to come and present views and is not a part of the 6 regular hearing, they always have the option of coming 7 at the open session for a five-minute period. 8 COMMISSIONER HORNER: But we wouldn't want 9 to leave a balanced presentation to the end of the 10 day, less significant, less media covered opportunity 11 for individual citizens. 12 We do want to have a balanced presentation 13 on these issues to the extent substantial different 14 15 points of view exist in the main body of the hearing. And I'm wondering if you are able to do 16 that with two or three people on the whole subject; 17 for instance, the relation of local law enforcement 18 with Los Angeles immigrant communities. Can you, with 19 20 a very limited number of witnesses, accommodate the demand for balance? 21 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair? 22 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, you may answer But let me tag onto the guestion and say that 24 25 I would hope that in considering your approach and

your answer that you would, keeping in mind what our 1 purpose is in terms of update, try to -- first of all, 2 I would hope the Commissioners, in suggesting 3 witnesses, would keep in mind that we're trying to get 4 balance and that there may be one organization, say, 5 that represents a broader spectrum of views. 6 I don't know the answer to that. I'm just 7 making suggestions, that you might keep those kinds of 8 things in mind, that the Commissioners might also, 9 when we suggest people, that this is what we're trying 10 to do. 11 But anyway, go ahead and answer the 12 question. 13 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Well, 14 confident that we will be able to have a balanced 15 presentation of views. And I will give you my 16 assurance that we will do that. 17 COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay, thank you. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Commissioner 19 Anderson, since you and Vice Chair are going to be 20 21 conducting this --My view of the COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 22 matter would be -- would be as follows, and it's a 23 little bit complicated, I suppose. Looking back at 24 the briefing we did several months ago about the

police conduct, it seemed to me that we had there --1 2 it was -- in my opinion, it was sort of an uneven briefing. 3 had witnesses who were obviously 4 institutional representatives who I felt were not as 5 helpful as say, for example, the academician from the 6 university. Was it Temple University, University of 7 Pennsylvania? 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think it was Temple. 9 10 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Temple. 11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Temple. 12 don't know how this goes to the matter of balance, but 13 I think, for example, the scholar we had could have 14 15 gone on -- from Temple could have gone on for an hour 16 easily. And in my 'own mind, we had some witnesses 17 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'm sorry. If 19 20 he was a scholar, he could only go 50 minutes. 21 (Laughter.) 22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: There were some -there were some others that I thought three to four 23 minutes was plenty. Now how you -- you know, devise 24 25 a rule to accommodate that, I don't know.

But I was not -- if we are going to try to get the kind of witnesses, using the Temple professor as an example -- I'm not particularly concerned so much about balance in terms of ideology.

And some of these panels, you know -- is there, for example, racial and gender bias? And my own sense is I'm not -- I would not like to see attorneys who have been involved in a number of these cases come up and explain all their cases and their current litigation and why there's tremendous problems, and then somebody else come up and say, for the defense, that there isn't.

I would be more interested in seeing one or two people who have studied the matter for a long time from some, at least, institutionally neutral standpoint, come in and talk to us about their assessment of the problem outside the context of particular involvement in litigation or complaints or something like that.

But that's my own impression. I don't know how that accommodates questions like balance, for example. But I would find that to be more productive. And I would rather have a half an hour to talk to that person than I would litigants or people who sort of come from the standpoint of being, you know, counsel

1	for litigation.
2	That's my only I don't know if that
3	helps at all, but
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That helps. All of
5	that is good guidance. Good ahead. Did you have a
6	response to
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: I do. Thank you,
8	Madame Chair. I just wanted to add one point in
9	regard to your comment, Commissioner Anderson. The
10	preparation for briefings is quite different, as you
11	probably know, than
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He knows because he's
13	been here for years now.
14	(Laughter:)
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Well, I'm just
i i	
16	trying to make the point that the pre-interview
16 17	trying to make the point that the pre-interview process for hearings is one where we would hope to
	,
17	process for hearings `is one where we would hope to
17 18	process for hearings `is one where we would hope to have the selection of witnesses.
17 18 19	process for hearings is one where we would hope to have the selection of witnesses.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Screening out people,
17 18 19 20	process for hearings is one where we would hope to have the selection of witnesses.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Screening out people, you mean?
17 18 19 20 21	process for hearings is one where we would hope to have the selection of witnesses.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Screening out people, you mean?  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Right.
17 18 19 20 21 22	process for hearings is one where we would hope to have the selection of witnesses.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Screening out people, you mean?  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Right.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And making sure that
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	process for hearings is one where we would hope to have the selection of witnesses.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Screening out people, you mean?  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Right.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And making sure that they are focused?

will take into account this discussion we're having 1 2 here and the expectations of the Commissioners are being made very clear. 3 I can see Commissioner Anderson's point. 4 If you had a scholar who had worked on 5 this subject and who portrayed no particular 6 7 ideological concern about it, although there is always some bias, that might be very informative on the 8 subject. 9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 10 I mean, we could all find scholars who have a particular --11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Bias. 12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: -- bias on things. 13 It comes out very clear. But I think there are some 14 who may not fall into that category. 15 16 Ι mean, I would share Commissioner Horner's concern about balance. 17 But maybe there's a 18 way so that we don't have to broaden our panels because we have to have every side institutionally 19 20 represented, I guess is the point I'm trying to make. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, that's true. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: But we have, of 22 23 many categories of testimony. And for 24 example, under practically each one, we have community 25 organizations or witnesses or advocacy groups. But it

1	seems to me a manifest we could have an advocacy group
2	representing one element of the community, maybe in
3	one panel, and the different advocacy group in another
4	panel.
5	That is, we don't have to have, you know,
6	a balance in each in each panel.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You mean advocacy
8	group?
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And I don't
10	think that that would have ten witnesses, you know?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So, let's try to do
12	that. Let's try to keep all this in mind as we as
13	we do this.
14	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Madame Chair?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes?
16	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: May I ask
17	I haven't
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
19	Higginbotham?
20	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: been a
21	beneficiary of these hearings, so I'm looking at it as
22	a stranger. Is there any reason why you can't ask
23	someone to give you a statement, which then becomes a
24-	part of the record?
25	Let me just give you an example. I've

been trying a lot of civil rights cases. I understand 1 2 how someone might say, well for instance, a civil rights lawyer has bias. 3 But the whole history of a corridor of 4 5 history demonstrates -- you know, if you look at the Thurgood Marshall trials -- used it, William Henry 6 Hastie, these people were a partisan advocate and made 7 a profound contribution. 8 So (1) if you let -- if you've got a 9 10 mechanism so a statement can be filed --CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes? 11 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: -- therefore, 12 we would not be involved on the pre-judgement so that 13 if you came across someone who had a series of cases, 14 15 either as counsel for the plaintiff or as counsel for the defendant, I would welcome that information going 16 into the record. 17 18 They do not necessarily have to testify extensively. So that that would be my approach into 19 20 asking the Staff to consider. And then we would have 21 record which you can work on very, 22 thoughtfully. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The answer to the 24 question is yes, we can have statements. collect information 25 number a of ways:

1	interrogatories, statements submitted for the record,
2	all sorts of mechanisms.
3	And your having made that statement goes
4	into the information that is available to the staff so
5	that they will be guided.
6	That's part of the reason why we have
7	these discussions, so that they can be guided by the
8	discussion in reading the transcript in terms of what
9	the Commission wants them to do. So, that's very
10	important to me, that statement. Yes, it can be done.
11	Right, Staff Director?
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: That's right,
13	Madame Chair.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Any other
15	comments about this process to guide the staff or
16	anything else on this subject before we go to another
17	subject?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, hearing none,
20	then we'll go to any other questions on the Staff
21	Director's report or any issues anyone wants to raise
22	or any oh, I said I was going to go back to the
23	point you made, Commissioner Redenbaugh.
24	You let me move on without discussing it,
25	that we received a letter

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: from Fernando
3	Hernandez, who is the Chairperson of the California
4	SAC. And Mr. Hernandez asked us he says, for those
5	who haven't read the letter or don't know where it is
6	or forgot it, the letter is can you hear me,
7	Yvonne? Commissioner Lee?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I thought she was
12	awfully silent. Somebody check to see where she is.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Would you check,
14	Mr. Wells?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It says, "This letter
16	is to re-urge a request previously forwarded to you by
17	former California SAC Chair, Mike Carney, regarding
18	the effort to gather information on employment
19	practices in the television media in L.A."
20	And the SAC wants the Commissioners to
21	complete the media project by having representatives
22	of the television media subpoenaed to appear and give
23	testimony at the mini-hearing.
24	And that they, in 1994, requested the
25	participation of two Commissioners at a public forum

1	27
1	in L.A. This request was predicated on the
2	Commission's Committee's conclusion that voluntary
3	cooperation would not be forthcoming, and they needed
4	Commissioners in order to get response.
5	And Commissioners were unable to act on
6	the request in time to meet statutory publication
7	requirements for Commission hearings.
8	But now that we're having a mini-hearing,
9	they would like us to help them in their television
10	project by having the Commissioners make a panel on
11	this part of the mini-hearing.
12	And what I'm wondering is (1) should we do
13	this? What is the view of the Commissioners? And (2)
14	is there some way for them to have a SAC for us to
15	have a procedurally have the Commissioners who are
16	there, if they are willing, to aid the SAC in
17	compelling testimony or would it have to be part of
18	this hearing?
19	I guess it would have to be part of a
20	hearing. It would have to be another panel on this
21	hearing. What is your view, Commissioner Redenbaugh,
22	since you seem to be apprised of this subject?
23	COMMISSIONER LEE: I only wanted to come
24	on again.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good morning. Where

1	did I leave you, Yvonne?
2	COMMISSIONER LEE: Well, after you made
3	the announcement, then everyone just trailed off. And
4	I kept yelling, but no one heard me.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, bracita.
6	(Laughter.)
7	COMMISSIONER LEE: Hopefully I'll be with
8	you for the rest of the morning.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Can you hear
11	all right now?
12	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to have
15	the L.A. mini-hearing on September 12th and 13th.
16	COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioners should
18	submit names of witnesses if they want to. And then
19	we'll apprise you of the other information about that
20	subject that we discussed.
21	COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay, okay.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now what we're
23	discussing is a letter from the SAC Chair in
24	California, Mr. Hernandez.
25	COMMISSIONER LEE: Right.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you aware of this
2	letter?
3	COMMISSIONER LEE: I am.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we're trying to
5	decide Commissioner Redenbaugh brought this up.
6	We're trying to decide what to do about it. So,
7	that's where we are in the discussion.
8	COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you say anything,
10	Commissioner Redenbaugh?
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Not yet.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay.
13	Commissioner Redenbaugh?
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, I you
15	know, I'm not enthusiastic about this. And I what
16	would be different in this from how would this
17	differ or augment what we did already in the media
17 18	, ,
	differ or augment what we did already in the media
18	differ or augment what we did already in the media project when we were there so long ago?
18 19	differ or augment what we did already in the media project when we were there so long ago?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we don't know
18 19 20	differ or augment what we did already in the media project when we were there so long ago?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we don't know because he doesn't tell us.
18 19 20 21	differ or augment what we did already in the media project when we were there so long ago?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we don't know because he doesn't tell us.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
18 19 20 21 22	differ or augment what we did already in the media project when we were there so long ago?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we don't know because he doesn't tell us.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I mean, he doesn't say

1 what it is.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Vice Chair?

Maybe he knows something.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. Madame Chair, I've had some knowledge of what's happening, not as complete and I -- of course that the General Counsel would want to be in touch with the SAC and stuff.

I take it that any hearing like this is surely within the purview of the General Counsel. But the SAC, a year or two ago, maybe it was '94, had its own hearing on these issues. I attended a part of it.

But when it was -- since it was their hearing, they could only have people testifying who were willing to come and testify. So, they felt that it was an incomplete hearing from the point of view that the officials in the industry declined to participate apparently, and to -- and to complete the process. They thought it was necessary to have -- to have them.

But they don't have subpoena power. We're the only ones that have subpoena power. So, that's why they were suggesting that.

How -- how many witnesses or how long? I don't know. The impression I have, it's only that, is

that it would be half a day.

so on, I think that it would be an important thing to do. And it seems to me that if we can work with -- with advisory committees, and we think the projects would work well and so on, then it's probably not a bad idea to have -- to have mini-hearings to help them finish the work that they're doing.

But their concern had been, as I understand it, was that they had this hearing. They considered it unfinished because -- because some of the officials from the industry weren't willing to come to testify.

And they would like to have them testify and wrap up their hearing. That's what I understand has happened.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner?

COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I assume that because we have different procedures for SAC hearings and Commission hearings that we really ought to -- I shouldn't say I assume.

Because we have different procedures, we ought to treat the request of this SAC as a request for a hearing, a mini-hearing. And we ought to assess it on its virtues, or lack of virtues, on that basis

alone.

And the reason I say this especially is that I think it might set a very bad precedent in terms of our relationship with SACs for SACs to believe that we stand by to avail the SACs of a subpoena power indirectly that they are not afforded by statute or regulation.

And therefore, I would not support our agreeing to this request until I saw a fully developed staff rationale for a mini-hearing on this subject.

In other words, I think we ought to treat it seriously as a mini-hearing suggestion. And therefore, I wouldn't be prepared to say yea or nay at this point.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we do the following if there's no objection? Why don't we ask the Staff Director to have the General Counsel find out what these people want to do in this mini-hearing, and then figure out if it makes any sense in terms of either the report itself or their report, or it's something that you ought to recommend to us?

And then if you recommend it to us, then detail what it is that we'll be doing. And then we can read it and consider it, just as we considered the other mini-hearings in accord with Commissioner

1	Horner's suggestion?
2	And you could then inform these people
3	that that's the response, and that we are considering
4	it. We haven't rejected it. It's just that we're not
5	going to pro forma agree to it just because the
6	Commissioners happen to be going there.
7	COMMISSIONER HORNER: But I think it's
8	important for other SACs
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right.
10	COMMISSIONER HORNER: not to get the
11	impression
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right.
13	COMMISSIONER HORNER: by what we say or
14	however we communicate to them that this is a motus
15	operandi that we're going to adopt whenever we have a
16	mini-hearing anywhere.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So, we would look to
18	see a proposal from you if that's what you decide to
19	do.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes, Madame
21	Chair, I'd be glad to follow up.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Vice Chair?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just want to
24	say I agree with Commissioner Horner on that. I had
25	once been approached by the California SAC to maybe

1	have something, a mini-hearing in Orange County,
2	pertaining to some electoral problems that they had at
3	that time.
4	And I suggested to them that they write to
5	the Commission. And I had assumed that then the staff
6	would do the work and make a recommendation. But then
7	apparently, they decided not to go forward with that -
8	- with that project.
9	But yes, I think that's it's an
10	independent judgement for us to run.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, we'll do it that
12	way then. Any other questions or comments on the
13	Staff Director's report? Commissioner Redenbaugh?
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh yes, well I
15	speak this may be mislocated, but I wanted to make
16	a report about this task force for the
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh yes, yes.
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, yes. Well,
19	the good news is I don't have much to report.
20	(Laughter.)
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I can report
22	that the Chair's memory is far more accurate than my
23	own.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, well that is
25	wonderful.

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Surprising, but
3	wonderful, in this case.
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
5	(Laughter.)
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That, in fact,
7	the task force in '93, I believe, did examine this
8	process and produce some recommendations which I
9	which the Commission adopted, which I think we are not
10	have not been following. Although, I think not
11	willfully ignoring them, they just they slipped
12	from view, as I forgot them also.
13	(Laughter.)
14	COMMISSIÖNER REDENBAUGH: I've circulated
15	the evidence of our past work to our colleagues,
16	excluding Connie Horner. Connie, you were drafted to
17	be on this task force with us. If you accept this
18	draft
19	(Laughter.)
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: this is to
21	review the SAC appointment process.
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I would be happy to.
23	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Then we really
	NEAL D. ODOCC

1	don't have anything to report except that there is
2	evidence
3	(Laughter.)
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: that we did
5	something, and we're not in compliance with that. So,
6	we will examine it more fully and have a report with
7	recommendations by the next Commission meeting.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I very much
9	appreciate that.
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I know you've
11	been losing sleep over that.
12	(Laughter.)
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well okay, good.
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And then I was -
15	- if I could ask the Staff Director, do you have a
16	report on on the recommendations that I made which
17	triggered this whole "look around and see" thing?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Before I do that, let
19	me see, did I hear you saying something, Commissioner
20	Lee?
21	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes. I think maybe
22	Redenbaugh for his viewpoint is very good, and I have
23	just one comment on the Staff Director's report.
24 -	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. It's about
25	something else. Okay, we'll finish this up, and then
ŀ	

Staff Director? I'll come back to you. 1 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Okay, the Western 2 Regional Office Director, Commissioner Redenbaugh, has 3 provided me just this morning with an update on his 4 progress in interviewing candidates for the California 5 SAC that you referred. 6 And there were additional candidates 7 referred by Vice Chairperson Reynoso. 8 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. 9 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: He has 10 11 interviewed some of these individuals, but is still in the process, has not completed the interviews yet. 12 But he's been travelling to the different 13 14 parts of California personally talking with these individuals. 15 And he expects to complete 16 interviews in the near future. I know he was interviewing this week even. 17 So, I'm hopeful we'll have a comprehensive 18 19 report from him between now and the next Commission 20 meeting in terms of results of his interviews and his 21 recommendations to me and my approval in terms of 22 candidates for interim consideration by the Commissioners. 23 24 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay, thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right,
2	Commissioner Lee?
3	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I have just one
4	comment on the Staff Director's report.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, will you excuse
6	me just a minute, Yvonne?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No, it's on a
8	different subject.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, a different
LO	subject. Go ahead, Commissioner Lee.
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: On the Congressional
L2	activity, I really enjoyed reading the section on the
L3	legislative development. But I do have a question for
L4	the Staff Director. Is it possible that you could
L5	prepare a summary and a status report on the
L6	particular legislative issues when you mention
L.7	reauthorization, the Individuals With Disability
L8	Education Act, so I will know what that act is and
L9	what's the status.
20	It would help me a little bit more. It
21	gives me more information on these issues. Is that
22	possible?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Staff Director?
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Commissioner Lee,
25	yes indeed, we can provide some additional background

1	information on what's included in each of these
2	legislative measures, as well as just the status in
3	terms of committee vote or full-floor vote.
4	COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so from now on,
7	we will when there's a report on some legislative
8	matter, the Commissioners will receive a description
9	of what this item is, what it's about, not assuming
10	everybody knows. And for people interested, they can
11	read it. Okay, the Vice Chair?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes, I just had
13	a question on Commissioner Redenbaugh's suggestion
14	that we have a briefing on three strikes. I just
15	wondered what the status of that was, whether the
16	staff had thought about it, thought it was a good
17	idea or
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Three strikes and
19	you're out?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Three strikes and
22	you're out, Staff Director.
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: We have
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Not meant to be
25	a status report on baseball.
	NEAL P. ODGGG

information on what's included in each of these

STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: That wasn't the 1 2 three strikes you were referring to. We -- the staff has followed up on the discussion at the last 3 Commission meeting on suggestions that were made for 4 5 briefings. That would be one of them. the though And work that's most 6 7 immediately being done is preparation for a briefing at the next Commission meeting on Consumer Racism and 8 Sexism, which as you recall we tried to have for the 9 April meeting and found that participants needed 10 additional time, you know, to prepare, and some 11 weren't available on that particular April date. 12 13 But we will be following up on each of the suggestions made for subsequent briefings. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the 15 16 Staff Director's report? Commissioner Anderson? COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: received 17 T something about the Commission going forward in the 18 19 Federal Register with a proposal for amendments to our 20 regulations. Is there anything -- is that true? 21 Is there anything the Staff Director can 22 tell us about that and maybe the nature of it? 23 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair? 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, sure. 25 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Commissioner

1	Anderson, I did not send anything out on that. I'm
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Astounded?
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: not aware of
4	the Commission proceeding in amending our regulations.
5	So, I'm I don't know how else to respond to you.
6	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe you could inform
8	us, Commissioner Anderson. Are we amending our
9	regulations?
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No. Well, I don't
11	know, and that's why I'm asking the question. There's
12	no plans for amendments to the regs?
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: None that I'm
14	aware of.
15	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
16	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: May I ask
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
18	Higginbotham?
19	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: does the
20	Federal Register have a reference to that or I'm
21	just trying to figure out your source.
22	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I didn't see it in
23	the <u>Federal Register</u> .
24	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Okay, all
25	right. Okay, fine, okay. If it's in the <u>Federal</u>

1	Register, I get worried.
2	(Laughter.)
3	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I throw it
4	out.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so there's a
6	gremlin somewhere. Anybody else have any other
7	questions for the Staff Director on the Staff
8	Director's report. Oh, the Mississippi Delta hearing
9	dates, we need to set some dates for the Mississippi
10	Delta hearing, my friends.
11	If we do that, is that the last one in
12	this series?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes.
14	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes, Madame
15	Chair.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So, we'll be finished
17	with this series if we set a date for Mississippi
18	Delta?
19	Query: do we want to burden yes,
20	Commissioner Redenbaugh?
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: We won't be
22	finished with the series, except we will have set the
23	dates.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
25	(Laughter.)

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: There's a great
2	deal of work between here and there.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do we want to burden
4	the Vice Chair and Commissioner Anderson by trying to
5	hold the Mississippi Delta hearing also in September,
6	or do we want so we get it done this fiscal year,
7	and be proud to have accomplished getting them all
8	done as we said we would do?
9	Or do we want to be more practical and say
10	well, we don't think we can get it done in September
11	although we'd like to?
12	The staff has proposed the dates of
13	September 18th through the what is that, a two?
14	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: The 20th. And
15	Madame Chair?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could
18	mention that September 20th is already the scheduled
19	September Commission meeting date.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And the Commission
21	meeting is scheduled for September 20th.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: In Mississippi?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, it's just
24	& scheduled.
25	(Laughter.)

1	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I'm
2	not I'm not available on the
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: 18th.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you available any
6	other time in September, Commissioner Horner?
7	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm available
8	the fifth through the ninth if I can fly out on the
9	ninth in time to get to New Jersey by the tenth.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. Well then, it
11	looks like we're moving to since that's the week
12	well, that's not the week. That's the week
13	Commissioner Anderson is not available.
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, if
15	you'll bear with me for a moment, I have an ambiguous
16	notation on my calendar for the 17th for the 15th
17	through the 18th.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Of September?
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I have a note that
20	I'm to hold for a corporate board retreat. And I
21	don't know whether that has those dates have been
22	overtaken by events. I would have to review my all
23	of October, November and December to see I have noted
24	firm dates that would supersede those dates and
25	therefore free them up.

1	If you could just bear with me for a
2	minute while I flip through those two months?
.3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Would everybody
4	else consider the months of September and October and
5	see how your schedules are looking?
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Since we have
7	the meeting scheduled for that day, if it's good with
8	Connie, that might not be a bad time to do it, even
9	though we would have a those from the California
10	hearing would have to
11	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I would have to miss
12	the first day. I would have to miss the 18th. I
13	could be available the 19th and 20th.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The 19th and 20th.
15	What does it look like for you, Commissioner Anderson?
16	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm travelling the
17	16th and 17th and 18th. But I could travel where
18	are we going to where are we going to hold this?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In Mississippi,
20	Greenville, Mississippi.
21	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Is that easily
22	accessible by plane?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How do you get there,
24	anybody?
25	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair,

1	it's a flight would need to be taken to a nearby
2	city. And the drive, as I understand it, is about an
3	hour, or another smaller plane.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So either an hour
5	drive or a puddle jumper.
6	COMMISSIONER HORNER: And the nearby city,
7	is that a city where a lot of flights from a lot of
8	places?
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes, there are
10	actually two options. I believe Jackson, Mississippi
11	which is the capitol, is one option. Little Rock,
12	Arkansas is also very close. They're both about equal
13	distance.
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay.
7.4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: ORay.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?
	<del>-</del>
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?
15 16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is
15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?
15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last week in
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last week in September. How is everybody else's September how
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last week in September. How is everybody else's September how about the last week in September. Does that look
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last week in September. How is everybody else's September how about the last week in September. Does that look awful, Commissioner Horner?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last week in September. How is everybody else's September how about the last week in September. Does that look awful, Commissioner Horner?  COMMISSIONER HORNER: I can't do it the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I ask, is the last week in September, that's not possible?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last week in September. How is everybody else's September how about the last week in September. Does that look awful, Commissioner Horner?  COMMISSIONER HORNER: I can't do it the last week.

1	that Commissioner Anderson is travelling every day.
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Speaking on
3	behalf of Commissioner Anderson's family, what's the
4	benefit of crowding this in this fiscal year? Because
5	we probably won't be done for months.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That would be except
7	to say we did it this fiscal year.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, we could
9	just say that then.
10	(Laughter.)
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
12	(Laughter.)
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: We have with
14	some other things. "
15	(Laughter.)
15 16	(Laughter.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
16 17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  (Laughter.)  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have a report
16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  (Laughter:)  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have a report  here.
16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  (Laughter.)  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have a report here.  COMMISSIONER HORNER: I am completely free
16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  (Laughter:)  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have a report here.  COMMISSIONER HORNER: I am completely free the first week of October.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  (Laughter:)  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have a report here.  COMMISSIONER HORNER: I am completely free the first week of October.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The first week in

1	relations benefit of announcing that we did something
2	that we won't then report on for another year, I don't
3	see of course, I don't understand public relations
4	and I would defer to our communications officer.
5	But I don't see any great harm or that the
6	public would be damaged if we slipped it into the
7	first quarter of the next year.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, all right, how
9	does how does October look for people?
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Unless we just
11	are intent on destroying the September schedule.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Or intent on
13	destroying Commissioner Anderson.
14	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, the first
15	week
16	
10	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Can I
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Can I CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSÒN BERRY: Yes.
17 18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could just
17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could just make a comment here before we seriously pursue the
17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could just make a comment here before we seriously pursue the first week in October?
17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could just make a comment here before we seriously pursue the first week in October?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could just make a comment here before we seriously pursue the first week in October?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: The funding
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I could just make a comment here before we seriously pursue the first week in October?  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.  STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: The funding situation is always, you know, one that you can't

1	last years, been on continuing resolutions which never
2	provide sufficient funding to conduct anything other
3	than regular business.
4	Travel money and other expenses associated
5	with the hearing, we could not afford if we were under
6	a CR. So, I would want the Commissioners to take that
7	into consideration.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, I hadn't thought
9	about that. So, that's a reason.
10	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: May I
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
12	Higginbotham?
13	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: just look
14	at my schedule? I think Commissioner Horner and I
15	are at opposite ends of the time spectrum. I could be
16	available the 26th, 27th and
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Of September?
18	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I can be
19	available then Friday, the 20th getting into Jackson
20	or wherever we have to get and the night before. My -
21	- and that's my September schedule.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is this
23	contemplated as a three-day hearing?
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Three days, yes.
25	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Can we do it on the

1	weekend?
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How do people feel
3	about Saturdays?
4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Commissioner
5	Higginbotham is available on the 20th. And if he's
6	available on the 21st and 22nd, I can do that with no
7	difficulty.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What do people think
9	about Saturdays? What do you oh, you think
10	something about Saturdays?
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: I do.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Staff Director.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, the
14	impact of having a hearing on a Saturday will result
15	in overtime expenses for many of the staff members who
16	are needed at hearings. And the cost of the hearing
17	would therefore increase.
18	I would like that to be factored in as a
19	consideration. And if I could add the fact that this
20	year, our funding situation is extremely tight. The
21	\$8.75 million that we just received is less than the
22	\$9 million appropriation the Commission had last year.
23	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I'd be
24	willing to be absent on the first day of the hearing

if that would make it easy, if we could do it then,

1	the 18th, 19th and 20th, and that meets other people's
2	requirements.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But then Commissioner
4	Higginbotham can only be there
5	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Oh, I'm sorry.
6	You're not available on the 19th.
7	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm not
8	available on the 19th. I would be available on the
9	20th, not on the 21st.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So you wouldn't be
11	available on the 21st anyway. What about
12	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: But the next
13	week, I gather that
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you're not you
15	have a tight schedule on the next week. Is that
16	right, Commissioner Horner?
17	COMMISSIONER HORNER: That is the week of
18	the 23rd?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I am available
21	Monday, Tuesday no, I am not available Tuesday or
22	Thursday of that week.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: But you're
25	available Friday and Saturday.

1	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm available Friday
2	and the following Monday and Tuesday. But that would
3	be expensive to keep us there over the weekend.
4	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: But what about the
5	Monday and Tuesday, the
6	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Oh, the Monday and
7	Tuesday, the 30th and the 1st?
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The beginning
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes, I'm available
10	those two days.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which two days?
12	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm available
13	Monday is the 30th of September, Tuesday is the first.
14	But Mary Mathews was saying.
15	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Don't we have to
16	get home before our money runs out?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You might have to stay
18	in Mississippi forever, never go home.
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: How about that
20	Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, do you think the CR
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which days?
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: The second,
23	third and fourth of October. It seems to me in an
24	election year, it's quite likely that this would get
25	resolved by the a day or two after the end of the

1	fiscal year, don't you think?
2	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Could I respond,
3	Madame Chair?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, please.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: While that may be
6	quite likely, what also happens, and you all may know
7	this, but I'll just say this to demonstrate the staff
8	difficulties here, the availability of new fiscal year
9	money does not occur until October one.
10	So, we could not even we couldn't even
11	commit to hotel rooms and
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I see.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: a court
14	reporter or any of the needs until and we need more
15	time than just one day before the event to make all of
16	these arrangements.
17	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, maybe
18	it would be a good idea for the Staff Director to
19	circulate one of those things that she has circulated
20	in the past, where we all note dates when we're
21	available and let you try to put it together and get
22	back to us.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, let okay,
24	we'll do that, but let me let me just to get a
25	sense here, have a couple more comments. One,

1	Commissioner Higginbotham?
2	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: We do have a
3	meeting On October 25th. And I, at least, would feel
4	good if you could combine these together.
5	So, what about October 24, 25, 26
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When does your October
7	
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I can't do it on the
9	24th.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
11	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: But you could
12	do it on the 25th and 26th?
13	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes, I could.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me ask
15	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The 26th is a
16	Saturday.
17	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes, I know.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me ask this. Is
19	Commissioner
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me ask this. Is
21	Commissioner George we haven't asked you any
22	schedule questions. What does your schedule look like
23	for the 19th and 20th of September, the 18th, 19th and
24 ~	20th
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: And 21st.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And 21st.
2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Which is the
3	Saturday.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What is your are
5	you able to
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The 18th and 19th
7	are fine.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The 20th is a
9	Commission meeting.
10	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The 20th is a
11	Commission meeting, and I can certainly be there in
12	the morning for that.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: At some point in the
15	afternoon, I'll have to disappear and I couldn't do
16	the Saturday. But I can do the 18th, 19th and much of
17	the 20th.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So Commissioner
19	Higginbotham can only do Friday, which means that if
20	the hearing were all day Friday, you could be there
21	you could come in Thursday evening. If we had the
22	open forum, you could do that. And then you could do
22	open forum, you could do that. And then you could do all day on Thursday.

1	Horner, on the other hand
2	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I can do all day
3	Thursday and Friday.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: can do all day
5	Thursday and Friday.
6	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And who else can't do
8	either of those? Can everybody else do all the rest
9	of those?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we will
12	circulate the Staff Director will try to get some
13	dates. But it seems to me that we ought to
14	tentatively, just because it's hard to get any date
15	for anything, say that we would do it the 18th, 19th
16	and 20th, and let Commissioner Horner and Commissioner
17	Higginbotham come in when they could and stay as long
18	as they could.
19	And then that means that the next time we
20	have a hearing, they have to come and stay the entire
21	time while the rest of us come in when we can. Yes,
22	Staff Director?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, do
24	you want to see if
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, Commissioner Lee.

1	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Commissioner
2	Lee is available?
3	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I'm available.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. You could do
5	it, okay. So, we're going to write down 18th, 19th
6	and 20th, but then circulate something anyway in case
7	anybody has any second thoughts, and then go for that.
8	
9	And then poor Commissioner Anderson
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, thank you.
11	Could I ask whether that week in October, the third
12	week in October, which Commissioner Higginbotham
13	suggested, whether that's a possibility, or did we
14	rule that out?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The third?
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Beginning the 21st?
17	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, that week.
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I can't do it on the
19	24th.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Nor can I.
21	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: What we need are
23	between Connie and Carl, right? I mean, you and I are
24	not useful in these things
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, I will not even

1	address that. I plan not to address that. So, we
2	will leave it that way, but circulate something
3	anyway. Any other
4	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: If I may?
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: If you can do
7	it on the 18th, 19th and 20th, I can probably work
8	something out and just have a leave deal with that
9	by phone the morning of the 19th.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, that would be
11	terrific.
12	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I could
13	conceivably do that.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That would be very
15	much appreciated. Okay, if nothing else on the Staff
16	Director's report, the next item is a major item.
17	At the last meeting when we agreed on the
18	program plans for 1996 and 1997, Commissioner
19	Redenbaugh, I think it was, said that we ought to
20	consider and remember, my memory is better than
21	yours now, Russell.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, I'm
23	reminded of that.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: My track record isn't
25	too bad so far. We're at one-zip right now.

Commissioner Redenbaugh suggested that we might consider a programmatic theme for the future, since we're finishing up on the racial tensions theme, and that we might discuss that.

And so the idea is that we would come up

And so the idea is that we would come up with, if we can, or if we think it's a good idea, another general programmatic theme for what the Commission might be doing, and so the staff would be guided in moving new proposals consistent with that theme, beginning no later than fiscal of 1998, unless everyone decides that the theme is so overpowering that we should throw out everything and do it immediately, which is what we did the last time. Commissioner Redenbaugh?

commissioner redenbaugh: Well, I thought more about this, and I definitely think there is a benefit to have some vision statement and some unifying theme to the work that we do.

I do think that it's difficult to come up with such a theme in this kind of formal meeting and setting, unless someone just has something that really just knocks us right off our chairs.

So, my thinking about it is that we could spend perhaps an hour, up to an hour, in a -- of course, we still do have it in a meeting, but in which

1	we maybe speculate some alternative themes, maybe even
2	have someone facilitate the discussion, and see if
3	there's something that emerges from the eight of us as
4	something that we all feel very strongly about and
5	connected to.
6	So, I think there is a to get these
7	things, it's been my experience there's a process that
8	you have to go through. Otherwise, they're just like
9	wallpaper that you just glue up and then it falls
10	right back down the next morning.
11	So, I think if we want to do this, and I
12	encourage us to do that, is structure the kind of
13	process where we think about it, write a little
14	something up, and then come together in perhaps a
15	facilitated meeting for an hour.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Wallpaper
17	manufacturers are going to send us letters of protest
18	when they read that statement.
19	(Laughter.)
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Not, the paper,
21	the glue. It's been my experience in my house, Cruz.
22	(Laughter.)
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then Russell, you will
24 -	spend the next six months after the letters come in
25	going around to wallpaper conventions

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: explaining that you
3	really didn't mean it and that you love all those
4	people.
5	(Laughter.)
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Your entire house will
7	be wallpapered.
8	(Laughter.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anyway, yes,
10	Commissioner Horner?
11	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Commissioner Reynoso
12	had his hand up first.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, that's yours.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, I was
15	just going to agree with Russell that I think it's
16	I think we ought to give this a lot of thought and I
17	think it's a good idea to have an overall theme within
18	which hearings or discussions can have deal with
19	that.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner?
21	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I
22	agree with just this one caveat. And that is, if we
23	have a facilitator, I hope it will be someone who is
24	respectful of our intellect and experience, and
25	sophisticated enough to recognize that we have a

1	little bit of both. Some of us do anyway.
2	That was a self-deprecating remark.
3	r
4	(Laughter.)
5	COMMISSIONER HORNER: My concern is that
6	over my years in government, I have frequently
7	encountered facilitator who condescended and wasted
8	our time and got in the way of intelligent discourse.
9	And I would rather that we do this in a free-wheeling
10	way on our own unless we have a high assurance that
11	our facilitator will be recessive and will not come
12	with any unusual theories we'd have to deal with
13	before getting to the subject at hand.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, Russell, why in
15	the heck do we need a facilitator?
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well
<del>1</del> 7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're all big people.
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's probably
19	why.
20	(Laughter.)
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, I've done
22	a number of these, usually in a corporate setting.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't you be the -
24	- no, okay.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I don't think I

1	can. You know, I'm a party at interest. It's been my
2	experience that skillful facilitation is very
3	important to bring things out and to manage the
4	dynamics of any group.
5	I have such a person in mind. His
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I knew you would.
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: His liability is
8	that he's a friend and colleague of mine. His asset
9	is that he's very skillful in this. He is a
10	Washingtonian, I mean ex-government guy from the party
11	not in power in the Congress.
12	In fact, he was in the Carter
13	Administration, Education Department. In spite of all
14	that
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: One of my former
17	employees.
18	(Laughter. )
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Keep talking, brother.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think he would
21	satisfy Connie's concern.
22	(Laughter.)
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is this a guy I fired?
24 -	(Laughter.)
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, this is a
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	guy you moved out to the turkey farm.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I see.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, I don't
4	think he is aware of you from that era.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, good.
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well Connie, he
7	would it's Dr. Jilevey. Connie, he would satisfy
8	your concern about sophistication and sensitivity. He
9	understands his role is to facilitate and not to
10	impose.
11	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Because facilitator
12	often impose a kind of juvenilization on the
13	participants.
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, I would
15	give my assurance that he would not do that.
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And I share your
18	concern. Often these are people who were too unsuited
19	for real work.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: This is very
21	interesting. This is the first time that I can
22	remember that Commissioner Horner and I agree
23	completely about anything.
24	(Laughter.)
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think

1	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, maybe
2	we could try this without a facilitator. And at the
3	expense of losing one hour of full Commission time
4	over the course of the year, if it didn't work without
5	the facilitator, we could then try it with the
6	facilitator. How about that, Russell?
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Would you oppose that,
8	Russell?
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Think of it as a
10	pilot project in non-facilitated discussions.
11	(Laughter.)
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I my only
13	concern, Connie, is about our colleagues that are less
14	loquacious than you. I'll accept this constraint.
15	That's all right.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right,
17	Commissioner
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'll try this
19	unfacilitated approach.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George,
21	did you have any comments? Commissioner Lee, did you
22	have any? You're less loquacious than Commissioner
23	Horner I guess.
24	(No response.)
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Especially if

1	you can't hear us.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Especially if you
3	can't hear us.
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What are you people
6	doing to her? She's not there, Tony. Commissioner
7	Lee is not there. She's cut off. Commissioner Lee?
8	Maybe I can bring her to light.
9	Could we try this without any type of
LO	commitment on the part of anyone? What do people
11	think about the idea of having an overriding theme?
12	That's the first thing, I guess.
13	We, the Commission, has not always had
14	overriding themes where the Commission has had
15	projects. And we had this racial tensions thing.
16	And before that, some years ago, the
L7	Commission had some theme ones. But it's not
18	necessary to have a theme.
19	How do we feel, since we've had this one
20	theme for a while? How do we feel about the idea, and
21	then we can revisit this? No one is committed by
22	anything they say today unfacilitated.
23	How do we feel about the idea of having a
24	theme? Russell has told us how he feels.
25	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I would

1	support it.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You think there should
3	be a theme?
4	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I support
5	exploration of the concept of a theme by committee.
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, if we don't
7	find one that fits
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, do any of you
9	who have had experience with the theme, the idea of a
10	theme, have any doubts about its usefulness or feel
11	that
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No. My only
13	experience really has been since I joined the
14	Commission. I was told that we had a series of
15	hearings that were basically on the theme of racial
16	tensions.
17	And I thought it was a good idea to sort
18	of have a general theme. So then when Russell raised
19	the issue of we're finished with that theme, why don't
20	we think of another theme, I reacted favorably. It
21	might be that if we think more about it, we may not be
22	as favorable.
23	But at least my my quick response was
24	to say, "Not a bad idea. Let's think about it."
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So, we're

1	willing to consider it. Now, the staff, based on this
2	piece of paper you just handed me, has been thinking
3	about programmatic themes in view of putting this item
4	on the agenda.
5	Maybe we could take a minute to have the
6	Staff Director tell us at least what they've been
7	thinking about, which doesn't preclude us from
8	thinking about something entirely different.
9	How about that? Would you mind doing
10	that?
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Not at all.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In general, just tell
13	us what they've been. Are you on, Commissioner Lee?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee?
16	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Excuse me.
17	Madame Chair, if I may, I don't understand why the
18	Commission has such difficulty in telephone service in
19	reaching Commissioners.
20	I'm on several boards and we never have
21	any trouble. And it's either that we have cheap
22	equipment or someone doesn't know how to operate it.
23	I'm assuming it's cheap equipment, and I think it's a
24	worthwhile investment to upgrade it.
25	Every time I've been on the phone, I got

1	about every third word. Well, I could do with every
2	other word, but getting only third word, you're at a
3	slight disadvantage.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And all of the
5	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I think it's
6	a serious problem.
7	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I agree.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And all of you how
9	serve on other boards and commissions and all of us
10	know that there is better equipment.
11	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you know, I've
13	spent hours, and I know you have, participating in
14	something and I never lost a word that anybody said.
15	So, it's possible to have better equipment.
16	COMMISSIONER LEE: Hello again.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And the equipment we
18	have now, for your information, is better than what we
19	had when I first came on the Commission in the Dark
20	Ages.
21	But even now, this is I mean, Staff
22	Director, is there something that you can do about
23	this equipment?
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, we
25	have one other option that I'm aware of. We can

1	certainly explore others that I'm not aware of. But
2	the one other option that we could use, which might be
3	just what was needed here, is to have lapel
4	microphones for each Commissioner, which would just
5	bring the microphone closer to the speaking voice.
6	But whether or not that will amplify
7	sufficiently for a Commissioner on the phone
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, we're talking
9	about the disconnections as well as the sound quality.
10	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Yes. I will have
11	staff look into this. Because I personally I don't
12	know what is causing this problem, and I'm as anxious
13	to have it solved as you all are.
14	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm on the
15	Board of the New York Times and the National
16	Geographic, and it just works all the time. National
17	Geographic is in Washington.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: No, I've never had
20	a problem in any corporate setting. And I think
21	probably we need the staff or a consultant to make a
22	recommendation to us about options for new equipment,
23	would be my guess, and find out how much that would
24	cost and if we had the money to do it.
25	It would be a terrific thing we could do

1	for the Commission for a long, long time.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner
3	Lee?
4	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good.
6	COMMISSIONER LEE: I'm on.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're talking about
8	the programmatic theme idea. And I've just been
9	handed a note by the Parliamentarian that the naming
10	of names of a possible person to be hired should not
11	be done because it might create a conflict of interest
12	if the person is hired, because people are supposed to
13	be hired through a bidding process and open
14	competition.
15	And guidelines can be established and
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, you're
17	thinking of the facilitator?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, I was
20	thinking this was pro bono work, not
21	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, that's not
22	necessarily
23	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: In the same way
24	that we have had people speak to us before: Dr.
25	Florez and, you know, other people come.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And so
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, so we're not
4	talking about a contract?
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, I'm not.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right,
7	now, what we're doing here
8	COMMISSIONER LEE: Excuse me, Madame
9	Chair.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes?
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: I think I missed part
12	of the discussion. On the programmatic theme, are we
13	talking about a separate meeting to talk about this or
14	
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we're doing is we
16	are agreed that the Commissioners will talk among
17	themselves at some point about a programmatic theme.
18	If that doesn't work, then the Commission will have
19	someone who is more expert come in talk to us and
20	facilitate our discussion so we can come up with a
21	theme.
22	And so far, everyone has agreed that there
23	ought to be some kind of theme, or at least explore
24	the idea of having a theme.
25	And we stopped there when you were off the

And I said the Staff phone, and now you're back. 1 Director had shown me a list here of themes that the 2 staff had been discussing. And I thought we would 3 4 just tell you what those were. COMMISSIONER LEE: Okay. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then we can either 6 discuss them, not discuss them, move on, or whatever 7 the Commission chooses to do. But go ahead, Staff 8 Director. 9 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: 10 Okay, Madame I have a couple of thoughts to bring up, and 11 12 just a couple of subsets for each to give you the feel for the staff's thinking. 13 These are not fully developed ideas yet. 14 The Civil Rights Implications for Children 15 is the first idea we have explored, looking at issues 16 juvenile justice and 17 such the Delinquency 18 Prevention Act of 1974. You probably are aware of 19 Congressional hearings that have been held recently on 20 juvenile violence. 21 And there are some statistics that the staff has been aware of showing the largest percentage 22 23 of criminals over the next five years is projected to 24 be in the teenage age bracket.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Another possible subset of this broad

category of civil rights implications for children 1 2 would be children in poverty. Questions that we could explore would be 3 things like what are the current figures on children 4 in poverty? What factors account for these figures? 5 Are they rising? 6 Another subset could be teenage literacy. 7 Just what are the statistics and what are the 8 precipitating factors there as well? 9 And another area we could explore would be 10 the issue of children and AIDS and the high percentage 11 that seems to be there currently in the statistics. 12 What are schools -- implications for schools with 13 children who have HIV/AIDS, virus testing for drugs, 14 15 that type of questioning. If I could move on to another --16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead. 17 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: -- possibility 18 19 for consideration would be a topic on the Status of And the subsets here we would be thinking 20 Women. about would be health care/pay equity issues, 21 employment in non-traditional fields, and sexual 22 harassment. 23 A third possibility staff is exploring is 24 the general concept of Hate Crimes. And in this area, 25

we would be thinking about the militia movement, 1 2 possibly following up on the Fort Bragg killings and some of the information that was imparted in our 3 recent Commission meeting from our Regional Director 4 5 on that, church bombings in the South and all of the concerns that they would raise in the civil rights 6 7 implications. What are the root causes? 8 The militia 9 Those would be some possibilities of movement. 10 getting into the -- into that subject matter. 11 And the last concept that staff is just beginning to think about is Civil Rights Enforcement 12 13 through Litigation. And this project, if we would pursue this, would examine over three to four years 14 15 the efforts of litigators to enforce civil rights in 16 various subject areas: housing, employment, education, voting and the like. 17 18 And the interaction of court procedure and 19 civil rights could be assessed to determine whether unexpected obstacles impede the progress of civil 20 21 rights. 22 Such analysis an could assist in determining what recommendations, if any, would better 23 enforcement efforts through substantive 24 enhance 25 statutes.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's interesting.
2	So, we have children, status of women, hate crimes,
3	and enforcement through litigation as themes that
4	they've been thinking about.
5	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm ready to
6	vote.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You're ready to vote?
8	(Laughter.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anyone, any comment on
10	any of the Staff's ideas? Yes, Commissioner Horner?
11	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I
12	don't know whether it's premature to comment since we
13	may be having a fuller exploration, but I see two out
14	of those that really stand out in my mind.
15	One is the children violence, juvenile
16	justice administration. Given the statistics we've
17	all been reading recently about what as Mary
18	suggested, what may be impending and how we're going
19	to deal with that or prevent whatever we can prevent
20	of it.
21	The other is the civil rights enforcement
22	through litigation. It's a constant theme and all our
23	discussions of civil rights enforcement, budgets, and
24	broad broad diverging approaches to civil
25	improvement of civil rights.

1	The question of litigation, public and
2	private, and its effectiveness I think is a
3	significant one.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any other anyone
5	else have any comments? Commissioner Redenbaugh?
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, I would say
7	that I would agree with Commissioner Horner about
8	those two projects. But I think all four of these are
9	projects rather than an overall theme.
10	They are projects that we could we
11	definitely ought to consider. But I don't think they
12	move up to the level of a vision statement that would
13	then guide us for a pneumatic or mission vision
14	statement for a long number of years, three years or
15	five years, something like that.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You see, that's why we
17	need a facilitator because we don't know the
18	difference between a project and a vision statement.
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, I think
20	they're worthy projects.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
22	Higginbotham, you said you were ready to vote. I know
23	you were kidding, but what's your reaction to these
24	topics?
25	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: No, I am. I'm

78 ready. 1 (Laughter.) 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You don't know the 3 difference either. 4 (Laughter.) 5 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Well I quess 6 if I had to vote for one broad category, without 7 drawing the specificity, I would include children, for 8 which there would be many subsets. 9 We have a tendency to often talk about 10 eradicating racial, religious, national origin or 11 gender discrimination. And we seem to be oblivious to 12 the fact that integrated poverty is as devastating for 13 the victim as a racial poverty or gender poverty or 14 religious poverty. 15 And somehow or another in the next 16 century, we're going to have to come to grips with how 17 we can talk in terms of broad scale human rights, and 18 what are the paths by which we can work on the 19 protection of human rights, which will have the civil 20 rights implication, and yet be very inclusive. 21 And so for that reason, the whole issue of 22

children in poverty, or some aspect of it -- you're talking about you would go for children in violence.

I am confident that if you get a rundown on the data,

23

24

1	you would find that poor children are more victims of
2	poverty than welcome. So, that it seems
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You mean of violence
4	or of poverty?
5	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Poor children
6	are more often, percentage-wise, victims of poverty
7	than affluent children.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think you mean
9	violence.
10	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes, let me
11	say it again. I obviously didn't say it right. Poor
12	children are more often a victim of violence than
13	affluent children.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: So therefore,
16	if you're looking at violence, you've got to look at
17	poverty. `
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. I see, okay.
19	Yes, Commissioner Redenbaugh?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think we're
21	having it right now, aren't we?
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: See, see. This
24	is man behind the curtain. Maybe the whole
25	question because one of the concerns I have about

1	children, having a number of them myself
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Too numerous to
3	mention.
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, no.
5	(Laughter.)
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Watch it. But
7	the concern that I have is the kind of lives the
8	children lead, even although middle class or affluent,
9	are very different from, I think, what I hold as the
10	ideal.
11	Maybe a theme of children and family, not
12	limiting it to children and poverty, but could be
13	something I could certainly get behind as a theme,
14	children and family.
15	And you know, there's a dozen or two dozen
16	subsets under that.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
18	George?
19	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Perhaps a consensus
20	is already emerging because I too think that of the
21	items that Staff has suggested, that the concern with
22	children would be the one that I would vote for if it
23	were put to a vote today.
24	I do think though that we shouldn't rule
25	out in advance the possibility that we would carry on

our theme of racial and ethnic tensions. There's more 1 to be donee. 2 3 I think what has been done is or will be The -- my experience on the Commission invaluable. with having that theme inclines me to the view that 5 having a theme is a good thing, although I don't think 6 it's an indispensable thing. 7 And if we can't agree on a theme, that's 8 fine. And I'm not arguing here for the retention of 9 the racial and ethnic tensions theme. I just want to 10 11 say that it should be in the mix. We shouldn't consider that we're done with that and can move on. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee, are 14 you still there? 15 COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I'm still here. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, I just wanted to make sure we didn't lose you. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair? 19 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: My memory of this case may be better than Russell's. We're beating 20 21 up on Russell today. Because it seems to me that in 22 the very initial discussion, Russell had suggested the theme that I've been thinking about, and it may work 23 24 out.

But I just want to put it on the table.

Of the suggestions, incidentally, I too am taken by an 1 overriding them of children. Because when we think of 2 civil rights, we want to think about a time in our 3 country when we have to worry less as a government of 4 civil rights and the American people, simply as a 5 matter of practice and custom, exercise civil rights 6 as we described it. 7 So, the theme of children can look 20 8 years toward the future. What can we do now? So that 9 when they're adults, we have less government -- in the 10 area of civil rights? 11 But the -- but my election is that a theme 12 that was suggested by Russell just in passing was the 13 theme of empowerment. And I've been thinking about as 14 a possible theme because with civil rights, we're 15 concerned about having all individuals and all groups 16 having the same power in our society to be able to 17 influence, power to protect themselves. 18 So, and that could come up with children, 19 20 with families, with different racial or ethnic or 21 religious groups. So, I just wanted to put that -- the theme 22 of empowerment on the table. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you recall this 24 theme, Commissioner Redenbaugh?

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I do. 1 2 (Laughter.) Surprising as COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 3 this might seem. 4 (Laughter.) 5 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm kind of 6 running away from the term "empowerment," but I like 7 8 the distinction and the phenomenon. Empowerment, I think, is kind of a loaded or code word among certain 9 groups in the country. 10 But I -- so it has -- the word has that 11 But one of the things I've been thinking 12 baggage. about is kind of what will the country be like in the 13 next century. You know, it's not too far off to begin 14 15 thinking that way if you're a long-term investor or policy planner. 16 And I've been thinking of that -- of our 17 18 paradigm of the -- of the entitlement paradigm is 19 going to give way to something else because the 20 country has now gotten pretty well divided into groups 21 that don't like each other. 22 Across that issue, there's a, you know, bid wedge around that. And I -- so I don't know where 23 24 it might lead. But I think where it might end up, one 25 of the candidates I think to replace that, is the

notion not of -- and to replace this notion of 2 redistribution is a notion of participation. 3 And empowerment, I think, is over in that direction of participation. I was -- the reports I 4 Ι was impressed by the 5 had from reports. Congressman Rangel's appearance on television last 6 7 night in which he said jobs and economic opportunity really the thing that the African-American 8 community needs. 9 10 And I'm so struck by the need for that, 11 you know? As I've said before, we are punishing our 12 citizens by having the economy grow at this crawling two percent rate, an enormous disparate impact on 13 14 people who are not employed or not fully employed. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 15 Well, you had every opportunity to run for president on such a platform: 16 17 a growth of two percent. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well --18 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's all right. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: -- in the recent 20 and not-lamented Republican primary campaigns, I 21 noticed the historical practice of killing the 22 23 messenger was subverted to the practice of because we didn't like the messenger, we killed the message. 24 (Laughter.) 25

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't even have to
2	ask you what message. Now, I have been thinking when
3	you said "empowerment," which you're right, it is a
4	loaded word. But when you mentioned that, I didn't
5	forget it either.
6	And I had been thinking about it. I
7	thought you would raise it again today and you didn't.
8	So, I was prepared to have you raise it.
9	And what I thought you meant, Russell, was
10	that and you and I had a conversation about this a
11	long time ago, which there's no way you could
12	remember.
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No way.
13 14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No way.
14	(Laughter:)
14 15	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden
14 15 16	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden in fact.
14 15 16 17	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden  in fact.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I remember that.
14 15 16 17	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden in fact.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I remember that.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That what you really
14 15 16 17 18	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden in fact.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I remember that.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That what you really want to do civil rights is get to a point where you
14 15 16 17 18 19	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden in fact.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I remember that.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That what you really want to do civil rights is get to a point where you don't have to worry so much about enforcement, as Cruz
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Laughter:)  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It was in your garden in fact.  COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I remember that.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That what you really want to do civil rights is get to a point where you don't have to worry so much about enforcement, as Cruz said. But when people are empowered or participate or

enforcement.

I mean, that would really be the goal; 1 2 that if people are treating each other the way they're supposed to be treating each other anyway, and there 3 are not the constraints on -- whether it's credit or 4 loans or whatever you're talking about --5 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- then you don't need 7 to worry about civil rights enforcement so much, 8 9 right? COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, I don't 10 believe in the perfectibility of man. And I think 11 these schemes that rely on our innate goodness are 12 really likely to fail. 13 14 But I know the arrangements that are based 15 on social power and economic power endure and work well. And I think the tragedy in America is that 16 there are large numbers of people and groups that are 17 systematically -- don't have access to participation. 18 And credit and capital is one of the 19 20 things you mentioned. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, if we were going 22 to pursue the racial and ethnic tensions with our 23 subtitle, which is what? I forgot what the subtitle was, poverty and inequality and discrimination? 24 25 As Commissioner George was saying, and if

were going to tie that together with your 1 participation, what I thought you were going to 2 propose Russell, so I'll say you're proposing it. 3 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, I like that. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is -- hypothetically, 5 is that the Commission might, over in the next series, 6 do some models of what works in all the areas of 7 trying to "empower" people so that they're in a 8 position to take care of themselves. 9 I mean, whether it's education models or 10 things at work, whether it's entrepreneurship models 11 12 or --COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Access to credit 13 14 and capital. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Whether it's access to 15 credit models that do, in fact, work. 16 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, credit and 17 18 capital. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And you know, if you 19 look -- yes, credit and capital. If you look at the 20 areas in which we think people need participation, 21 22 whether it's voting areas that work, see what works. This time what we've done in the racial 23 tension series is to identify all the problems and 24 25 have everybody tell us what they are, and make some --

we hadn't made any findings yet, I don't think. Maybe 1 we made some report. 2 But this would be a whole different 3 ballgame in that you're trying to figure out what does 4 work to move people to the point where we think they 5 should be moved. 6 And there will, of course, be disagreement 7 about whether this works or that works or whether 8 somebody thinks that should work or not work, or 9 whether it's consistent -- whether there would be news 10 about something else. 11 But the identification of what works, I 12 think, would make an important contribution. 13 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think so too. 14 And I think it can begin an important discussion. 15 think what we ought to be -- not we, the Commission --16 what we, the country, ought to be arguing about is how 17 best to get the growth rate of the economy up to four 18 percent, not how best to slow it down. 19 And you know, we have a billion new people 20 in the global labor force that weren't there five 21 years ago. And that's been a tremendous change in the 22 supply, and a tremendous source of 23 competition for Americans who only have to sell their 24 25 labor.

1	And you know, it's one of the one of
2	the facts of the rest of the century and into the next
3	one that can't go away, that the labor/capital ratio
4	has shifted very dramatically in a very short period
5	of time.
6	And I think that as long as it's my
7	view that as long as we maintain this two percent
8	growth rate, we will trap people right where they are.
9	We will trap them in poverty. We will trap them in
10	middle class sort of wage/slave, you know, work hard
11	to pay your taxes; two incomes are not enough.
12	And at the same time, it's not a surprise
13	that incomes of the at the bottom end of the labor
14	spectrum are falling in real terms, because that's
15	where all the new competition is.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then of course
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And I think
18	we've got to take account of that in the work we do.
19	You know, otherwise, too many groups in America will
20	be entitled to sit in the front of the stopped bus.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Okay,
22	Commissioner Higginbotham?
23	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I sort of am
24	a scribbler. If I had to vote within two minutes for
25	a theme, what I would call it would be "Children at

T	Risk from violence, Poverty and Inequality to a New
2	Empowerment, Height and Opportunity."
3	And within that, you can spin off a whole
4	host of things. You can look at race. You can look
5	at religion. You can look at immigration.
6	But what we're talking about is going from
7	where we are to where we should be. And that has to
8	be the theme. And in it, you look at all the impact
9	of racial discrimination.
10	So, I guess we've got to work out a two
11	sentence theme. You know, and then you can spin off
12	a whole lot of components within that.
13	COMMISSIONER LEE: Excuse me, Madame
14	Chair. Could you ask the person to speak louder? I
15	can't hear the
16	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: You can't hear
17	me?
18	(Laughter.)
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Talk in that little
20	thingy there.
21	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm sorry.
22	Can you hear me now?
23	COMMISSIONER LEE: Oh yes. Oh, that was
24	you, okay.
25	(Laughter.)

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Say that again so
2	Yvonne can hear.
3	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: No, I was
4	saying that I had to try to figure out in less than
5	two sentences, a theme that would sort of be your
6	skeleton, and you would build up from that a great
7	deal.
8	And if I had to have a theme, it might be
9	"Our Children at Risk from Violence, Poverty and
10	Inequality to a New Empowerment, Height and
11	Opportunity."
12	Now when you talk about inequality, you
13	can spin off all of the present discrimination,
14	intentional or unintentional, the economic problems.
15	And then you talk about the vision as to where they
16	should be.
17	So, that was what I was trying to suggest.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner?
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair
20	Leon, did you say "Our Children," O-U-R?
21	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes, O-U-R.
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay, okay.
23	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I mean, you're
24	going to strike out
25	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Right, does

violence? 1 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think he was just 2 making clear that it's a statement. In other words, 3 it's not put in the form of a question. 4 COMMISSIONER HORNER: Right, right. 5 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: "Our Children 6 at Risk:". 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the violence and 8 the economic stuff Russ was talking about, the 9 violence stuff that Connie and others were talking 10 about, all of that somehow would have to have a place 11 in it. 12 it's not just totally the So, 13 discrimination side. There's the other side, which is 14 (1) you know, what causes the crime, how do you 15 contain it, what's going to happen. And the economic 16 stuff because if you don't have economic empowerment -17 18 - I wish I can think of the -- economic whatever, the children won't be able to prosper, whether their 19 20 families are able to prosper, which is connected to this whole issue of jobs and growth and all the rest 21 of it. 22 23 So, it's trying to come up with a theme that would encompass all of that. Yes, Commissioner 24

Horner?

1	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I think that's a
2	very good theme, and I would support it with just a
3	question as to whether in identifying violence,
4	poverty and inequality, we aren't presenting a pre-
5	judgement as to the range of sources of
6	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: There are many
7	more.
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes, there are many
9	more, and I think we must I think it would be
10	preferable to say "Our Children at Risk" and then
11	either a generic statement.
12	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Sure.
13	COMMISSIONER HORNER: For instance, I
14	would want to family break-down, et cetera, from my
15	side of the table here, and so on. But generically
16	
17	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'm not
18	hostile to exploring family breakdown.
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I know you're not.
20	But I think broadly children at risk is not only
21	perfect for this Commission, I think it's appropriate
22	for the whole country.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about "Causes,
24 -	Consequences and Remedies?"
25	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes, something like

that.
COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: The same
prescription I'm not sure.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You don't have to say
what the answer is
COMMISSIONER HORNER: Right.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: since we don't know
what the answer
COMMISSIONER HORNER: I think that would
be better.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Something like that.
Yes, Commissioner George and then Commissioner
Redenbaugh?
COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, there are some
things that are whether or not they're causes,
they're certainly consequences like violence. And I -
- if we could agree on just what the bad consequences
are, then maybe we would maybe we should draw
attention to that.
I mean, I think the value of doing some
programs, hearings, or other events in this area is
just focusing the spotlight on some things that are
that are known in some areas, among academics,
professionals of the criminal justice system, and so

forth, but need to be more widely known.

People need to be more worried generally about this. And juvenile violence is plainly -plainly one of them. The problem that I've been worrying about a lot, as you know, is the plight of the African-American male I think is -- comes under this, and is exactly the kind of problem where a light needs to be shed. People really need to know the facts about this. And we can argue, and need to argue a lot about what the origins of the problem are and what can be done about the problem. But that there is a problem, that has got to get some attention. And we can, I think, do a service in that. So we can, you know, I think at least identify some bad things that we want to shed the light on, and then maybe make an effort, it doesn't have to be in the title of the thing, to highlight not only the problems, but as -- as you say, Madame Chairman, try to identify what has been working out there, at least in small scales and try to encourage the good as well as throw light on the bad. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Mr. Redenbaugh, did

you have another comment or did this squelch you? Did George's comment --

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

· 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, I don't. I

think that would be unlikely. 1 (Laughter.) 2 3 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Conceivable, but -- as long as we're not on legal topics. No, I don't 4 know how to do this, but I think it is important that 5 the staff really support and be a part of -- and 6 endorse this kind of vision statement or theme. 7 Now I gather since the seed of this came 8 from staff that they are not hostile to what we've 9 done here. But I think -- and I don't know -- in this 10 kind of meeting, I don't know how we can accomplish 11 12 that. But I would not want us to go in the 13 direction that the eight of us loved and that the 14 15 staff really resisted because they had no passion for 16 it. You know, I think that -- I've been in 17 organizations like that, not fun. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, Commissioner 19 Horner, did you --20 21 COMMISSIONER HORNER: just wanted to I 22 add that I think we really ought to focus as a theme 23 of what we do on your suggestion of what works. And it needn't, as Robbie suggested, be part of our formal 24 25 title, although perhaps that would be a good thing.

But I think it ought to be an aggressive 1 effort by the staff in constructing our undertaking to 2 focus not exclusively, but in a significant way on 3 that, on models that work. 4 Commissioner BERRY: CHAIRPERSON 5 Higginbotham? 6 I just threw COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: 7 this out. I think that we've got to look at it this 8 way. What is it that captured the attention of a broad 9 spectrum of people to cause them to recognize a 10 11 significant problem? The reason why I used "Our" O-U-R, 12 "Children at Risk," is that there is sort of an "us 13 and them" mentality in this country. And I think all 14 15 of our children are at risk in many, many way, so that we have to convey a message that you cannot sort of 16 create artificial boundaries and the problem does not 17 18 spill over. 19 It's just like the whole question with 20 these nuclear plants. If a plant blows up in Russia, 21 in Sweden you may die. And if something blows up in 22 North Philadelphia, it's going to have a big impact at 23 Bryn Mawr. 24 And I think that we've got to reach the 25 American public so that they do not think there are

1	false security barriers which they can put up and
2	their children will not be at risk.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, why don't we
4	one way to test the staff response is to note body
5	language. And I haven't seen anybody out there
6	(Laughter.)
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: or anything else
8	out there. The other is
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Did you see
10	them all giving the victory sign out there?
11	(Laughter.)
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The other is to ask if
13	the Staff Director could take away from this
14	discussion, if it is the Commissioners' wish, and
15	attempt to, in draft form, sort of put something
16	together that contains these ideas that we have all
17	expressed.
18	And there are areas that I can hear
19	resounding in my ears of agreement, at least about
20	what we ought to be looking at, and the idea about
21	children.
22	And then we could look at it and think
23	about this some more, and revisit the question again.
24	And I think we did pretty well
25	unfacilitated, but maybe I'm wrong.

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm not willing
2	to accept the assessment that it was unfacilitated.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right. Is
5	there anyone who thinks the suggestion about having
6	the staff do that and we will get some sense when
7	we get it back of how they feel about it to from the
8	way it's written up and
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, I like that
10	recommendation.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
12	Anderson?
13	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Can I ask, does
14	that leave open the possibility for further discussion
15	of themes
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh sure.
17	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: the next.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh sure. This was
19	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: But I think it's
20	a good I think it's a good theme, but I'd like to
21	reflect a little bit more on
22	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: There may be
23	others proposed.
24 -	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And meanwhile, why
25	don't we think? If we think of others or nuances on

this one, the next time we come together, we won't 1 just spend time discussing this one, but react to it 2 some more and see what else we think. 3 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair? 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 5 STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: If I can add one 6 We'll be very happy to respond, as comment here. 7 indicated, on the dialogue here today. 8 Commissioners desire to consider the beginning of this 9 project in Fiscal 1998, we would need to have some 10 closure at the next meeting for budget preparation for 11 submittal in early September. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Let me ask too, 13 at least two Commissioners expressed some interest in 14 the civil rights enforcement through litigation as a 15 topic at least maybe, if not a theme, then as a 16 17 project. Would you like the staff to elaborate 18 somewhat on that, see what it looks like, or shall we 19 20 just move on? Yes, Commissioner Anderson? COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I would appreciate 21 I didn't address -- no one has addressed the 22 that. other topic there of hate crimes. And I wonder if it 23 isn't worth speaking maybe at the next meeting a 24 little bit on whether we think that -- and I don't 25

know whether the best description of this as a topic 1 is hate crimes. 2 But we spent a lot of time looking at 3 racial and ethnic tension. And as we come to the 4 conclusion of this, we see a much larger incidence of 5 militia -- so-called militia activity, bombing of 6 7 churches. And do we consider that to be simply a 8 9 blip that is a several year phenomena, but is in a Or are we seeing something here 10 sense extraneous. that is a shift somehow and may be a shift as a result 11 12 of globalization or a number of other items? And if it is a shift, like maybe what 13 14 happened in the 20's with the resurgence of the Klan 15 in so many states and it was sort of a decade 16 phenomenon, we're seeing something like that happen, maybe it deserves our attention in a way that it won't 17 18 be attended to in other forms. 19 But I say maybe hate crimes is not the 20 best topic to address that phenomena. Maybe it's not 21 as significant a phenomena as I may be suggesting it is. 22 23 But if it is a significant phenomena, then 24 maybe this Commission, even though it's not an easy 25 one obviously to look at, maybe it's something we

1	ought to think about a little bit. I just wanted to
2	put that out.
3	COMMISSIONER LEE: Madame Chair?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Lee?
5	COMMISSIONER LEE: I agree with Commis-
6	sioner Anderson. I am concerned about the increasing
7	activities against these groups. And even though we
8	may agree on bringing that up, find that report or
9	whatever, I think time does not permit us to do that.
LO	I would appreciate having a briefing on
11	this issue and a very near future meeting. Because
L2	we've gotten reports from the Department of Treasury
L3	that I do think it would help me a lot if we have a
L4	briefing among the Commissioners just to discuss the
L5	topic.
L6	And that may help us to decide on future
L7	activity areas.
L8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I think that a
L9	briefing would be a good idea. And in particular, I
20	am struck by Commissioner Anderson's points about
21	globalization as a possible factor, and other kinds of
22	things, and whether there is some kind of a change
23	going on or some kind of a sea change or a "blip" as
24	he put it.

And it is an important-enough issue that

1	it would seem curious indeed if we, as a Civil Rights
2	Commission, paid no attention to it or while this
3	is going on and it's everywhere, or at least being
4	discussed everywhere.
5	And so if we could begin with a briefing
6	where we brought in some experts as well as maybe
7	we could find the kind of experts like the guy from
8	Temple is going to become a paradigm of what it is
9	that we're trying to find who would talk to us
LO	about these matters.
11	That would help us in trying to decide
12	whether we need to have a project on it or something
13	else. What do you think about that, Commissioner
14	Anderson?
15	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Sure, it would be
16	great.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'd like to hear
19	from the Southern Law Poverty Center, as experts with
20	a passion on one you know, a passion and a vision
21	about this situation.
22	Then, I would like to hear from academic
23	experts, if any, who believe that the material that
24 ·	the Poverty Center puts forth is on one side of the
25	question that Carl asked, a blip rather than a trend.

1	In other words, I have had the same
2	question. Are we are we in one of those situations
3	where we're reading the early signs of something that
4	will be historically awful, or are we seeing
5	heightened communication of isolated events that have
6	always been with us, or that are only slightly
7	escalated for easily explained reasons?
8	So, I hope that we can make a very serious
9	effort to answer that question rather than just
10	provide another venue for aggregated expression of
11	aggregated anecdotes which we've all read a lot of.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we then say,
13	unless someone objects, that the briefing will be
14	directed at that particular question? We'll try to
15	enlighten ourselves about that.
16	Of course, in the course of the
17	discussion, the experts may say something about the
18	episodes or something.
19	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Oh no, no, that's a
20	given.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: But I don't know
23	whether we have anyone who is attempting to answer
24	this question. But only contending parties with the
25	point of view with in other words, is there an

impartial academic assessment available anywhere? 1 I don't know. If there is, I sure would 2 love to hear from it. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And Charlie Rivera, I 4 may say that, Staff Director, who does these things, 5 there has to be squirreled away somewhere an academia, 6 somebody who's sitting there musing about this and 7 writing all kinds of things in obscure journals nobody 8 ever reads, except five other people, who would be 9 10 happy to come and tell us at great length about all the reasons for this, where the trends seem to be 11 Or maybe one of two. Yes, Commissioner 12 going. 13 Higginbotham? COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I think there 14 15 are a lot of -- more than 25 years ago. I was on the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of 16 our Conservative -- Senator Kennedy was assassinated. 17 Malcolm and some others. 18 19 What I would hope -- what I would hope is 20 that anyone whom we have to come to speak, that we get their material which they've written and that we get 21 22 it a few days in advance. 23 My mind isn't fast enough to sort out a 24 But if I got the data a week in advance, I 25 can then correlate it to a whole host of others. And

I have just found that those kinds of presentations 1 2 are much more effective. If we have data, then we can have a real 3 Otherwise, we're just the recipient of a 4 penetrating speech. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Yes, Vice 6 Chair? 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Sometimes, I 8 find that rather than having there be conflicting 9 views that the people who spend a lot of time on these 10 issues generally end up agreeing. But somehow it 11 doesn't get translated to public policy. 12 So, I'm not sure that we'll always find 13 In some areas, there might be contrasting views. 14 pretty uniform opinions by those who have spent a lot 15 of time studying these issues. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. Okay, so we'll 17 do that on that question. All right, if there is no 18 objection, then we'll go to the next item on the 19 agenda, which is item number six, the Commission's 20 subpoena power, which we have visited and visited and 21 continue to visit, because it's an important issue. 22 And we have a memo from Commissioner 23 Commissioner George, would you like to --24 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Thank you, Madame 25

Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- comment and begin the discussion?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I have not modified my proposal since the last time I had it before you. It was modified from the time before that, especially in light of Commissioner Higginbotham's observations and suggestions.

I hoped that what this proposal would do, if enacted -- and it's in the form of a motion to issue a policy directive to the Staff Director within the administrative instructions -- would be to improve the accountability of the -- in the use of our subpoena power and the Commissioners' role and accountability in the use of the power, and also to avoid potential First Amendment problems having to do with compelling opinion testimony, without harming or restricting in any serious or damaging way the scope of the subpoena -- of the Commission's subpoena power.

A broad scope, I think, is necessary to accomplish the goals that we have, and our responsibilities to fulfill them. But I don't think that that means that we cannot improve accountability and other aspects of our exercising the subpoena power.

1	So, I'll simply recall that my proposal is
2	in two parts. One goes to the question of
3	distinguishing opinion, which I call perspective
4	testimony, from fact testimony.
5	And the second part has to do with
6	procedures for approval by the Commissioners,
7	subpoenas duces tecum.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee, are
9	you there?
10	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I'm still here.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I just want to make
12	sure we hadn't lost you.
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I don't if
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you hear
15	Commissioner George?
16	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I can hear him.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I would be happy to
19	vote on my proposal today, but I don't want to force
20	this. I think this is an issue that we should work
21	out altogether.
22	And if people want still more time to
23	think about it or if people want to propose further
24	revisions in view of any thought they've been able to
25	give it in the meantime, I would be happy to do that

	as well.
2	I hope that we will, sooner rather than
3	later, get around to some reform. And I'd be happy,
4	as I say, to do it today, but it doesn't absolutely
5	have to be done today from my point of view.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone just
7	point of information, Staff Director, do you know when
8	the Commission's reauthorization hearing, I guess it's
9	a hearing, is to take place?
10	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, the
11	latest word I have is not definite. It's just
12	possible thinking about the House Oversight
13	Subcommittee and the months that they are considering
14	holding a hearing for our reauthorization are possibly
15	June or July.
16	On the Senate side, we may or may not have
17	a hearing on reauthorization.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, in view of
20	that, Madame Chairman, maybe it would be good to vote
21	on this today if we possibly could.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When is the June
23	meeting?
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: The June meeting
25	give me one second is June 14th.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The fourteenth. 1 I'11 give you a moment there, Staff Director, to see what 2 Mr. Cunningham has to --3 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Let me say in the 4 5 meantime, Madame Chairman, that I recognize that my proposal is not perfect. I just have not been able to 6 7 come up with a way in my own mind to improve it still further. 8 There's a particular issue that will, I 9 think, be a vexing one under my proposal, which is it 10 11 won't always be possible to distinguish very easily between the two types of testimony that I've 12 13 designated fact and perspective in part one. And I just think it's one of those areas 14 15 where we're going to have to do the best we can, and 16 hope by good will all around, we'll be able to muddle through. 17 18 I think there will be, in most cases, clear cases as to whether we're asking for somebody's 19 20 perspective and philosophical view or we're asking for 21 data. But plainly, there will be cases where 22 23 it's difficult to try the line. I just don't know what to do about them. 24 -

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you have anything

to add on the reauthorization issue? 1 The Assistant STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: 2 Staff Director for Congressional Affairs indicated to 3 me just a moment ago that in his latest discussion 4 with the Senate Staff, they have now indicated that 5 they will hold a hearing, but the date has not been 6 set. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Commissioner 8 Horner? 9 10 COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, I don't know what issues the Senate or the House are 11 planning to raise in the context of reauthorization, 12 and yet you're going to be asked to go up and testify, 13 14 perhaps as early as early June and before another 15 meeting of the Commission. And since I dom't know what the issues 16 are, I don't know that we are able to give you the 17 18 Commission's advice on how to testify with respect to these issues. 19 20 And I'm wondering if you're planning 21 simply to react out of your own sense of what's 22 appropriate or if you have a -- in other words, what's the Commission going to say through you when asked 23 24 about issues, whatever they are? 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, if we have a

hearing or when we have a hearing, I would hope, given 1 2 the fact that the Congress now has a majority from the Republican party, that one -- at least one of the 3 Commissioners who is a Republican would be willing to 4 go to the hearing. 5 In the past, Commissioner Anderson has 6 We've all been very grateful for that. 7 gone. Commissioner Horner, Mr. Anderson -- let's see, do we 8 have anybody else who's actually a Republican here? 9 So that it would be very helpful both to 10 give their perspectives, I mean your own perspective, 11 about whatever it is I'm saying or not saying, and 12 your own point of view, and also to show the 13 bipartisan nature of the Commission publicly. 14 We've always thought in the past that that 15 When the Democrats controlled the 16 was important. Congress and the Chair went up, who was a Republican, 17 often somebody from the Independent side or affiliated 18 with the Democrats would go up to show support and 19 20 that it was bipartisan. So I would hope that the same thing would 21 22 happen. COMMISSIONER HORNER: Madame Chair, if 23 anyone is going to do that, if we're not going to 24

attempt to achieve a consensus respecting any of the

1	issues relating to reauthorization, at least the
2	members of the Commission ought to know well in
3	advance what the members of the House and Senate
4	Committees think are issues. What are their plans and
5	proposals for us?
6	I don't know. And I would like to know as
7	soon as possible through the professional Legislative
8	Staff here or whatever.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I would like to
10	know too, and don't. I have no idea. The last time
11	I had gone up to testify, no one told me anything was
12	an issue before I got there.
13	COMMISSIONER HORNER: That's dreadful.
14	(Laughter.)
15	COMMISSIONER HORNER: And frankly, we
16	need to remedy that within the week, I would think,
17	and fill in the gaps.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So to the extent that
19	staff can find out what the issues are, it would be
20	very helpful if we knew so that we could discuss them.
21	In the absence of a discussion, in the
22	absence of finding anything out, all I have done is do
23	what Chairs have done before, which is answer
24	consistent with what I think the Commission has
25	publicly done on the record, because that's about all

1	I can do you know, unless I'm asked for my opinion.
2	And Commissioner Anderson, I guess he's
3	given what he thinks publicly as well as what his
4	opinion is. Is that pretty much the way it's been,
5	Commissioner Anderson?
6	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Well, that's a good
8	fall-back I suppose, but I don't think it's optimal.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I agree. Commissioner
10	George?
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, I don't think
12	I think we know at least one thing they're going to
13	ask about, and that's the subpoena issue. I mean,
14	we're not completely in the dark.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do we know this?
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, I guess we
17	don't know it officially. But realistically, we know
18	that this is a concern that we have all sorts of
19	evidence that this is a concern up there and there are
20	people prepared to introduce proposals, perhaps have
21	already introduced proposals.
22	I've seen at least drafts of legislative
23	proposals that I think would be Draconian as far as
24	the Commission's subpoena power is concerned and go
25	much too far in the name of reform.

1	So that's frankly, I mean if it's not
2	clear to people, let me make it clear to people. It's
3	frankly one of the reasons I'm interested in our
4	taking some action on this.
5	I think we can we can deal better and
6	more sensitively with our own problem here than can
7	Congress.
8	And I think I'm hoping we'll be able to
9	persuade Congress that we have done something.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director, do you
11	know or does the Assistant Staff Director for
12	Legislation know, officially whether this issue is
13	going to be raised?
14	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair, I
15	do not know. I have not received any information
16	about issues that might be raised at a hearing. I
17	could ask the Assistant Staff Director for
18	Congressional Affairs if you would like.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ask him, please.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Dr. Cunningham?
21	DR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes? I don't have any
22	official correspondence, but I know that in in
23	discussing this with staff, it is a very big concern
24	of theirs that the Committee Chairman does not have a
25	position on our subpoena power. But it is certainly

1	an issue that is likely to be addressed by the
2	Committee in considering reauthorization and
3	legislation.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And while you're
5	standing there, has anybody suggested any other
6	issues?
7	DR. CUNNINGHAM: Not that I've heard of.
8	And obviously, it would be the term of our
9	reauthorization and whether we would be reauthorized
10	would be an issue.
11	But frankly, whether we would be
12	reauthorized has not been discussed with the
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
14	DR. CUNNINGHAM: But the Chairman is
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So go right ahead.
16	COMMISSIONER HORNER: So as far as you
17	know, those are the only questions that would come up
18	that are substantial?
19	DR. CUNNINGHAM: Those matters
20	COMMISSIONER HORNER: And would you be
21	able to or I should direct I guess to the Staff
22	Director. Would it be possible for us to have a short
23	memo that would lay out what you know officially,
24	unofficially, however you know it, about the point of
25	view of the Committee members so that anyone who goes

1	to the hearing doesn't go in completely ignorant of
2	who thinks what as far as we know.
3	I mean, they've written us, made comments
4	in other hearings, talked to the press, whatever your
5	source
6	DR. CUNNINGHAM: That is our normal
7	procedure, and we would certainly
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay.
9	DR. CUNNINGHAM: be prepared to prepare
10	that memo.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right?
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MATHEWS: Madame Chair,
13	yes, I would add that for any hearing on this topic,
14	staff contacts the staff of the members of the
15	Subcommittee in advance of the hearing and tries to
16	glean this kind of information.
17	Sometimes it's forthcoming and sometimes
18	not. But we have consistently made an effort to get
19	this, and provide we will provide whatever
20	information comes out of those discussions?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. I just thought
22	we needed to know this information. Let's proceed.
23	Does anyone have any I forgot to mention that
24	Commissioner Redenbaugh, who has forgotten already,
25	testified once in the past at a reauthorization

1	hearing when Fletcher was Chair. Do you remember
2	that?
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I do, yes.
4	(Laughter.)
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: It's actually
6	coming back to me.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So Madame Chairman,
9	the party that you and Russell and I belong to was
10	represented fully?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
12	(Laughter.)
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone beg
14	your pardon?
15	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, no, just
16	mumbling.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have any
18	comment on Commissioner George's proposal or any other
19	matters related to the item number six, which is the
20	Commission's subpoena power? Yes, Commissioner
21	Higginbotham?
22	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I have a
23	rather strong position in terms of never drafting
24	anything to satisfy a Congressional Committee's
25	hostility to a procedure so that they will not become

Draconian if you think your position is 1 2 fundamentally right. I just don't believe in capitulating. 3 they want to take a position which I think is wrong, 4 I'd rather for them to do than to make a concession 5 which I think is inappropriate. 6 And that's my starting point. And so 7 8 therefore, I have to know, and I, the least experienced Commissioner here, as to what is the 9 problem and why? 10 11 Now, there's one decisive fact to me which is that of all of the federal independent commissions, 12 only two are required to seek enforcement through the 13 United States Attorney General. 14 15 So therefore, when someone talks about the United States Commission on Civil Rights being sort of 16 potentially more pernicious, the fact is it can't be. 17 18 Because we have the least amount of power of all of the agencies. So, that's my first point. 19 20 The second is that this system has been working from the beginning. And the Republicans 21 22 stayed on its axis and its function. So therefore, if someone wants to say 23 24 we've looked at your history for more than two decades 25 and how we want you to function differently than all

of the preceding commissions, I think it's their 1 2 burden to prove and not mine. So that my position, flat out, is we don't 3 have to do anything to placate anyone if we think 4 they're wrong. And I'd rather meet it head-on, let 5 them propose the most Draconian things, rather than to 6 make a concession which they're not entitled. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So your reading of the 8 memos about what the other commissions do leads you to 9 believe that ours is the most restrictive? 10 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I think so. 11 No one has made a suggestion in any document that the 12 Civil -- the United States Civil Rights -- the United 13 States Commission on Civil Rights is out of tandem 14 with what everyone else does, or that we are more 15 harsh or irresponsible or unfair. 16 So, I see no reason why we have to change. 17 Now, if -- if we get past the point where you've got 18 a majority's vote to change, then I can deal with the 19 20 language. But I think there's a very real risk on 21 amending administrative instructions. All you do is 22 open litigation because there's nothing which an 23 adversary likes more than to say they haven't complied 24 25 with their own regulations, their own instructions.

so therefore, when we start to, as for example in paragraph two, set up a guideline that all of these things have to be done at least one week in advance of the Commission meeting, and someone does it six days in advance, or five days in advance, right away you get subject to litigation that you didn't do -- give it timely notice.

Now in view of the smallness of -relative smallness of our staff and in view of what I
observed in my brief period of time, that they're
always in a crunch to set up additional criteria, it
seems to me, makes it much harder for the Staff to do
the job because by the nature of our situation,
there's always going to be a crunch.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Any other comments? Yes, Vice Chair?

Chair, as Rob indicated, there are two parts to his suggestion. The second part, I'll direct my attention to that before -- as I see it, the real change in the suggested procedure would be basically that the regulations now say "subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of written or other matter, can be issued by the Commission over the signature of the Chairman and may be served on any

person designated by the Chairman." 1 And as I -- the principal difference in 2 paragraph two would be that on many occasions, that 3 the Commissioners would have to vote on the issuance 4 of that. 5 And I'm just -- again, I was struck -- and 6 I mentioned last time -- with how liberal several of 7 the other commissions are, sometimes even allowing 8 individual members of the commissions to enforce their 9 -- to sign and enforce their subpoenas. 10 I would just hate to be more restrictive 11 than is required by law. And the subpoena reg that I 12 just read, it seems to me, does put the statute --13 have us do. So, I don't know that I'm in favor of 14 having us, as individual commissioners, vote on 15 subpoenas as they come up. 16 Because if we have a real question as to 17 the purpose of the hearing or the thrust of the 18 hearing, we, as commissioners can express that. 19 just -- I just don't know that we need to have the 20 individual commissioner's vote. 21 On the first part, I agree that it's 22 sometimes hard to tell when a person is a witness 23 that's going to be a fact witness or a --24

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Perspective?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: -- perspective witness. Well, there's an element of confusion there. My suggestion would be that we pick up, I think, on a suggestion that you had, Rob, early on that if we have a hearing, maybe we divide the hearing into two parts, a hearing and a non-hearing.

For the hearing, we continue to issue subpoenas. Then we could half a day or something of that sort where we have people come and testify without subpoenas on the broader philosophical, historical, other issues, but have that be not really be a hearing.

But the hearing itself sort of stick to the procedures we've followed. And that way, even if they get into testifying on facts, that's all right.

It's just the big difference is that we haven't subpoenaed them. And I don't know if that would be too confusing for the staff or not. But I remember our discussing that, oh, two or three months ago.

And rather than -- than changing the regs on our -- on how we exercise our subpoena power, because I think there is some danger to that, maybe we take care of that in a different sort of way, it can all happen together.

But for example, in one hearing -- well, 1 the hearing that we haven't had yet on affirmative 2 action, Connie was suggesting that she wanted some 3 folks who would just speak to the philosophical 4 aspects of affirmative action. 5 Presumably those would be what you would 6 call perspective witnesses. And if we have such a 7 hearing, maybe we have half a day of non-subpoenaed 8 witnesses that just speak to their own views and how 9 view affirmative action historically and 10 philosophically. 11 And then when we get to the witnesses that 12 testify as to programs and all that, we would want 13 facts, that then we follow our normal procedure. 14 So, that was sort of my overall reaction 15 to the memo. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER LEE: Madame Chair? 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Lee? 19 Maybe I have not COMMISSIONER LEE: 20 attended any of the Commission hearings, but I just 21 22 don't see the urgency of this Commission to revise or amend any of the power that the Commission has, which, 23 by reading all the records, from the Staff's report 24

front line complications that

and all the

1	Commission idel the Commission.
2	I think we have to subpoena power
3	already. And I think the Commission has operated very
4	well within the power that gives to the Commission.
5	And I agree. I don't see the need or the urgency to
6	voluntarily limit our current practice and our current
7	powers.
8	And if people want to do that, let them
9	come and tell us and let us see where it stands. But
٥.	I just don't see the need to do it now.
L1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George?
.2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes, let me respond
L3	to all three. First in response to Judge
L <b>4</b>	Higginbotham's point, if I believed that our
.5	Commission's procedures were not in need of reform,
L6	then the threat of a more drastic of a drastic
.7	action, I think would not be sufficient
L8	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Sure.
.9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: as a ground for -
20	- for reform. So, I do want to make it clear that
21	well, as I said earlier, one of my motives here is to
22	forestall what I fear will be Draconian action.
23	I want to make plain that when I say that,
24	I mean to share the view that we need reform, but to
25	say I think we can reform it better, more sensitively.

We know what our needs are. We know what 1 our experience is. We know what our problems have 2 been, at least those of us who think that there have 3 been at least some problems. 4 And I think we can do it with a scalpel. 5 I don't want a meat axe. 6 In response to Vice Chairman Reynoso, I 7 think, Cruz, that you're basically agreeing with what 8 I proposed in 1, which -- but I think your objection 9 10 is to 2. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'd like to get 11 away from the ambiguity, or my marginal note says, 12 "confusion in terms of what type of witness." 13 that way if we could just have -- I don't know how 14 15 this will -- but if we could have a section in a hearing, if in a hearing we decide it's important to 16 have some folk there who will keep presenting 17 philosophical or other non-factual bases, then simply 18 19 have that be as part of the proceedings but not part of the full hearing. 20 Well, COMMISSIONER GEORGE: that's 21 precisely what I meant to do in 1(a). And if I failed 22 to, it's not my -- it's not a problem with my goal. 23 24 It's a problem with my language.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO:

Okay.

commissioner George: The idea here is that fact witnesses testify at hearings; what I call prospective witnesses do not. However, they could testify at proceedings that are held in conjunction with hearings, and their testimony could be taken into account in hearing reports, noted in hearing reports, and so forth.

So I think what I'm trying to do in 1 is exactly what you think is a good idea and I think is a good idea. And if I haven't done it, let's just work over the language.

Now, you have a real -- I think a real objection on 2, and I think here we just have a disagreement. And I think that Commissioner Lee's objection is identical, so I can treat them both together. I just want to stress that unless I'm, again, failing in my goal, I am not attempting to restrict the Commission's subpoena power. I don't think that it has that effect at all. We still have the same scope of subpoena power.

What I've tried to do is to improve Commissioner accountability in the area of the particular type of subpoena that we use -- the subpoena duces tecum -- where documents are being requested. So we might just have a philosophical

disagreement about that, and I see any hope of a majority kind of disappearing on me as we talk about it.

But I still do think it would be better if the Commissioners themselves passed on subpoena duces tecum, except in the circumstances in which I think that's stated here, that there would be an exception rather than staying with the current system.

I respect the alternative view that Commissioners Reynoso and Lee take. I just think it would be better to do it the other way.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I wonder if we could have a discussion about -- you indicated to Commissioner Higginbotham that, in fact, as I understood it, though you didn't go into detail, that maybe there are some things that we could improve. I wonder if it would be helpful to have discussions, as we've had some other times in the past, and then have the General Counsel, who has implemented these policies, then take those concerns into account.

That is, if there is something that we've done that in your view is not the right thing to do, we ought to have that discussion. And if there's sort of a consensus around the table, then -- as I understand it, then the staff has taken that into

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

account in terms of how they implement the subpoenas.

For example, there was some question in the subpoenas in Florida that there was a catch-all phrase in some subpoenas duces tecum that said, "And all other documents that you might have bearing on this issue." If we have some qualms as to that type of language, then we should express it maybe, and then maybe have a response from the General Counsel in terms of why that perhaps is normally done in all subpoenas, why it's not done.

In other words, when something has bothered us in the past, sometimes we have talked about it and resolved it that way rather than with a formal changing of regulations, and that sort of thing.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, I think we probably have a philosophical difference here. If my proposal fails, then I hope an alternative proposal would come onto the table that might remain closer to the current system but provide some opportunity for greater supervision of — precisely of subpoenas duces tecum.

My philosophical view is that this is an area where we're getting into people's papers. We often have very good reasons for it, but when we're

doing that I would very much like us to take 1 responsibility and to be accountable as Commissioners 2 directly. That's the philosophical position I hold. 3 I think it's a matter of I think it's a good one. 4 good government. But I understand and respect those 5 who disagree. 6 Well, Commissioner CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 7 Anderson I think had his hand up next. 8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Right. Thank you. 9 Well, I think I've said on a number of 10 occasions on issues like this that I favor greater 11 Commission accountability and review, and I'm not sure 12 accountability great deal of 13 have a we Commissioners over the subpoena power. So I think 14 that Commissioner George ought to be commended, at 15 least from my perspective, of advancing a proposal 16 that raises this and focuses what I feel is a need for 17 18 greater Commissioner accountability in this matter. Now, as we talk about the Commission's 19 power of subpoena, I think our scope is pretty broad. 20 I don't see us as having a more restricted scope for 21 subpoena than other Commissions. We may have a more 22 restricted power of enforcement, having to go through 23 the Justice Department. 24

But I would say when you're looking at a

small organization which may have, you know, on paper a husband and wife and three or four other people or 10 people have started an organization and they're working, for a federal agency to come in with a subpoena demanding all of the papers or whatever, I mean, the chilling effect on a small organization is pretty heavy.

And I'm not sure that when they are told,
"And, by the way, the Attorney General of the United
States is going to enforce this subpoena," that they
understand that to be a limitation on our subpoena
power --

## (Laughter.)

-- rather than amassing the entire power of the Department of Justice suddenly on our side. So I think it's a problem now.

I don't want to rehash the issues that were surrounding the Miami hearing, but I do think that the controversy in Miami suggested quite clearly that there is a potential for problems, and I don't think, frankly, that the committee -- and I have not talked to anyone on the committee or any of the staff of the committee about the reauthorization hearing, whether this is going to come up as an issue, but I think anybody who has been in this town for more than

15 minutes. given what has happened, ought to see that it probably is going to come up at the hearing. It's probably going to be discussed in any markup on our reauthorization bill.

I'm not sure that the committee just ought to leave it alone and say, "Well, the Commissioners are going to, you know, try to reach consensus on it."

If we try to take some kind of an action vis-a-vis our internal administrative rules, I don't know whether that's sufficient or not, but at least it indicates that we see that we need greater accountability, or we need greater input into the process.

I must say with Commissioner Higginbotham that the more we start putting deadlines and dates and everything, we're just -- we're in a sense creating all sorts of grounds for litigation and objections and defenses to enforcement of subpoenas, etcetera, which I would, you know, think would be problematic. And so maybe the whole effort that provides this with a certain finesse is not going to work for a variety of just sort of practical reasons.

But I think it's something that we ought to look at, because I do believe that the subpoenas for the production of documents holds with it a potential of real chilling effect on some

1	organizations. And I do think the issue of whether a
2	witness who we would like to appear before us, because
3	of his expertise and not necessarily because he is
4	cognizant of facts that basically only that witness
5	knows, and, therefore, we have to have, I think that's
6	a real issue that we compel somebody against their
7	desire to give us his opinion about something. I
8	think that's important.
9	Now, somehow I believe this Commission
LO	ought to have more review and involvement in whether
Ľ <b>1</b>	or not we compel these people to do this, and I'm not
L2	sure that we've found any formula that I'm the
L3	current formula I'm not happy with. Let me put it
L <b>4</b>	that way.
L5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
L6	Redenbaugh, were you about to say something? Has Carl
L7	said what you were about to say?
L8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: He did.
L9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well, then I'll
20	go on to the next
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: However
22	(Laughter.)
23	now that I've been reactivating my
24	memory
25	(Laughter.)

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

--

23

24

25

I would say that I join with Commissioners George and Anderson in saying that from my standpoint a problem, and it is a problem of there is insufficient Commissioner accountability. And I think there may be some defects in the George proposal, particularly as it specifies time rather rigidly, but I certainly -- I'm in favor of our -- us maintaining our independence by examining and modifying ourselves, rather than waiting until others do it. So I in its certainly support the proposal general orientation.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Horner?

commission a tremendous reservoir of potential very beneficial accountability in the presence of members of the Commission who are appointed by more than one President and members of Congress. I think that that reservoir of accountability ought to be used.

I think that we ought to affirmatively vote every subpoena of a witness and a document, take responsibility for it. And if we're not as a body — if a majority of us as a body is not willing to take accountability and responsibility for the use of such

1 Congress to go on giving us that power. 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 entirely. 10 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me try -- go 11 ahead, Vice Chair. Do you want to say something? 12 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 14 15 had not realized that 16 17 18 19

great government power, then we shouldn't ask the

It is an enormous power, and it can be very, very easily abused. And I think that if we have any -- are to have any standing as a Commission, we ought to retain that power, but we ought to hold ourselves accountable for its use. And, therefore, I think I would join with Commissioner Higginbotham in voting against this, but from a different perspective

going to say that I have not -- I thought this was more meant to correct something that had gone awry. it was more like a philosophical approach in terms of the role of the Commission. Though my position really doesn't change, it seems to me that to set down the quidelines included in Arabic 2, I still view as a limitation, so I would still vote no on that. And I would go with the understanding that Robbie has indicated I proposed

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me try this. It seems to me from listening to the discussion this time

yes on Arabic 1.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I was just

and last time that either no one, or someone who hasn't said so, objects to the idea that we should not subpoena people who are not in possession of facts, who hold themselves out not to be in possession, and we don't think they're in possession of any facts. And that if a Commissioner recommends somebody as a witness that a Commissioner ought to be able to figure out whether they're recommending them to be a fact witness or a prospective witness.

I see Commissioner Horner shaking her head, so maybe the second --

(Laughter.)

that -- the point I was going to make was that if there is consensus that for people who say they are philosophical, or you say they are when you recommend them, and we feel that their views would be interesting or informative, or whatever, we could have a consultation or a briefing or something in connection with the hearing to hear from these people, and that their views could, then, be taken into account in the reports, so long as they're identified as people who were not subpoenaed, who were there as prospective witnesses.

I sensed before I said that that most

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

people thought that there was nothing wrong with that. 1 Commissioner Horner, are you objecting to 2 that? 3 Madame Chair, I'm COMMISSIONER HORNER: 4 sorry that I can't join what seems to be otherwise a 5 consensus. I do not believe that the differentiation 6 between fact and prospective is a realistic one. 7 I believe, moreover, that to attempt to 8 make that distinction would relegate people who have 9 an informed lifetime of experience to bring to bear on 10 an issue, but no statistical data because they're not 11 social scientists but might be, for instance, 12 practitioners, that that would relegate their 13 14 testimony to a lesser status, that C-SPAN would close up shop and go away, and, therefore, the public 15 education function those people would provide would be 16 17 lesser. think it would 18 And I subject the Commission itself to endless squabbling over whether 19 20 a Department of Labor Deputy Assistant Secretary was 21 representing fact, i.e. the staff produced information provided that that Deputy Assistant Secretary or 22 23 opinion as an appointee of a given administration. I just don't think it can work in practice. 24

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madame Chair?

## CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I find myself sort of in between and betwixt. I don't believe that it would work in practice from the point of view that a person would only give a point of view and not back it up with statistics or historical events, and so on. But procedurally, and I thought that's what we were trying to get to, the only difference is that the person would not be subpoenaed. Therefore, the person's presence would be completely voluntary.

once present, still speaking a philosophical or -- in philosophical or historical terms, presumably that person would use all of the facts, etcetera, that the person had at his or her disposal, and we could take advantage of that. So I agree with Commissioner Horner that once the person is there, I find it very difficult to say, "This is only going to be philosophical and not factual."

But I was focusing more on how you'd get the person there, and the import was that such a person who will be giving, if you will, a philosophical view based on facts, etcetera, we would not exercise or power of subpoena. So it's how you get them there rather than what happens after they get there.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, having been
2	reminded that there's no consensus about
3	(Laughter.)
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Oh.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Consensus means
6	Commissioner Horner didn't agree.
7	(Laughter.)
8	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Commissioner
9	George, again, you have tackled an important and
10	difficult problem, and I thank you for it. I am
11	inclined
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: On with which
13	everybody agrees, I would say.
14	(Laughter:)
15	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: brought you all
16	together.
17	(Laughter.`)
18	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: The
19	hypothetical I was going to ask you and I just
20	don't know how this Commission would look at it you
21	have John Jones, a claims agent for insurance
22	company X, which specializes in insuring churches, and
23	he has investigated 20 claims in state A, B, and C,
24	where the members of the congregation are African-
25	American, or a synagogue, where the people are Jewish.

1	NOW, He has put all of these things
2	together. We want to know, what does he see in the
3	totality about these? Now, is he a fact witness or a
4	prospective witness?
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: You're not going to
6	have any difficulty, Leon, in identifying hard cases,
7	cases that are going to be very I said that at the
8	beginning, and you've just proven it, although I'll
9	give you my opinion on this one.
10	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: All right.
11	Well, what you're asking
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: On this one, he's a
13	fact witness.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, absolutely.
15	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: He's a fact
16	witness.
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: He's a fact witness.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He's a fact witness.
19	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He has facts,
21	information that he is excuse me. Oh, that's
22	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: But at the end
23	he has to
24 -	(Laughter.)
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Mrs. Berry, co-

1	counsel.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead, Counsel.
4	(Laughter.)
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, no, I of
6	course, everything is a
7	(Laughter.)
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
9	Higginbotham?
10	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: He has
11	investigated all of these claims. Your last question
12	is, do you believe that these bombings of synagogues
13	and black Baptist churches have anything to do with
14	anti-semitism or anti-race?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Based upon
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madame Chair,
17	I have been called as a witness, a fact witness.
18	(Laughter.)
19	I refuse to give that information.
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Counsel, do you want
22	to answer that?
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, I mean, I'll
24	take I mean, it was an amusing line. I mean, I
25	think that if the witness made that objection, I think

I would honor it and say, no, we won't compel you under the subpoena power to answer that question, although I think it would be appropriate for the person, the claims examiner, to render an opinion on that based on his very close acquaintance with the data.

Now, I have a different case in mind of -- at least I want to give a clear -- what would be to me a clear case. Say, we have the affirmative action hearing, and we invite Cornell West to come and give his opinion, and William Bradford Reynolds to come and give his opinion on whether affirmative action policies, at least this or that affirmative action policy is --

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Clearly, that wouldn't be based on fact.

(Laughter.)

know, I don't think either of them should be testifying under compulsion. I mean, they would agree on the -- we'd say, "Well, here is what we've learned about how the program works at Davis or at Texas," or whatever it is. "Here is what they do. Here is the procedures." Now, is that just, unjust, constitutional, fair, good?

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: From your perspective.
2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: From your
3	perspective, exactly.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And the answer to your
5	first question, if I may interject, Commissioner
6	Higginbotham, is that the insurance examiner, in the
7	context of the way Commission hearings are conducted,
8	could be asked whether he found any indications in his
9 -	investigation that would lead him to believe that
10	there was a connection between the burnings, or
11	whatever they were, targeted on particular groups.
12	That is, if he saw anti-semitic graffiti
13	or something like that, without reaching a conclusion
14	as to the meaning, unless he meant to, which is a
15	question of fact. Did he find anything that had
16	anything to do with this? He could be asked that.
17	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Is it the
18	position that an expert is it the position that we
19	can't subpoena anyone who is an expert?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We can subpoena anyone
21	we want to.
22	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: The claims examiner
23	is an expert. I mean, he
24 .	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Well, from
25	your prospective witness I'm using expert in the sense

l	144
1	of <del></del>
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you mean get back
3	to
4	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah. If it's
5	purely a prospective witness, then I don't think we
6	should be using the subpoena power there.
7	Now, I have anticipated the case where,
8	you know, we have a where we have what I'm calling
9	a fact witness, but since we've got him here we're
10	going to ask his opinion. That's Cruz's case. We
11	might ask more broad even a more broad
12	philosophical question, and I have no objection to
13	that person answering that question. I'm just saying
14	if a person doesn't want to answer that question we
15	should honor that. We would
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But before we get
17	hopelessly confused and muddled here, or before I do,
18	the situation as it exists now and has since 1957 is
19	that the Commission subpoenas witnesses for hearings.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Every single one.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And the Commission
22	made a policy of subpoenaing all of the witnesses for
23	hearings, and the Commission made that policy because

the Commission, 1) wanted to make sure that people

showed up, and there were people from whom they wanted

24

people who wanted to be protected by the subpoena to 2 show up. 3 And instead of drawing all of these 4 distinctions, they made a general rule that for a 5 hearing you have the subpoena power, you subpoena 6 people for hearings. And that has been honored, and 7 I think there's one mayor somewhere who wasn't 8 subpoenaed one time. But that has been honored for 9 those purposes, and that's the situation now. You can 10 11 subpoena anybody you want to subpoena for a hearing. What we're talking about is, are there 12 changes that need to be made for whatever reasons 13 people think changes need to be made? 14 Commissioner Anderson? 15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 16 Thank you. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll recognize you 17 18 next, Cruz. 19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I've listened to 20 the discussion here, and I have a lot of questions in 21 my own mind as to who would be a fact witness, who 22 would be a prospective witness or an expert witness. 23 It seems to me the only clear person who 24 would be a fact witness would be a government official 25 called on to testify specifically as to what the

to get information who wouldn't come, and also other

agency or department is doing. But regardless of whether the eight of us can decide in our minds that's clearly a fact witness, that's clearly an expert witness, what to me is determinative is the fact that you give almost everyone who is not a government official the opportunity say, "No, I'm not a fact witness. I'm a prospective witness."

Now, they may have a strong case or a weak case, but you potentially put into jeopardy almost everybody from the private sector you are calling as a witness, because unless we're going to ask them only a series of questions related to facts and no opinions, they can all argue the purposes of avoiding and forcing enforcement of the subpoena, or at least the procedure to enforce the subpoena, that they're really being called for their perspective on the issue.

And so, therefore, I think it's -- as I hear the discussion going on and on, and how unclear we are on certain hard cases, which I think are a limited number of categories, but nonetheless almost all of our witnesses may fit in those categories, it convinces me that maybe we cannot make that kind of a distinction.

At some point months ago, if I had not put

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

147 it on the record I had thought it pretty strongly, and 1 that is I think we probably ought to just vote on 2 every subpoena. I hadn't thought about that for a 3 while, but I think the more I hear the discussion 4 maybe that's how we resolve this. 5 But in any event, the question of expert 6 witness versus fact witness I think is a morass that 7 opens up a very large problem for us. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair? And I'll 9 10 get you next, Commissioner Redenbaugh. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But as I hear 11 the discussion. I confess to becoming a little bit 12 more iffy, even about Arabic 1, because the complaints 13 14 that I've had are witnesses that are friendly, actually, to the Commission, but had a hard time 15 setting that time aside, etcetera. And probably if 16 they didn't want to appear, they would say, "Wait a 17

I was just looking at the proposal that we have for the mini-hearing. Mayor Reardon, I'm sure, is a very busy person, and if he by chance doesn't want to appear, he'll say, "I've got nothing but opinions to give you. And how dare you to call me

minute. I've read your regulations, and I think I'm

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

when your own regulations say that." So I can see

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that there might be some problems. 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner 2 Redenbaugh? 3 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think that the 4 5 thing I remain troubled by -- and I think my colleagues across the room do, too -- by the following 6 -- that -- and there has been no, really, response to 7 this point. I don't think we should compel, under 8 threat of enforcement of a subpoena, private citizens 9 to come and testify when we know that what we are 10 11 asking them -- we know that we're asking for their 12 opinions and not because they are in possession of evidence. 13 And I think it is very different when we 14 want a police chief to come and testify on the conduct 15 16 of his office. I could understand why he would not But I think he has placed himself by want to come. 17 18 being in the public office in a position where he -this is one of his reasonable duties. 19 And we are sort of dancing around this 20 21 issue by calling them fact versus opinion witness, but 22 for me I'm against compelling private citizens to come and give their opinion. 23 CHAIRPERSON **BERRY:** Commissioner 24 25 Redenbaugh, this is one of those that if you think

1	about it very carefully I bet you're going to change
2	your mind.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I hope I've got
4	a lot of things like that.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If, in fact, we did
6	not were not able to subpoena private citizens, we
7	wouldn't be able to find out anything that's going on
8	in any industry, whether it's Wall Street or brokerage
9	houses. We wouldn't be able to find out any
10	information.
11	When we're setting up the consumer racism
12	and sexism briefing, I'm told by the Staff Director
13	that some people don't want to come who have
14	information in the industry, because it's not a
15	subpoena and they it's not that they only have
16	facts; they just think it's not in their best interest
17	to ``
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, and I think
19	that is a different case, because we are subpoenaing
20	information about for which they have knowledge and
21	about the conduct of themselves or their industries or
22	their companies.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's very
25	different than asking Cornell West to come and talk to
	1

1	us.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, Cornell West
3	first of all, I meant by private I meant non-
4	governmental entities, which is what I thought you
5	were going to rethink. Because the point is that Wall
6	Street is not a governmental entity. You know that.
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, I
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And neither are these
9	people who run the laundry industry, who don't want to
10	charge me less money to iron my blouse. But
11	(Laughter.)
12	in point of fact, these people and
13	over the years, the Commissioners found that people
14	who are non-governmental people for whom the
15	Commission needs information to be able to do an
16	adequate job are reluctant to come, especially if they
17	think that the information is going to put them in a
18	bad light.
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm not
20	objecting to subpoenaing that person.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you're not.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Madame Chair?
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes?
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I'm interpreting

1	Commissioner Redenbaugh as simply agreeing with
2	number 1. Well
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Arabic 1 here,
5	which
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you're agreeing
7	with 1.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: which would
9	permit us to subpoena. The distinction between
10	federal, state, and local employees and private
11	parties comes in 2, not in 1. I want to be very clear
12	about this. And this goes to the question I'm
13	going to make one more plea. Connie, I think I'm not
14	going to be able to convince you, so I'm not pleading
15	with you here. I
16	(Laughter.)
17	I'm pleading with the judges and with
18	Commissioner Lee on the ground that I am not
19	restricting my proposal does not restrict the scope
20	of the subpoena power, that every subpoena we now
21	issue we can still issue, same scope, that we're not
22	limiting how broad the scope can be. We're just
23	taking responsibility for that scope when we establish
24	it.

The same is true here. Anybody we can now

1	suppoena we'll be able to suppoena under 1, 11 we're
2	going to ask them questions about facts. I mean, even
3	Cornell might have some facts. We might compel him to
4	testify as to that. But if we're going to not ask for
5	facts but for opinions, then, you know, we've given up
6	that right to subpoena that person.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I want to be clear
8	that I misunderstood you, Russell. If Robbie's
9	interpretation of what you said is correct, I
10	misunderstood you.
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You were talking about
13	1(a)
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: which is the one
16	about the prospective/fact
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I thought you meant
19	that under no circumstances
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: would the
22	Commission subpoena anybody
23	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, no.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: who wasn't a
25	government official.

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, no.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Good.
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No, that would be a
4	different the government/non-government would be a
5	different distinction, and I'm not proposing that at
6	all.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I see.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: My distinction is
9	fact and prospective.
10	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm still confused
11	about Commissioner Redenbaugh's point of view on this.
12	Could you just restate it? What are you for, and what
13	are you against?
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm for let
15	me recompile this, then. I am for all of us as
16	Commissioners voting on each subpoena.
17	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Voting what?
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: On each
19	subpoena.
20	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay.
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I myself
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Witness or
23	documents.
24 '	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, let me just
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	interrupt there. Then, that goes further
2	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Than you
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: than I'm going
4	here.
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, that's
6	fine.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee, are
8	you there?
9	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I'm here.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, good.
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And, Connie, I
12	want to also stipulate that I would not support the
13	compelling of opinions from private citizens.
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Okay. Okay. Fine.
15	I understand that. Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, the other point
17	that I was going to make about the lack of consensus,
18	total agreement in consensus, was that in my own view
19	it is practically impossible and unrealistic for the
20	Commission to say that we would vote on every subpoena
21	ever issued by the Commission, and if we intend to
22	have hearings.
23	Why is that practically impossible? Given
24	the schedules of Commissioners and I'm not just
25	talking about this Commission but all of the ones I've

served on of this Civil Rights Commission -- given peoples' schedules, their involvements, and the way hearings are put together, and the time constraints on the staff and everything else, to say that before any subpoena could be issued every Commissioner has to vote -- now, if you wanted to say something different, which was that once you got the witness list, or the documents witness list, if any Commissioner objected to somebody being subpoenaed, they could inform the Staff Director and Commissioners might be polled. That's a whole different issue. But to say that every time we have a list of documents or subpoenas, everybody has to vote on each item before we can go ahead and prepare a hearing, that is just logistically -- this is not ideology speaking. This is practically speaking. That is totally unworkable, given the schedules that people have, their involvements, what people are

held one hearing in three years we'd be very lucky. I'm just telling you that. That is the case, and that's my view of it. And so I'll leave it at that.

Commissioner Horner?

doing, the timing on trying to get it done.

COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'll just respond

**NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

 very briefly. I think that it should be entirely possible at the meeting preceding a hearing -- that is, typically a month in advance -- or let us say two meetings preceding a hearing, typically six weeks in advance of a hearing, that the Staff Director could present to the Commission a list of every individual the Staff Director wishes to subpoena, and every document the Staff Director wishes to subpoena, and the language of those subpoenas, for the Commission to vote up or down on.

rarely on one individual or one kind of document or documents. And it seems to me that it gets to the administration of the Commission's business that we don't have 30 days or 40 days before a hearing full knowledge of what we intend to do at a hearing. That is the one of the reasons we are ill-prepared when we go into the hearings, because the staff has not given us 30 days in advance a full list of people.

Now, over the course of the succeeding period, the staff might drop someone, but ought not at that point, it seems to me, to be adding someone.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The nightmares that go on around this place within two months of a hearing

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are unbelievable -- the 24 hours a day people put in, the smallness of the staff, the fact that we try to do two or three hearings, which is, you know, like a nightmare, the people who can't show up, the somebody who got sick, the this that happened, or the that that happened, or whatever. I mean, it is just incredible.

And then I'll make one last point, and then I'll recognize whoever's hand was up. I think it's Commissioner Higginbotham.

No one has addressed, really, the point that while the scope of who we may subpoen is very broad, the point that someone made here about the restrictions on what we do, and I don't think these are to be taken lightly. I mean, all of these federal agencies — I read that long document. I mean, there are places where Commissioners subpoen people. Staff members subpoen people.

We can't make anybody come, and we can't tell anybody that the Attorney General is going to enforce the subpoena because we don't know if the Attorney General is or not. It's up to the Attorney General to decide that. And over the years there haven't been that many. I mean, we have a check on what we do. There haven't been that many times anybody has asked anybody to enforce a subpoena or

that they have enforced it.

And so when you read the plethora of approaches to doing this in all of the other agencies and then look at what we do, we have more restrictions on us than anybody.

I, too, wanted to say before I recognize Commissioner Higginbotham, I very much appreciate what you've done, Commissioner George. This is a tough problem, and you've given careful thought to it, and I thought this fact/prospective thing was going to be a winner here. It turned out I was wrong.

But I just -- you know, I just want to commend you for taking a crack at it, and we'll continue with the discussion.

Yes, Commissioner Higginbotham?

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Well, Oliver Wendall Holmes said à page of history is worth a volume of logic. We've had 39 years. Before I'd throw out 39 years to make any significant modification I've got to have some compelling logic to throw it out.

Now, if you talk to any U.S. Attorney in the country, and you told him that on every major case he or she has to be ready 45 days before, 60 days before, they would look at us as if we were mad.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1	The way litigation works is sometimes
2	you're doing very you know, Sadie Smith is supposed
3	to testify, and we know that, and 60 days in advance.
4	But then Sadie Smith has a baby, and then you want to
5	find out, well, who is going to replace Sadie Smith?
6	And that's Jacqueline Jones, who is out of the state.
7	And this becomes critical.
8	I mean, we are acting with blinders on in
9	terms of the way litigation works. If we have so much
10	trouble getting together with just the seven of us,
11	who are sort of
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Eight.
13	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Eight. Well,
14	seven plus the Chair.
15	(Laughter.)
16	I presume the Chair is flawless.
17	(Laughter.)
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. All right.
19	(Laughter.)
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: He'd make rather a
21	good lawyer, wouldn't he?
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I think if we
24	get an abuse I think the staff has gotten a signal.
25	If we get a specific abuse, in view of that abuse we

1	should let everyone know that we want to have as much
2	order and fairness as possible, but I think it's tough
3	to put a prophylactic rule in. And I guess that's
4	where I am.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner
6	George?
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Perhaps I could wrap
8	it up. I'll try not to provoke any further comment,
9	but just say a final word in defense of my proposal.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: This is not your
11	final
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: What's that?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: This is not your final
14	word. You may have to go back to the drawing board.
15	But anyway, go ahead.
16	(Laughter.)
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I have a feeling
18	about that, but
19	(Laughter.)
20	I just want to be very clear, since in the
21	discussion of my proposal other possibilities that I
22	am not proposing have been raised, which would much
23	more dramatically alter the policy. So if there is
24	anybody who hasn't decided how he's going to vote yet,
25	and trying to make up a mind, do have in mind the

1	particular modest, sensible
2	(Laughter.)
3	moderate proposal that I have put on
4	the table here, both in terms of one the common-
5	sensical proposal that I have put on the table.
6	So I will formally move this, and I will
7	ask possibly Russell if he would favor me with a
8	second and
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no. Let's not
10	move it
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No?
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: please.
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think we ought
14	to come back.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think we ought to
16	come back. Russell agrees. I think this discussion
17	each time we discuss this I learn more myself. And
18	you're making progress. It may not seem like it.
19	(Laughter.)
20	But why don't we, you know, go back and
21	rethink, and ask your colleagues and I ask all of
2.2	you think about this some more, and consult with
23	Commissioner George, and I don't want your proposal
24	voted down. You've made a good effort here, and it
25	has lots of interesting possibilities, and maybe there

are changes that could be made in it that could command a majority. But I don't want your proposal voted down.

Why don't we leave it for consideration, since it wasn't -- you know, we don't really have to vote on it. Nobody has moved officially to do that.

And let's continue to discuss it, unless you're just so totally fed up that you --

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No, I'm not fed up.
(Laughter.)

No, I am not fed up, and I appreciate all of the kind words that you and Judge Higginbotham and the others have said about my efforts here. But I do get the sense that I am in a position where altering things in one direction is going to lose me some people who might support me. Altering things in the other direction might' lose other people who might support me.

I don't know if there is anybody who supports me. It's entirely unclear to me, based on a lengthy discussion. Usually, I can tell how people are going to vote. I know how some of you are going to vote. But my sense is that I don't know what else I can do which will either -- I think whatever I do is going to lose me possible support on one side or the

1	other, and I don't see the support there for my
2	proposal.
3	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'll second your
4	proposal in order to call the
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, I don't want
6	to if people don't want to vote, I don't want to
7	ram it down their throats. But
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But, Commissioner
9	George, you've heard possibilities here about
10	modifying timelines that some people think are too
11	rigid. You've heard suggestions here about changing
12	the modus operandi in terms of the voting that you're
13	requiring. There have been all sorts of suggestions
14	that have been made here for improvement of your
15	proposal.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: But, Madame Chair,
17	if I go in one direction, modifying it, it may
18	alienate some people. I can try, but
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I mean
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I don't
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I would appreciate
22	it if you tried. I mean, you could always vote it
23	down the next time, I mean, if you really are in the
24	mood for
25	(Laughter.)

1	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: That's
2	something that is cruel and unusual punishment.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If that's what you'd
4	want. I'm trying to
5	(Laughter.)
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Let me get some
7	I don't know what's appropriate here, Madame Chairman.
8	Rule me out of order, if I go out of order. But can
9	I get some sense of
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How people are
11	feeling?
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: how is there
13	anybody who thinks that the perspective just to
14	start with number 1, the prospective/fact distinction
15	is not hopeless?
16	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes, it's not
17	hopeless.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're not actually
19	going to vote on
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: There are four of us
21	who think it's not hopeless.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The rest think it's
23	hopeless? Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah. Well, no, and
25	I understand that, as I said. I mean, you're not

1	going to have any difficulty coming up with hard cases
2	here, and I'm not claiming infallibility on this or
3	anything.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Pope John.
5	(Laughter.)
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Claiming
7	infallibility for him, but not for
8.	(Laughter.)
9	Now, on number 2 now, remember, I am
10	not proposing that we vote on every subpoena. I know
11	that there are some Commissioners who would prefer
12	that, but that is not what I am proposing. I am
13	proposing the modest, moderate, sensible step of
14	voting on subpoenas duces tecum when those are issued
15	to non-governmental parties.
16 🛫	Can I get a reading of who thinks that is
17	not hopeless?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The way he puts it
19	hopeless.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, I've got four
21	well, I don't have a majority on either.
22	COMMISSIONER HORNER: You got your vote.
23	(Laughter.)
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, I don't see
25	how I can win. I mean, and any amendment I make:

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson
2	wants to say something. Shall we let him?
3	Commissioner Anderson?
4	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I have one
5	question, and then something to say perhaps. Is there
6	a motion on the floor?
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, we're just
8	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes, I thought
9	there was.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no.
11	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Didn't we
12	second it?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No. The item was put
14	on for discussion. Then, Commissioner George said he
15	was going to move it and asked Redenbaugh to second
16	it, and I asked him if he would hold that and not move
17	it.
18	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: But what did
19	Commissioner Horner say?
20	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I'm sorry. I
21	thought he had moved it.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, I asked him to
23	hold it.
24	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Okay.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So then he
	NEAL D. CDCCC

1	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I was seconding
2	nothing.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: She was seconding
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: But she did
6	exceptionally well at it.
7	(Laughter.)
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, Commissioner
9	Anderson?
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I think it
11	would be worthwhile to reach consensus on what could
12	be reached, either in a negative sense or a positive
13	sense. What I would like to do, if Commissioner
14	George does not move his entire proposal, I for one
15	would like to move an amended form. And I hesitate to
16	say this before we move on yours, because I don't want
17	it to be seen as undercutting the proposal, but I
18	think there is a sense that the proposal, as it's
19	drafted now, will not be adopted in the next few
20	minutes.
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee, are
23	you there?
24	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes. I'm still here.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: So, I mean, in my 1 view, I would move the adoption of what we are now 2 referring to as Arabic 2, amended to strike the second 3 sentence in the third paragraph, which is paragraph 4 (b)(2), so that it would then read, "Subpoenas duces 5 tecum will be issued only in connection with a 6 documents hearing, except as described below." 7 Strike the next part of the sentence, so 8 that it would then continue, "Commission staff will 9 present the Commissioners with a list of all persons," 10 etcetera, so that we would not be confined or 11 constrained by an arbitrary time limit, which then 12 gives rise to the difficulty of what both the Chair 13 and Commissioner Higginbotham have indicated. 14 15 Now, that may not be a perfect -- that may not be perfect, but I think it represents a baseline 16 of what I think should be done. And so if we're not 17 going to move Commissioner George's full proposal --18 and he has no objection -- then I would move this, as 19 20 I've just amended it. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All of Section 2, with 21 the exception of that one sentence. 22 23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Right. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, it's --24 25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Right.

1	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: it's not a
2	complete sentence. In other words, the second half of
3	the sentence remains.
4	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yeah.
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So it begins,
6	"Commission staff will present the Commissioners
7	" you know, and so forth.
8	COMMISSIONER HORNER: May we have two
9	minutes of silent time?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Two minutes of silent
11	time?
12	COMMISSIONER HORNER: To read it.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, sure.
14	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Read all of
15	Section 2.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Sure. We'll take two
	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Sure. We'll take two minutes to read Section 2.
16	,
16 17	minutes to read Section 2.
16 17 18	minutes to read Section 2.  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The intention here
16 17 18 19	minutes to read Section 2.  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The intention here is to get us out from under an arbitrary time limit
16 17 18 19 20	minutes to read Section 2.  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The intention here is to get us out from under an arbitrary time limit that causes those problems.
16 17 18 19 20 21	minutes to read Section 2.  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The intention here is to get us out from under an arbitrary time limit that causes those problems.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But people need
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	minutes to read Section 2.  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The intention here is to get us out from under an arbitrary time limit that causes those problems.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But people need silence to read this
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	minutes to read Section 2.  COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The intention here is to get us out from under an arbitrary time limit that causes those problems.  CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But people need silence to read this  COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes.

1	Did you get that point, Commissioner Lee?
2	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes, I'm reading it,
3	too.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Has it been two
5	minutes? I don't know. It's been two minutes. Let's
6	see, you moved your and somebody seconded it. And
7	I've forgotten who it was.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, maybe
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, you moved it.
10	Because I need to ask a question about the proposal.
11	What is the status of it? You moved it, Commissioner
12	Anderson.
13	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I moved it. I
14	don't think I have yet received a second.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You haven't received
16	a second. Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: But if you
18	don't have a second
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You'd better ask for
20	a second.
21	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Second.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now, is there
23	any discussion?
24	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Without prejudice to
25	my vote.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me ask a question
2	of Commissioner George, who wrote this originally.
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes, ma'am.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So he knows what all
5	the rest of it means. Could you explain this
6	proposal under B, which is what we're looking at? The
7	only time we'll issue a subpoena duces tecum is if
8	there is a documents hearing, except with the rest
9	of the stuff that's after that.
10	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that correct? Am
12	I reading it right? It says, "Will be issued only in
13	connection with a documents hearing, except" oh,
14	you don't have one.
15	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No, I've got it.
16	I've got it. Yes, okay, "except as described below."
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. And so any
18	time it's not a documents hearing, we follow these
19	procedures below. Is that correct? It says except
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No, no. Here is
21	I think here is the idea that we will sometimes obtain
22	documents even when we're not having a documents
23	hearing.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay? Those will be

circumstances in which people are prepared to make available to the staff, through the Commission, documents that they don't mind us having and they think would be useful to our deliberations, whatever they are.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. But what I'm trying to understand is, "A subpoena duces tecum will be issued only in connection with document hearings, except as described below." In other words, we follow the procedures after that paren. closed, if it's not a documents hearing, is that right?

has just called my attention to the relevant reference there. If you go down two more paragraphs, "The Commission may also request" -- it's on page 2, the penultimate paragraph, "The Commission may also request and obtain documents relevant to a Commission hearing a report to a request on the record during the hearing. A subpoena duces tecum may be issued only after a failure to comply with this request."

I had recalled -- I think in part, Madame Chairman, this also comes from a conversation that I had with you about the usefulness of situations in which we've had a witness before us, and suddenly that witness makes reference to a document that we didn't

would you be kind enough to make a copy of that 2 available to the staff?" 3 Usually not in connection with the 4 proceeding that we're in, because they might not have 5 it there to hand, but then they'll ship something to 6 Mary Mathews, or whomever, the -- Stephanie or whoever 7 8 the appropriate person is, and we've acquired it that 9 I don't want that to be somehow a violation of 10 our procedures. COMMISSIONER HORNER: In other words, no 11 one could be compelled to produce documents pursuant 12 to a --13 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right. 14 15 COMMISSIONER HORNER: -- during the Commission without a subsequent vote of the --16 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: 17 That's right. COMMISSIONER HORNER: -- Commissioners. 18 19 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Now, let's say we 20 find out that there is some very important document --21 let's say that we find out there is a very important 22 document, and in connection with this discovery for 23 some reason what popped into my mind is -- what is his name? His name is Butterfield, all of a sudden said 24 25 we have these tapes of the -- those might be of some

even know about. And we have very often said, "Well,

+	relevance.
2	But if we all of a sudden have a discovery
3	that there is an important document out there, we can
4	request that, and the other person might say, "Well,
5	I can't turn that over to you, because that contains
6	sensitive information." At that point, we might want
7	to have a documents hearing and issue a subpoena duces
8	tecum to compel.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'm not really
10	acquainted with
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Speak up a little.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'm not really
13	acquainted with the term "documents hearing."
14	Normally, you subpoena a person and then ask that
15	person to bring the documents. You can subpoena the
16	documents, too.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: They mean like the one
18	we had on Wall Street, where all we did was documents,
19	I think.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, but you
21	still subpoena a person to bring the documents.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: To bring them, yes.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is that what
24	you mean?
25	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: A document

(202) 234-4433

1	doesn't arrive on its own.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The custodian of the
4	documents.
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I don't know. Isn't
6	that room in the White House where they suddenly
7	appear?
8	(Laughter.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let the record show
10	that I objected rather strenuously to that.
11	(Laughter.)
12	Now, let's proceed.
13	(Laughter.)
14	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, that's, Cruz,
15	what I had in mind. And I think that that is a term
16	that we do use. I don't know if it's in the
17	administrative instructions now, but it's a term that
18	we have used. I think it would be well understood by
19	the staff.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Good.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
22	Higginbotham, are you sighing or speaking?
23	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Well, both.
24	(Laughter.)
25	This is a fundamental, profound change in

the 39-year history when you end up, when you say a majority of all Commissioners must vote to approve the issue of a subpoena duces tecum. And I -- I know that there is no division among this Commission. But in the future --

(Laughter.)

-- in the future, there may be Commissions which are evenly divided.

(Laughter.)

And if you want to really put the Commission on dead center, all you have to do is to have four people to not vote for the issuance of a subpoena, and the Commission becomes absolutely ineffective. And I think it can bring in a whole lot of implications.

You look at the statute, and the statute doesn't require it. When you look at all of the other -- of the terrific analysis of the other agencies, that isn't required. And what it means to me is that if you want to make the United States Commission on Civil Rights impotent, that's all you need, because if they don't have to produce -- if they don't have to produce the document, you can't have a comprehensive enough hearing. And I think that that could be a very, very significant impediment.

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	And my final thing is, why is it that for
2	almost four decades this Commission has been able to
3	function without a scandal in this area, and now it
4	has reached such a cause celebre that we have to get
5	to this point.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner?
7	COMMISSIONER HORNER: I think it would not
8	have the effect of making the Commission impotent. It
9	would have the effect of making the Staff Director
10	unable to make decisions of extreme sensitivity
11	unilaterally in the face of the Commission's
12	impotence.
13	I think it would make the Commission
14	potent and responsible, and if that were to lay bear
15	the sometimes reality that there is great division in
16	these issues, that might well suggest that given such
17	division the government in the part of the on the
18	part of the staff ought not to be demanding the
19	presence and testimony and documents of private
20	citizens.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Please
22	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: May I respond?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let her finish,
24	please.
25	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Oh, I thought

she had finished. I'm sorry. 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: She was only saying 2 "ah." 3 That's all right. COMMISSIONER HORNER: 4 And I had some other major point to make, which has 5 now escaped my mind, so --6 (Laughter.) 7 -- if I may, I'll come back --8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me -- before you 9 Higginbotham, while Commissioner and speak, 10 Commissioner Horner tries to recall --11 COMMISSIONER HORNER: It's hopeless. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- let me just say 13 that -- remind those who have been on the Commission 14 that the Commission approves a hearing, the Commission 15 votes to approve a hearing. That has to be done by a 16 The Commission votes a proposal for a 17 majority. hearing, which says what the hearing is going to be 18 about and all that sort of stuff, by a majority. 19 The Commission even reviews, as we did 20 today for the mini-hearing, the agenda for the 21 hearing. The Commission recommends witnesses for the 22 23 My only point is it's not that the hearing. Commission is totally uninvolved in the process and 24

has no points at which it can say to people, "Listen,

1 either we shouldn't do this, or if we're going to do it we should have this kind of witness and not that 2 witness." That would totally kind of be 3 4 irresponsible. What we're really talking about is what do 5 in the run-up to the hearing itself, 6 procedurally, and trying to get the witnesses, get the 7 materials, and so on. And if we have a documents 8 hearing, the Commission votes to have a documents 9 10 hearing, not that the staff just goes ahead and has 11 one. So those have all been the points, the levers by which the Commission operated to exercise 12 13 influence in the past. Your query is, is there something that has 14 15 happened after 39 years that means that the Commission ought to exercise greater leverage in the record of 39 16 17 years? And I guess that's what your question is. COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: 18 Not greater 19 leverage, greater preclusion. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Preclusion. 21 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Preclusion is 22 the issue here. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. It's 24 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: not 25 leverage.

### CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, okay.

means, as a practical matter, is suppose a subpoena duces tecum was issued. What is the worst which could happen? The person testifies, and suppose the four people who would not have voted to approve the subpoena duces tecum, they have full latitude to comment on whether the subpoena should have been issued. They've got full latitude to comment on the evidence.

When you preclude testimony, you preclude the public from knowing what the person would have said, and that's what I'm concerned about.

#### CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Also --

making it, as a Commissioner, within an adequate record. That's the terrible thing about this suggestion. You are precluding the issuance of a testimony — of testimony when you don't know enough facts, you don't know as much as the staff. And that's the reason why practically no one has this rule.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's also true,
Commissioner Higginbotham, that, if the Commission
wants to enforce a subpoena, you need five votes at

_	
2	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Sure.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can't enforce it
4	if you don't have a majority. You can't even ask
5	you can't get it enforced anyway unless the attorney
6	decides to. But you can't even ask them to unless a
7	majority of the Commissioners agree to do that.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's the way
9	it is now?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. You can't ask
11	the Justice Department to enforce a subpoena unless a
12	majority of the Commissioners agree to do it. And the
13	U.S. Attorney can even decide then not to enforce it,
14	but you've got to have five votes in order to do that.
15	The Chair can't do it. Four Commissioners can't do
16	it. The Staff Director can't do it. That's the way
17	it's done. It has been done that way.
18	Commissioner Horner, did you remember what
19	you were going to say?
20	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Yes, I did, Madame
21	Chair, and I'll make my point very briefly. Judge
22	Higginbotham asked what has changed over 39 years to
23	make the Commission advise now not to allow the staff
24	to subpoena American citizens at will.
25	I think what has changed is an increased

the power of the Federal Government 1 dramatically increased over that period of time, 2 ordinary citizens have felt a greater sense of threat, 3 and in my view somewhat legitimately so, although one 4 doesn't wish to be carried away on this subject. 5 But to the degree that there is legitimate 6 concern, and to the degree that there is concern which 7 perhaps not legitimate is nonetheless felt, I think 8 it's incumbent upon the Federal Government now to 9 change its ways, to modify its ways, and to be more 10 sensitive to both the perception and the reality of 11 federal intervention in the lives of private citizens, 12 especially on issues of great religious, political, 13 and other kinds of sensitivity. 14 recognize the perspective you're 15 Ι bringing to bear on this. It's entirely admirable. 16 But I am reacting to my perception of what the 17 condition of the country demands now. It's a judgment 18 call. 19 COMMISSIONER LEE: Madame Chair? 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Lee, 21 22 I'll recognize you then. It's my understanding COMMISSIONER LEE: 23 that the staff really does not subpoena potential 24 witnesses at will. As I recall, the staff report 25

1	mentioned it was a very small percentage of witnesses
2	that needs to be subpoenaed. Isn't that right?
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We subpoena everybody
4	who is going to be a witness at a hearing.
5	COMMISSIONER LEE: Right.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But that's a
8	small percentage.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If they are within
10	subpoena range.
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: Right.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But that's a
13	small percentage, generally, of the potential
14	witnesses that are interviewed by the staff maybe.
15	COMMISSIONER LEE: Right.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yeah.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's right. They
18	interview a lot of people.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yeah.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Right.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's true.
23	COMMISSIONER LEE: I really think that if
24	we changed the rule now by making it a majority of the
25	Commission having to approve any kind of a subpoena,

1	I agree with the Judge. You know, how about the
2	potential witnesses who go whose opinions we need
3	to know we'll never know, because they would not want
4	to come forward to these cases.
5	And, again, if ain't broken, if it hasn't
6	been broken for 39 years, I just don't see why we have
7	to voluntarily redo this to meet it's pressure.
8	It's not a power. It's a very pressured pull to carry
9	out the Commission's position.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did I hear you say, in
11	the words of friendly Peter Dooley, if it's not broke
12	don't fix it, or if it ain't broke don't fix it?
13	COMMISSIONER LEE: Well, I just don't
14	think that
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh.
16	(Laughter.)
17	Okay. Commissioner Anderson?
18	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I listened very
19	closely to what Commissioner Higginbotham was saying,
20	and I must say that much of it convinced me of the
21	rightness of my amendment, although I'm sure you
22	didn't intend that effect on my part.
23	There is the issue I mean, the point
24	you make is well taken, that by requiring a majority
25	to agree to the subpoena we do put certain power in

four Commissioners to thwart moving forward. But I think there are two things to keep in mind -- that not every Commission has had the complexion of this Commission and not everyone will in the future.

The first, in my mind, is if you require five votes, you're required on both sides, and we've got a number of witnesses that are suggested by all sorts of Commissioners and all sorts of groups of Commissioners. So that I don't think the requirement for five votes necessarily cuts the same way.

The second thing is that I think we should put procedures in play that require us to move on the basis of consensus, and to be very candid about it, and not on the basis of, say, half the Commission being opposed but being unable always to find a fifth vote. And, therefore, the division on the Commission gets deeper.

I think we ought to look at a procedure that requires consensus up front, rather than going through a long process and then finding at the end of the process -- that is, when the report is being written, the recommendations being made -- a deep division on the part of the Commission that detracts from the effectiveness of the report and the impact of the report.

And so, therefore, I think that in looking 1 at how we set up the hearing, if we're going to have 2 Commission approval of all of these steps, it is not 3 such a profound leap to require Commission approval 4 for this intermediate step. If we're going to require 5 five votes to go to the Justice Department to enforce 6 a subpoena, then I don't think it's such a large step 7 to require five votes up front to issue the subpoena 8 to begin with. 9

So I think that, as I reflect on what has been said and thinking about this for several months, that the more we can try to move toward consensus among the Commissioners earlier in the process the better off we are in getting a product that the Commission as a whole can support. And, therefore, I think I'd like to go forward with this proposal.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George, do you want to say something?

commissioner George: Yes, I just wanted to say in response to Leon's point that we are exercising a very significant power over people, and the power to do good is the power to do evil, and I think it's very good even for good governments to be very meticulous about procedural protections of people against possible abuse.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And what my proposal is aimed at doing is offering that kind of protection, and it does seem to me -- and it might just be a difference of philosophy here -- it does seem to me that we shouldn't exercise this power over private parties of getting into their papers if we don't have a majority, if there aren't five Commissioners who are prepared to take responsibility and be accountable for that.

I suspect that the way it works, the way it would work in practice, is the staff could propose a particular subpoena duces tecum of a particular breadth, and some Commissioners might object to any subpoena duces tecum being proposed. More often, I suspect, some Commissioners will be prepared to agree to a subpoena duces tecum, but will want the breadth to be narrowed somewhat, and that that would be the practical protective effect.

Where a majority was unwarranted, a fourperson group were unwarrantedly preventing the
Commission from getting access to crucial materials,
that would be done on the public record. And they
would be accountable for that and I would suspect
would be held accountable publicly and in the media
for that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I just wanted to say

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that there is nothing in the record that indicates that the Commission has subpoenaed materials and papers from private parties who are unrelated to any organization, any cause, or any other matter that the Commission was interested in.

In other words, the Commission -- there's nothing in the history of this Commission, either recently or since 1957, that indicates that the Commission went about subpoening materials from private citizens who, in fact, were not involved in some kind of organization or entity or function that the Commission was seeking information about.

So I just wanted to say that, as a matter of fact, that is the case. Yes, they have been non-governmental people, but it has been in their capacity of being related to some cause, some organization, some something, that the Commission wanted something about. So I think that's fair to say.

I think the other thing is the more I listen to this discussion, the more I sense that what is intended by changing this clause on the discussion about the majority voting to approve subpoenas duces tecum could be accomplished simply by informing people who are to produce materials that no subpoenas can be enforced unless a majority of the Commission agrees to

do so.

In fact, if they knew that, and they didn't want to submit the materials and felt that they could command a majority — they could not — we could not command a majority, and it was split four to four, to have them present the materials, they could simply not present them. And the Commission, unless a majority agreed to ask the U.S. Attorney to enforce it — I mean, I can see where somebody who doesn't know that may have a different view.

But if we informed all people who were asked for materials that subpoenas can only be enforced if a majority of the Commission agrees, then they, in fact, know that that is the case. And you could accomplish that without making any change in the rules. I just pointed that out -- that probably is totally unsatisfactory, but I thought I would point it out.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, let me just say why it's unsatisfactory. I mean, I think if we issue a subpoena we ought to enforce it.

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: We don't have that option.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: We don't?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, we do.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

I mean, the COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: 1 Attorney General is --2 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Oh, I understand, 3 Judge. But, I mean, if we issue a subpoena, we should 4 5 seek its enforcement. We should go to the Attorney 6 General, and I would hope ordinarily united. I mean, I can certainly anticipate many situations -- I mean, 7 8 it would be -- I would be loathe ever to vote against 9 enforcing a subpoena that we had issued as a 10 Commission, even if I were personally opposed to that subpoena being issued. 11 12 There are some circumstances, I'm sure, that would be extreme enough in my own view that I 13 14 would be compelled to do that, but I can imagine many 15 circumstances in which I might think a particular 16 subpoena is overbroad, and I would have voted against it and would vote against issuing that subpoena. 17 18 But then when it -- if someone resisted 19 our subpoena, it would be very important to me that the Commission subpoenas be enforced, and so I would 20 21 vote for enforcement. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Just so you all know 23 this, in the past the Commission has subpoenaed 24 materials and witnesses. And when they were not

forthcoming, even though the Commission unanimously

agreed to do this, the Commission has decided not to enforce a subpoena.

Why did the Commission decide not to enforce it? Because given the circumstances of the conduct of the hearing, given efficiency and use of resources, given what the Commission was involved in, they decided that it was a better part of valor to in that particular instance.

So I'm just saying that it's not that every time they agreed to do it they went ahead and enforced it. They made a new judgment each time.

and there can be very good reasons that we become aware of for not enforcing it. But I guess I'd like to, to the extent possible, depoliticize it at that stage. If we have reasons for not enforcing it, well, that's fine. Or if it makes sense for the Commission, we can accomplish our goal, we've learned we can accomplish our goals without it, that's fine, too.

But if we're going to have a philosophical or a political dispute about whether a subpoena -- whether someone should be compelled, I would very much like to have it at the stage where we're deciding whether to issue the subpoena and taking responsibility for it there, rather than down the line

on the enforcement issue.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The last point I'll make is in the history of the Commission -- and this is in the history books about the Commission -- the Commission was more vehemently attacked for being part of an oppressive Federal Government in its early years than it has even been in recent years, or that the Federal Government has been in recent years. In fact, Commissioners were almost run out of the State of Mississippi.

Commissioners had great difficulty trying to maintain the power of the Commission to do its work, to use its enforcement power. Commissioners and staff were called all sorts of names about people as representatives of the heavy-handed Federal Government.

I'm just pointing this out so that you will know that the history of this organization, and the history of the Federal Government, is replete with even more heated and virulent controversies than attend what goes on in the public today. And the Commissioners every time have stood up and said, "Hey, you know, this is what we have to do, and this is what we have to maintain."

There are controls on what we do, and I'm

193 not trying to advise you in any way in terms of how 1 you vote, but I'm just telling you that that is the 2 history of the organization, which you can read in 3 books about the history of -- that people can make 4 available to you if you wish to confirm that this was 5 the case. 6 Is there any further discussion? Yes? 7 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I will make 8 this last presentation less than five hours. 9 (Laughter.) 10

> It makes absolutely no sense to -- in the year 1996, to be making this distinction between private versus governmental. I mean, are we saying that General Motors is private and the State of Mississippi is governmental? Are we saying that Mitsubishi is private and the State of Illinois is governmental? That distinction between private and government has been out of American juris prudence for half a century.

> We know that major corporations who are "private" have much more power (quote) governmental. And are we throwing all of the support of the Commission -- throwing out all of the cases which disregard this private/governmental distinction?

> > Let me give you a couple of examples.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Most of -- many of the people who are going to prison now, they aren't in (quote) "state prisons." We have prisons which are being operated by private corporations, and let us suppose that some of the private corporations are -- in the administration of their jails are seriously violating the rights of inmates.

Do we say as a Commission, "Oh, yeah, but that's done by a private corporation"? That kind of distinction is dead from any juris prudential view, so we are going back centuries when we start to make these distinctions.

If someone is big enough to violate human rights, whether it's done by General Motors, Mitsubishi, or EEOC, or the State of Mississippi, there should be no distinction. And we will look like we are bereft of history when we start making — when 50 years from now when someone looks in our record, they're going to look at Griswold's great descent as a great moment of this Commission, when he was in Mississippi, dealing with private entities who were involved in vigilante movements, to deprive people of their rights.

And Griswold could stand up against the vigilante movements, which included killing Medgar

1	Evers, and now we are worried about offending private
2	enterprises. It is a repudiation of what this
3	Commission has stood for, and maybe that's where we
4	are in this society. But to make this private versus
5	governmental distinction it seems to me is to turn the
6	clock of history back.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, I know we are
8	going to get
9	COMMISSIONER HORNER: It is.
LO	(Laughter.)
L1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
L2	Horner?
L3	COMMISSIONER HORNER: It is, indeed, to
L <b>4</b>	roll back and increasing excrescence of public power.
L5	Yes, that's an accurate characterization, but there is
L6	a different way to look at it. And that is that this
L7	will be more in keeping with earlier distinctions of
L8	public/private to the benefit of the citizenry.
L9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is the Ku Klux Klan a
20	private organization or a public
21	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: It is. It
22	certainly is.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It is? Oh. I don't
24	know. Somebody else had their hand up. I think it
25	was Commissioner George. Sorry. I'll recognize the

Vice Chair and then let --1 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Oh, sure. Sorry. 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 3 I was just going to say that, clearly, government has the 4 potential for the present actions. And, you know, we 5 don't have to go back in history beyond the McCarthy 6 hearings to be reminded of that. And if I were 7 convinced that the history of this Commission was to 8 violate people's first amendment or privacy rights, 9 then I might be thinking differently. 10 11 The history of this Commission actually 12 has been, it seems to me, the opposite. By the use of 13 the subpoena power to protect the first amendment and 14 civil rights of folk -- and I think basically that's 15 the way the Commission has used it -- so I am reluctant to then vote on what I view is a limitation, 16 a self-imposed limitation of that. So that's sort of 17 18 where I started. 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Back where you started 20 from. 21 Commissioner George, do you want to speak, 22 or do you want me to go ahead and --23 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, go ahead and 24 -- I mean, I don't know how we've gotten into this or 25 what I said in my proposal that triggered this, but

I'm just very disappointed. I don't think that the -I could be missing it, Leon, but I do not see how
anything in my proposal would raise any of the
concerns that you've raised.

I have not proposed that the Civil Rights Commission cannot play a role in highlighting and combatting discrimination by private parties under civil rights acts that do outlaw that sort of -- those sorts of civil rights violations.

I could, I think, make a detailed response to draw some distinctions to try to show you that your most recent intervention was not apt in response to what I'm trying to do here. But I'm afraid it would just get us into a very lengthy, continuous exchange on the matter. I think there is a valid distinction between private and public power. I think it's absolutely — the power of private and public institutions is absolutely crucial in many areas of our juris prudence, which I would be very happy to go into.

Nothing in that, in the recognition of such a distinction, suggests that civil rights cannot be violated by private organizations or that the Ku Klux Klan is not a private organization, or that we ought not to be able to reach the activities of the Ku

Klux Klan. I mean, nothing like that at all.

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

I'm trying to deal here with what I take to be a significant problem, and I thought at least many of my colleagues agreed with me that there's at least a problem here. And I can appreciate that I perhaps haven't quite accomplished it or done it as well as I could, but this is not a debate over whether we ought to be concerned about discrimination by powerful private interests at all.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do I hear other comments, or should I call this for a vote? Yes, Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Let me just say, I don't want to read an implication into anything that has been said that's not there. But as far as I'm concerned, and my intention, it was in no way to shield any organization that would be violating civil rights through this proposal. Certainly, I mean, the guestion isn't the Ku Klux Klan private organization. I mean, it is not an intention to shield any organization like that.

And I think if any -- for example, if we were to hear serious allegations that there is a private contractor operating a prison system where there are violations, I would assume that we would all

vote to go after that. I mean, I voted to go into the Mississippi -- a review of the jail situation there that we did. So I don't see it as that.

I see it simply, number one, we are a federal agency in charge -- directed to review the civil rights enforcement of other federal agencies, and so I think that we ought to have a very automatic, if you will, subpoena power with federal agencies. And we ought to be able to get those documents very readily.

And there should be no -- well, really, there should be no need for a subpoena, because it's a federal agency. And, certainly, there really should not be a need for a subpoena against a state agency because they should cooperate with us. So I see that as a perfectly reasonable part of this proposal, that if there is resistance then we have very clear discretion to go do that.

what I'm saying is where we have a private entity, we ought to afford a second look, a review by the Commission. And I don't see that review as being in any way shielding it, but I think that people are entitled to that, and I think organizations are entitled to it. And I think, frankly, if we give that second look up front, it will make it much more easy

24~

to move for enforcement, to recommend enforcement, and to deal with the witnesses and the documents that we do get.

So that's -- anyway, that's the intention that I had behind it, and we may have a very important disagreement on philosophy. But at least I want to make my intention and my motivation clear on the thing.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll recognize you,
Commissioner Horner, but first let me say that my
saying is the Ku Klux Klan a private organization was
not meant to imply that anyone here thought the Ku
Klux Klan should be insulated from investigation. I
was simply trying to clarify, you know, what did we
mean by private organization.

And, secondly, to remind you again that the Commission, when it agrees to have a hearing, if it's a documents hearing, it knows that we are subpoenaing documents from brokerage houses, banks, whatever. It's not that you don't know this. It's not that it comes as a surprise when we get the witness list. You know this already, and you have a full opportunity to say, "You know, I don't think we should subpoena banks," or whatever it is you don't think we should, "or pressure groups against banks,"

# NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

or whatever.

Commissioners do have opportunities —
they may not be sufficient opportunities in the minds
of some Commissioners, but Commissioners do have
opportunities to make decisions about this process.

### Commissioner Horner?

-- to make sure that I was not misunderstood, that I am trying to support a situation in which the Commissioners take responsibility for subpoenaing governmental and private organizations and citizens, not to avoid subpoenaing, but to force us to take responsibility and to walk us back a bit from the power of the Staff Director and the staff and elevate the potency and meaning of our inquiries and our investigations by forcing us to take responsibility.

And I also would like to associate myself with Commissioner Anderson's remarks about the necessity to force us to engage in what I think the founders anticipated in setting up our form of government -- horse trading, moving to the center, modification of views. And I think that by forcing us to deal with these more difficult issues, and not just leaving it to the untrammeled power of staff, that we will become a better Commission.

	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: II there are no other
2	comments, I guess the motion is on the floor.
3	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Madame Chair,
4	I gather that silence no response is not considered
5	that there's not one thought about.
6	(Laughter.)
7	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Fair enough.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I wish to call the
9	question. All those in favor of Commissioner
10	Anderson's motion
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Just to clarify,
12	Madame Chairman, I think we're just voting on
13	Section 2 of my original draft as revised by Carl
14	Anderson.
15	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right? Not
17	Section 1. There's no
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, your proprietary
19	statement here on the part of George.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: What's that?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm telling Anderson
22	he heard your proprietary statement.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Oh, I didn't mean to
24	be proprietary. I just mean we're not voting on
25	the

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm getting to it.
2	We're voting on the George-initiated proposal of your
3	Section 2, as modified by Commissioner Anderson. And
4	all of those who are in favor of this proposal and
5	a roll call vote has been asked for. First of all,
6	let me see what the vote is, and then I'll call the
7	roll.
8	All those in favor indicate by saying aye.
9	(Chorus of ayes.)
10	Okay. Who said aye? 1, 2, 3, 4. Okay.
11	All those opposed indicate by saying no.
12	(Chorus of nos.)
13	1, 2, 3. And then I have to vote. Hm.
14	(Laughter.)
15	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Surprise us, Madame
16	Chairman.
17	(Laughter`.`)
18	Let's call the roll.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's a tough one,
20	Robbie. No.
21	Commissioner Anderson?
22	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Berry,
24	no.
25	Commissioner George?

1	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Aye.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
3	Higginbotham?
4	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: No.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner?
6	COMMISSIONER HORNER: Aye.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee?
8	COMMISSIONER LEE: No.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
10	Redenbaugh?
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair Reynoso?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The motion
15	fails. But let me suggest this. I
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, let me just
17	say that I am beginning to change my opinion on the
18	view and have been persuaded by you that work
19	(Laughter.)
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I would like to
21	suggest that I think that maybe we should move for
22	further discussion on this.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I will be speaking
25	to some of you about some ways that we can do

-	something else on this.
2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I want to know how
3	I allowed myself to get
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm not giving up
5	altogether.
6 .	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: so emotionally
7	invested in subpoena requirements.
8	(Laughter.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's important.
10	Future agenda items? Anyone have future
11	agenda items?
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Do you mean for
13	a future meeting?
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Good. Because
16	I'm worn out now.
17	(Laughter:)
18	And I wasn't even in the middle. I would
19	like to come back to two questions. My reading of the
20	transcript confuses me, as to our project proposal for
21	<b>'</b> 97.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: '97.
23	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: '97. So I don't
24	want to take it up now, but I think I'd like some
25	clarification on that. It also is my view that it is

1	still a very ambitious schedule, from the standpoint
2	of the eight of us. I don't think the eight of us can
3	get that done, especially given the length of this
4	meeting. So that's one thing.
5	And then, secondly, we are still open on
6	<b>'</b> 98.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right. That's
9	not
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're still discussing
11	that. Right. Would you like an answer to any of
12	that, or are you just saying you want to discuss it
13	some time?
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah, I'm I
15	don't want to discuss anything now.
16	(Laughter.)
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Well,
18	could I have a motion to adjourn?
19	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So moved.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's not debatable, so
21	the meeting is adjourned.
22	(Whereupon, at 1:31 p.m., the meeting was
23	adjourned.)
24	_ <sup>v</sup>
25	

### CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in the matter of:

Meeting

Before:

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Date:

May 10, 1996

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

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