U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

COMMISSION MEETING

TE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Friday, April 14, 2000

Washington, D.C.

The Commission convened at 9:35 a.m., in Room 546, YWCA Building, 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20425, Chairperson Mary Frances Berry, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON
CRUZ REYNOSO, VICE CHAIRPERSON
CARL A. ANDERSON, COMMISSIONER (Via Telephone)
CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR., COMMISSIONER (Via
Telephone)
YVONNE Y. LEE, COMMISSIONER
ELSIE M. MEEKS, COMMISSIONER
VICTORIA WILSON, COMMISSONER
RUBY G. MOY, STAFF DIRECTOR

STAFF PRESENT:

KIMBERLEY ALTON DAVID ARONSON KI-TAEK CHUN BARBARA de la VIEZ PAMELA A. DUNSTON BETTY EDMISTON MICHAEL FOREMAN M. CATHERINE GATES EDWARD A. HAILES, Acting General Counsel MYRNA HERNANDEZ TRICIA JEFFERSON LISA M. KELLY TINALOUISE MARTIN JOSEPH MANALILI JENNY KIM PARK MARC PENTINO BERNARD QUARTERMAN

STAFF PRESENT: (CONT.)

PETER REILLY, Parliamentarian KWANA ROYAL DAWN SWEET MARCIA TYLER AUDREY WRIGHT MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

PATRICK DUFFY CHARLOTTE PONTICELLI NAOMI SODETINA KRISHNA TOOLSIE EFFIE TURNBULL

AGENDA

		PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda	4
II.	Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2000 Meeting	5
III.	Announcements	5
IV.	Staff Director's Report	10
v.	State Advisory Committee Reports Community Concerns About Law Enforcement in Sonoma County (California)	68
	Equal Educational Opportunity for Hispanic Students in the Oklahoma City Public Schools (Oklahoma)	
VI.	Hawaiian Civil Rights Issues	69
VII.	Future Agenda Items	76

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

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The meeting will come to order.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The first item is the approval of the agenda. Even though we know that we are not -- you have never received the draft of the Police Practices Report, because there isn't any, and you were informed of that, and this was put on the agenda because we have to notice the agenda some time ahead of the meeting and as often has happened in the history of the Commission, the staff isn't able to finish something in time for us to consider it and that item is put off. We do want to discuss at some point how we release that item, but I think we should approve the agenda with a modification that we will not be considering the draft of that report because we don't have a draft of that report, and it will be considered at some other time.

With that, could I get a motion to approve the agenda?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved, with that amendment.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?

COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor, indicate

i	by saying "aye."
2	(Ayes.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
4	(No response.)
5	II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 2000 MEETING
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the
7	approval of the minutes of the March 3, 2000 meeting.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
10	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor, indicate
12	by saying "aye."
13	(Ayes.)
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	So ordered.
17	III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then there are
19	announcements. We have four new attorney-advisors in
20	OGC, is that right, Staff Director?
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are they here?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: They are here.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you stand up so we
25	can see your bright and shining faces? This is Michael

Foreman, Jenny Kim Park, Barbara de la Viez, and Bernard Quarterman. Welcome to the Commission, we're glad to have you with us, we need all the help we can get.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Very glad.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The other item I wanted to mention is that one of our former Commissioners and who was Vice Chair of the Commission for a number of years, Morris Abram, who was a distinguished American who served as president of Brandeis University and had other distinguished contributions to this country on various threshold commissions and was Vice Chair of this Commission during the Reagan Administration, passed on March 16, 2000. Morris' picture is up there somewhere on the wall. We are all enshrined there forever -- there he is, right behind Elsie Meeks, on the wall. So, we want to note that.

The other is that I and Commissioner Meeks and Regional Director Melvin Jenkins met with the Governor of Nebraska, Governor Johanns, to discuss issues concerning Whiteclay, Nebraska, on March 21. This was a followup on our forum in Rapid City concerning the problems with the Indian deaths, the unexplained Indian deaths in South Dakota, and one of the issues to come up was the alcohol trading post in Whiteclay, right across the border, which seemed to exist for no purpose except

1.3

to sell alcohol to the Indians.

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

And so one of the outcomes of the SAC report was that we wanted to talk with the Governor of Nebraska about what he might do to better educate the people in Nebraska about the Indian problem, and also what they might do in terms of perhaps setting up some kind of detox center or other measures that might take place in Whiteclay to reduce the impact of that trading post.

So, I went out there, Commissioner Meeks came over, and Melvin Jenkins, and the Chair of the Nebraska SAC, and we met with him. There was some followup to that meeting that was promised -the Governor promised that he would look at his budget and figure out whether within the Human Resources -- I think it was the Human Resources part of the budget, or some part of the budget -- whether they could allocate some money for an educational strategy, a public education strategy, within Nebraska, which seemed to be essential if you ever wanted to get some legislation or some kind of policy that will address the issue, and he told us that within ten days -- he promised that within ten days he would get us a report on that.

His Special Assistant called my Assistant to say that that report is delayed but it is on its way -- and we know how these things are -- but that he is

planning to respond, and he will respond and will tell us. So, that's very good.

The other thing that happened is that there was -- I guess the Governor of South Dakota was not too happy with our report. I guess that's the way -- I mean, that's putting it mildly, I guess.

I had a long talk with the Governor of South Dakota on the telephone about it, and asked to meet with him and my request to meet with him is being pursued by our Regional Director, John Foster Dulles, and I have asked the Staff Director to tell John to continue to pursue that because I think that Elsie and I and others should meet with the Governor about this report, even though the Governor, in our phone conversation, was not willing to meet and was unhappy, to say the least, and there must have been some fallout in Nebraska.

I did tell the Governor that if nothing else happened as a result of this report, I was going to ask this Commission to agree that we should do a project with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, looking at the alleged disparities in the way the law is applied in the criminal justice system in South Dakota, in two of the counties -- in Roberts County and the one with the "W" -- the other county -- the two prosecutors who came --

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Walworth County.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- Walworth County and 1 Roberts County -- but that I would do that even if the 2 Governor doesn't want to meet and even if the Governor 3 doesn't want to do anything else. 4 5 So, Elsie, is there anything you'd like to add to explorations in South Dakota? 6 7 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: No, I think that's really important that -- I mean, to me; the whole report 8 9 was that, you know, with people's perceptions we were 10 dealing with, and that was by and large what the 11 testimony was about. And so the study, to me, is the 12 most important recommendation -- I mean, I think the 13 federal sentencing guidelines that the federal task force 14 set forth. So, you know, if South Dakota isn't willing 15 to -- the State of South Dakota isn't willing to come to 16 the table on this, I think we should. 17 talked to the Director, and Now, Ι 18 volunteered for me to talk with the South Dakota 19 Community Foundation to apply for some funding for this 20 type of study, and I thought that was good. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I have had, as you know 22 -- and you have had with me -- some conversations with 23 people at Justice about these issues, and I've had some 24 conversations with the Attorney General about them. 25 intend to pursue the matter of a task force with her, but

she's a little busy right now, and so I'm going to wait a few days to talk to her about it again. She is very interested in these issues. So, we will pursue that.

And now we are just making reports, but I would like to ask the Commissioners to agree -- and maybe we can talk about it under the Staff Director's report, which is next after we finish Announcements -- whether you would agree that we ought to pursue this idea of a study of the disparities in criminal justice.

I think that's all I have on announcements anyway, so we can go to the Staff Director's report, unless somebody else has an announcement they'd like to make.

IV. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Doing that, let me then mention as a first item under that, would the Commissioners think that it is a good idea -- and we've discussed this before in connection with South Dakota -- that we pursue the study of disparities, alleged disparities -- the people at the forum said that there were disparities -- in the criminal justice system in South Dakota in those two counties -- in South Dakota at least, those two counties at least -- and the prosecutors, as you will recall, from those two counties were present at the forum. And one of them -- I've forgotten which one -- welcomed such a study and

said that he has information but he hasn't analyzed it and he doesn't know, and that anybody who wants to come to look it may. And I think I may have reported to you - and maybe I didn't -- that the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics has said he is agreeable to joining with us to do such a study. He also had talked to the South Dakota Attorney General, I think, or the South Dakota -- yes, the Attorney General -- about the possibility of them doing such a study, and they weren't interested in doing it.

So, what I would like to know is if you would like the Staff Director to pursue the idea with staff joining us together with the Bureau of Justice Statistics in doing an analysis of that issue as a contribution we can make, no matter whether anybody else does anything or not, in South Dakota.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, I must say, from being at the hearings and hearing all the testimony, I would think that it would be a very good idea. The impression I got from the local prosecutor was that he did not have the background or expertise to do it. He felt rather confident that it would not show a disparity, but I think in light of the sense of division that exists in the state, the Indians and non-Indians, it would be very good to simply come with the facts, and if they show

there is disparity there and the local prosecutor is 1 willing to take that into account in how he utilizes his 2 prosecutorial discretion I think would be good. 3 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Madam Chairman. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Edley. 5 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I like the idea of 6 7 doing a study, but I'd like to raise two cautions, maybe One is I think it could prove to be very 8 methodologically difficult because of the problems of 9 categorizing and because of the numbers of cases 10 involved, small and big, as it were. 11 Number two, I think that not to come out 12 whether the right focus is a couple of counties or some 13 14 broader area, and I think that's something that should be thought through pretty carefully in the design of the 15 16 effort. 17 And, number three, I would much prefer that 18 we participate by contracting out, perhaps, or providing

And, number three, I would much prefer that we participate by contracting out, perhaps, or providing an honorarium or something to an academic who would conduct a study to be in conjunction with the BGS or NIJ or whoever would be doing it from the Justice Department, rather than allocating internal staff resources, given the huge list of projects that we are juggling now and into the foreseeable future.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think that we would

19

20

21

22

23

24

have to consider timing, and that would be something for the Staff Director and the staff to figure out. All we would be doing today is asking them to -- saying in general that we think such a study of some aspect of the criminal justice system in South Dakota is warranted, and that we would like to do so, but the Staff Director would be responsible, with the staff, for figuring out what is the best way to do that and recommending it to us and telling us. And taking into account the comments that you've made and that others might make, I would like, along with when they consider this, to ask the question of whether we should do it with anybody else or not.

Even though BGS has volunteered, we don't do studies with other government agencies, we do them with ourselves -- you know, because, in a sense, we monitor what BGS does. So from that standpoint, we -- it would be good if they want to do such a study and use their resources to do it, and we could look at it and see what we thought of it. That might be interesting, too.

But for now -- and I'm always in favor of having academics receive honoraria to do studies, I think that's really terrific, either in your university or mine, Chris, or anybody else's, it's always a good idea.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Either one would do a great job.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: For now, though, why don't we, if there is consensus, ask the Staff Director to propose such a thing to us and to work out the way it might be done, and we can discuss it again, but there is a general sense that we would like to do such a study of some type on disparities, alleged disparities, in the criminal justice system.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: In general, I'm in favor of moving forward on this, however, I have to say that I tend to be opposed to any new project until we get the Americans With Disabilities Act study that I think has been characterized as "languishing" on some kind of a time frame and schedule that looks realistic, and we can understand is going to be completed sometime in the millennium. So, that would be my concern here.

I would like to hear from the Staff Director when we are going to move forward on that. Commissioner Redenbaugh is not here, and so I feel a little bit of an obligation to raise that point because I think he might if he were here.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director, do you

have any idea, or do you want the General Counsel to 1 speak to that, or what would you like? 2 STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Well, since we have new 3 additions to the General Counsel's office, I know he has 4 5 assigned the project to one of the new Attorney Advisors. 6 So, Mr. Hailes? 7 Good morning, Commissioners. MR. HAILES: 8 Actually, Commissioner Anderson, if you review the MIS 9 materials that were submitted, there is very detailed 10 information about both the status and the expectation of 11 a completion date, which suggests that by September the 12 ADA project will be completed. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And you are having your 14 new attorneys making that possible. 15 MR. HAILES: It is a valuable and great 16 addition. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I quess we would 18 have to figure out, Mr. Anderson, as the Staff Director 19 figures out whether we can do this sort of thing, is 20 which office would do it, whether it would be OGC or OCRE 21 or what, you know, how she thinks it would be. 22 now, I would like her to take into account all the 23 comments that everyone makes, and any others that anyone would like to make, and then come back to us and tell us 24 25 how, why, when, whether.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, Madam Chair, I think it's fair to ask that whatever the allocation of resources are, the time frame for this new study we're contemplating would not affect the ADA schedule?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, she can answer

that, too. It may very well be that she will propose that we not do it this year but in the next year or something, or in an outyear. Whenever we do it, the point is -- I don't think the problem is going to be solved in South Dakota immediately, and my whole point is that we should -- this Commission should be committed to doing at least one thing about the issues that were raised in South Dakota whereas 20 years ago, or whatever time it was the other report was done, insofar as we're able to tell, no one followed up to do anything at all, so that even if we did it two years from now, at least we would be doing something.

So, I'm not suggesting that we do it immediately, I'm just suggesting that the Staff Director can tell us how it can be factored into either what we do now or in some outyear, but I'm just asking for a consensus that it is something that ought to be done in response to the report.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I agree with that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now, anybody have

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

anything else under the Staff Director's report? Yes, Commissioner Lee?

COMMISSIONER LEE: Madam Chair, on page 4 of the Staff Director's report, regarding the Budget Director's meeting with Omega, I think this is an ongoing issue causing a couple of Commissioners here some problems. I would like to renew my recommendation to the Budget Director through the Staff Director that we've had complaints from the Commissioners regarding dealings with Omega. They are related to the Budget Director so he knows of the problems, so he knows of the problems as late as last week.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What is the status of this arrangement with Omega, and what's going on, because the people -- everyone seems to be -- or many people seem to be making complaints about the relationship.

STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: The Omega contract -the complaints have to be in writing so that we can have
some sort of background information to give to the Omega
people. It's under contract. Unfortunately, George
Harbison, who is away on a family emergency, is not here
to explain the whole process, but it is my understanding
that if there are complaints, that you should submit it
to us in writing so that we can go forward with the Omega
folks because, as I understand it, you have Omega Travel

Offices in the West Coast and also on the East Coast. We don't have a problem here, but I know that a lot of the problems have been on the West Coast.

COMMISSIONER LEE: We deal with the Washington Office, which is local, figuring all of that was part of them.

I think that I just want to mention briefly the experience that I had last week. Under the strong recommendation of the Staff Director, I went back to Omega to make the travel arrangement, and I was given the runaround for the entire week. And even when the staff got on the phone, the information that she gave me was not the information that they gave her. So, it was just confusing, and I felt that given our time having to deal with other things, unless Omega really straightened out, it's really difficult for us to have this mayhem on a monthly basis.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: It just might indicate that the staff can take a portion of this transcript as a complaint. I don't see why this has to be as a formal memo from an individual saying "I hereby complain and petition the government to do this." I mean, it seems to me that we're being overly formalistic within this Commission about how to bring complaints to Omega.

1	And I just want to add for the record that
2	I've had similar experiences, that it takes forever in
3	terms of the time that we put into dealing with impolite
4	and incompetent people who don't know what they are doing
5	and who sometimes don't get tickets to us on time. In my
6	view, dealing with Omega has been an absolute disaster,
7	and I think that it might be helpful to the Commission,
8	in indicating the unhappy state of affairs that some of
9	us have, to simply take a portion of this transcript and
10	indicate to them the extreme unhappiness that at least
11	two Commissioners have and several staff people,
12	including unanimously every staff person I have had, in
13	dealing with Omega. The time it takes, their
14	incompetence, their discourtesies, they never seem to
15	know what the best way to get from A to B is. Other than
16	that, they are a terrific organization.
17	(Laughter.)
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that all right, Staff
19	Director, will you do that
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Yes, I think that would
21	be a good idea.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: so they should know
23	of our discontent.
24	Does anybody have anything else on the Staff

Director's report?

1 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Madam Chair.

1.2

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner Edley.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I do have a cousin who is a travel agent also.

(Laughter.)

I wanted to raise a question and make a comment about the press leaks. I don't know at what point to do it --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can do it here because this is a matter of ongoing -- how we behave in an ongoing fashion in terms of our operations, which we usually discuss them in the Staff Director's report, anything to do with operations.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: First, I think that there have been substantial and important "leaks" -- is the best way to characterize them -- of uncompleted Commission work, discussions of Commission activities, to the press in connection with the percentage plan statement and with the forthcoming New York report. And I guess I was very dismayed and, I must say, angered to read these reports, in part, because it seems quite political. It certainly tends to undermine the work of the Commission, and the standing of the Commission, and the perception of the Commission by the public -- and I'm not a newcomer, by any means, to the ways of Washington,

so I understand that leaks happen -- but that said, I find it deeply objectionable and wanted to express that.

And I don't know the source of the leaks, I don't know whether it's the Commissioners or whether it's people on the staff, but it certainly disserves the institution.

That is point number one.

Point number two is, I think that aside from the general issues of politicization and undermining the think of the Commission, I that some work circumstances leaks of the sort that we've experienced over the last couple of weeks have serious potential to Some of the work that the do damage to other people. Commission does, particularly in connection with formal hearings, if there's premature disclosure or circulation to the public, to the media, I think could be quite problematic. I don't know what will be in the draft of the New York City report when it finally gets to us, but I also know that it's entirely possible that there will be things that the staff might draft or things that might be excerpted from transcripts or something that could do damage to people's reputations, that could lead to hysteria, kind of anticipatory hysteria over things that actually will never see the light of day or never be presented, much less endorsed by the Commission in a formal way, and meanwhile the damage to reputations, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

misunderstanding and confusion that could be sewed, is really quite substantial, which leads to my third point, which is, in light of all these concerns, particularly the concerns about the possible damage to people outside the Commission, I would like to know whether there are regulations or statutes that are applicable to this kind of unauthorized release of information. And I know everybody has First Amendment rights and the like, and we're not exactly dealing with national security matters, but on the other hand if there are ethics rules, or anything of the sort, that bear on this as a formal matter, I'd like to understand that.

And I would also like to know under what circumstances, if any, the unauthorized disclosure of information, whether by staff or by Commissioners, is an appropriate matter for referral to an ethics office or to an Inspector General?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, let me say, and then maybe the Staff Director will want to say something about what actually happened, but let me say a word about what actually happened insofar as I know.

You mentioned two projects, but the first one in recent months that has been leaked to the press ahead of our consideration was the gender and mathematics report. I got a call from a television network which had

i7

1.8

the report in hand, and wanted to -- said they had been told by whoever gave it to them, that they ought to do a program -- a thing on it, because it was a horrendous report that did all sorts of horrible things about wanting girls to learn advanced math, and that they were not going to do it because they thought that that was stupid because girls needed to learn advanced math, but they just wanted me to know that they had been given the report. Then after -- that's the first in recent memory that it's happened. The second is the -- and it's hard to trace where that came from because that report was in the hands, in its final form, of a lot of people before we considered it.

The one on percentage plans, the version that was leaked to the press, was in the hands only of the Commissioners, their assistants, and the people in the Staff Director's office -- two special assistants and the Staff Director, the Commissioners, and their assistants. They were the only people who had that last copy, which means that somebody in that group leaked it. That narrows the circle a little bit.

So, one can just sort of figure out to whose advantage it was in terms of how it was played and that it was leaked, to figure out who did it.

The third one is on New York -- this has all

been very interesting to me because I have not seen a draft of the New York report, yet I keep reading in the media that there is a draft of the New York report. The reporters keep calling up, talking about a draft of the New York report, and I've never seen one. I know the Commissioners were not -- were any of you sent a draft of the New York report?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: We haven't even seen a transcript of the hearing yet.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I haven't either. I haven't seen any of it. So, I don't know what they are talking about, yet they keep writing in the press that there's a draft. Ι also think that there's some misunderstanding -someone onour staff qave misunderstanding to the press because the Associated Press is particularly confused about this -- they thought that the reason why we weren't considering the report today was because of some story that somebody wrote about me when, in fact, we are not considering it because we don't have the draft to consider and it is not finished. And they don't understand that we put things on the agenda and we often don't consider them if we don't have But I am told by reporters that someone on our them. staff told them that, which means we've got people on our staff who are telling -- and I don't think the reporters

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are -- I used to be a reporter, they don't just make things up out of whole cloth. I mean, they have their own interests and biases and so on, but they usually don't make stuff up like that just, you know, off the street.

So, somebody on our staff has a reason for putting out this kind of information. Now, my concern about it is -- and then on the last one, you've got, of course, this brouhaha with people responding to what they think is something we have and did, when none of us knows anything about what it is and we haven't seen it, and people keep calling up, asking us to respond to it. It's very weird.

So, I don't know the answer, Christopher, because I know that, from my time being in government and on the fringes of it, there's always been leaks, and you know this, too, and usually you can't find out who did it. When the circle is narrow and you know how many people have something, you can figure out that one of them did it, and you figure out what their interest was in doing it, but most of the time, you can't. But I think your question about whether it ought to be referred to the Inspector General for an investigation is an interesting one.

Commissioner Wilson.

1	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Thank you, Madam
2	Chair. I'd just like to add as sort of an annotation to
3	your comment, that in terms of I mean, I was called by
4	a television station, called to respond to the report
5	and, fortunately, I just had the presence of mind to say
6	"I know nothing," which I did. And then, furthermore, to
7	respond to the report in the New York Times, which
8	unfortunately I had not a chance to read the paper that
9	day, however, that night I did see that the Commissioner
10	of Police had called a press conference in response to
11	this report, the said report, and more to the point, the
12	Mayor had already put a spin on it in terms of the
13	senatorial campaign.
14	And it seems to me that it does a major
15	disservice to the hard work of this Commission that there
16	is a political spin that's put on this when people are
17	working very hard to put forth a report, and many people
18	have been hurt in the wake of what it is we're
19	investigating. So, I think it's very damaging and very
20	serious.
21	. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madam Chair.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll recognize you in
2.3	just one second, Carl, Commissioner Meeks had her hand
24	up. Commissioner Meeks.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, you know, it

really raises that when the draft does get finished -you know -- I mean, it's my understanding that the
Commission reviews the draft and doesn't -- and then it
goes for agency comment, and then the final report is
voted on and released, is that right?

So, I mean, it really -- in fairness to anyone that commented in the report, you know, I just think we need to be very careful about the leak when the draft finally does come.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Carl.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I have two comments. The first is, I don't know what's in the New York report, I have not see a draft of it. But according to what I read in the paper, Reverend Al Sharpton does, he told them you have the report, and so we find out it's Reverend Sharpton. That's my first comment.

My second comment is, on April 6th, I received -- I think we all received -- a memorandum from the Staff Director which said the following -- and it's only three sentences, so I would like to read: "Please set aside time in your schedule early next week to read the New York report before the next Commission meeting. Unfortunately, it is not available for this mailout, and . I know you have been urgently waiting for it. It will be sent to you in a few days."

Now, at least the Staff Director, my interpretation of this memorandum would be, thought the report was completed. So, if the report is not done, I find that interesting. Apparently, on April 6, the Staff Director thought it was done or it would be done in the next day or two, but that does not explain why, if, in fact, the report had not been sent for comment to the Police Department or the Mayor's office. So, I think that is maybe a question we ought to raise here, too, while we're talking about the report.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll let the Staff Director comment in a minute, but just to be clear for the new Commissioners so they will understand this, when we consider a report here, that doesn't mean it's ready Very often when we consider a report to be published. here, it's either out already for what we call "affected agency review," which means agencies that have testified get to comment, or we send it out after we -- depending on what the timing is and what we're doing -- after we're generally satisfied with it, to get comments, and sometimes we put their comments in an appendix -- like, if they send a letter back saying blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah -- we just put all the letters in an appendix so people will have them when the report is published.

If they say anything that challenges the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

factual accuracy of some point that's made and the staff believes that that is correct, then they will change whatever it is. But when we consider it here, that doesn't mean that's the end of the process. That was the other confusion that people had who were looking at the agenda. They thought that if we voted on this report, it somehow meant we were going to publish it like that.

And, clearly, part of the process -- and it's always been part of the -- not always been, but in the last 15 years it's been part of the process -- that affected agencies are called, get to comment on reports that we do before we finally publish them.

And we can ask the General Counsel and Staff Director to affirm this, but I am clear, from my conversations with folks in New York when we did the hearing, that they knew that they would get to comment on this report before it was issued, that there was affected agency review, and that they would get to comment on it, which is the other reason why I was puzzled when there was all this stuff about -- apparently, someone told that if we voted on it today, if we had it and voted on it, that we weren't going to let them comment on it before it got out. Maybe that was what the confusion was, I don't know.

Staff Director, do you or General Counsel

have any comments on any of this at this point, 1 2 further comments? STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Thank you. We sent the 3 report out to the Editorial Board for review and, based 4 on comments there, staff here had asked for an extension. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That was why you sent 7 that other memo? STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Right. We thought it 8 would be done by then, but staff here had asked for an 9 10 extension and I granted it, and I don't know if Eddie 11 wants to add to that. 12 MR. HAILES: That's accurate and, in fact, 1.3 we are revising the report. We expect it to be completed We will follow all of the procedures that 14 very soon. this Commission has always followed in terms of affected 15 16 agency review. We were very concerned about the news 17 report, which appeared to be nothing more than an acute case of "overreactionitis," but at the same time we are 18 19 continuing to do the sound legal work we've always done and making certain that every line in the report is 20 21 accurate, based on facts, based on testimony, 22 analysis of all of the documents that we received. 23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madam Chair, I have 24 two questions. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner

Anderson.

2.3

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: First is, just so we're clear here, when do the affected agencies get a chance to comment, before we vote on it, or after?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to discuss this right now because, normally -- and I'll let them answer -- if my answer is wrong, you guys tell me and you can answer. We have, in the past, let affected agencies comment either before we approved it at a meeting, or afterward, or at the same time, depending on the timing on it. We've done it all those different ways.

The main thing we've done is we've not ever published a report before we got the responses from the affected agencies and considered them. So, we've done it those three different ways.

What I want to ask this Commission now -and since we're discussing this, we might as well discuss
it -- is what we should do, given the fact that there are
all these leaks, given the fact that there's all this
misinformation that's running all around in the press
about what we're doing and what we're not doing, and
given the leaks, how are we going to protect this report
from being leaked by Commissioners and their special
assistants, when we give it to the Commissioners? Based
on what has happened to date, somebody among the

Commissioners and their special assistants is likely to leak this report. And if it's leaked, then the question is -- it will be in the press before we get a chance to even say anything, do anything -- I mean, that is clear, given the attention here -- and we've got to consider among ourselves -- it's unfortunate that we have to, but If we give it to affected we do -- what do we do? agencies, they will leak it with their spin on it because laid. all is already with the groundwork the misinformation in the press about who is doing what to whom -- I mean, that's clear --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And why.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- and why, and all the rationales out there about who is doing what to whom and why they're doing it to whom. So, I think that we need to really consider what we want to do. I mean, one option would be to release the draft when the staff gets it, to us and to the affected agencies and to the press, all at the same time, and tell them it's a draft and we're waiting to get stuff back from the affected agencies, we're waiting to read it ourselves, and here it is world, everybody have at it. That's one way to do it.

I mean, you could argue that that's a good way to do it because everybody's got it and everybody gets it at the same time, and you don't have to worry

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about somebody leaking it to somebody, to get some kind of what they think is advantage and undermining the work of the staff.

I guess the opposite argument would be that you shouldn't do that because the affected agencies should get a chance to respond first, but given the environment we've got and knowing what's going to happen, that doesn't make it -- we can't trust ourselves and we can't trust anybody else. So, that's unfortunate, but it's true. So, what do we do? Yes, Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I think there is a solution to one-half of the problem. I don't know what solution we can have to, if the press reports are correct, having a Commissioner indicate what's going to be in the New York report and putting a political spin on it so none of us know what's in there, anybody can say anything, and I very much regret that that happened, but since we don't even have the report, I don't know of any way that we can prevent that from happening except folks using, hopefully, good judgment.

We can, however, do something about draft reports. I felt very disadvantaged to get phone calls from reporters from Florida, asking me to comment on the percentage report when, as I understood it -- and I checked with the Chair on this -- the policy was not to

comment on reports until they had been officially issued by this Commission, and yet those reporters had a draft - and I saw a letter from the Governor of the State indicating that he had a draft, and the reporter was saying, "Well, Commissioner Reynoso, what do you have to say about it," and I had to say, "Well, my understanding is that I can't comment on it." Then I get a rash of phone calls from New York, saying, "You've got this report now, what do you have to say? Somebody is saying that you're after Giuliani, and somebody is saying that that is what this report says," and I don't say, "One, I don't have the report but, two, if I had it, policy is I can't say anything about it."

The second part I don't think we can take care of, the first part I think we can. While not necessarily with reports, but in many areas of government activity, including judicial opinions by trial court judges, tentative rulings where drafts are issued publicly, and that way everybody understands that it's a draft, subject to change, subject even to change 100 percent, as happens with tentative opinions sometimes.

So, my suggestion would be that at least as to draft reports, that when they are released to the Commissioners they are made available to the public and the press, and that way, when they call and say, "Well,

Commissioner So-and-So says that this is a political attack on So-and-So," then one can at least point out that the report is very complimentary about that particular office, so that at least that half of it I think we can do something about.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So you would support the release to the world at the same time that you give it to us and to everybody, as I was suggesting, you would support that?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Very much so.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll get you in just a second, Christopher. Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Madam Chair, I find it sort of tragic that we've spent the last half an hour talking about an issue when I think that we should talk about more relevant issues, that's why I got on this Commission. But that being said, I do think that if we have strongly recommended to other folks who came before us that they would be afforded all kinds of courtesy, all kinds of confidentiality, that they would have the opportunity to review those reports, and we, on the other hand, violate kind of a trust, is something that we need to really look at very seriously.

I think that, of course, in the long-term,
we can agree on releasing a draft report so that

everybody will get it at the same time, including the press, so that all the accurate information could be sent out, but I do think that our credibility right now is at risk because people may not feel comfortable coming before us because if they think that whatever they said, they may not have a chance to review it, yet somehow the press got a hold of it and afforded certain comments that they had actually not even reviewed, so I think that we really need to address this issue very, very carefully.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, see, Yvonne, you have hit on and reinforced the reason why we had the policy before, that when we got it, we would read it and we would come and discuss it. If we hadn't gotten the comments from affected agencies, we all understood we were waiting to get the comments, and no one would talk about or do anything until it was finished, until we got those and people had a chance to get back. But when we can't trust ourselves and we're going to go give it to the press before hand, then the question is, do we give it selectively or just simply give it to everybody. And you're right, it does say to witnesses who come before us, "Commissioners are going to give all your stuff to people before you have a chance to see it," it's really quite distressing. I don't know what to do about it.

Commissioner Edley?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: There's a problem with, I think, what Cruz has suggested, which is once the draft is circulated and then the final is different, you have then another round of stories about what were politics of why the final was different from the draft, and who pressured whom to do what, and why, and it also puts us in a position of having to react to media flurry based on the draft. I mean, suppose we put out a draft and some party in New York is upset about something in the draft and holds a press conference to talk about. Then what are we supposed to do? Are we supposed to respond in the press to their concerns? Are we supposed to just stand mute and take the hits, even if they are distortions or even if the Commission has no intention of moving in the direction suggested by the comments, or even suggested by whatever passages they are quoting from the report.

I guess I want to come back -- so I don't know the way out of that box at all, but I would like if there's any guidance available from you or Counsel on this question of whether an Inspector General has a role or could have a role in all this.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm going to let there be a response to this but, Commissioner Anderson, what do you think about how we do this?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think we have to keep focused on one item here, and that is the problem with our procedure with this percentage plan statement. The fact of the matter is that this statement was never discussed in a public meeting of the Commission. voted on in secret by a poll vote, the specifics of which, as far as I know, have never been released to the public. And if you proceed with a statement like this, is this the kind of fashion -- and I don't believe there was ever even one word changed on this statement -you've got to expect that it is going to cause certain There were no witnesses, that I understand, problems. were used in formulating the percentage plan statement. So the problem, hypothetical problem, that maybe somebody can't trust our process here I don't think is applicable to this issue of the percentage plan.

Now, where you have a procedure where a draft is publicly discussed at a Commission meeting, the Commissioners are able to raise concerns about draft language, draft recommendations, draft findings. It's all on the public record, and there are members of the news media present in our meeting. Obviously, it's now in the public domain. They follow up with Commissioners after the meeting with questions, and that's an open way of proceeding. And, generally, when we proceed in that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Τ	manner, we don't run into this kind of problem.
2	So, I think in trying to talk about whether
3	an Inspector General is going to come in and investigate
4	and have some kind of a witch hunt over a few leaks, that
5	would be fine, but the real issue, as far as I can see,
6	is that we have rushed to judgment on this and we've gone
7	outside of our normal procedures. If we had stuck with
8	our normal procedures for example, I'm not even aware
9	that there is a legal sufficiency review of the
10	percentage plan statement. Certainly, the affected
11	agency Governor Bush apparently indicated he had no
12	opportunity to comment on it before we were able to vote
13	on it.
14	So, I think if we go back to our normal,
15	usual procedures, we're not going to run into this kind
16	of problem in the future.
17	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Madam Chair.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I just disagree sharply
20	with Commissioner Anderson. I don't understand why it
21	does not seem to me
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Christopher.
23	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I thought you
24	recognized me.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Christopher.
	NEAL R. GROSS

- 1	
1	Christopher? Christopher?
2	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I'm here.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hold just one second.
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I'll try.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I want to correct a
6	factual thing.
7	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Right.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson,
9	you've been on this Commission for a long time, not as
10	long as I have but a long time. And you know that
11	hearing procedures are very different from research and
12	analysis reports. For hearings, there are specific
13	procedures that are in a handbook, that are in the
14	regulations, that are everywhere, that we follow. And
15	one of those is the affected agency review.
16	When we do a research and analysis report,
17	it is not the same thing as a hearing, and the procedures
18	are not the same, that's the first thing.
19	The second thing is, the Commissioners were
20	asked whether they would like to vote on the percentage
21	plan report by a poll vote. The Commissioners voted to
22	vote on it by a poll vote which, as I understand from
23	General Counsel, that is perfectly legal proper, it is a
24	decision the Commissioners can make, and the decision to

take the vote was made by the Commissioners.

The fact that you lost on the vote -- I used to be 6 to 2 for years on this Commission, and lost every vote, including some poll votes and including some votes on whether to take a poll vote -- but the fact of the matter is that the Commissioners voted to do this, and it was research and analysis, and it was not a hearing in which there was some testimony by somebody that they got to look at, and that includes Gray Davis, the Governor of Texas, the Governor of Florida, and so it is not the same thing, and it was not some willy-nilly sort of process that was done without the Commissioners agreeing that this is what they wanted to do. I just wanted to correct that factual part in terms of how hearings are done, and procedures and how the reports -- now, Commissioner Edley, I will recognize you if you have now -- if you still remember what you wanted to say.

calmed down a little bit, so thank you. I do not believe that an individual Commissioner's objection to a process that was used provided it was a process that could be accepted by a majority of the Commission -- I don't believe that an individual Commissioner's objection to that process gives that Commissioner license to do what has happened in these cases, to leak and to then attempt to undercut the work of the Commission. I reject that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proposition.

But I still want to know whether, apart from my climbing on my high horse and objecting to the proposition, whether there is any applicable law here, or whether there could be applicable law on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone know the answer to that, or is it something the staff would have to look up?

STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director wants to say something.

STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Of course, our staff has been dismayed about what has happened this past week on both of the -- or all of the articles that we've seen in the newspapers, but in trying to do some research to see what we can do -- there are Standards of Official Conduct, plus the Code of Government Ethics, plus each individual's own integrity, and also for the good of the agency, so I am continuing to look at these things, and there are these rules and regulations out there, and they also affect all government employees, whether they are full-time or part-time.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So you will be informing us after the staff has explored this further, as to the answer to Commissioner Edley's question?

1	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Yes, including the
2	answer to the Inspector General
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Including the question
4	about the Inspector General?
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Right.
6	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: May I ask, would it be
7	inappropriate to also just and then the staff try to
8	sort this out that you touch base with the Inspector
9	General at the Agriculture Department, and ask their view
10	about what the options are from their perspective,
11	because I just well
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You're dismayed, right,
13	Christopher?
14	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: And then some. I'm
15	looking through my thesaurus right now.
16	(Laughter.)
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If there's no objection,
18	we'll ask that the Staff Director, as she pursues this,
19	also ask the Inspector General what the options are. Did
20	someone else want to say anything else about this?
21	Commissioner Wilson.
22	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Thank you, Madam
23	Chair. Just go back to the original question you had
24	
i	posed, Commissioner Edley, I understand what you are

to respond to those drafts, even though they are not final, and statements that may be made in them that, of course, then may be taken back or changed or modified.

At this point, we are responding to reports that don't even exist. And in terms of witch hunts -- because I come from New York, I've been in New York, and I will say that the statements made about the United States Commission on Civil Rights in the New York papers and from the Commissioner of Police and the Mayor, it seems to me to be the beginning of a witch hunt.

And, you know, I think it's a very serious situation, but it seems to me that the only way to deal with it -- which is an unfortunate way, particularly in light of what Commissioner Lee has observed and commented on -- is to release statements and the report to everybody at the same time, until we can solve this problem or fix it or change it or understand a way to really deal with it.

as we should know, all probably know, that there are various versions of this report, not a draft report, because a draft is what we did, technically, when we did it. But the staff cannot help but have versions of what they are writing, which means that somebody or other is telling various reporters about some version of something

they saw that somebody suggested or wrote, or this, or 1 that, or the other, in order to put their own spin on it. 2 If there is a draft report -- there can't be 3 one because it would be what we would be considering, and 4 we don't have anything to consider -- but having that 5 already been done just with versions, we can imagine what 6 will happen when the actual draft report is available. 7 And so we really don't have that many 8 If we don't release it, Christopher, somebody 9 options. 1.0 is going to release it anyway, and we'll all be asked 11 about it, and all the questions that you just said would 12 be asked of us anyway. 13 So, I am intérested in knowing, Commissioner 14 Anderson, would you support the idea of our releasing the drafts at the same time we give them to Commissioners, 15 16 and give them to the affected agency, so that everybody 17 gets it all at the same time, clearly stated to the public that this is a draft which will be changed, or may 18 19 be changed, after we receive these comments and after the Commissioners review it? Would you be opposed to that? 20 21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I don't think I'm 22 opposed to that. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You don't think you're 24 opposed to it? 25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No. I think it's a

I mean, we might want to

reflect a little bit on it, but I think that's one option 2 we ought to seriously consider. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Christopher, do you want 4 to say something else? 5 Just that I think what COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 6 you and Vicky have just said I find it unpersuasive in 7 the case of this New York report because so much damage 8 has already been done. But I'd like to reserve judgment 9 about what our procedure ought to be in the future, and 10 to make that judgment about the future in light of the 11 further analysis and consideration by the staff and the 12 consultation with the Inspector General. Do you see what 13 I'm saying? 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I understand. 15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madam Chair. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson. 17 18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think one way we might want to proceed on this is to bring the transcript 19 to a position where we can review it, particularly the 20 I think they ought to 21 new members of the Commission. have the opportunity to review parts of the hearing 22 23 transcripts before they see the report. And I think there's so much controversy around this, we might even 24

reasonable way of proceeding.

1

want to think about not considering it until November.

Then we can look at it calmly, put a little distance between the controversy and the report, and maybe we can consider it calmly and the public can receive it calmly.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I wouldn't do that. in its history, has never caved in Commission, political pressure, and the Commission has always issued reports when they were finished and done, without fear or favor, and no matter who objected, and no matter what the individual Commissioners. consequences were to Commissioners have, in fact, been threatened with arrest and jail, and some of them have been harassed and assaulted in the history of this agency, over their desire to release a report that was ready when it was ready, in a political environment they were told by politicians was too dicey for them to issue. We would break faith with those who served before us on this Commission, and with the mission of it. And so I, myself, embattled, no matter how no matter how criticized, no matter what happens, if a report is ready, as far as I'm concerned, we are going to issue it.

This report on New York -- I mean, I've had

people asking me, "Is this about the senatorial

election," which is just B.S. You all know we started

this hearing way back before anybody was running for the

Senate. "Is this about trying to get Giuliani?" If his

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

name as I told the New York Times, if his name was
Santa Claus, we would still be writing this report. I
mean, it's just that he happens to hold the office of
Mayor of New York. And so as far as I'm concerned, to
put this off after November would be "us" saying our
report is political and therefore we don't want to affect
we issue reports when they are done. Civil rights
business doesn't stop because there is an election
anywhere in this country. That's my view. Others may
differ with me. And if you start down that road, you'll
be putting your finger in the wind every time there is
something this Commission ought to do or there is an
issue, trying to see what political way, or who is going
to attack you, or who is going to say what. Of course,
we'll be attacked. There are people who want to
undermine our work. There are people who are afraid that
this report is going to come out and make some beneficial .
suggestions or say something, and as well it may, even
though I haven't seen it I don't know what you guys
are putting together, but I trust you. So, therefore, I
am against that. If the rest of you want to do that, you
can vote to do that, but I am against it, unalterably.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think the record

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

will show that last fall when we discussed this report, we had an agreement that it would be completed by December and we would vote on it, to keep it out of this campaign controversy. So, please don't interpret my suggestion as caving in to political pressure because I voted in favor of moving forward on this report on the condition that we would keep it out of this campaign season, and that's what I thought we were going to do. And that's why I relied on the representation that this report would be done last December. And I think the record will show that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, somebody can pull the record and look at it, but you and I both know that the staff finishes reports when they can. I mean, the last time something was finished when they said they were going to finish it -- and this is really remarkable that this is getting finished within a year of the hearing. It's the first time I've seen a hearing report get finished that fast since I've been here. But I repeat, for myself, I don't care about the election, or about what anybody might say about the election or anything else. If people disagree, that's fine. I only have one vote.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I agree with your position, and I'm sure the report, when

it comes out, will show what some of the witnesses said, mainly, that these are the types of issues they've been dealing with. I recall one witness, a religious leader, saying that he had been dealing with these issues I think he said for 20 or 30 years, that it wasn't new. And I'm sure the report will reflect that. I personally reject out-of-hand the notion this may be a political report.

Madam Chair, I know that at least two Commissioners have expressed some qualms about the notion of distributing the reports when they are in draft form, but I suppose out of this experience, my feelings are sufficiently strong that I'd like to motion that we do so, and then if -- we can always reconsider it in the near future, if it is not working, and change our minds. But, certainly, I am convinced, based on my experience, that it would work better to proceed in that fashion.

So, I'd like to make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You can make that motion, but let me just say this. Staff handed me a note to say they had called the Mayor's office again to reconfirm that, one, there is no draft report, and, two, that of course they and affected agencies will, as they told them before, have an opportunity to review the portions of the report dealing with them before it is published and say whatever they want to say about it, and

that's because I got this letter from the Mayor's office

-- which was released to the press before I got it,

obviously -- the other day saying, "Why aren't you going

to let us look at this report, blah, blah, blah", which

in fact we know.

Anderson, that the reason why we don't have to worry about the Mayor having his say, or the politics of his campaign or whatever, he will be able to have his say. He gets to comment, say whatever he wants to say about this report when it is out. And the proof of the pudding in terms of whether this report is some kind of political attack on the Mayor, will be in the report, which the staff is writing, and I trust them, and I know that they will be fair. So, I'm not that concerned about it.

Also, staff asked me to point out that verified transcripts have already been given to some Commissioners who asked. So there are some Commissioners who have -- is that right?

STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- copies of the transcript now, as we sit here in this room. If there are other Commissioners who would like to have copies, then they can have it. Does Commissioner Anderson have one?

STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: I don't know. 1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No, I don't. I've 2 requested it for weeks now. I'd be interested to know 3 whether Commissioner Redenbaugh has been 4 5 transcript. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you give transcripts 6 7 to their assistants? STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: I okayed it and --8 Eddie, can you tell me if it was delivered? 9 Full copies of verified MR. HAILES: 10 transcript were just made, and they were transmitted to a 11 special assistant this morning. So they are 12 available, and we can make additional copies if any other 1.3 Commissioner or special assistant has such a need. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Wilson and 15 16 Cruz. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I am 17 grateful for being reminded that, indeed, it would seem -18 - of what our procedure is, and it would seem to me 19 unfair to be changing the procedures midstream in terms 20 of any hearings that we're having. I think we should 21 proceed in a principled way -- by principled, I mean 22 23 under our procedures -- I still think my idea is good, but I can change my motion to deal with future hearings 24

and future reports, not those that are already in

1 process. Yes, Commissioner CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 2 Wilson. 3 COMMISSIONER WILSON: Two things. If we all 4 see transcripts, does that assume that they will not be 5 6 leaked as well? 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, it doesn't. We have to assume that everything will be leaked. From now on, 8 9 assume -- just assume, as you walk around in your daily life, that anything having to do with this Commission 10 will be leaked. 11 12 COMMISSIONER WILSON: Okav. Well, that's 13 something for us to consider in light of what we've just spent quite a good deal of time discussing. My second 14 15 point is, do we want to issue a small press releases 16 stating the way in which we proceed -- that is, when 17 there is a draft or a report that the agency being 18 discussed in the report gets a chance to see it and 19 comment on it. The Mayor has issued statements saying 20 that he hasn't seen it. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I was quoted as saying 22 that -- in the New York Times story this morning -- I did 23 talk to the New York Times yesterday, and the Mayor's 24 office knows that. But if we decide to proceed in this

way of releasing it, I will have a press briefing on the

day that it is released, and will answer any questions the press has, and will tell them exactly what the procedure is, and remind all of them again, so that they will know that the Mayor has got it, everybody has got it who is an affected agency. They are all going to respond. We are going to take that into account and we are going to finalize it. This is a draft, folks, treat it like it is -- a draft. I mean, that's what I would do, and let the word go forth that that's what this is. And after that, I'm still not -- well, I quess if there is consensus that people -- you know, I'm not absolutely certain that this is the right thing to do, I don't really know how to do this either, I've never been in this fix before. I always thought there was nothing new under the sun, but I quess there is. So, why don't we do that this way. Cruz, could you restate your motion?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, I felt, based on the note that the staff had given you, that it would be unfair to the Mayor and others, to release a draft report, if we have given them assurances that draft reports are not released until they get a chance to comment. So, I was changing my motion to exclude from the motion any hearings and reports that are presently in progress, and applying my motion only to future reports where the rules would then be when we have a draft report

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it would go out to everybody even before we have comments from the affected agencies.

Well, I don't want to CHAIRPERSON BERRY: further -- I hate to protract this discussion further, but the point you've made -- expect, folks, that if we decide to release the draft to the world, including all the affected agencies, that it is likely that we will be attacked -- in other words, we're damned if we do and damned if we don't -- by folks who will say, "Even though you released it to us, you should wait until we comment before you release it to the world." If we don't release it to the world and give it to them, they will leak it and put their spin on it before we have a chance to. So, no matter what we do, we are going to be attacked because, to some people, their political interest in this is so great that they feel like what they need to do is attack us. So, you have to keep that in mind.

So, I guess what we have to do is figure out what has the most integrity, and the more I think about it, I guess I'm going to change my mind because, if we follow our procedures, which is that you let people respond before you put out the final report and that we don't issue drafts, we're just going to have to trust our Commissioners and then let's be prepared to all comment and be assailed on the day the draft comes out, by people

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

who call up and say Commissioner So-and-So gave me a copy of this, or Special Assistant So-and-So gave me a copy of this, or civil servant So-and-So got it and gave me a copy. And then we'll just be assailed for what the report says, even though it's in draft and even though people have a right to comment, that that's just going to happen to us if we follow our procedures. If we don't, we're going to be attacked for not following our procedures.

Yes, Christopher.

am on this, which is why I think this publication of draft work should be done in the New York City case and at least for the moment treat it as an exceptional situation because of the damage that's already been done. But if at all possible, I'd like to construct things so that we don't have to do it this way in the future.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But are you -- in terms of damned if we do and damned if we don't, are you more comfortable being damned for not following our procedure in this case, or would you be more comfortable being damned for following our procedures and having somebody leak it and have people call us up and say all kinds of nasty things?

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think that under the

circumstances, we do less damage to all the relevant interests by circulating the draft, but I think that we should not expect, and we certainly should do everything we can to avoid in the future, with guidance from the Inspector General and so forth, and we won't be hemorrhaging like this as a general matter.

And while I'm at it, let me also say that I think that while we didn't hit the December deadline for getting this thing out, I think the Commission and the staff proceeded in good faith in trying to get this thing done quickly, to minimize the risk that it would get caught up in election politics.

That said, our first duty is do a good job, and our second duty, it seems to me, is to do something that is timely that responds to the controversy and the problems in New York and around the country. We did not choose the timing of these unfortunate deaths, and the controversy itself in New York City. We didn't choose it. And it doesn't seem to me that we should turn our eye away from it because it happens -- because we've gotten into an even numbered year.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. I'm going to close this down. I'm going to listen to Yvonne's comment, then I'm going to close this down. Commissioner Anderson, were you saying something?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'd like to be recognized, too.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, as soon as Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Before I do, I just wanted to recognize a guest in the audience, Ruby Lam, the Deputy Director of the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Welcome to our meeting.

I would like to comment COMMISSIONER LEE: would reluctantly support the Vice Chair's original motion, which is to release the draft report on the New York report because, as Commissioner Edley said, the damage has been done. But I am going to object to the practice of releasing draft reports for future projects because I think that the integrity of this Commission is at stake. We will not have any -- we would not have many witnesses who are willing to come forward to testify, to share with us their knowledge, their insights, if they know that whatever they say without them checking it off to make sure that it is sufficient, it's accurate, we will be releasing it to the public, and I don't think that's fair to future witnesses, and I again want to stress that I don't want to go down that I do think that we have a major problem dealing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with potential situations like that, that we can deal 1 2 with it in other arenas that I certainly would not want to give the public this impression, that whatever you 3 say, anyone will get a hold of it and you won't even have 4 5 a chance to correct it beforehand. I just don't think that's fair to our future witnesses. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson. I'm not quite sure 8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 9 what the status of Commissioner Reynoso's recommendation 10 is, but --11 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: It hasn't been 12 seconded, so it hasn't gone anyplace. 13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, if you have to 14 second it so we can discuss it, but it seems to me that 15 when you have -- if you want to go back to the Ellsburg 16 paper, and Nixon and everything, all the things, 17 essentially, that begin to happen when people don't trust 18 the process. 19 And I think the best way to proceed is to 20 re-establish trust and confidence in the way we proceed in the consideration of our reports, and the way to do 21 22 that, in my mind, is from now on to make sure that 23 affected agencies, affected individuals, get an 24 opportunity to comment before we consider it, where we

can take into consideration their comments.

give them the assurance that their views, their facts, will be taken into consideration by all of us. And that, I think, will minimize the feeling on their part that they are needed, or that is the only way to get their side of the story before the public. We may feel we have to vote to tackle controversial issues by poll vote, without public discussion, without the light of day. I hope we don't do it again.

I think that leads to the impression that people cannot get their views heard without proceeding in that way; other Commissioners may feel differently. I think if we go back and we proceed deliberately, we can assure that we get input from all affected parties in a timely manner so that we can consider it. I don't know whether that's covered by Commissioner Reynoso's motion or not, but that's how I would proceed. And whether we make the draft reports available to everybody at the same time is not as important to me as getting it to all the affected parties, whether we're doing statements or whether we're doing hearings or whether we have the right not to send that copy or seek their comments, I think the appropriate thing to do is when we've affected somebody, we give them an opportunity to comment on the report so all of us can take into account those comments. I think if we do that in the future, this problem will largely

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

disappear. We can have policy differences, but we'll have confidence that we're proceeding fairly.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson, we will proceed according to the procedures that have been long established. Depending on what kind of report it is, we will have the people respond who are supposed to respond. This is nothing new with this Commission, with me as Chair and the Vice Chair as Vice Chair. I have been on here long enough to know what procedures have been followed throughout the history of this Commission, at least for the years that I've been on here, which is too many, and that policy has been followed.

When the Commission, for example, issues a statement, which it has done, analyzing a legal case or whatever, and takes a position on it, it doesn't go out and ask people what they think about it, or even people who are mentioned in it. I've voted against such reports, and lost, but in fact it depends on what kind of report it is. Here, we are talking about a hearing, and our real problem is not the people out in the public who are taking positions, it is Commissioners who are leaking things, or staff who are leaking things, or people --it's us. We are the problem.

So, I guess here we are. Do we -- first, I

2.2

would like a motion to release all of the drafts of this 1 New York -- release the draft of the New York report to 2 both public, affected agencies and Commissioners at the 3 same time, so that I can see if everyone is in agreement 4 with that. So, could somebody move that so we can see? 5 COMMISSIONER WILSON: I'll move it. 6 Would anybody second CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 7 that? 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'll second it. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any further debate? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just want to 11 12 mention that I had proceeded with that motion originally, thinking that probably that was a good solution. 13 The problem, I've heard a lot of discussion that now makes me 14 wonder whether, in fact, there is that view, and I don't 15 know whether it's wise to change our procedures without 16 sort of a unanimous notion that it is proper to change 17 the procedures, so I'm having qualms about 18 19 seconded it so we could discuss it further, but I confess 20 that I have qualms now that I didn't have half an hour 21 ago when folk, I think, expressed quite logical concerns 22 about it. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Unfortunately, there are 24 always at least two sides to every question. The more

you talk about it, the more sides you think of.

1	though I was supporting such a motion and, in fact,
2	suggested it at the beginning, I have the same qualms you
3	do. In a sense, the principle part of me that loves to
4	be punished, loves to be embattled and criticized, would
5	rather stand on principle and say our procedures are that
6	we have drafts, we don't release reports until they are
7	in final form and voted on and we've gotten responses,
8	and if some Commissioner or their special assistant or
9	somebody wants to leak it to somebody and put a spin, we
10	just deal with the firestorm. That's principled, because
11	then we're following our procedures even if others don't
12	behave the way they are supposed to. And in a sense, I
13	have this sort of quirky feeling that it might be the
14	better part of valor, but how would I respond if one of
15	the affected agencies says to me, "Well, your procedure
16	is that we are supposed to get to respond first," and
17	even though they leaked it themselves, or a Commissioner
18	did it, they say, "Well, that's part of the ballgame, but
19	you're supposed to follow your own procedures."
20	So, could I ask the Commissioners, now that
21	I have these qualms, do you have enough of a qualm about
22	it, too, Cruz?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes.

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

qualms about it, Yvonne, you've been here the longest?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you have enough

24

1	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we withdraw
3	the motions and why don't we just let the chips fall
4	where they may and follow our procedures?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But I didn't make
6	the motion now, so
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get you to do
8	that, Vicky? Just withdraw it. Let's let the chips I
9	know you're in New York, and you've got to suffer the
10	slings of arrows of outrageous fortune.
11	COMMISSIONER WILSON: When you say, Madam
12	Chair, let the chips fall where they may
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What do you mean?
14	COMMISSIONER WILSON: I know where the chips
15	will fall.
16	(Laughter.)
17	COMMISSIONER WILSON: I think before I
18	retract the motion, I would like to say that in this
19	particular instance we release all the reports to
20	everybody simultaneously, and then we take it on a case-
21	by-case.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So you're speaking in
23	favor of the motion, which is still on the floor.
24	COMMISSIONER WILSON: If I'm voted down, I
25	won't take it personally.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone else want to
2	speak in favor or against the motion?
3	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I do.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who said something?
5	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Edley did. I guess I
6	still find myself persuaded by Vicky's logic.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. If there are
8	no further questions, we're going to vote on this motion.
9	All those in favor of the motion to release all of these
10	at the same time to the affected agencies, to the public,
11	to Commissioners, and all whenever we get this draft
12	report from the staff, indicate by saying "aye."
13	COMMISSIONER LEE: This is only on New York.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Only on New York, that's
15	all we're voting on. Indicate by saying "aye."
16	(Ayes.)
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to have to
18	call names. Commissioner Wilson, how did you vote?
19	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Aye.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who else said "aye?"
21	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Edley.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Edley said "aye." Any
23	other ayes?
24	(No response.)
25	All those against the motion, indicate by
ł	NEAT, P. GROSS

1	saying "no."
2	(Noes.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You have to say your
4	name and say your vote because we're writing it down.
5	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Anderson, no.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anderson, no.
7	COMMISSIONER LEE: Lee, no.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Lee, no.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Reynoso, no.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where do you stand,
11	Meeks?
12	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Aye.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Meeks said "aye." So
14	what is the count now?
15	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Three-three.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that means I have to
17	vote.
18	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hmm.
20	(Laughter.)
21	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: We should have just let
2:2	you decide.
2 3	(Laughter.)
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hmm. Since I'm the one
25	who asked it. Well.
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: And you're going to be
2	the point with the press, so this is very appropriate
3	that
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, damn.
5	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Before you do this,
6	I'd just like to quote my mother, who always used to say
7	to me and my sister, "Girls, there's going to be tears."
8	(Laughter.)
9	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That's why you get the
10	big bucks, Mary.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I could abstain.
12	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Oh, no. If you
13	abstain, the motion fails, right?
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Damn. Okay.
15	I'll vote I'll vote
16	(Simultaneous discussion.)
17	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Mary, can I make a
18	I'm sorry, I know the debate is closed, but there's one
19	other concern which is contrary to my vote, and that is,
20	forget the Commission, forget Giuliani, and just ask
21	yourself, what is in the best interest of the observing
22	public.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In other words, the
24	observing public after all that has happened, like if
25	nothing had happened, then there would be one answer, but

1	since all this stuff has happened, then there is another
2	answer.
3	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Right, so for the
4	observing public who are trying to make heads or tails
5	out of all this mess.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. I'll say "yes"
7	then because then we'll have I'll just have to argue
8	with you know I mean, I have to argue with somebody
9	anyway. Okay. I say "aye."
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I
11	just would suggest that we communicate this vote now to
12	the affected agencies so they know what's going to
13	happen.
14	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Good idea.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. So we should
16	call them and tell them this, and tell them why this is
17	happening. It's because of what has happened, so that
18	they can have a press conference and denounce us, and
19	then the reporters can call me and then I can try to
20	explain it. Well, thank you. This has been a very
21	interesting debate, and we will get answers about what we
22	do.
23	
24	V. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS
25	Before you go, Edley, we need to vote on the

Sonoma County and the Hispanic Students in Oklahoma City 1 2 Public Schools Project, so stay there just for a minute. Can I get a motion? I need a motion. 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I move that they 4 5 both be approved -- not approved, but accepted. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second? 7 COMMISSIONER LEE: Second. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor, 9 indicate by saying "aye." 10 (Ayes.) 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? 12 (No response.) 13 VI. HAWAIIAN CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES 74 And we need to vote also, Edley, on the --15 we need your vote -- we're going to discuss Hawaiian 16 Civil Rights Issues next, and we're going to have some 17 discussion, but the end result of it is that the Hawaii SAC would like us to have -- they'd like to have a forum 18 19 out there and have some of us come, at least like we did 20 in South Dakota -- is that right, Commissioner Lee -- and so the end result is that we want the Commission to 21 22 express its sense that such a forum, if they hold it, we 23 would be willing, some of us, to go and participate in 24 it. 25 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I would support that,

and I thought the reading was fascinating, but let me just say that before we go, or whoever goes, I think it would also be useful to get a little background from the staff, just some sort of comparisons with Native American tribal issues because that analogy which kind of runs through the cases, I'd just like a better understanding of what that background is.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. In reading the case and discussing it yesterday with the Staff Director, to me that the opinion in the case it seems particularly egregious, and the principal part of it that is egregious is the implication that one could deny the rights of American Indians by using the same analogy, you know, that there's no rationale for any kind of -- or Alaskan Natives -- that there's no rationale for any kind of benefits to remedy the harm that's been done, and the language in there that leaves open that possibility as a further root -- and in a way, it sort of invites someone to bring a suit like that, as if to say, "Come on, guys, consider this issue," I think is we'd like to particularly outrageous.

I think it's also particularly outrageous given the history of Hawaii and what happened to the Hawaiian monarchy. And when I was in undergraduate school, I took this course and wrote a paper on the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

history of the fall of the monarchy in Hawaii, and am particularly fond of Queen Liliuokalani, who was the last queen of Hawaii. And knowing the abuse that the Hawaiian people took, and for the State to pass a law to try to remedy that, this court's opposition to remedies for harm done to people is particularly outrageous. So, for the majority of the court, it is a decision that comes easily because it is consistent with their other decisions where they outlaw remedies for discrimination against folks who have been harmed in the past. But for Hawaiians, I can understand why they are upset, and not just the Native Hawaiians, but other people, I understand, out there also, is that right, Commissioner Lee?

COMMISSIONER LEE: I do apologize, I was trying to get the brief by the Alaskan Natives and the Native American Coalition, and I think that will outline very clearly why the issue of indigenous people's treatment in this country will be addressed, and I think that the public forum will give it a really good airing as to why people think the Rice decision is not just Native Hawaiians, that it deals with indigenous people's treatment and also deals with political relationship between the U.S. Government and the various indigenous groups, and also on the self-determination issue. So, I think that the public forum will not be just on Hawaii,

but the overall broad question.

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

VICE CHAIRPERSON Ιt REYNOSO: was an because even though it was interesting opinion constitutionally based, part of the constitutional basis appear to be based on the fact that the majority felt that Congress had not acted in certain respects. So, it seems to leave a little bit of a gray area indicating that maybe there is some room for Congress to act. I'd be interested in seeing what those who have examined the opinion in light of the briefs think about that sort of gray area in the opinion.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do we know whether there are any discussions going on involving advocates for Native Americans and the folks who are particularly concerned about this Hawaii case about strategies to respond to this?

a month ago a group of tribal judges were in Hawaii meeting with the community to talk about joining -- not joining forces -- but sharing some common concerns because they do expect future challenges on their political relationship with the U.S. Government. So I think that the Native American community is also looking at this very, very closely, and they are working with the Native Hawaiian community very closely. Even though the

1	tribal judges could not speak on behalf of other tribes,
2	the fact that they are actively working with the
3	community shows the urgency.
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Mary, I'm sorry, I've
5	got a class.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. You're late,
7	Christopher.
8	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes, I know. Goodbye,
9	everybody, I'm sorry.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You only get a ten-
11	minute break because you're a professor, but you've got
12	to be there.
13	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: What I say is just
14	completely redundant to what everyone else said, but, I
15	mean, I just think that this is definitely you know,
16	could be an attack on the American right, and there is
17	that gray area that can be defined one way or the other,
18	and this is going to be very important. So, I agree with
19	us taking this up.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Vice Chair.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But there is the
22	area for a clear enunciation by Congress that they've
23	meant what they've said in times past with respect to
24	Native Americans, and there's also the gray area that
25	says that may say "in light of the Supreme Court

opinion, whatever power we have as Congress that we thought we were ceding to the State, we now take back," so it's just an interesting -- that aspect of it is interesting.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we don't know when they are planning to have this forum, and what shape it would take. I also think that if we end up having it, or if they end up having it -- well, we first have to know what shape it's going to take and get a proposal from them, Staff Director, but then, of course, some of us will try to go. They should have it in the summer so that people won't think we're going there on a junket, so make sure it's really hot in Hawaii when we go there, as opposed to going in the wintertime.

Okay. Are there any --

COMMISSIONER LEE: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LEE: I just want to clarify, I think the request from the Hawaiian SAC is for the Commission to hold a public forum with them, so it's not a SAC activity per se, but it will be a joint activity. I think they requested a joint activity because there is this great need that the general public really needs to know the compelling history. It is really evident when you read the majority decision that the Justices really -

- either they dismissed the history, or they really have no idea -- when they talk about immigration to Hawaii, they mention all the different groups, but they neglected to mention whites, who were among the first immigrants there. So, I think the Hawaii SAC members felt that it is really imperative that this public forum needs to be supported and met by this Commission.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So it would be a joint
- and whereas we don't have an activity that is specifically called a "forum", that doesn't mean anything. The only difference between a forum and a briefing is that you hear from people as opposed to just having experts talk. So, Staff Director, what we would be doing is working up a proposal for us to join with them in sponsoring such a program, and those of us who could go, would go.

Could we get some idea -- Staff Director, I know you don't know exactly, so we don't want to be nailed down to it -- could we get some idea from the staff as to when they think they might possibly have a draft of the New York report, so that we can sort of plan our lives a little bit around -- you know, is it like another week, or another ten days, and why don't we agree that we will actually vote on it at the next meeting -- that is actually vote ourselves, us Commissioners, on the

1	report at the next meeting but when does the stair
2	think it might possibly have a draft so we can plan our
3	lives and be ready to try to read it when it comes?
4	MR. HAILES: I'm going to try to be as
5	precise as possible. I would say between five and 14
6	days, five and ten business days from today.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Fourteen days, at the
8	outset, including Saturdays and Sundays. Okay. Which
9	would give us then sufficient time for everybody to
10	respond, discuss, gyrate, do whatever they want to do,
11	before the meeting that we would vote on it. Okay. All
12	right. So you can plan your schedules accordingly. And
13	you can also head for the bunkers accordingly on the day,
14	or go on a long trip somewhere.
15	Is there anything else that should come
16	before us that I have forgotten, Staff Director?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: No.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I haven't forgotten
19	anything?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MOY: I think that covers it.
21	VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are there any future
23	agenda items or other matters that any of the
24	Commissioners would like to do? If not, we have done a
25	good job today and finished in record time.

1	Could I get a motion that we then adjourn?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
3	- CHAIRPERSON BERRY: A second?
4	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's non-debatable. All
6	in favor, indicate by saying "aye."
7	(Ayes.)
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
9	(No response.)
10	So ordered.
11	(Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the proceedings
12	were concluded.)