

funding for the recovery programs have received considerable support in Congress because the programs serve as a dispute resolution and provide a means to solve a very complex set of problems. However, as the amount of funding required increases because capital construction projects are underway, program participants are seeking clear statutory authority to help ensure that needed funds continue to be appropriated by Congress.

The Recovery Program is a mutually supported program including the states, government agencies, Indian tribes, private organizations, and environmental organizations. Participants in the Upper Colorado River program alone include the state of Colorado, the state of Utah, the state of Wyoming, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Western Area Power Administration, environmental organizations, water development interests, and federal power customers.

This bill would authorize the appropriation of \$46 million to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and ensure the completion of the capital projects and research needed to recover the listed species. Once the bill is enacted, non-federal participants like the states and those who purchase power from federal hydroelectric projects, will also share in the cost of the capital projects.

This bill is a good example of how the recovery of listed species can coincide with existing and future uses of water for states needs. Also, this is an opportunity to set a precedent for other regions of the country who could be impacted by the recovery of a listed species. These implementation programs are running models—showing how cooperation between states, government agencies, and private organizations can achieve results. Participants in these programs are eager to move ahead and willing to share the costs. I urge all my colleagues to support and co-sponsor this Act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to provide cost sharing for the endangered fish recovery implementation programs for the Upper Colorado River and San Juan River Basins.

#### D.R.O.P. SPECIES ACT

### HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 24, 1999*

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, today I am dropping the fourth in a series of single-issue bills to make common sense corrections to the Endangered Species Act. My bill, the Direct Review of Protected Species Act, would amend the ESA to provide for the review and recommendation by the National Academy of Sciences of species that should be removed from the list of endangered and threatened species.

During ESA's 26 years, over 1,154 animals and plants have been listed as endangered or threatened, yet only 27 species have been removed from the list. 27! That is a recovery rate of 2 percent, which leads me to believe that either the Fish and Wildlife Service is not keeping up with their mandate to review the list every five years and remove recovered species, or their best efforts to conserve habitat at the expense of billions of dollars to tax-

payers are failing. Either conclusion is unacceptable. The DROP Species Act would take the de-listing process out of the hands of politicians and place it in the hands of a well-respected, independent panel of scientists.

I'm unhappy with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. Speaker. So unhappy that I will introduce one ESA reform bill every week until the Resources Committee field hearing in California on July 9. The agency has a responsibility to balance the rights of species with the rights of taxpaying citizens. This is a call to common sense.

#### EXPOSING RACISM

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 24, 1999*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to document and expose racism in America, I submit the following articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HARRISBURG, Pa. (AP)—The question of whether ex-cons should be able to vote is becoming an issue in Pennsylvania and nationally.

Human-rights groups and prison-rights advocates plan to challenge the law because of its "racial implications," said Pennsylvania Prison Society director William DiMascio said.

In addition, there is legislation in Harrisburg seeking to overturn the law. And the chairman of the state Senate Judiciary Committee, Sen. Stewart Greenleaf, R-Montgomery County, a former prosecutor, said he is "willing to look at" a reconsideration of the law.

State Rep. Jerry Birmelin, R-Wayne County, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Crime and Corrections, said that while he opposes inmates voting, he'd consider extending the vote to ex-cons.

Pennsylvania's law, which passed virtually unnoticed as part of the 1995 "motor voter" legislation, bans felony ex-cons from registering to vote for five years after release from prison. Before 1995, ex-cons could register as soon as they got out of prison.

The law's supporters, including state Attorney General Mike Fisher, say criminals should pay for their crimes, and that losing the vote is part of the price.

"Since the Legislature has determined a convicted felon does not enjoy the same rights as people who are not convicted felons, I have no problem with that," Philadelphia District Attorney Lynne M. Abraham said through spokeswoman Cathie Abookire.

The effort to eliminate the ban comes as the prison inmate population rises to record levels nationally and in the face of a new Justice Department report that says blacks are six times more likely to be jailed than whites, and 2 times more likely than Hispanics.

It also comes as some Pennsylvania politicians become more concerned about losing 100,000 potential voters because of the ban.

A state-by-state study by Human Rights Watch, an international research group, estimates that 3.9 million Americans currently are banned from the ballot box. About 13 percent of black men, more than 1.3 million men nationally, cannot vote, according to the study.

While the ban applies to anyone convicted of a felony, it does not apply to people convicted or jailed on misdemeanor charges.

The only problem is that many minor criminals think they also are forbidden from voting, critics say.

"We find ex-offenders and other non-felony folks under the impression they can't vote," said Leodus Jones, director of Community Assistance for Prisoners, a nonprofit advocacy group. "I really believe there are thousands in Philadelphia alone."

Only four states—Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts and New Hampshire—allow inmates to vote.

Estimating exactly how many Pennsylvanians are affected is difficult due to recidivism and because no one adequately tracks state, local and federal releases. The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency offered "rough numbers," saying there are about 86,000 to 101,000 inmates and ex-cons who currently cannot vote.

The irony for those who believe the law is discriminatory is that in the 1995 "motor voter" law the ban is a part of what was designed to increase minority voting by making registration easier. However, many lawmakers say they were unaware of the felony provision, which was inserted at a time the Legislature was being hurried, under a federal court order, to pass a motor voter bill.

"We call it 'the mickey bill,' because they caught everybody asleep when they passed it," Jones said.

State Rep. Harold James, D-Philadelphia, a former Philadelphia police officer, said, "When we voted on 'motor voter,' we didn't even know that was in there."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1999]

WORKER BIAS LAWSUITS FLOOD AGRICULTURE DEPT—MINORITIES, WOMEN ALLEGE DISCRIMINATION

(By Michael A. Fletcher)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is grappling with a flood of discrimination complaints from minority and female employees who describe the agency as a hotbed of racial bias and harassment, where women assigned to remote work crews are physically threatened by male colleagues and minorities are routinely passed over for promotions.

Minority and women employees have long complained about what they call a deeply entrenched culture of discrimination at the sprawling federal agency, which is often derided as "the last plantation." The problems have intensified in recent months as more employees have stepped forward with formal complaints, even as top USDA officials have acknowledged longstanding civil rights problems. Earlier this year, the agency agreed to a huge court settlement that could result in hundreds of millions of dollars being paid to thousands of black farmers for past discrimination.

With a work force of 89,000 and a sweeping mandate that includes administering farm aid programs, managing national forests and running the food stamp program, USDA is one of the federal government's largest departments. With many of its workers deployed in rural outposts, critics charge that USDA's rank-and-file often seems impervious to the civil rights edicts that flow from the agency's Washington headquarters.

The agency is facing at least five class action or proposed class action complaints, either in federal court or before the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, where groups of female and minority employees allege that they have been the victims of blatant racial bias or repeated sexual discrimination and harassment. In addition, more

than 1,500 individual employment discrimination complaints are pending at USDA. And of the 1,800 cases resolved over the past two years, more than 1,000 ended with settlements, indicating that they had merit, said Rosalind Gray, USDA's director of civil rights.

Charges lodged against the agency either in lawsuits or individuals' complaints run the gamut:

In several bathroom stalls at USDA headquarters, someone had scrawled "NAACP" and underneath it, "now apes are called people." Some employees say such graffiti is evidence of workplace hostility that the agency has not done enough to address.

Black and Hispanic employee complained about working in rural offices under white supervisors who assign them few important tasks or the kind of training that would put them in line for promotions.

Women such as Ginelle O'Connor, 42, who work as Forest Service firefighters say they were subjected to a never-ending stream of taunts and sexually laced comments and even threats of rape from male colleagues.

The men "were making bets on how they could get rid of me," said O'Connor, now a USDA biologist working in Northern California. "But I was determined they weren't going to run me off."

The settlement with the black farmers was part of Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman's effort to "change the culture" of the agency. "For far too long USDA has been ignoring serious, pervasive problems within our civil rights system," he said.

"Clearly, Secretary Glickman is concerned by the number of EEO complaints against USDA," said Tom Amontree, Glickman's spokesman, noting that the department has "resolved the vast majority of the EEO complaints that were part of the so-called backlog."

Amontree said that Glickman "is impressed with the progress and the changes instituted" under Gray. "Under her leadership, USDA is implementing procedures that will hold people accountable, and the secretary will continue to keep a close eye on that progress."

Despite Glickman's efforts, the barrage of slights, insults and outright harassment over the years has helped foster a culture that makes many female and minority employees at USDA complain that they feel like outsiders on their own jobs.

In a case now before the EEOC, a group of 300 African American managers at the Farm Service Agency, the branch of USDA found to have discriminated against black farmers, says they have been repeatedly passed over for promotions in favor of less qualified whites.

Charles W. Sims Sr., 55, a program coordinator at USDA's Washington headquarters, says he has been ignored for promotions on more than 40 separate occasions over the past 18 years. "Management will not tell me why they will not hire me for a higher position," said Sims, who says that he was given meaningless assignments after he began filing EEO complaints against the department. "They always tell me that I'm a great employee, so the only thing I can surmise from that is that it is a race thing."

During his 23 years at USDA, Carnell McAlpine, a program complaint specialist in Alabama, said he has learned to "expect the worst" from his job. He has been passed over for promotions given to whites with less experience and made to feel excluded from the flow of information.

"Those are the adversities a black person has to deal with," McAlpine said. "You just have to harden yourself. . . . When I've had good things happen to me on the job, I've learned to view them as surprises."

Harold Connor, 46, deputy director of USDA's Price Support Division, says he has faced insults since his first days at the agency. More than 20 years ago, it was the white local farm committee member who vowed to "go out the back door" the day Connor, who is black, entered the front door as a new director in the St. Louis area. Now that he works in Washington, the insults are often indirect: He was advised not to seek promotions initially because he was too new. Later, he was discouraged by superiors who said he had been in Washington too long and that the agency needed fresh thinking.

"You just kind of do a slow burn," he said. "First you doubt yourself. But then you realize it is not you, it's them."

While some employee activists cite USDA as among the worst federal agencies when it comes to civil rights complaints, they point out that charges of racial and gender discrimination are not uncommon within the federal government. That is seen as a troubling reality because for years federal employment was seen as a sure route to the middle class for women and minorities, particularly African Americans. Blacks make up 17.2 percent of the federal work force, compared with only 10.6 percent of the U.S. labor force.

Groups of minority employees have filed successful class action discrimination complaints against several federal agencies, including the Library of Congress, the Army Corps of Engineers and the State Department. Suits also are pending at other agencies, including the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Commerce. Black employees also allege bias at the Social Security Administration [Details, Page A21]. Activists call the complaints evidence of the growing civil rights problems within the federal government.

Many employee activists say that nowhere in the federal government is the problem more pronounced than at the Department of Agriculture, an agency whose roots reach deep into rural America.

While 20 percent of USDA's employees are minorities, whites hold 91 percent of the senior management positions, a reality that critics call a direct outgrowth of the agency's culture. Some 80 percent of USDA's best-paid employees are men, although women make up more than 40 percent of the work force.

USDA officials have pointed to enforcement of civil rights laws as a priority in recent years. Since assuming his job in 1995, Secretary Glickman has convened a blue-ribbon panel on the matter, ordered a civil rights review and reactivated the agency's dormant civil rights office. Yet the problem continues to grow.

The employee complaints are buttressed by the findings of the department's own civil rights task force, which two years ago issued a report that described widespread bias both within the department's work force and in its delivery of programs to the public.

The report was a key piece of evidence in a federal lawsuit brought by black farmers. The farmers charged that USDA officials unfairly discouraged, delayed or rejected their applications for federal loans. The suit resulted in a settlement that lawyers involved in the case said could cost the federal government as much as \$1 billion. A federal judge approved the deal last week.

Ironically, some USDA officials say privately that Glickman's aggressive rhetoric and work to attack employee complaints—the backlog of unresolved employee discrimination complaints has been cut significantly during his tenure—have opened the agency to more charges of discrimination. Also, top USDA officials say their civil rights efforts have been met with significant resistance.

"There are some people who don't want their way of life changed," said Gray, who was appointed by Glickman to be the department's lead civil rights enforcer. "Their way of life is based on their local culture, and we have a work force that is spread out throughout the country."

While acknowledging the hurdles, some activists complain that Glickman has not moved boldly enough. While he has threatened to fire employees found participating in reprisals against those who make discrimination complaints, few have faced such punishment.

"The secretary is selling snake oil," said Leroy W. Warren Jr., who chaired an NAACP task force that last summer issued a critical report on employment discrimination in the federal government. "It is all good rhetoric. But I'm waiting on the substance."

Similarly, many of the employees who have brought complaints against the agency say they also are waiting for justice.

O'Connor, who joined a class action filed by female Forest Service employees, said she faced harassment throughout much of her 17-year tenure at the Forest Service. In 1982, she was the only woman on the Fulton Hot Shots, an elite firefighting brigade that battles blazes in national forests.

One day, she made her way to the fire camp's bathroom for a shower. She unwittingly dropped her panties on the way from the shower. Hours later, she found her underwear flying on the antennae of a fire engine. Her colleagues drove the truck for a day before removing the underwear.

For O'Connor and other women at the Forest Service, the incident represented far more than a boorish prank: It was another example of the harrowing sexual harassment and hostility they had to endure.

Lesla L. Donnelly, a 19-year Forest Service employee and lead plaintiff in the lawsuit, said some of the hostility grew out of resentment of a federal court order requiring the Forest Service to hire more women in its western region.

In the wake of the order, she says, female firefighters were threatened with being pushed into wildfires. They were spit at and hit during physical training. Other women said they were stalked or tormented with dead animals. Some were allegedly left in the woods without transportation.

The women's class action suit is in mediation and a federal judge in San Francisco has set a May 26 deadline for settlement efforts.

"We have heard horror story after horror story," said Lawrence Lucas, president of the USDA Coalition of Minority Employees. "But unless people are held accountable, nothing is going to change at USDA."

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS BEGINS POLICE BRUTALITY HEARINGS

(By Paul Shepard)

WASHINGTON (AP)—Rep. James Clyburn pledges that the Congressional Black Caucus' first hearing on police brutality will yield more than a report that will sit on a bookshelf and collect dust.

"We are focused on solutions," Clyburn, D-S.C., said Monday. "Panels like this often focus only on the horror stories, but we are talking solutions. We need to stay focused and achieve some meaningful results."

The caucus on Monday hosted the first of a planned national series of hearings on police brutality designed to measure whether the recent spate of high-profile deaths of young blacks at the hands of police are an aberration or a troubling new outgrowth of tougher policing policies nationwide.

Early in the five-hour hearing, the panel heard from representatives of the civil rights

community, including National Urban League President Hugh Price and Raul Yzaguirre, president of the National Council of La Raza.

"The problem isn't only excessive use of force but dragnet techniques" that include racial profiling of suspects on traffic stops and the random stopping and frisking policies employed by New York City police, Price said.

Later, Bill Lann Lee, acting assistant attorney general for civil rights, told the caucus members that although his office is limited in its ability to bring federal prosecutions in local police jurisdictions, it has reached settlements with the cities of Pittsburgh and Steubenville, Ohio, which were judged by the Justice Department to discriminate in policing.

Lee said investigations of the Washington, New York City and New Orleans police departments are continuing.

"We have seen several tragedies in the last few months," Lee said. "We have to see how we as a nation as a whole respond, not by pointing fingers but by moving forward."

Witnesses like Dorothy Elliott provided tearful testimony of how their loved ones died at the hands of police. Mrs. Elliot's son, Archie Elliott III, 24, was stopped by Prince George's County, MD, police in June 1995 for driving erratically.

Police said Elliott, with his hands cuffed behind him in a police car, pointed a gun at them. The official version of events was that after refusing police orders to drop the gun, Elliott was shot 14 times and died.

"You can call it a tragedy, but I call it a murder," Mrs. Elliott sobbed. "My son didn't resist arrest. My son's life had value."

The shooting was ruled justified by authorities. Seated next to Mrs. Elliott was Saiko Diallo, whose son Amadou Diallo, a street vendor from Guinea, was killed Feb. 4 outside his apartment in the Bronx when four white police officers fired 41 shots, striking him 19 times and making the young immigrant a national symbol of police abuse.

"The police officers have been indicted for (second-degree) murder," Mrs. Diallo said in halting tones. "But they are still working full time with a full salary. This is unfair. This is not right."

Additional hearings are planned for New York, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago and Atlanta.

BELL ATLANTIC WORKERS SUE COMPANY FOR \$100 MILLION

(By Genaro C. Armas)

PHILADELPHIA.—A group of current and former employees of Bell Atlantic Corp. filed a \$100 million federal lawsuit against the company Monday charging that a racially hostile environment led to the suicides of three employees who worked at a company garage.

The lawsuit filed in U.S. District Court alleges that company executives did not do enough to stem the discrimination allegations lodged by 10 plaintiffs against two men who were supervisors at the garage where the suicide victims worked. The three workers, all black males, died between 1994 and 1997.

The suit said the alleged harassment against the victims, as well as other black workers in the Philadelphia garage by white supervisors, Thomas Flaherty and Nick Pomponio, who were named as defendants in the lawsuit, was so harsh that some workers considered "taking the laws into their own hands."

"But (they) opted to endure the suffering instead, believing that Bell Atlantic would take the action it promised to take (to inves-

tigate complaints and take corrective action)," court documents said.

Both Flaherty and Pomponio have since been transferred out of the garage, plaintiffs' attorney John Hermina said. Flaherty, reached by phone, referred comment to corporate attorneys. A number the company provided for Pomponio was incorrect and he could not be reached for comment.

Joan Rasmussen, a Bell Atlantic spokesperson in Arlington, VA., said Hermina had tried to file a similar lawsuit in federal court in Washington seeking class status but a judge "denied their claim of a pattern of discrimination."

"Bell Atlantic is proud of its record on diversity," said Ms. Rasmussen, who declined to comment specifically on the Philadelphia lawsuit because she had not seen it. "Discrimination is totally unacceptable in the workplace at Bell Atlantic."

The lawsuit accuses the company of racial discrimination and retaliation, negligence, breach of contract, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

"Bell Atlantic knew this was going on," Hermina said. "It's a culture of neglect, because apparently Bell Atlantic felt that these African-American employees don't matter."

IN SUPPORT OF COLORADO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 99-1020

**HON. BOB SCHAFFER**

OF COLORADO

**HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO**

OF COLORADO

**HON. JOEL HEFLEY**

OF COLORADO

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 24, 1999*

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in the matter of designating certain additional wilderness lands in Colorado, the Colorado General Assembly has spoken clearly.

By the passage of Colorado House Joint Resolution 99-1020, the General Assembly has established Colorado's official position on pending federal legislation designating approximately 1.4 million acres of land in Colorado as wilderness.

We hereby submit for the RECORD the full text of the resolution adopted in both houses of Colorado's General Assembly and urge all colleagues to consider the stated official policy of our state regarding this important matter.

Furthermore, we commend the leadership of the authors and prime sponsors of H.J.R. 99-1020, State Representative Diane Hoppe and State Senator Gigi Dennis.

Mr. Speaker, we hereby serve notice of our intent to support and represent Colorado's official position, as expressed in H.J.R. 99-1020, regarding the relevant legislation pending consideration by the U.S. House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 99-1020

By Representatives Hoppe, Smith, Alexander, Berry, Clapp, Kester, Larson, McKay, Miller, Mitchell, Spradley, Taylor, Webster, T. Williams, Allen, Dean, Decker, Fairbank, Hefley, King, Lawrence, Lee, McElhany, McPherson, Nunez, Paschall, Scott, Young.

Also Senators Dennis, Anderson, Arnold, Chlouber, Dyer, Epps, Evans, Hillman,

Musgrave, Teck, Wattenberg, Wham, Congrove, Lamborn, Owen, Powers.

CONCERNING OPPOSITION TO H.R. 829, THE "COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999"

Whereas, H.R. 829, the "Colorado Wilderness Act of 1999", proposes to designate another approximately one million four hundred thousand acres of land in Colorado as wilderness prior to the revision of many of Colorado's forest plans, thereby usurping the United States Forest Service's land management review process and ignoring the original wilderness recommendations made to the United States Congress by the United States Bureau of Land Management ("BLM") that totaled four hundred thirty-one thousand acres; and

Whereas, H.R. 829 was drafted without input from either the general public or local elected officials and does away with local control over land management; and

Whereas, Federal lands in Colorado have been exhaustively studied for their wilderness suitability under the "Wilderness Act" of 1964, the Department of Agriculture's second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II), the wilderness evaluation by the BLM, the "Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980", and the "Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993"; and

Whereas, Many acres of federal lands slated for wilderness designation do not qualify as pristine as required by the "Wilderness Act" of 1964; and

Whereas, The United States Congress considered the option of wilderness designation for federal lands in Colorado and designated several areas under the "Wilderness Act" of 1964 and approved two statewide wilderness bills. One of those statewide wilderness bills was enacted in 1980 and classified one million four hundred thousand acres as wilderness. The other was enacted in 1993 and provided wilderness protection for six hundred eleven thousand seven hundred acres, bringing the total wilderness acreage in Colorado to three million three hundred thousand to date; and

Whereas, The United States Congress declared that lands once studied and found to be unsuitable for wilderness designation should be returned to multiple-use management; and

Whereas, H.R. 829 creates a federal reserved water right for each wilderness area, an approach specifically rejected in the 1980 and 1993 wilderness bills; and

Whereas, The designation of downstream wilderness areas may result in the application of the federal "Clean Water Act of 1977" requirements in a manner that interferes with existing and future beneficial water uses in Colorado; and

Whereas, The overall effect of the designation of downstream wilderness areas will be to destroy Colorado's ability to develop and use water allocated to the citizens of this state under interstate compacts, thereby forfeiting Colorado's water to downstream states; and

Whereas, Many of our rural economies are dependent on a combination of multiple uses of our public lands, such as timber production, oil, gas, and mineral development, and motorized and mechanized recreation, all of which are prohibited by a wilderness designation and also severely inhibits the ability to conduct grazing activities on public lands; and

Whereas, Wilderness designations limit the land management options available to public land managers to protect forest health and dependent watersheds; and

Whereas, Additional wilderness designation puts increased pressure on the new designated lands as well as lands currently open to multiple-use activities and limits access to only the most physically capable individuals; now, therefore,