

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 2006

+ + + + +

WASHINGTON, D.C.

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman
 ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman
 JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner
 PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner (via telephone)
 ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, Commissioner
 MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner
 ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner
 KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY
 RACHELLE BRACEY
 TERESA BROOKS
 CHRISTOPHER BYRNES
 DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Associate Deputy Staff Director
 TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director
 PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and
 Clearinghouse Division
 BARBARA FONTANA, Library
 SETH JAFFE
 SOCK FOON MACDOUGALL
 TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director of Management
 EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian
 MIREILLE ZIESENISS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

LISA NEUDER
KIMBERLY SCHULD

NEAL R. GROSS

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

AGENDA

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	4
II. APPROVAL OF 12/16/2005 MEETING MINUTES	11
III. ANNOUNCEMENTS	12
IV. BRIEFING	14
Remarks by Chairman	14
Speakers Presentations:	
Noelani Kalipi	21
H. William Burgess	30
H. Christopher Bartolomucci	37
Gail Heriot	40
Motion to keep briefing open for public comment	
128	
V. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT	130
VI. PROGRAM PLANNING	
Voting Rights Statutory Report	136
Campus Anti-Semitism	138
VII. Management and Operations	
Extension of GAO Implementation	151
July '06 Commission meeting date	152
VIII. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES	
Working Group on SAC Reform	153
Extending term of state advisory committees	155
Arizona SAC Report	159
IX. BRIEFING REPORTS	
Voting Rights Briefing Report	159

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

9:40 a.m.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Welcome. This meeting will come to order.

This is a meeting of with most of the Commissioners participating in person with the exception of Commissioner Kirsanow who is participating by telephone.

I APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. May I have a motion for the agenda?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: So moved.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion.

Jennifer, didn't you want to change an item on the agenda?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is where you want me to raise what we just talked about?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I guess I would like to move that we table the discussion of the Arizona SAC Report in order to reconsider the procedure that we passed in November for how we deal

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with SAC reports.

2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Second?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second it.

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just by way of
6 explanation, as I've already explained to the Chair, I
7 have been uncomfortable with the language we adopted
8 for considering SAC reports. And I'd just like to go
9 back to the Committee and reconsider how we handle the
10 SAC reports. And I'd like to try to come up with a
11 way that wouldn't be quite so convoluted.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Additional comments,
13 questions?

14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is there a motion for
15 something?

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. There's a
18 motion to table the discussion of the Arizona SAC
19 Report, take it off the agenda.

20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I absolutely agree
21 with that. Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And to reconsider
23 our process for how we vote to accept or not accept
24 the SAC reports.

25 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'll second that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I basically
2 already did, Michael.

3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, but you didn't
4 get a democratic second.

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There you go.

6 I'm happy to talk to you later about what
7 my concerns are. We can just save it for the working
8 group.

9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Additional comments,
10 questions? Okay. Let's vote.

11 All in favor, please say aye.

12 ALL: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
14 Any abstentions? The motion passes.

15 Okay. The next motion to amend the agenda
16 is to add a discussion on the SAC membership selection
17 final rule as the first sub item under item 8 of the
18 agenda. May I have a second?

19 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Discussion?

21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We're changing the
22 agenda?

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. We're basically
24 going to vote on the final rule for SAC membership
25 selection. Any comments, questions, concerns?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, Mr. Chair. As you
2 know, I've continued to express my concerns about the
3 final rule for selecting state advisory committee
4 members. I am uncomfortable with the fact that the
5 Commission is backtracking from its previous
6 commitment to ensure that the diversity of the SACs
7 should be reflective of the constituencies that we are
8 charged to represent and protect, as well as the
9 constituencies of the population that they represent
10 in each state. I am concerned that the criteria used
11 and the diminution of the role that effected
12 constituencies should play in the membership of the
13 SACs could eliminate, I think, a very good and
14 historically reliable source of information and data
15 on the ground for the Commission. So I am going to
16 vote no on adoption of the final rule.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Additional comments?

18 Okay. I just have a brief one. The
19 proposed rules, in my opinion, will not affect the
20 effected constituencies. Anyone who has a
21 demonstrated interest in civil rights is welcome.

22 Our sole reason for doing this is to --
23 well, our primary reason for doing this is to ensure
24 that racial preferences are not used in the selection
25 process and also to broaden the skill sets that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 members of the SACs possess.

2 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, just in
3 response. I respect your point of view. I understand
4 broadening the skill set is a worthy goal. I don't
5 believe that the administrative instruction; I
6 understand that there was a letter promulgated by the
7 Staff Director in the past that may have been
8 contrary. But I don't believe that the administrative
9 instructions as they were constituted have any sort of
10 racial preference involved in there and instead sought
11 to have representation that was reflective or
12 proportional to the demographics of the population of
13 the state for which they represented, which I believe
14 is constitutionally viable. But we disagree on this.

15 And I would also just say notwithstanding
16 with no reference to any of the members of this
17 Commission, but I would are say that there are people
18 who are interested in the issue of civil rights whose
19 interests in civil rights are certainly not the same
20 as mine.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Point of
23 information.

24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: At this point

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we're just voting to add this discussion to the agenda
2 under Roman numeral VIII, correct?

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We'll have an
5 opportunity --

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, this isn't to vote
7 on the final rule.

8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is adding it.

9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Well, the actual
10 vote will take place later on in the --

11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And we'll
12 have an opportunity to raise these issues and discuss
13 it further after the briefing, right?

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Yes. Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So we're
16 just voting right now to put it on.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: To put it on the
18 agenda.

19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just wanted to
20 clarify that.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right.

22 Commissioner Melendez?

23 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Just a comment. I
24 think that this is a very important issue, and I know
25 that we had discussed it and I had a concern with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 changes to the SAC at one time, and I had to really
2 fight to just get it an extension for two weeks to
3 basically get some input from our local SAC within the
4 state of Nevada. And I know it is still a concern.

5 When we get to issues that are of real
6 concern to the Commission, I would hope that we could
7 not be adding things on at the last minute. I hope
8 that if it's a real debatable issue that we could put
9 it on the agenda from the very beginning. Then we
10 have an opportunity to know what's coming. I just
11 think that on real important issues that we should
12 agendize it real early so that we know it's coming in
13 the following month to really have a good debate.

14 I think it's just when you add things on,
15 I don't have a problem if they're not really
16 important. But I think this is a real important issue
17 and it should be agendized from the very beginning.

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I appreciate your
19 comments. And in this particular case, this issue has
20 been discussed on several occasions. And I felt
21 comfortable adding it to the agenda because everyone
22 is well versed in the issues. But I do appreciate
23 your comments and we'll strive to get these types of
24 issues on the agenda at an earlier date.

25 Okay. At this point if there are no more

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 questions or comments, let's vote. All in favor to
2 adding to the agenda?

3 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?

5 COMMISSIONERS: No.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Any
7 abstentions?

8 Please let the record reflect that
9 Commissioners Braceras, Taylor, Thernstrom and
10 Kirsanow voted in favor. And that Commissioners Yaki
11 and Melendez voted in opposition.

12 The motion carries.

13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And the Chair
14 voted in favor, right?

15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, yes. Yes. Thank
16 you.

17 **II. APPROVAL OF 12/16/2005 MEETING MINUTES**

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next
19 up is the approval of the minutes of the December 16,
20 2005 meeting. May I have a motion?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.

22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?

23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any discussions or
25 proposed changes?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Okay. Let's vote. All in favor, please
2 say aye.

3 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any abstentions?

6 The motion carries unanimously.

7 **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next
9 up we're at the point where we'll do the
10 announcements. In this case we just have one. On
11 January 16, 2006 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. would
12 have been 76 years old. We commemorate and honor the
13 ideals for which Dr. King fought and celebrate how far
14 we have come in realizing these ideals, while also
15 taking time to ponder how best to reach the goals that
16 we have not achieved.

17 Dr. King was a pivotal figure in the civil
18 rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s. Dr. King was
19 arrested over 30 times for participating in civil
20 rights activities aimed at dismantling Jim Crow laws
21 that kept the races separate and blacks subjugated by
22 white rule.

23 Dr. King was instrumental in the
24 successful Montgomery bus boycott in 1956 as well as
25 spearheading the 1969 march on Washington, which

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 brought together more than 200,000 people seeking
2 justice. It was at this event where Dr. King delivered
3 his "I Have A Dream" speech where he so artfully
4 articulated the goal for which we all strive, which is
5 that our children will one day live in a nation where
6 they will not be known by the color of their skin, but
7 the content of their character. For these and
8 other activities he was awarded the 1964 Nobel Peace
9 Prize.

10 Thanks to Dr. King's leadership our nation
11 has made tremendous progress in eliminating
12 discrimination. And on behalf of the Commission I say
13 that we will continue to honor his legacy by moving
14 the nation closer to his and our highest ideals.

15 Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Jim?

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, Commissioner
18 Kirsanow?

19 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I just had, it's
20 not really an announcement, but I simply wanted to
21 note that my assistant Chris Jennings did another bang
22 up job preparing an extensive examination of the civil
23 rights record of Samuel Alito in anticipation of the
24 nomination hearing.

25 I am pleased to forward that to everybody

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 at some point in the future. But suffice it say that
2 it was integral to the nomination hearing at least in
3 terms of the civil rights component of the hearing.
4 And it is a several hundred page document that he
5 prepared at my direction. And it's just splendid
6 work.

7 So I just wanted to commend him. I think
8 he's not there because he's got a bout of food
9 poisoning. But he did just a phenomenal job. And I
10 can't commend him highly enough, as did some of the
11 members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who very
12 much appreciated his work.

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Yes.
14 Commissioner Kirsanow, I would appreciate a copy of
15 the document when it's complete.

16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Will do.

17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, Commissioner
18 Kirsanow, I think all of us would. And, of course, all
19 of us commend Chris Jennings on once again doing some
20 very good work.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

22 IV. BRIEFING

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: At this point we're
24 going to start our briefing. The briefing is on the
25 Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 On behalf of the Commission on Civil
2 Rights I welcome everyone to this briefing on the
3 Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act. The
4 Commissioner frequently arranges such public briefings
5 with presentations from experts outside of the agency
6 in order to inform itself and the nation of civil
7 rights situations and issues.

8 At this briefing a panel of experts will
9 advise the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights concerning
10 a bill before Congress: Senate Bill 147, which would
11 create government-to-government relationship between
12 the United States and Native Hawaiians. Some argue
13 that this bill is a reaction to the United States
14 Supreme Court discussion in *Rice v. Cayetano* that held
15 in 2000 that a policy allowing only Native Hawaiians
16 to vote for trustees of the state's Office of Hawaiian
17 Affairs violated the 15th Amendment of the
18 Constitution which prohibits race-base exclusion from
19 voting.

20 The bill defines Native Hawaiians by
21 racial characteristics and residual sovereignty, and
22 in doing so extends to Native Hawaiians the policy of
23 self governance historically granted to American
24 Indians and Alaska Natives.

25 Proponents of the legislation believe that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it would represent a major advance in Native Hawaiians
2 affairs while opponents believe that it would go
3 beyond racial preferences and potentially create a
4 race-based government.

5 In 1991 the Hawaii Advisory Committee to
6 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued a report on
7 this topic entitled "Reconciliation at a Crossroads:
8 The implication of the apology resolution and *Rice v.*
9 *Cayetano* for federal and state programs benefiting
10 Native Hawaiians."

11 This issue is one of national import. It's
12 an issue that's important to all Americans. And for
13 that reason we're delighted to conduct this briefing.

14 Okay. We will begin with our
15 introductions. This morning we are pleased to welcome
16 four experts on various aspects of the proposed Native
17 Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act. I welcome all
18 of you on behalf of the Commission, and I will
19 introduce everyone and describe your background and
20 then I will call on you according to the order in
21 which you have been introduced.

22 First, we have Noelani Kalipi. I'm sorry,
23 did I pronounce your name?

24 MS. KALUPI: Kalipi.

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Kalipi. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Ms. Kalipi was born and raised in Hilo,
2 Hawaii. She graduated with a bachelor's degree in
3 government and politics and economics from George
4 Mason University, and a JD from the National Law
5 Center at George Washington University.

6 Ms. Kalipi served in the United States
7 Army Judge Advocate Generals Corp from 1996 to 1999.

8 Ms. Kalipi is licensed to practice law in
9 Hawaii and the District of Columbia.

10 She served as Senator Akaka's counsel from
11 1999 to 2005 and advised him on legislative issues
12 pertaining to veterans affairs, judiciary, homeland
13 security, armed services, U.S. territories and Pacific
14 Islands and finally, Native Hawaiians.

15 Ms. Kalipi was appointed Democratic Staff
16 Director on the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs
17 in February of 2005.

18 Ms. Kalipi will deliver a written
19 statement authorized by Patricia Zell, former
20 Democratic Staff Director of the United States Senate
21 Committee on Indian Affairs and editor of the *Indian*
22 *Law Review*.

23 Thank you for being with us, Ms. Kalipi.

24 Next we will hear from H. William Burgess,
25 an attorney who lives in Hawaii who is an opponent of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Hawaiian sovereignty movement and of government
2 programs that give preferences to Native Hawaiians.

3 After attending the University of Virginia
4 Law School and graduating in 1953, he enrolled in the
5 U.S. Marine Corps from 1953 to 1958 as a fighter pilot
6 and legal officer. Once out of the military, Mr.
7 Burgess joined the law firm of Carlsmith & Carlsmith
8 and then A. William Barlow.

9 In 1965 Burgess opened his own law office
10 where he focused full time on business and real
11 property litigation. From 1969 to 1972 he was the
12 volunteer President of the Legal Aid Society. In 1979
13 Mr. Burgess was one of the founders and first
14 President of the Neighborhood Justice Center of
15 Honolulu now called the Mediation Center of the
16 Pacific.

17 In 1994 he retired from his practice and
18 become a trustee for a Maui shopping center and a
19 Chapter 11 reorganization. Mr. Burgess was
20 instrumental in bringing two controversial lawsuits
21 seeking to declare programs as unconstitutional.

22 In July of 2000 Mr. Burgess filed *Arakai*
23 the state of Hawaii challenging the requirements that
24 the trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs be of
25 Hawaiian ancestry on the basis of the 14th Amendment,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the 15th Amendment and the Voting Rights Act. In
2 December of 2002 the United States Court of Appeals
3 for the 9th Circuit partly ruled in favor of the
4 plaintiffs. The court based its decision on the
5 plaintiffs' 15th Amendment argument.

6 In March of 2002 Mr. Burgess and attorney
7 Patrick W. Hanifin filed a second lawsuit *Arakaki v.*
8 *Lingle* challenging the constitutionality of the Office
9 of Hawaiian Affairs and the Hawaiian Homes Commission
10 Act. In 2005 in a two to one decision by the U.S. 9th
11 Circuit Court of Appeals found that state taxpayers
12 had standing to challenge the appropriation of tax
13 moneys to, the office of Hawaiian Affairs, but
14 dismissed the rest of the plaintiffs' claims. Mr.
15 Burgess is a member of the Grassroots Institute of
16 Hawaii, a nonprofit organization that has gained
17 prominence through its intense campaign to educate the
18 public and Congress about the Native Hawaiian
19 Government Reorganization Act

20 Next we will hear from H. Christopher
21 Bartolomucci, a partner at the law firm of Hogan and
22 Hartson.

23 In law school he was an editor of the
24 *Harvard Law Review*. Following law school he clerked
25 for the Honorable William L. Garwood of the U.S. Court

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of Appeals for the 5th Circuit.

2 Mr. Bartolomucci served in the
3 Administration of President George W. Bush as
4 Associate Counsel to the President from January 20,
5 2001 to August 15, 2003. While serving in the White
6 House he assisted the President in matters ranging
7 from the selection of federal judges to the
8 consideration of pardon requests. He also served as
9 counsel for the Inspector General of the District of
10 Columbia, Associate Special Counsel to the Senate
11 Whitewater Committee. And he's also a Bristow Fellow
12 at the Office of the Solicitor General of the United
13 States Department of Justice.

14 At Hogan and Hartson Mr. Bartolomucci
15 focuses on appellant and Supreme Court litigation, and
16 other litigation involving complex legal issues at
17 both the trial and appellate levels. He has briefed
18 numerous cases in the U.S. Supreme Court at the
19 certari and merit stages for both private clients and
20 the United States Government.

21 Finally, we have Gail Heriot, who is a
22 professor law at the University of San Diego School of
23 Law. Ms. Heriot was formerly Associate Dean for
24 Academic Affairs and professor of law at George Mason
25 University School of Law, and counsel to the Senate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Judiciary Committee.

2 She also served as a litigation associate
3 at Hogan and Hartson in Washington, D.C. and Mayer,
4 Brown and Platt in Chicago.

5 After she graduated she worked as a law
6 clerk for the Honorable Seymour F. Simon of the
7 Supreme Court of Illinois.

8 She has numerous academic publications,
9 such as faculty editor for "A Symposium On Direct
10 Democracy: An Introduction" at the Journal of
11 Contemporary Legal Issues; Standardized Tests Under
12 the Magnifying Glass: A Defense of the LSAT Against
13 Recent Charges of Bias" at the Texas Review of Law and
14 Politics, and; also "Strict Scrutiny: Public Opinion
15 and Racial Preferences on Campus. Should The Courts
16 Finds a Narrowly Tailored Solution." And that was
17 published at the Harvard Journal of Legislation.

18 Okay. Now that we've dispensed with the
19 introductions, we can start.

20 Ms. Kalipi, please speak for 15 minutes.

21 MS. KALIPI: Good morning.

22 Thank you for providing me with the
23 opportunity to present information related to S. 147,
24 Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2005.

25 I ask that my written statement along with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that of Dr. Patricia Zell be included for the record.

2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It was.

3 MS. KALIPI: I have served as Senator
4 Akaka's primary staffer on Native Hawaiian issues
5 since 1999. I have brought with me information for
6 each of the Commissioners, which was delivered to you
7 in the blue packet.

8 The blue packet includes the substitute
9 amendment to S. 147, which was negotiated between
10 Hawaii's Congressional Delegation, Hawaii's Attorney
11 General and officials from the Department of Justice,
12 Office of Management and Budget and the White House.
13 So this is the most recent and accurate version of the
14 legislation.

15 The substitute amendment addresses
16 concerns raised in the letter sent to Senators John
17 McCain and Senator Byron Dorgan on July 13, 2005.

18 The packet also contains an information
19 sheet about the substitute amendment, the committee
20 report filed by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs
21 on S. 147 and numerous news articles regarding the
22 legislation.

23 The customs, traditions and culture and
24 Hawaii's indigenous peoples, Native Hawaiians, serve
25 as a basis of society in Hawaii. The essence of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Hawaii is captured not by the physical beauty of its
2 islands, but by the beauty of its people and their
3 willingness to welcome others into their society in
4 order to share their culture, environment and lives.
5 This attitude often referred to as the aloha spirit
6 originates from the culture and traditions of Hawaii's
7 indigenous peoples, Native Hawaiians.

8 Hawaii's motto "Ua mau ke ea o kay aina I
9 ka pono: The life of the land is perpetrated in
10 righteousness" captures the culture of Native
11 Hawaiians. Prior to western contact, Native Hawaiians
12 lived in an advanced society that was steeped in
13 science. Native Hawaiians honored their land and
14 environment and therefore developed methods of
15 irrigation, agriculture, aquaculture, navigation,
16 medicine, fishing and other forms of substance whereby
17 the land and sea were efficiently used without waste
18 or damage. Respect for the environment and for others
19 formed the basis of their culture and tradition.

20 Unlike a number of other aboriginal peoples, the
21 Native Hawaiians welcomed foreigners into their
22 society. Over time this generosity resulted in the
23 near decimation of the indigenous population and
24 almost destroyed the precious traditions and culture
25 of Hawaii. A monarchy was overthrown, a provisional

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 government was established which proclaimed Hawaii a
2 republic and transferred vast amounts of land to the
3 United States.

4 The perpetuation of Hawaii's important
5 cultural traditions were discouraged by these leaders
6 who were convinced of their primacy and committed
7 exclusively to the propagation of western values and
8 conventions.

9 Despite these events the remaining Native
10 Hawaiians continued to share their culture and
11 tradition with non-Native Hawaiians and continued to
12 include them in their society. Indeed, the spirit of
13 aloha has endured and flourished in spite of
14 pestilence, political upheaval and poverty. It
15 transcends political and geographic demarcations and
16 remains the noblest legacy of the Native Hawaiian
17 people to their American brethren and to the world.
18 For this reason efforts to preserve Native Hawaiian
19 tradition, culture and custom are widely supported in
20 Hawaii and are nonpartisan.

21 S.147, the Native Hawaiian Government
22 Reorganization Act of 2005 is supported by Hawaii's
23 congressional delegation, the Hawaii State
24 legislature, the Governor of Hawaii and numerous
25 organizations and associations as well as individuals

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in Hawaii and across the nation. The bill is also
2 supported by the National Congress of American Indians
3 and Alaska Federation of Natives.

4 The formal extension of the federal policy
5 of self governance and self determination to Native
6 Hawaiians provides parity in federal policies towards
7 American Indians, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians.
8 While Congress has enacted more than 160 statutes
9 addressing the conditions of Native Hawaiians, the
10 formal extension of the federal policy of self
11 governance and self determination through a federally
12 recognized government-to-government relationship has
13 not happened. This bill corrects this oversight and
14 injustice, thereby putting Native Hawaiians on an
15 equal footing with their indigenous brethren, American
16 Indians and Alaska Natives as 147 recognizes the
17 political and legal relationship between Native
18 Hawaiians and the United States.

19 The United States Supreme Court has
20 acknowledged that Indian tribes were originally
21 independent nations and European nations historically
22 dealt with Indian tribes as such nations prior to the
23 establishment of the American republic. Indian tribes
24 lands were incorporated within the United States
25 through military force or through treaty. American

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Indians were dispossessed of their lands by the United
2 States and Congress later had to take remedial
3 legislation to help alleviate the destruction and
4 devastation visited upon Indian tribes by federal
5 policies and actions.

6 Similarly, the Kingdom of Hawaii was a
7 distinct independent nation with treaties with
8 European nations and the United States. The United
9 States Minister to Hawaii used U.S. forces to assist
10 in the overthrow of the Hawaiian nation in favor of
11 American settlers. But President Grover Cleveland
12 recognized the overthrow as an international wrong.
13 In 1898, five years after the overthrow, the United
14 States annexed Hawaii. Twenty-three years later the
15 Native Hawaiian people were destitute and Congress
16 enacted the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in 1920 to
17 establish protected lands for Native Hawaiians who had
18 been devastated by the overthrow.

19 It is also clear that Native Hawaiians are
20 native in the same sense as American Indians, meaning
21 aboriginal. Thus, when Congress deals with Native
22 Hawaiians as an aboriginal peoples it legislates on
23 the same basis as it does with American Indians. This
24 is clear in the legislative history of the Hawaii
25 Homes Commission Act of 1920.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Only non-Indians consider American Indians
2 a distinct race of people. American Indians consider
3 themselves to be many peoples; Cherokee, Chippewa,
4 Dakota, Pueblo and Navajo to name a few bound together
5 by a common experience of dealing with the United
6 States overthrow of tribal governments of seizure of
7 tribal lands. The fact that some non-natives were
8 included in the Kingdom of Hawaii does not make the
9 kingdom non-native. And Indian tribes frequently
10 incorporated non-natives whether French, American or
11 otherwise, and this did not change the native
12 character of the community. In fact, some Indian
13 treaties and statutes provided for the allotment of
14 Indian lands to non-Indians who had married into an
15 Indian tribe.

16 The fact that the Kingdom of Hawaii was
17 overthrown does not prevent Congress from dealing with
18 Native Hawaiian people as a native government because
19 Native Hawaiians remain a distinctly native community.

20 No one who spends anytime in Indian Country and then
21 visits Hawaii could fail to recognize the many
22 similarities between the circumstances of the native
23 communities in the continental United States and in
24 Hawaii.

25 Congress has declared that it has the same

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 authority to deal with Native Hawaiians and American
2 Indians under the Indian Commerce Clause. And those
3 declarations are entitled to a presumption of
4 constitutionality.

5 In short, a fair review of history cannot
6 ignore the fact that there were aboriginal peoples in
7 the United States of America prior to the formation of
8 the American republic and the Constitution provides
9 authority to Congress to deal with them as distinctly
10 native communities, not based on race but upon
11 political status as citizens of separate native
12 polities that have been incorporated within the United
13 States.

14 Finally, I would like to talk about the
15 bill itself. We have worked hard to ensure that the
16 bill strikes a careful balance between necessary
17 structure and flexibility so that key issues such as
18 the citizenship in the governing entity can be
19 determined by Hawaii's indigenous peoples.

20 I hope all of you take the time to really
21 examine the process in this bill. There are two
22 processes. The first provides for the reorganization
23 of the Native Hawaiian governing entity. It is not
24 the creation of a new entity as much as it is
25 restoring the right of Native Hawaiians to govern

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 themselves, as do other indigenous peoples within the
2 framework of federal law.

3 The second process is a negotiations
4 process which provides that upon federal recognition
5 the Native Hawaiian governing entity will negotiate
6 issues such as the transfer of any lands, natural
7 resources and assets commiserate with jurisdiction,
8 grievances for historical wrongs and any governmental
9 authority with the state of Hawaii and the United
10 States. This negotiations process is inclusive and
11 intended to represent all of the people of Hawaii.
12 Before any transfers can be completed, enabling
13 legislation at the state and federal levels if
14 necessary, must be enacted.

15 Opponents to the legislation have made
16 wild accusations as to what could potentially result
17 from the enactment of this bill. In reality, the bill
18 is about the process. The bill is about finally
19 allowing Native Hawaiians to make some decisions.
20 Many, both opponents and proponents, have advocated to
21 Senator Akaka that he should attempt to predetermine
22 the outcome of both of these processes. He has
23 refused to predetermine either the structure of the
24 entity or the negotiations process for he has
25 confidence that the bill provides the tools necessary

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for the people of Hawaii, both native and non-native,
2 to resolve the longstanding issues resulting from the
3 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii in order to provide
4 a better future for all children of Hawaii.

5 It is an honor to present testimony before
6 you this morning. I stand ready to answer your
7 questions.

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.

9 Next up, Mr. Burgess. You, too, will have
10 15 minutes.

11 MR. BURGESS: Hi, and good morning.

12 Thank you for allowing me to come and
13 share my views about this important subject -- is that
14 better?

15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

16 MR. BURGESS: I've lived in Hawaii for 50
17 years. The first two years as a Marine Corps legal
18 officer and fighter pilot - in peacetime. And the rest
19 of the years as an attorney in private practice. For
20 the last 28 years I've been married to a lovely lady
21 of Chinese, Filipino and Hawaiian ancestry. In the
22 last eight years she and I have been litigating pro
23 bono to bring back to Hawaii the idea that everybody
24 should play by the same rules.

25 My wife puts it this way: She asks why

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 should I get more rights and privileges than my
2 Chinese cousins, my Filipino cousins, or my Irish-
3 English husband just because I have some Hawaiian
4 ancestry and they don't?

5 She deploras the effect of entitlements and
6 the victimhood mentality on young Hawaiians. Based on
7 her own life and family experience she knows that
8 waiting for a free homestead or handouts is not the
9 way to better your condition or to build wealth. Hard
10 work is.

11 From my perspective as a lawyer I'm amazed
12 that the entitlement programs in Hawaii have lasted as
13 long as they have. Hawaii is the only state in the
14 nation that gives homesteads restricted exclusively to
15 people that are defined explicitly by race. The
16 definition of Native Hawaiians in the Hawaii Homes
17 Commission Act, for example, is any descendent of not
18 less than one-half part of the blood of the races
19 inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778.

20 The state also gives to the Office of
21 Hawaiian Affairs, it's referred to locally as "OHA",
22 for that very small racial group annual cash
23 distributions of public land trust revenues. That's
24 revenues before expenses. The state gives no cash
25 transfers to any of the rest of the beneficiaries of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the public land trust.

2 And as taxpayers we are appalled at the
3 waste by the end of the Waihee administration in 1994
4 when the public schools in Hawaii were crumbling, the
5 state department of education couldn't even afford to
6 buy books for the students or to repair or even to
7 clean the restrooms and yet money and public resources
8 were gushing out of the fist for the benefit of that
9 same small racial group. And the more that was paid,
10 the more demands were made, not only for that limited
11 racial group, the 50 percent or more Hawaiians, but
12 also for people with even a drop of Hawaiian ancestry.

13 And now the Akaka bill would push Hawaii
14 over the cliff. It would permanently segregate the
15 state of Hawaii and its people on grounds that the
16 Supreme Court calls odious to a free people. Even
17 Senator Akaka has acknowledged that the bill could
18 lead to secession.

19 I'm not going to read my entire prepared
20 statement, but I'd like to touch on just three reasons
21 that I think it would be just plain nuts for Congress
22 to go into the most integrated state and reverse
23 course.

24 First, Kamehameha united us. Akaka would
25 divide us forever.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Second, the Indian tribe analogy does not
2 work. There is no Native Hawaiian tribe to be
3 recognized, and there never has been since the Kingdom
4 of Hawaii was created.

5 This is the third point. The U.S. did not
6 overthrow the queen. When you look at history wearing
7 blinders you get a distorted picture.

8 I would like to discuss just those three
9 points in order.

10 First of all on the concept of unity and
11 equality. The Supreme Court has explained that the
12 United States Constitution contemplates an indivisible
13 nation composed of indestructible states. And the
14 first of America's self-evident truths is that all men
15 are created equal: Every citizen of the United
16 States, whatever her or his ancestry is entitled to
17 the equal protection of the laws.

18 Those two basic rules of American
19 democracy, unity and equality were embraced early on
20 by Kamehameha the Great. Long before he united the
21 islands and created the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1810,
22 Kamehameha brought non-natives onto his forces and
23 into his family. And ever since then non-natives have
24 continued to intermarry, to assimilate and to
25 contribute to the social, economic and political life

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of Hawaii both as leaders in high positions and as
2 ordinary citizens.

3 The crux of the Akaka bill is that it
4 would break up the state of Hawaii and it would
5 discriminate between citizens of the United States
6 solely based on their ancestry. Merely having a drop
7 of the favored blood would make some people superior
8 to all others forever. And we feel that that violates
9 not only the United States Constitution, it dishonors
10 and defies the fundamental laws of the Kingdom of
11 Hawaii and the vision, particularly, of Kamehameha the
12 Great which has made Hawaii today in many ways a model
13 for the world.

14 As to the Indian tribe analogy, the Akaka
15 bill supporters, as Noelani said, say all we want is
16 parity; Alaska Natives and American Indians get all of
17 these benefits. It's not fair that Native Hawaiians
18 don't get some, too. But the Akaka bill would not
19 just give Native Hawaiians parity, it would give them
20 supremacy. No group of native Americans has the right
21 to be recognized as a tribe simply because of
22 ancestry. A preexisting, longstanding political
23 entity is required without an existing tribe or polity
24 of some kind there's nothing to be recognized.
25 Congress cannot create tribes out of thin air. It can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 only recognize those historic tribes which still exist
2 and function. And there has never been in Hawaii,
3 even during the years of the Kingdom, a tribe or a
4 government of any kind for Native Hawaiians separate
5 from the government of the rest of the citizens of
6 Hawaii.

7 Census 2000 showed about 400,000 persons
8 who identified themselves as being of some degree of
9 Hawaiian ancestry. Those entire 400,000 would qualify
10 under the definition of Hawaiian as in the Akaka bill.
11 Those 400,000 people reside throughout all the 48
12 Census districts of the state of Hawaii and throughout
13 all the 50 states. In California, for example, 60,000
14 people identify themselves as being of Hawaiian
15 ancestry. There is no way under Indian law that such
16 a group could qualify for recognition as a tribe,
17 because they are not governed by a single government,
18 and they do not live in a separate community.

19 And the third point I'd like to talk about
20 is the rest of the story about the Akaka bill. Just
21 last Sunday on the *Honolulu Advertiser* there was a
22 headline that said "Morgan Report Is Public At Long
23 Last." The Morgan Report of February 26, 1894 is the
24 final report of the Senate Committee on Foreign
25 Affairs that was investigating the overthrow of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Hawaiian monarchy. The report consists of 800 pages
2 of sworn testimony, exhibits and findings. That
3 Committee was composed of six Democrats including the
4 Chairman John Morgan and five Republicans. And the
5 report concludes that despite the earlier statements
6 by President Cleveland based on the report by his
7 minister or his representative, former Congressman
8 Blount, that the overthrow was instigated and aided by
9 the United States. But the conclusion of the
10 Committee, the bipartisan committee, was that in fact
11 the U.S. troops had landed as peacekeepers to protect
12 American lives and property and had remained
13 completely neutral.

14 Now the advocates or the supporters of the
15 Akaka bill frequently report President Cleveland's
16 earlier statements, but they don't ever mention the
17 fact that, after the Morgan Report, President
18 Cleveland recognized, he accepted the verdict of
19 Congress, he recognized the provisional government of
20 Hawaii and subsequently the Republic of Hawaii as the
21 lawful successor to the Kingdom of Hawaii.

22 Now, I would urge for your consideration
23 the Morgan Report. It's available now digitized for
24 the first time, easily accessible to the public. It
25 can be found on the Internet at morganreport.org. No

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 spaces. It's indexed, it's searchable and it's good
2 reading because you can hear from people who were on
3 the scene with personal knowledge.

4 I'd be happy to answer any questions that
5 the Commission has.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We're going to hold
7 off the questions until the end.

8 Mr. Bartolomucci, you have 15 minutes.

9 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Chairman Reynolds and
10 members of the Commission, thank you for this
11 opportunity to participate in the briefing on S. 147,
12 the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of
13 2005.

14 I'd hope to focus today on the issue of
15 Congress' power to enact S. 147. The principal legal
16 question presented by S. 147 is whether Congress has
17 the constitutional authority to treat Native Hawaiians
18 the way it treats other Native Americans, i.e.,
19 American Indians and Native Alaskans. Constitutional
20 text, Supreme Court precedent and historical events
21 provide the answer.

22 Congress' broad power in regard to Indian
23 tribes allows Congress to recognize Native Hawaiians
24 as having the same sovereign status as the other
25 indigenous peoples of this country. S. 147 would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 establish a process by which Native Hawaiians would
2 reconstitute their tribal government.

3 Before Hawaii became a state, the Kingdom
4 of Hawaii was a sovereign nation recognized as such by
5 the United States. In 1893 American officials and the
6 U.S. military aided the overthrow of the Hawaiian
7 monarchy. A century later in 1993 Congress formally
8 apologized to the Hawaiian people for the U.S.
9 involvement in this regime change.

10 Congress has ample authority to assist
11 Native Hawaiians in their effort to reorganize their
12 governing entity. Congress' broadest constitutional
13 power, the power to regulate commerce, specifically
14 encompasses the power to regulate commerce with the
15 Indian tribes. Based upon the Commerce Clause and
16 constitutional provisions, the Supreme Court has time
17 and again acknowledged Congress' plenary power to
18 legislate regarding Indian affairs. As the Supreme
19 Court said only two years ago in the case *United*
20 *States v. Lara*, "The Constitution grants Congress
21 broad general powers to legislate in respect to Indian
22 tribes, powers that we have consistently described as
23 plenary and exclusive."

24 Congress has used that broad power in the
25 past to restore lost tribal sovereignty. In 1954

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Congress terminated the sovereignty of the Menominee
2 Indian Tribe in Wisconsin. In 1973 Congress reversed
3 course and enacted the Menominee Restoration Act which
4 restored sovereignty to the Menominee.

5 Pointing to the Menominee Restoration Act
6 the Supreme Court in *Lara* affirmed that the
7 Constitution authorized Congress to enact legislation
8 "recognizing the existence of Indian tribes" and
9 "restoring previously extinguished tribal status."

10 S. 147 is patterned after the Menominee
11 Restoration Act and would do for Native Hawaiians what
12 Congress did for the Menominee.

13 S. 147 does not run afoul of the Supreme
14 Court's 2000 decision in *Rice v. Cayetano*. In *Rice*
15 the Court ruled that the state of Hawaii could not
16 limit the right to vote in a state election to Native
17 Hawaiians. But *Rice* did not address whether Congress
18 may treat Native Hawaiians as it does other native
19 Americans. Indeed, the Court in *Rice* expressly
20 declined to address whether Native Hawaiians have a
21 status like that of Indians in organized tribes or
22 whether Congress may treat the Native Hawaiians as it
23 does the Indian tribes.

24 Some opponents of S. 147 have pointed to
25 *Rice* in support of an argument that the bill violated

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 equal protection principles. But the Supreme Court
2 has long held that congressional legislation dealing
3 with indigenous groups is political, not racial, in
4 character and therefore is neither discrimination nor
5 unconstitutional. When Congress enacts laws for
6 indigenous peoples it does so on a government-to-
7 government basis. Scores of federal laws and
8 regulations exist relating to American Indians, Native
9 Alaskans and Native Hawaiians and none has ever been
10 struck down as racially discriminatory.

11 At the end of the day a decision by
12 Congress to treat Native Hawaiians like other native
13 groups is a political decision and one that the courts
14 are not likely to second-guess. In the 1913 case of
15 *United States v. Sandoval*, which involved the New
16 Mexico Pueblos, the Supreme Court ruled that Congress
17 could treat the Pueblos as Indians even though their
18 culture and customs differed from that of other Indian
19 tribes. The Court decided that Congress' judgment was
20 not arbitrary and that judicial review should end
21 there. S. 147 easily passes that legal test.

22 That concludes my opening statement, and
23 I'll be happy to answer the Commission's questions at
24 the appropriate time.

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Professor Heriot?

2 PROFESSOR HERIOT: Thanks for inviting me
3 to participate in this briefing.

4 In order to stick to the time allotted,
5 I'm going to deviate a little bit from my draft text.

6 Let me start by saying Indian law is a
7 very complicated area of the law full of
8 contradictions and ripe for major reform. The last
9 thing that it needs is a major expansion that would
10 come, even with the recognition of an additional
11 Indian megatribe. But the proposed Native Hawaiian
12 Government Reorganization Act goes far beyond merely
13 recognizing a very, very, very large tribe. And I
14 believe that it does so in an unconstitutional manner.

15 First of all, I'm going to call it the
16 Akaka bill for brevity.

17 The Akaka bill does not simply recognize
18 an existing tribe. It creates that tribe, or more
19 precisely it creates the mechanism for creating the
20 tribe. The Constitution contains no clear statement
21 of congressional authority to create or organize new
22 Indian tribes. In fact, it's worth pointing out the
23 Constitution contains no clear statement of
24 congressional authority to regulate even existing
25 Indian tribes as opposed to regulating commerce

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 between the United States and Indian tribes. The
2 authority to regulate existing tribes is sometimes
3 said to derive from the necessity of dealing with
4 reality. The existence of Indian tribes in this
5 country in 1787 as well as today is a fact, and truly
6 it was the intention of the framers to confer upon
7 Congress the power to deal with that reality, whether
8 that reality was considered a happy one, an unhappy
9 one or something in between. But the power to
10 authorize the creation of new tribes or even authorize
11 the reorganization of a previously existing tribe is
12 not merely the practical power to cope with the world
13 as it is.

14 New tribes and newly reconstituted tribes
15 alter the status quo in significant ways. If that
16 power exists, what limits should be placed on it?
17 Does Congress have the authority to create an Indian
18 tribe from Mexican Americans living in Southern
19 California, for the Amish in Pennsylvania or Orthodox
20 Jews in New York?

21 By the way, religious groups would be
22 among those most desiring tribal status since tribes,
23 if they can be conceptualized as sovereign or quasi-
24 sovereign entities are not governed by the Bill of
25 Rights except insofar as the Indian Civil Rights Act

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 imposed that legal responsibility upon them, which is
2 only partial. Religious groups could therefore
3 arguably surmount the establishment clause
4 difficulties dealt with by the Supreme Court in the
5 case of *Board of Education of Kiryas Joel School*
6 *District v. Grumit* by becoming an Indian tribe. So
7 this is not a fanciable issue.

8 It's been pointed out that in the past the
9 Supreme Court has allowed Congress to reconstitute
10 Indian tribes, in particular the Menominee Tribe. But
11 I disagree that this has occurred in the past.

12 First, the Supreme Court has not put its
13 mark upon this at all. It was never challenged in
14 court. But more importantly, the Menominee Tribe was
15 not extinguished by an act of Congress. What happened
16 was federal supervision ceased in the 1950s as part of
17 a general policy at the time to decrease federal
18 supervision over Indian tribes with the thought that
19 eventually perhaps these tribes would melt away. But
20 the tribe continued to exist. It continued to be
21 organized. It became a corporation with the members of
22 the tribe as shareholders of that corporation.

23 And so by recognizing the Menominee Tribe
24 again Congress was not in anyway creating a tribe. It
25 wasn't recreating the mechanisms to put together a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tribe. Those people who were members of the Menominee
2 Tribe knew that they were members of the Menominee
3 Tribe. There was a political unit and it was simply
4 rerecognized by Congress and federal supervision was
5 undertaken again. So that is quite distinguishable
6 from this case.

7 Nevertheless, in examining the
8 constitutionality of the proposed Akaka bill we can
9 put all this aside, at least temporarily, because
10 another issue looms much larger in an age in which
11 racial entitlement are an important future of the
12 political landscape in nearly every part of the
13 country Hawaii is in a league by itself. Its Office
14 of Hawaiian Affairs administers a huge public trust
15 that in theory benefits all Hawaiians, but for reasons
16 that are both historical and political in practice
17 provides benefits exclusively for ethnic Hawaiians.
18 Among other things, ethnic Hawaiians are eligible for
19 special home loans, business loans, housing and
20 educational programs. On the OHA website the caption
21 proudly proclaims its racial loyalty saying, and I'm
22 quoting here, "The Office of Hawaiian Affairs for the
23 betterment of Native Hawaiians."

24 The proposed Native Hawaiian Government
25 Reorganization Act is, in large measure, an effort to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 preserve that system. The constitutionality of the
2 system has recently been called into question as a
3 result of the Supreme Court's decision in *Rice v.*
4 *Cayetano* and the 9th Circuit's decision in *Doe v.*
5 *Kamehameha Schools*.

6 *Rice* held that Hawaii's election system
7 under which only ethnic Hawaiians could vote for
8 trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs was a
9 violation of the Constitution's 15th Amendment, which
10 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race in
11 voting rights.

12 *Doe* held that the prestigious King
13 Kamehameha Schools which are privately wrong cannot
14 give ethnic Hawaiians priority over students of other
15 races and ethnicities for admission without violating
16 42 USC Section 1981.

17 Given the result in these cases it is
18 considered by many to be only a matter of time before
19 other aspects of OHA's special benefits programs will
20 be challenged in court on equal protection and other
21 civil rights grounds and ultimately found contrary to
22 law.

23 The best hope for those who favor these
24 programs is to transform them from programs that favor
25 one race or ethnicity over others, to programs that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 favor members of a tribe over non-members. As the
2 Supreme Court has held in *Morton v. Mancari*, a case
3 involving a hiring preference for tribal members at
4 the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I'm quoting
5 here, "Such a benefit is granted to Indians not as a
6 discreet racial group but rather as members of quasi-
7 sovereign tribal entities." In other words, it's not
8 race discrimination, it's discrimination on the basis
9 of tribal membership.

10 The question I hear I think boils down to
11 this: Can the United States Government and the state
12 of Hawaii achieve by indirection what they very likely
13 could not have achieved directly on account of the due
14 process clause of the Fifth Amendment and the equal
15 protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment? I
16 would respectfully submit that the answer is no.

17 Know however, that the *Mancari* decision,
18 just as an aside, is a double-edged sword. If
19 discrimination by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in
20 favor of tribal members is not race discrimination,
21 then presumably discrimination against tribal members
22 by a state government is also not race discrimination.
23 But that aside, it cannot apply to a tribal group that
24 does not yet exist. The very act of transforming
25 ethnic Hawaiians into a tribe is an act performed on a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 racial group, not a tribal group. When as here it is
2 done for the purpose of conferring very large benefits
3 on that group, it is an act of racial discrimination
4 subject to strict scrutiny; scrutiny that likely
5 cannot survive.

6 I think the best way of illustrating this
7 is simply alter the facts slightly. If the state of
8 Hawaii were operating its special benefits program for
9 whites only or for Asians only, no one would dream
10 that the United States could assist them in this
11 scheme by providing a procedure under which whites or
12 Asians could be declared a tribe. There are standards
13 for determining what is a tribe and what is not a
14 tribe. And important among them is that there be some
15 sort of political unit that has continuously existed.

16 And that is very much not the case here. And just
17 looking at the Akaka bill will illustrate that this is
18 not the case since this sets up a procedure under
19 which, for one thing, membership in the group can be
20 defined. A tribe that exists doesn't need to be told
21 by the United States Government who is in the group
22 and who isn't. They don't need a mechanism of this
23 sort. And hence, I would respectfully submit that
24 there is no tribe here.

25 Rather than speak further, I think I will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stop so that we can get on to what I suspect the
2 members of the Commission are most interested in, and
3 that their questions.

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I'd like to
5 thank the panelists. This has been enlightening.
6 This is a very important issue.

7 When it's appropriate for the state to
8 distribute benefits and burdens on the basis of race
9 or ethnicity is extremely important in a
10 constitutional sense, but also in a public policy
11 sense.

12 For me there are two questions that need
13 to be asked. First is is it constitutional? And
14 second, even if it is, is that something that we want
15 to do or is it something that we want to expand? So
16 the comments today are most appreciated.

17 And at this point I'll open up the floor
18 for questions.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: If we may have
20 a minute to question each to respond.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Would any of
22 the panelists like to pose a question to another
23 panelist?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Or respond to
25 another panelist.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Thank you. I just
2 wanted to respond to a strong point made by Professor
3 Heriot, that being her point that Congress may have
4 the authority to recognize Indian tribes but doesn't
5 have the authority to create a tribe. And as lawyers
6 are to do, I want to present two counter arguments
7 which are arguments in the alternative.

8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is why one lawyer
9 is a town is poor but two lawyers in a town are rich.

10 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: The first being
11 assuming that Native Hawaiians now are not a tribe, I
12 would point to the Supreme Court's decision in *Lara* in
13 which Justice Breyer's opinion expressly stated that
14 Congress has the authority to "restore extinguished
15 tribal status." So that language, which was written
16 in the opinion that the entire Court joined, would
17 support Congress' power to take a tribe that
18 previously existed and bring it back into existence,
19 as in the case of *Menominee*.

20 And then my second response is that it's
21 actually not clear to me that Native Hawaiians are not
22 a tribe now. I think if you ask Ms. Kalipi, she would
23 tell you that there still is a Native Hawaiian tribe.
24 That nothing that Congress or the American Government
25 could do could take away their status or destroy their

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sovereignty. And that what they're seeking is merely
2 reorganization of the tribe and federal recognition of
3 the tribe.

4 I can't speak for the Native Hawaiians,
5 but I think they would say that their sovereignty is
6 invalidable and was not taken away by the acts of 1893
7 and that what they're seeking is a reorganization and
8 recognition.

9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Professor Heriot a
10 rejoinder?

11 PROFESSOR HERIOT: Just on the Breyer
12 opinion. Breyer says that Congress has the authority
13 when we're talking about tribal status. But I think
14 what he means there is not the existence of the tribe.
15 He doesn't talk about extinguishing the tribe. But
16 status in terms of the eyes of the United States
17 Government. So I don't think he's talking about
18 anything beyond recognition.

19 Again, the *Menominee* case is the one
20 that's always pointed to. That group did not disappear
21 as a political unit. In fact, even before the
22 Restoration Act, there had already been a decision by
23 the Court that made it very clear that the Menominees
24 continued to be sovereign in the sense that they
25 continued to be exempt from Wisconsin law on issues of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fishing and hunting rights which could only be if
2 there's actually a tribe.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Ms. Kalipi?

4 MS. KALIPI: Yes. I just wanted to clarify
5 or respond to a couple of points that Mr. Burgess
6 made.

7 With respect to Senator Akaka, he has
8 never advocated that this bill would lead to secession
9 from the United States. He did an NPR interview where
10 he was asked what the future of the governing entity
11 would look like and he said my bill sets up a process.
12 That's something that will be determined by the future
13 generations of Hawaii by my grandchildren or whoever.

14 When the story was put on NPR they ran an
15 independences piece and said some of the advocates
16 even say this could lead to independence and they put
17 that quote in there. But Senator Akaka has never ever
18 said that this bill would lead to secession. His
19 position is the bill would extend the federal policy
20 of self governance and self determination, which is
21 how indigenous peoples have self governance within the
22 federal framework in the United States. So I just
23 want to make that clear for the record.

24 Second, with respect to the Morgan Report,
25 the Morgan Report has always been public as has been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Blount report. And it shows evidence of how the
2 United States has flipped-flopped, for lack of a more
3 articulate term, on dealing with Hawaii and Hawaii's
4 history.

5 As you can see, the Morgan Report said
6 that the United States remain neutral --

7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's important to say
8 what the date of the Morgan Report was?

9 MS. KALIPI: It was in the 1800s. It was--

10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: This was not something
11 that just came out?

12 MS. KALIPI: Right. No. The Blount report
13 came out, that was President Cleveland's person. And
14 then Morgan's report came out with the Senate
15 Committee on Foreign Relations after that.

16 So one report said that the United States
17 participated in the overthrow. The next report, the
18 Morgan Report said they remained neutral. Similarly,
19 in 1983 a Native Hawaiian Study Commission had a
20 majority report and a minority report. A majority
21 report saying that there was no trust relationship
22 with Native Hawaiians. The minority report saying
23 that they said that there was.

24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I ask just a
25 question about that specific point?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. KALIPI: Sure.

2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Obviously,
3 historians can differ about the role of the United
4 States.

5 MS. KALIPI: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You know in the
7 events leading to the dissolution of that government.
8 But can you just tell us your view on what the
9 relevance of that is to this? I mean, in other words
10 the decision by the United States Congress now as to
11 whether or not to recognize Native Hawaiians as a
12 separate tribe seems to me to be separate and distinct
13 from that historical question.

14 MS. KALIPI: The reason I think it's an
15 important clarification is because it goes to the
16 points being made by opponents to the bill that this
17 is a creation of a governing entity. Native Hawaiians
18 believe that the Kingdom of Hawaii was our governing
19 entity and when it was overthrown, and when we were
20 prevented from having a government structure because
21 we had a republic put upon us of which Native
22 Hawaiians were not allowed to participate and it was
23 their government, that goes directly to our argument
24 that this is a restoration of a preexisting native
25 government.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I see.

2 MS. KALIPI: So that's why we believe that
3 the clarification is very important. Not that we
4 would like to rehash what happened. What happened,
5 happened historically.

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

7 MS. KALIPI: But the reason the point is
8 important is for that very reason because there are
9 those who claim that because the Kingdom of Hawaii,
10 include non-Native Hawaiians, it was not a native
11 government, and that's why I talked about it in my
12 opening statement, Native Hawaiians were open but it
13 was clearly their government.

14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

15 MS. KALIPI: You know, and so they should
16 not be penalized for having the wisdom to have
17 processes to allow others to be part of their
18 government. And when that government gets overthrown
19 and they're no longer allowed to have that government
20 and we get to link it up with our bill, the reason we
21 have that process is because Native Hawaiians have not
22 been allowed to have that governing structure. So we
23 have to provide an opportunity for the reorganization
24 of it. And we see it as a restoration of that
25 government. And that's why I was going through that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 history.

2 So I just want to make clear that, you
3 know, if we're going to go on the flip-flops rather
4 then the current United States' position really is the
5 1993 Public Law 103-150 where Congress apologized to
6 Native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for
7 United States participation in the overthrow and
8 committed to a process of reconciliation with Native
9 Hawaiians.

10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Burgess?

11 MR. BURGESS: I'd like to respond to some
12 of those points.

13 The Kingdom of Hawaii was not a tribe.
14 The Kingdom of Hawaii was never exclusively of, by or
15 for Native Hawaiians. For example, the first
16 Constitution of the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1840 by
17 Kamehameha III, began by saying, "God
18 hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on
19 the earth, in unity." The civil codes of the Kingdom
20 of Hawaii provided that naturalized foreigners had the
21 same rights and privileges and immunities as natives.

22 By the time of the overthrow, in fact by
23 the Census of 1890, Hawaiians were in a minority of
24 the inhabitants of Hawaii. The non-natives played
25 important roles as judges, as elected officials in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 legislature, as cabinet members and as business
2 leaders.

3 So if the logic of the whole sovereignty
4 movement is to restore the Kingdom which was
5 wrongfully overthrown, then that certainly by no
6 stretch of logic could justify creating an exclusively
7 Native Hawaiian government. I mean, it would have to
8 be an inclusive government of all the people of
9 Hawaii. And that's, in effect, no different from what
10 we already have.

11 The Morgan Report is important. It's true,
12 as Commissioner Yaki said, that it has always been a
13 public document but it's not available and just a few
14 libraries have it. It's very difficult to find. Now
15 it's out there and easily accessible. And that's the
16 benefit of it. And it's really pretty good reading if
17 you're interested in the subject because you're
18 getting information from people who were there and
19 living through the days and seeing exactly what the
20 orders were to the Marines and the sailors that landed
21 that day, just as they had on previous occasions to
22 help the Kingdom of Hawaii restore order.

23 For example, after the election of King
24 Kalakaua that he was accused of corruption and the
25 supporters of Queen Emma who was his opponent in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 election, they rioted and he asked for help. And the
2 U.S. warship that was in harbor at the time sent some
3 troops in and they helped restore order. But simply
4 as peacekeepers. And that's the only role that the
5 United States played in 1893 at the time of the
6 overthrow.

7 And the Morgan Report is important because
8 the Queen surrendered but on the request that the
9 United States reinstate her to the throne. President
10 Cleveland, after he got the Blunt report, he then
11 tried to do exactly that. He sent a new Commissioner
12 Willis to Hawaii to negotiate with the Queen to
13 restore her to the throne. But he said that you
14 should agree to amnesty for the people who did the
15 overthrow. And the Queen said no. She insisted they
16 are traitors and they have to be beheaded. And she
17 finally backed down from that demand, which President
18 Cleveland couldn't very well have actually complied
19 with. She finally backed down with that demand a
20 couple of months later, but by then President
21 Cleveland had already referred it to the broader
22 discretion and judgment of the Congress. And the
23 report of the Morgan Committee is what resulted from
24 that. And President Cleveland after that accepted it
25 and moved on.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 That was not the only official
2 congressional report. Also 1983 the United States
3 Congress requested a thorough study of the events of
4 the overthrow. And again, the official study was to
5 the same conclusion; that the United States was not
6 responsible.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, I suspect
8 that Commissioner Yaki has a question or two.

9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Go ahead. I was just
10 waiting for -- we'll go by whatever order you choose
11 to go in, Mr. Chairman, is fine with me.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
13 Melendez?

14 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. For either
15 Mr. Burgess or Ms. Heriot. Thank you for coming out.

16 You argued that Congress is considering
17 establishing a race-based government. It appears,
18 however, like this legislation would put Native
19 Hawaiians on similar footing to the legal status of
20 American Indians and Alaska Natives. Do your
21 objections to sovereignty for Native Hawaiians extend
22 also to sovereignty for the Indians tribes? And how
23 can you distinguish between the groups of indigenous
24 people who all exercise sovereignty over the homelands
25 prior to the arrival of the Europeans?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 PROFESSOR HERIOT: I'll go first. No, I
2 have no objection to the status of Indians in the
3 United States or I'm not familiar with the Alaska
4 Native case. But I believe that Indian tribes
5 preexisted the United States and that the federal
6 government is fully authorized to recognize a tribe
7 that exists and is functioning. And that's fine.

8 The difference between that is that it has
9 been many, many years since there was anything
10 approaching a tribal entity in Hawaii that there is no
11 functioning tribe there now and that rather than
12 recognizing Indian tribes in the United States,
13 Congress is seeking to create a mechanism that would
14 allow a tribe to be created. And that I don't think
15 they have the authority to do.

16 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: On that same
17 question, what would your definition of a tribe be?
18 Basically because the word "tribe" basically didn't
19 come out of a Native Americans for the tribes as
20 they're called now. Actually, basically tribes in the
21 United States have certainly a self governance that
22 they demonstrated. So it may not have even been
23 European style English governments as they are since
24 the Reorganization Act of 1934. And who is to know
25 exactly how they actually operated. Maybe they were

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 similar to the way Hawaii operated as far as the queen
2 and that hierarchy. So how would you respond?

3 PROFESSOR HERIOT: Yes, I think that it's
4 actually a very interesting and very difficult
5 question about what constitutes sufficient separate
6 cultural and political existence here. It's certainly
7 true that many groups that we would call tribes had
8 very different political structures from those that
9 we're used to today, and that's fine. But there has to
10 be some continuous political unit there. There has to
11 be something which is recognizable as a political
12 structure. It can be very different from what I might
13 choose if I were in charge of the world or what we
14 might be use to, but there has to be something there.

15 And I think the tribes recognized on the mainland,
16 all of those that I'm aware of, have had some
17 political structure to them. But at this point, and
18 it has to be continuous, at this point if there was
19 ever a political structure of that sort in Hawaii, it
20 doesn't exist anymore. And what I'm saying is
21 Congress does not have the authority to go back and
22 recreate it, assuming that it existed in the first
23 place.

24 And, of course, the Kingdom of Hawaii
25 itself was very much a multiracial political unit. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 so, you know, how far do we have to go back before we
2 find an ethnic group or unit there? I'm not certain.
3 But I'm certain that it doesn't exist today.

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
5 Taylor, any questions?

6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Maybe just one or
7 two preliminary questions, and I know I don't have to
8 formally reserve the right to ask additional
9 questions, but I suspect I will have some more.

10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We're not formal
11 around here.

12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm trying to get my
13 mind around two basic concepts. One, supporters of
14 this legislation -- and I want to make sure this
15 assertion is correct. They don't take the position
16 that this just creates a racial or ethnically based
17 group, correct?

18 MS. KALIPI: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It is, indeed, a
20 tribe, right?

21 MS. KALIPI: It's a group of indigenous
22 peoples.

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Which goes to
24 the fact that -- well, if it's a group of indigenous
25 peoples must they have a recognized political system

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in place in order for this to be viable in your view?

2 MS. KALIPI: Our position is that we had a
3 political entity in place, it was overthrown. And when
4 the republic was asserted you had to swear allegiance
5 that you would not reform. So Hawaiians did the best
6 they could in terms of maintaining their communities
7 throughout without a government as others would
8 perceive a government. And what this bill would do
9 would be to recorrect that by providing a process for
10 reorganization.

11 And the fact that Congress has always
12 treated Native Hawaiians as they have with American
13 Indians and Alaska Natives.

14 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So the key question
15 is whether or not you can identify a point in time
16 where there was indeed a structure? That's in your
17 mind the key question. And if you can identify a
18 point in time where there was a structure, regardless
19 of the amount of time that has passed --

20 MS. KALIPI: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- then Congress is
22 authorized to go back and, your words, recognize or
23 restore rather than create?

24 MS. KALIPI: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let me follow up on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that. The issue of sovereignty when the Kingdom was
2 overthrown a monarchy was in place. In terms of logic
3 the monarchy is overthrown, didn't the sovereign
4 entity in place at that time, wasn't it extinguished?

5 MS. KALIPI: No.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There wasn't a
7 democracy in place at the time, so the sovereign did
8 not reside in the people since it wasn't a democracy.
9 The power of the sovereign resided in the queen?

10 MS. KALIPI: You could make that argument,
11 yes, but the Native Hawaiians believe firmly that the
12 monarchy was their government. It was similar to
13 others. Hawaiian history is a little bit different.

14 For example, in comparison to when you
15 compare the monarchies of European countries to the
16 monarchy of Hawaii, the commoners had more of a role.
17 In fact, the commoners worked for chiefs who then
18 reported up to the monarch. And the commoners could
19 move and if the commoners left that chief, the chief
20 lost power and it similarly went upscale.

21 So it was -- the Hawaiian culture and
22 tradition and form of government was different. And
23 everyone feels that it was the Hawaiian government.

24 Now I think if you were to apply the
25 western concept of a monarchy, then what you're saying

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with respect to the sovereignty of that governing
2 structure residing with the sovereign, then your
3 statement would be correct. But that's not how Native
4 Hawaiians view it.

5 And I would also pose that the type of
6 governing structure I would argue should not -- the
7 fact that we didn't have a tribal government in the
8 sense of what tribal governments looked like after
9 1934 with the Indian Reorganization Act should not be
10 held against Native Hawaiians in terms of what kind of
11 governing entity they had.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And it's not
13 going to be based raced. It would be raced on
14 ancestry. But it wouldn't work it exactly like a
15 racial preference in that non-Native Hawaiians would
16 be -- you would have the ability to treat non-Native
17 Hawaiians differently? You would be able to use
18 classifications, those who can demonstrate Native
19 Hawaiian ancestry versus those who don't? So the
20 practical effects we have here, wouldn't the effect
21 that you can maybe get a subsidized loan for a home or
22 a car or to get an allotment, that would continue
23 unabated? I have family who have lived in Hawaii for
24 22 years. They would still be ineligible for those
25 benefits?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. KALIPI: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

3 MS. KALIPI: But I'd like to also make the
4 clarifications that our position is that that's based
5 on the political and legal relationship that the
6 United States has with Native Hawaiians as an
7 indigenous group, again going back to the fact that
8 they had a preexisting government which is the whole
9 basis of what we're talking about.

10 Second, I just want to make clear in terms
11 of the processes in this bill. I think it's easy to
12 jump to conclusions or assumptions about what this
13 government will look like and what supposed
14 entitlement or benefits and services will look like
15 when, in fact, the bill defines Native Hawaiian for
16 the sole purpose of identifying who can participate in
17 the reorganization of the government, which I think is
18 an important clarification.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: One follow-up
20 preliminary question.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, Commissioner
22 Thernstrom.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Maybe in my own
24 mind I want some help on two very basic issues.
25 Native people, indigenous people, and the government

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 or political entity you are seeking to "restore," they
2 sound different to me. The government that was in
3 place did not sound like it was a government
4 exclusively of Native Hawaiians.

5 MS. KALIPI: It wasn't.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So how are you
7 then restoring that --

8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would clarify. I
9 would say at the time of dissolution it was not.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It was not?

11 MS. KALIPI: This is how I would clarify
12 it. With respect to Mr. Burgess' comments regarding
13 the Census if you look solely at the Census in 18 -- I
14 think it's between 1880 and 1893, right before the
15 overthrown, Hawaiians I think you could extrapolate
16 and say Hawaiians were only 40 percent of the Kingdom.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

18 MS. KALIPI: The context of that is that
19 we were in a period of influx with respect to sugar
20 plantations and we had thousands and thousands of
21 immigrant workers from China, Philippines, Japan and
22 Portugal and they were included in that Census.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: In that Census.

24 MS. KALIPI: They were not participants in
25 the government. Not all of them were participants in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the government. In fact for a long time Japanese and
2 Chinese immigrants were not allowed to participate and
3 were discriminated against.

4 So everything has to be looked at in terms
5 of context. If you were to make that assertion and
6 look closely at it, Native Hawaiians were still the
7 majority of people participating and it was still
8 their government.

9 Now with respect to your question that
10 goes back to what I said in my opening statement,
11 which was it was a native government; whether or not
12 it's a monarchy or albeit it a different form of what
13 people have conceptualized a tribal government ought
14 to be or may be, but this native governing entity made
15 its own decision as to how it would allow foreigners
16 to participate.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

18 MS. KALIPI: And so my position and point
19 is that because --

20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: They kind of came on
21 visas.

22 MS. KALIPI: Because this government had
23 that mechanism that didn't make that government non-
24 native.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. So as a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 policy matter then are you expressing a judgment on
2 the appropriateness of establishing a new government
3 through this reorganization process that would have
4 the ability to say we are seeking to restore a
5 government that at the time admitted foreigners, we
6 may choose not to admit them? I mean is --

7 MS. KALIPI: The process allows the Native
8 Hawaiians --

9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: To do that?

10 MS. KALIPI: -- to decide if they want to
11 or they don't want to.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean just as
13 a supporter of the bill, is that a good thing in your
14 view or a bad thing?

15 MS. KALIPI: I think that's a good thing.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

17 MS. KALIPI: Because when you look at the
18 history in Indian law and you look at the reason we're
19 doing this with respect to the political and legal
20 relationship and the ideals of the federal policy of
21 self governance and self determination for indigenous
22 peoples it's a decision that indigenous peoples are to
23 make.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chairman?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow?

2 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.

3 I first want to, again, thank the staff
4 for putting together a splendid panel.

5 I've got a number of questions, but I'll
6 just ask one for now. And this is directed at anyone,
7 but I think it's probably best directed at Professor
8 Heriot and Mr. Bartolomucci. This is a subpart
9 question.

10 Would a discrimination statute such as
11 Title VII and its progeny and/or sovereign immunity
12 apply to this sovereign governing entity if this
13 Senate bill 147, I think it is, were to pass?

14 PROFESSOR HERIOT: If the bill were to
15 pass in the condition that it's in right now,
16 presumably there would be some level of sovereign
17 immunity on the part of the tribe. There is an
18 amendment that is being considered that would
19 specifically subject the governing entity to the
20 United States Constitution and to federal anti-
21 discrimination laws. That same proposed amendment
22 would clarify the sovereign immunity issue as well.

23 Just reading from the operative sentence
24 here, this amendment would include a sentence "The
25 Native Hawaiian governing entity and citizens of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Native Hawaiian governing entity shall be subject to
2 liability in any court of the state of Hawaii in an
3 action in tort by a person who is not a citizen of the
4 Native Hawaiian governing entity to the same extent
5 that the state and the citizens of the state would be
6 subject to liability. in such an action."

7 So there's an amendment out there that
8 might address itself to your question.

9 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's the Kyl
10 Amendment?

11 PROFESSOR HERIOT: I believe this was done
12 by Kyl's office.

13 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: With that such
14 amendment do you believe that there would be Title VII
15 application to the affairs of the governing entity.

16 PROFESSOR HERIOT: If this amendment is
17 not included?

18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right.

19 PROFESSOR HERIOT: If the amendment is not
20 included, presumably the tribe is not subject to
21 federal anti-discrimination laws.

22 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And one practical
23 question. The bill has a definition for Native
24 Hawaiian that deals with lineal descendants and it has
25 dates in there with respect to who is considered to be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Native Hawaiian as a result of lineal descendency.
2 And just a practical question. Is there some type of
3 registry as to who was considered a Native Hawaiian in
4 1893, I think is the one date and then the other date
5 is 1921 for the Hawaii Homes Commission Act? Is there
6 some kind of registry that had identified who was a
7 Native Hawaiian at that time so that lineal
8 descendants can be identified? That's the first
9 question. And a subpart to that is if in fact there
10 is some means by which to identify that person, is the
11 one drop rule in effect? In other words, if the lineal
12 descendent is one who by virtue of intermarriage would
13 still be considered a Native Hawaiian even though
14 they're one thirty-second Native Hawaiian? There used
15 to be the old -- that for example identified someone
16 who is black if they're great, great, great
17 grandfather was black and everyone else was white.

18 And that's directed to anyone on the panel
19 who wishes to answer.

20 MS. KALIPI: I'd just like to make one
21 quick clarification on Professor Heriot. The
22 amendments that are in your packet were drafted by
23 Senator Kyl before the substitute amendment was
24 negotiated with the Administration. So the substitute
25 amendment has sovereign immunity provisions in it. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I would direct -- and it's sovereign immunity for the
2 federal government and for the state government.

3 In addition --

4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. Where
5 do we find the substitute amendment.

6 MS. KALIPI: The substitute is in your
7 packet on the left side right behind that factsheet,
8 ma'am.

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

10 MS. KALIPI: That's the substitute
11 amendment.

12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And this is
13 supported by the current Administration?

14 MS. KALIPI: It was negotiated with the
15 Department of Justice, White House and Office of
16 Management and Budget. And it addresses the concerns
17 that they raised in their letter to Senators McCain
18 and Dorgan.

19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. And I'm
20 sorry, when did that language come out?

21 MS. KALIPI: That was in September.

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This one came out
23 in September?

24 MS. KALIPI: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The letter that
2 Senator Kyl received also had a paragraph discussing
3 some constitutional concerns.

4 MS. KALIPI: Yes. This amendment reflects
5 negotiated language that could address anything short
6 of ideology.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So the constitutional
8 concerns that --

9 MS. KALIPI: Right. The constitutional
10 concerns are still out there in terms of the
11 ideological question of does Congress have the right
12 to recognize Native Hawaiians as an indigenous people.

13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: The sovereign immunity
14 section was actually negotiated --

15 MS. KALIPI: Right. Right.

16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- and put into the
17 amendment, which was the second part of the Kyl.

18 MS. KALIPI: But the sovereign immunity
19 provisions related to the federal and state
20 governments were included in the substitute and are on
21 pages 39 and 40 for your reference. I just want to
22 make that clarification.

23 In addition, the bill provides on page 34
24 of the substitute for the protection of the civil
25 rights of members of the entity and those affected by

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the entity. And the bill had always provided that.

2 When the Secretary certifies the organic
3 governing documents of this entity, one of the
4 requirements is that the organic governing documents
5 have to provide for the protection of the civil rights
6 of the citizens of the governing entity and all
7 persons affected by the exercise of governmental
8 powers and authorities by the Native Hawaiian
9 governing entity. So I would just like to make that
10 clarification.

11 With respect to the registry --

12 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Wait a minute.

13 I don't think that answers Commissioner Kirsanow's
14 question about the application, for instance, the '64
15 Civil Rights Act, Title VII, whatever. I mean, I
16 think the answer is no to that. It doesn't answer
17 that problem.

18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Or it's left open to
19 the government to decide.

20 MS. KALIPI: It's left open to the
21 governing entity as part of the process, ma'am, in
22 developing its organic governing documents with the
23 Secretary of the Interior having the check on it.

24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So that governing
25 entity could opt into the civil rights protections

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that all other Americans enjoy or --

2 MS. KALIPI: Or not. That would be up to
3 the entity and the Secretary of the Interior in making
4 the certification would have to comply with this
5 requirement. So if the Secretary of the Interior
6 determined that the organic governing documents did
7 not meet this -- what I'm quoting on page 34 on lines
8 1 through 6 of the substitute, then she could not
9 certify the entity and not provide federal
10 recognition.

11 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Before we get
12 away, I want someone to answer the question about the
13 one drop rule.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, I do, too.
15 I was about to say that question was never answered.

16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

17 MR. BURGESS: Could I take a try at that?

18 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And can I just
19 add that, you know, it seems to me we got a semitic
20 little dance here about racial groups and tribal
21 groups. And, I mean, the definition here of the
22 tribal group is a one drop of blood definition.

23 Now Mr. Burgess was about to speak.

24 MR. BURGESS: Okay. The definition in the
25 Akaka bill, the shorthand for it is that anyone with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 an indigenous ancestor, no matter how remote, is
2 eligible.. Whether it was 1921 or 1893 it says on --
3 who had directly a descendent of someone who resided
4 in the Hawaiian Islands on or before 1893. So that
5 could go back as far as you want to go. And it could
6 include anybody with one five hundredths. They would
7 be eligible to participate in the creation of the new
8 government.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But it's anybody
11 who resided on the island at that time? So it could
12 be somebody who is white?

13 PROFESSOR HERIOT: No.

14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No?

15 MR. BURGESS: I could be --

16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait. I want to
17 hear--

18 MR. BURGESS: If somebody could establish
19 who was white now, could establish that he or she has
20 an ancestor --

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I'm not
22 interested in what they look like now.

23 MR. BURGESS: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm interested in
25 what group of people from the 1800s it applies to. In

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 other words if 60 percent of the Islands was not
2 native, do the direct lineal descendants of those
3 people, they're not covered?

4 MR. BURGESS: No, no. No, they're not
5 indigenous.

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

7 MR. BURGESS: It's only people who are in
8 indigenous.

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And see, that goes
11 to my question how would you establish that one is a
12 lineal descendent of someone who is a Native Hawaiian?
13 Was there some central registry or is this thing
14 something that could possibly be subject to fraud?
15 Can people buy into it, as has been the case in other
16 tribal cases? How does one establish that Joe Smith
17 in 2006 was a lineal descendent of a beautiful
18 Hawaiian as of 1893 or whatever the other date
19 mentioned, '21 I think it is, was?

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commission Yaki
21 is going to answer your question.

22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki is
23 going to answer your question and start in on his
24 questions.

25 First, I want to say a warm aloha to the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 members of the Hawaiian community who have joined us
2 in this room.

3 And actually your question, Peter, is one
4 I wanted to address because it directly effects me.
5 My grandfather was born on the Island of Hana. And he
6 told us throughout his life, he was put in an
7 orphanage when he was young. And he said the reason
8 he was put in an orphanage was that his mother had
9 died and his mother was Hawaiian. But the records of
10 that orphanage were burnt to the ground in a fire, so
11 I have no idea if I am one eighth or whatever, but all
12 I do know is that as of now I cannot claim to be
13 kanaka maoli or a Native Hawaiian, but I can tell you
14 that as someone who goes to the Islands frequently, I
15 think of it as home.

16 Part of I think the struggle that
17 conceptually we're having here is because in addition
18 to the normal role that we have in talking about
19 traditional civil rights, Title VII, Title VI, Title
20 IX Voting Rights Act, you name it, we are now dealing
21 with the civil rights of indigenous peoples who form
22 the backdrop for one of the less sanguine aspects of
23 our nation's history. And in attempting to repair the
24 damage done during those times, the federal government
25 using its plenary authority under the Indian Commerce

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Clause and the Treaty Clause has created a special
2 status, sovereign status within this country for
3 Native American tribes.

4 Now, let's all be realistic here. The
5 nomenclature that we're talking about is uniquely
6 derived from western culture. If Columbus hadn't taken
7 a wrong turn and thought he was in the East Indies, we
8 would probably be using a much different term nowadays
9 to talk about Native American indigenous peoples here.

10 But when we talk about tribes, when we talk about
11 Indians and when we look to the words of the founders,
12 I think we have to look to take them in the context of
13 what they were seeing at the time, and those were the
14 people who were native and on the land at the time.

15 In the subsequent years through '34,
16 through the other acts that this government has
17 established to attempt to right some of the wrongs
18 done to Native Americans over the past, they have
19 created this unique and, albeit limited as exhibits in
20 the *Lara* court that the Congress has the ability to
21 limit or expand sovereignty as it sees fit, but it has
22 created this limited sovereignty between Indian
23 organizations, and they call them tribe, they call
24 them nations, I would simply call them sovereigns and
25 the United States Government.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So when Commissioner Kirsanow asked the
2 question about Title VII, you know the question to ask
3 is well what is the application of these laws right
4 now as it relates to the sovereign status of Native
5 American governments. And I think that the question
6 right now, I think Professor Heriot has talked about
7 how there's been some struggle and some tension over
8 the application of these laws, but for right now a
9 number of courts have said that a number of the laws
10 that normally would apply to every citizen including,
11 perhaps, some of our civil rights laws, may or may not
12 extend to those tribal sovereigns that the United
13 States has negotiated a treaty.

14 I think the questions that to me I want to
15 ask go to that. Because I think we're getting bogged
16 down in this semantic definition of what is a tribe or
17 what is a Hawaiian. To me we wouldn't be having this
18 debate if it were not for, quite frankly, the aloha
19 spirit of the Hawaiian people over the years. If the
20 Great King Kamehameha, if King Kalakaua, if Queen
21 Liluokalani had decided that we're going to get a
22 bunch of guns and get these people out of here because
23 we're just sick and tired of the fact that our lands
24 are being transferred and we have no property rights,
25 and the only people that get to vote are the people

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that came here afterwards, and they lost and they
2 exiled to Niihau, we wouldn't be having this
3 discussion. It would be very clear what would have
4 happened. They would have been isolated, put into a
5 remote area. And we all know how little habitable an
6 area of land there is in Hawaii. We wouldn't be
7 having this discussion. It would be very neat and
8 clear. It would be of question of, who knows, maybe
9 we'd have a big casino on Niihau by now. But that's
10 not what happened. That's not what the Hawaiians
11 chose to do.

12 And by penalizing the Hawaiians, by making
13 them neither fish or fowl, by saying that they're not
14 a tribe nor or they really even native Hawaiians, I
15 think is uniquely unfair given the fact that they
16 simply chose a different path. They chose peaceful
17 resistance, peaceful abdication rather than --

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's just --

19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I'm just saying,
20 the question is -- there is question here. The
21 question --

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, what is the
23 question, Senator Biden?

24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: If I were Senator
25 Biden, I would be reading -- oh, never mind.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 But the question is there's a lot of talk
2 about what this bill could lead to. But the fact is
3 that this bill is really only just a process for
4 something. And I would like for the elucidation for
5 this Commission, I would direct this question to Ms.
6 Kalipi. Does this bill create divisiveness? Does it
7 create the prospect that Waikiki is going to become,
8 you know, some other type of land? Does it transfer
9 any new assets into this entity? And more
10 importantly, what is the process that it really is
11 setting up so we understand how far away we are from
12 the parade of horrors that people are talking about
13 here?

14 MS. KALIPI: The processes in the bill
15 provide -- well, first of all to answer your question,
16 with respect to divisiveness, we don't believe the
17 bill would be divisive.

18 The vast majority of people, whether
19 they're Native Hawaiians or non-Native Hawaiian in
20 Hawaii appreciate Hawaiian culture, support Hawaiian
21 culture and support the preservation of the culture
22 and traditions. For that reason, almost every elected
23 official in the state of Hawaii has come out in
24 support of this bill. And for that reason the bill,
25 even on the national level, is largely bipartisan.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'm pleased to see Senator Murkowski's staff here, and
2 Senator Murkowski is a strong supporter of our
3 legislation.

4 The reason that it doesn't lead to
5 divisiveness is because the bill provides a process
6 and a structured process to finally allow the people
7 of Hawaii, native and non-native, to begin to discuss
8 the longstanding issues resulting from the overthrow
9 of the Kingdom of Hawaii. What's happened since the
10 overthrow is that there was a lot of pressure to be
11 western. So, for example, Senator Akaka as a child
12 was told you cannot speak Hawaiian, you need to speak
13 English. You need to not make trouble, don't raise
14 these issues. Just fit in with the way everything is.

15 And as we've gone through, we're now two
16 or three generations past the people who actually
17 experienced the overthrow, we have a younger
18 generation of Native Hawaiians who look back at the
19 history and say wait a minute, why didn't we resolve
20 this. And non-Native Hawaiians as well. Some who
21 support Native Hawaiians and some who don't who say
22 why haven't we discussed this, why is this still
23 hanging out there. And we have a lot of
24 misunderstanding, a lot of mistrust and we have a
25 situation where it's not harmonious. We have a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people arguing and debating these issues.

2 So Senator Akaka's position is this bill
3 provides the process for the people of Hawaii to begin
4 to have a structured process to address these issues
5 and not to -- his position would be if we don't pass
6 the bill, we'll have more divisiveness.

7 Now with respect to the second part of the
8 question, the second part of the question goes to will
9 there be an immediate transfer of land if this bill is
10 enacted? No, there won't. Nothing happens except
11 that first the governing entity is reorganized and, I
12 might add, the bill provides several checks for the
13 federal government to be satisfied before federal
14 recognition can even be conferred on the resulting
15 reorganized governing entity, which in the Native
16 Hawaiian's opinion, is not the best situation.

17 And second, upon federal recognition the
18 governing entity then has to negotiate any proposed
19 transfer of lands and authority to the governing
20 entity. Following that enabling legislation at the
21 federal and state levels have to be passed before
22 anything can be transferred to the governing entity.

23 So, again, when we hit on process the
24 reason we have this process is to be as inclusive as
25 possible to allow the people of Hawaii, both native

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and non-native, to participate and to determine the
2 outcome with the idea that we're bringing the state
3 closer together and allowing the state as a whole to
4 move forward.

5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If I could, I
6 still have not gotten an answer to the second part of
7 my question, that is how do we identify a Native
8 Hawaiian? I made reference to whether or not there
9 was a registry, and I know there are many vehicles
10 that can be employed to try to establish that lineal
11 descendent.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow,
13 I think that we have a response coming from Mr.
14 Bartolomucci.

15 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Yes. I wanted to point
16 out that the definition in the bill is not the
17 definition of who is a member of the Native Hawaiian
18 entity. It is merely the definition that is used to
19 establish an initial role of persons eligible then to
20 vote for an interim governing council. .It's a well
21 established principle of Indian law that it's up to a
22 tribe to decide for itself who are the members of the
23 tribe. And that is what will happen here.

24 The bill calls for the Secretary of the
25 Interior to create a commission of experts in the area

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of determining Native Hawaiian ancestry and lineal
2 descendency. And that commission will be responsible
3 for establishing criteria for fitting the definition
4 and deciding whether people do fall within the
5 definition. Once that role is established, those
6 folks will have the initial election to determine an
7 interim council. But it will be later in the process
8 that the Native Hawaiians will themselves decide who
9 should be in the entity and what is the test?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So in other
11 words you're going to have experts decide who has one
12 drop of blood? Isn't that what it amounts to?

13 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: You'll have experts
14 decide who meets this definition of do I have an
15 ancestor who fits with the definition.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: People who have
17 the right blood? But Gail wanted to say something.

18 PROFESSOR HERIOT: I wanted to say several
19 things. One, I wanted to comment back here on the
20 notion of the parade of horrors, will that occur.

21 The parade of horrors is already in
22 place. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs already is
23 managing a huge program of special benefits based on
24 Hawaiian ethnicity. And this is simply an attempt to
25 recast those benefits that already exist in terms that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are not specifically racially. But I would --

2 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But you conceded in
3 your testimony that if these were benefits given by a
4 sovereign tribal government, there wouldn't be these
5 kinds of questions asked.

6 PROFESSOR HERIOT: But that's the point.
7 In order to create that sovereign tribal entity, the
8 Act has to work on a racial group. If a group existed
9 before, then it would not be a group that the United
10 States is recognizing based on race. They'd be
11 recognized based on sovereignty that exists. But you
12 can't hand sovereignty someone and then say from now
13 on I'm giving you these further benefits because
14 you're a sovereign.

15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But that is seen--

16 PROFESSOR HERIOT: The original gift of
17 sovereignty --

18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But if you took
19 sovereignty from them, can't you give it back?

20 PROFESSOR HERIOT: It has to be
21 continuous.

22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Why?

23 PROFESSOR HERIOT: Because that's what the
24 law says.

25 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But let me ask you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this question: You say that it has to be continuous.

2 PROFESSOR HERIOT: Congress doesn't have
3 any authority otherwise.

4 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Congress, I think, has
5 plenty authority to decide in what constitutes a tribe
6 for the purposes of its ability to determination
7 recognition. I think that here we can -- I mean,
8 again, I hate the fact that we keep on using the word
9 "tribe." We are talking about an indigenous peoples
10 who came to these islands thousands of years ago who
11 had a community there, who anthropologists have said--

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki,
13 doesn't the Constitution discuss tribes, not
14 aboriginal people?

15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And by inflating the
17 history of Native Hawaiians --

18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the Constitution
19 was written in 1787 by people who decided to call them
20 tribes and Indians. And it also made
21 characterizations of other ethnic groups that we don't
22 deal with anymore.

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The Constitution --

24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: The Constitution has
25 changed has we characterize people, how we treat them.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 How we decide they're not three-fifths anymore has
2 evolved over time. So all I'm saying is get away from
3 the idea that we're tribes and into the fact of the
4 mindset --

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If we get away from
6 the nomenclature --

7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- where here who
8 lived here by themselves.

9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If you agree that
10 Native Hawaiians have a different history and a
11 different relationship with the U.S. Government, and I
12 would like to suggest that because of this different
13 history that that may justify different treatments.
14 In one case you may recognize a tribe and another you
15 may not recognize the Native Hawaiian people.

16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, maybe the
17 fortunate part was that they were on an island and
18 they really couldn't force them off a thousand miles
19 off of their normal, they're native grounds like we
20 did to the Native Americans in this country. And maybe
21 because of the way that the Hawaiian peoples are, that
22 didn't become an option.

23 The fact, though, is that there was an
24 organic government in there over time that if you read
25 the history became slowly -- I'm not going to say the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 words I want to say, but changed over time. And then
2 when it become completely inconvenient to have them
3 around, we went in and knocked it out to the point
4 where, you know, a hundred years later the United
5 States Government has officially apologized for that
6 unless, of course, we're denying that Congress ever
7 apologized for that act in the first place, which one
8 of our speakers seems to believe.

9 I mean, the idea that you cannot call
10 Native Hawaiians indigenous peoples for the purposes
11 of the Commerce Clause and the Treaty Clause I think
12 is just not reading history and not reading -- I mean,
13 it's just not reading history correctly.

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras?

15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a couple of
16 narrow questions. But just to respond to my colleague
17 here and his statement about the nomenclature that we
18 use to discuss these issues. The fact of the matter
19 is when you're dealing with a constitutional or legal
20 question you have to deal with the text as written.
21 And we all understand that the Constitution was
22 written by dead white men and that some of the terms
23 that they used or the things they put into place may
24 not be palatable to us today. But that is what the
25 amendment process is for. We have amended the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Constitution numerous times. And the bottom line is
2 unless you're willing to say that you don't want to be
3 ruled by the Constitution because you don't like the
4 nomenclature or use it, then you have to deal with the
5 text as written. If the text says tribes, the text
6 says tribes. So I'll get off the soapbox now about
7 that.

8 But a question for Mr. Bartolomucci. Your
9 remarks were very carefully limited to the
10 congressional authority to pass this legislation. And
11 I'm curious if you can give us a brief synopsis of
12 your views of the propriety of the legislation,
13 putting aside Congress' ability to do this? Is this a
14 good thing for our country?

15 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Well, as I've
16 indicated, what I did was study the legal issue of
17 Congress' authority. And I haven't opined upon
18 whether it's something Congress should adopt.

19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I know. But I'm
20 asking you to opine.

21 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Yes. Well, I want to
22 make this point. And I was struck by this when
23 Professor Heriot was making her point that well it's
24 okay to treat as a tribe a group that's had a
25 continuous existence, but not one that ended as a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tribe. And her point basically is you can't bring
2 them back. But, I find this somewhat ironic that it's
3 okay to treat as Indian tribes, those tribes that we
4 pushed off their lands and put into reservations. But
5 if we went even further and we took away their
6 sovereignty, if we overthrew a monarchy, if we did
7 even more then we can't treat them as a tribe, we
8 can't give fairness to that kind of group?

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And that's exactly
10 why I want to get away from the semantic question of
11 what is a tribe and go to the heart of the matter,
12 which is simply is this piece of legislation something
13 that's, in your view, good or bad for America?

14 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Well, I think there's a
15 strong case to be made on equality grounds that Native
16 Hawaiians ought to be treated the same as Native
17 Alaskans or American Indians. No one doubts that
18 Congress can and should treat Native Alaskans like it
19 should, Indians in the lower 48 states. Yet Native
20 Alaskans are very dissimilar culturally, ethnically --

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I guess what I'm
22 getting at is do we want to increase and further
23 perpetuate a system whereby certain groups are treated
24 differently than others and there's a reason why they
25 are, I understand that, but is that a system that we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 want to extend and expand as a policy matter?

2 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Well, you know, if
3 you're making a slippery slope argument --

4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not making any
5 argument. I'm just asking you whether in your view
6 that's a system that should be expanded and if so,
7 why.

8 MR. BARTOLOMUCCI: Well, I think it could
9 be expanded to Native Hawaiians with some justice. But
10 anticipating a possible slippery slope argument, I
11 don't think it could go beyond Native Hawaiians. I
12 think they are the last indigenous group in America.

13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What about Native
14 Puerto Ricans? I mean, the situation in Puerto Rico
15 is quite different, but there were indigenous peoples
16 on the island. They were killed off quite rapidly,
17 unfortunately. But presumably there are Puerto Ricans
18 to this day who can trace their lineage to the native
19 peoples on that island. Puerto Rico is very much a
20 mixed culture today of Spanish and African and some
21 indigenous cultural aspects. So how does that differ
22 or doesn't it?

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does inherent
24 sovereignty remain in Puerto Rico?

25 MS. KALIPI: If I may, ma'am, it's because

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Puerto Rico is still a territory which is why, as a
2 Congress, we're still dealing with what they want
3 their political status to be, which is why they keep
4 having their referendums of whether they're going to
5 be a state of a commonwealth. I would make the same
6 case for Guam and American Samoa.

7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I understand.

8 And I believe this Commission is going to be looking
9 into that very question later on. But as a
10 theoretical matter, I understand that Puerto Rico's
11 political status is still undecided. But let's just
12 for the sake of argument hypothesize that Puerto Rico
13 became a state. Is there an argument to be made that
14 the people who can trace their heritage, Puerto Ricans
15 who can trace their heritage back to the indigenous
16 peoples of the island should be given a tribe by
17 Congress? Would you view that as difference or not?

18 MS. KALIPI: In the context of what we are
19 advocating with respect to indigenous peoples, I'm not
20 unfortunately familiar with Puerto Rico's history so I
21 don't know, you know, if there was a Puerto Rican
22 government or if they were a part of the Spain. I
23 apologize for --

24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I guess that's
25 what I'm getting to. Does the argument for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 recognition of tribal status depend on the particular
2 history, the political history of the territory and
3 how it was incorporated or does it depend strictly on
4 racial affiliation, custom, culture, culture
5 identification? Because clearly in Puerto Rico, I
6 mean the Puerto Ricans could vote tomorrow to become a
7 state, but that wouldn't take away a cultural sense of
8 community or cultural ties to indigenous traditions
9 and rights. And so I'm trying to figure out what the
10 determination hinges on. Does it hinge on cultural
11 identity or does it hinge on political history?

12 MS. KALIPI: In my view it hinges on both.
13 Because the United States policy of self governance
14 and self determination with indigenous peoples is
15 based on the political and legal relationship the
16 United States has with the preexisting sovereign
17 entity that was there before the United States took
18 that land and took over that area. So it would depend
19 on what the political entity was at the time and how
20 the history played into it. So my answer is it would
21 depend on both of those issues.

22 And in your scenario in your hypothetical
23 if Puerto Rico's history is similar to ours with
24 respect to the fact that they are indigenous peoples
25 whose government was overthrown and who had a native

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 government and the United States has dealt with those
2 indigenous peoples through a political and legal
3 relationship, then yes. But it's in your
4 hypothetical.

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think it's very
6 different in that sense. But it seemed that at least
7 my colleague Commissioner Yaki was suggesting that the
8 critical question was really not whether we call them
9 a tribe or whether they had a political governing
10 structure, but whether they were indigenous and
11 whether they are culturally connected. And if that's
12 the case, I see no reason why Puerto Ricans don't fall
13 into that category.

14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: With due respect --

15 MR. BURGESS: Could I jump in,
16 Commissioner Braceras.

17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I need to respond.

18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: With due respect to
20 Commissioner Braceras, that wasn't my point at all. My
21 point was that we have a situation where you had an
22 indigenous sovereign government that was dissolved by
23 the United States for its own purposes. I never have
24 said -- I mean, to me it's silly to almost talk about
25 the issue of race here because certainly no one who

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 practices Native American Indian law, whatever it's
2 called nowadays, can say that the recognition of these
3 tribes is not based in part of on the fact that they
4 are ethnically a part and the fact that they are
5 culturally and as a cohesive group apart from what
6 government later came to take their land. The
7 same situation as here with Hawaii.

8 I think I would like to hear one of the
9 things that sort of creates the trail, I think, of how
10 the government has over the years tried to understand
11 its obligations to the Native Hawaiians has been for
12 example, the Hawaiian -- is the Hawaiian Homestead --

13 MS. KALIPI: Hawaii Homes Commission Act.

14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Hawaii Homes
15 Commission Act, which was required to be part of the--
16 its continuance was a condition for admission into the
17 Union. Various acts with Congress over time I think
18 you reference in your testimony have continued to talk
19 about the indigenous peoples of Hawaii and the
20 responsibility of the government.

21 Can anyone elaborate on those facts,
22 because I think that would also help create the trail
23 of responsibility?

24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, Mr.
25 Burgess wanted to respond. So before we go on to your

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 question --

2 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- I'd like to give
4 him an opportunity to respond.

5 MR. BURGESS: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman.

7 A lot has been said that I think is just
8 really incorrect. Indigenusness has no status and no
9 effect at all under the Constitution. The
10 Constitution doesn't mention indigenous. The very
11 same arguments that I've heard advanced here today
12 were made in the *Rice* case before the Supreme Court.
13 And the argument was made that all indigenous people,
14 whether they're a tribe or not, are entitled to have a
15 special relationship, and the Supreme Court just did
16 not accept that.

17 PROFESSOR HERIOT: Right.

18 MR. BURGESS: They simply decided without
19 out.

20 The same argument was made in *Arakaki v.*
21 *State*, which was our first lawsuit. And, again, the
22 Court just rejected it because being indigenous has no
23 effect under the laws of the United States.

24 There is an international movement to
25 declare the rights of indigenous people. That has not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 been adopted by the United States. And the problem
2 and the real danger of the Akaka bill is that it would
3 immediately, as soon as it passes if it does and
4 becomes law, it would recognize a new privileged elite
5 in America consisting of anyone with an indigenous
6 ancestor. Not just Native Hawaiians. That's one of
7 the findings that would become effective immediately
8 when the bill is passed. And that would have drastic
9 consequences. It would bring about a radical change
10 in Indian law.

11 Anyway indigenous to the lands that are
12 now part of the United States would then have a right
13 of self government and presumably, they would have the
14 right to have the federal government assist them in
15 creating their own new separate government. That would
16 apply to Puerto Rico. It would certainly apply to any
17 indigenous people living anywhere in the United
18 States. And that would certainly include the Aztlan
19 Movement, Mexicans who are seeking to liberate the
20 southwestern part of the United States. It would
21 apply to Indians who are now a part of the mainstream
22 that don't participate as members of tribes. But they
23 would then arguably simply because of being
24 indigenous, they would have the right for self
25 determination. I think that's the potential of this,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of this bill. It's indeed a radical change. It would
2 ultimately lead to the breaking up of every state and
3 I think ultimately to, you know, what would happen.
4 You know, where does it end? What would become of the
5 indivisible Union composed of indestructible states?

6 I'd like to, if I may, also address a
7 question that you mentioned, Mr. Chairman. A
8 distinction between race and ancestry. In the *Rice*
9 decision one of the points was that the definitions of
10 Hawaiian are based on ancestry. But the United States
11 said you're using ancestry as a proxy for race. And
12 that's exactly the same use of ancestry here.

13 So although it's called ancestry instead
14 of race in the Akaka bill, it's basically racial
15 discrimination that's contemplated by the Akaka bill.

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
17 Yaki, you were about to pose a question?

18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. I already posed a
19 question.

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I wondered,
22 Commissioner Yaki, do you have any thoughts on what he
23 just said? I'm wondering relative to the movement in
24 the west and would we recognize a unique status for
25 indigenous people if this were to pass?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. KALIPI: I'd like to make a
2 distinction.

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.

4 MS. KALIPI: And the distinction is that
5 Congress has passed 160 laws and statutes to address
6 the conditions of Native Hawaiians. Congress has
7 established political and legal relationship with
8 Native Hawaiians since the time that we were a
9 territory. And this bill just, again, formalizes that
10 political and legal relationship. That's a big
11 distinction then from making a jump to the idea that
12 any indigenous peoples with which Congress hasn't had
13 this kind of historical political and legal
14 relationship with would have the ability to create a
15 government which goes to, I think, what Chris was
16 saying in response to Commissioner Bracer's question
17 in terms of Hawaiians probably being the last
18 indigenous group that would be able to comply with
19 this.

20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: You raise an
21 interesting point in my mind. Because what you have
22 just said indicates to me that for your purpose at
23 least the fact that we're talking about indigenous
24 people is important, but what's more important is that
25 the federal government decided to deal with this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 group. So that it's decision not to deal with other
2 indigenous people in my view would be somewhat
3 arbitrary if I were thinking about this issue. Why are
4 they dealing with this indigenous group and not
5 others? And does that make sense? Why aren't they
6 dealing with those indigenous people if that is an
7 important characteristic?

8 So what do we say to the next indigenous
9 group of folks that have not been dealt with by the
10 federal government? Why?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Or the next
12 group that calls themselves --

13 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's my
14 fundamental question. If this is really important
15 relative to the status of a group being indigenous, if
16 that's important, then shouldn't we apply that same
17 principle to every indigenous group whether or not the
18 federal government has decided to engage them or not?

19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, actually, the
20 federal government does apply that principle to many
21 groups. You'll find that there are many organizations,
22 individuals who say that they are members of this
23 tribe or that tribe who have not been recognized yet,
24 do not enjoy sovereignty, have to go through a very
25 lengthy process through the Bureau of Indians Affairs,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 correct, in order to get that established. But, I
2 mean, we could make the argument all day about whether
3 or not we're omitting group one, group two, group
4 three. The fact is that as the representative from
5 Senator Akaka's office pointed out, the U.S.
6 Government in a kind of half way there kind of
7 attitude attempted to provide some sort of semi-
8 recognition to the fact that would it did in the
9 Hawaiian Islands was something that it was not
10 entirely comfortable with and to the Hawaiian peoples.
11 The Akaka bill, and let's just focus on the Akaka bill
12 because that is the focus of this discussion, is
13 simply to complete the process of creating the
14 recognition between the two. It does not predetermine
15 what the outcomes are, it does not predetermine who
16 will be part of that outcome and does not predetermine
17 what are the results of that outcome. It is simply to
18 say we have basically ignored or neglected this
19 decision since 1893 and beyond. We decided to punt it
20 during statehood admission as well. And now, you know,
21 finally as the government has become more progressive
22 in its attitudes toward its native indigenous peoples
23 to the tribes who exist, that perhaps we should accord
24 the same respect and recognition to a peoples who were
25 in 1778 a wholly indigenous, wholly insular society

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and who in 1893 whose government we decided was no
2 longer useful to us.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Vice Chair
4 Thernstrom?

5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I believe in
6 1959 Hawaii joined the United States with an
7 overwhelming vote that Hawaiians wanted to become
8 Americans. I don't think a problem in this country is
9 that there's --

10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
11 Thernstrom, I could barely hear you. Are you near the
12 microphone?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, I'm
14 terribly sorry. What have I done with my microphone.

15 Can you hear me now? I'm terribly sorry.
16 I dropped my microphone.

17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I said I'd
19 thought in 1959 when Hawaii joined the United States
20 there was an overwhelming vote on the part of
21 Hawaiians that they wanted to become Americans. And it
22 does seem to me that one of our problems in this
23 country is not insufficient recognition of the
24 distinctive culture and rights of racial, ethnic,
25 other subgroups but the fact that we no longer assume

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in this country that Americans are Americans. And,
2 you know, more recognition for a subgroup, I don't
3 understand why that's a good thing. And it goes back
4 to the questions that Commissioner Braceras and
5 several other people raised: Why is this a good
6 thing? We are -- the bill here with authorize, I
7 don't see how you can get away from this -- authorize
8 the creation of a race-based government for Native
9 Hawaiians living throughout 50 states with a nightmare
10 in terms of legal enforcement and a nightmare in terms
11 of further dividing this country with respect to who
12 is entitled to what because of ancestry. I mean, I
13 didn't think that's what this country was all about.

14 I mean, the history here, obviously this
15 would not have arisen before the rise of the whole
16 regime of race-base entitlement and high levels of
17 ethnic and racial consciousness in this society. And
18 you say well the supporters say, you know, there's no
19 commitment to a particular form of government. Well,
20 we're talking about restoration of recognition, of
21 separateness. Well, if we're talking about restoration
22 why couldn't the government install a monarchy?

23 I don't know what we're going down the road here
24 on.

25 And this question of bipartisan support. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mean, this seems to me, it doesn't pass the laugh
2 test. Everybody knows that anytime a bill is before
3 Congress that seems politically problematic to oppose
4 because you could be labeled as racially insensitive,
5 then the Republicans for good historical reason, I
6 agree, run for cover and the Democrats, of course,
7 like race-based entitlement. And so you got something
8 that's called bipartisan.

9 I think that there are many Republicans on
10 the Hill who would welcome a strong statement against
11 this bill on the part of the Commission.

12 On the question of cultural identity. I
13 was curious here. What is the intermarriage rate of
14 Native Hawaiians? I mean, intermarriage rates are one
15 of the good indications always for a group of cultural
16 distinctiveness and whether groups have separate
17 cultural identities. What is the cultural
18 intermarriage rate? What is the intermarriage rate,
19 I'm sorry.

20 MR. BURGESS: It's the highest by far of
21 any state, more racial intermarriage in the state of
22 Hawaii. And I think Hawaiians in particular, that has
23 been studied and it's always been -- I think it's been
24 mutual love affair between immigrants and Hawaiians
25 from the beginning. But that I think has been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 documented in studies.

2 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
3 Thernstrom, can I jump in real quick.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sure.

5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: To comment on to a
6 point you made. I've gone through the materials here
7 and one of the things I was trying to discern is
8 something related to Commissioner Thernstrom's
9 statement about the vote for statehood. It's been
10 nearly 50 years and I'm wondering what was the
11 precipitating event? And I realize most of these
12 things evolve over time, but what was the
13 precipitating event that prompted the introduction of
14 this bill at this particular point in time? And also
15 along the lines of what Commissioner Thernstrom said
16 is I remember it was Winston Churchill who said that,
17 you know, democracy is the worst form of government
18 except for all the others.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It was
20 Churchill.

21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: In terms of,
22 again, this goes to Commissioner Thernstrom's point,
23 if there was a watershed event that prompted the
24 introduction of this bill now 50 years later, what's
25 the end gain here? In other words, it seems to me,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 yes, the United States Government has got all kinds of
2 problems while going to Churchill's statement again,
3 you know, except for all the others isn't that too
4 bad? What is it about the form of government -- and I
5 understand the whole idea is to have self rule and
6 self governance and everybody wants to have their own
7 form of government and the idea that cultural means
8 sometimes a direct form of governance, but what does
9 one hope to obtain that is separate and distinct or
10 maybe better the current state of governance?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Gail Heriot?

12 PROFESSOR HERIOT: I think this is all
13 connected to the *Rice v. Cayetano* litigation which was
14 pending at the time. And that this was very much
15 focused on providing an alternate justification under
16 the Constitution for the racial preference system that
17 is operated by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Just a quick
19 comment.

20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait. I'm sorry.
21 I'd like to have some of the other panelists answer
22 Commissioner Kirsanow's question. What is that you
23 hope to achieve from this legislation? How would this
24 legislation make things better for the native people
25 of Hawaii. What is the end game?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. I was
2 going to ask the simple question. You start the
3 sentence this is a good idea because.

4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What is the end
6 of the sentence?

7 MS. KALIPI: The end of the sentence is
8 because it allows the people of Hawaii to move forward
9 as a state because it provides a structured process to
10 allow us to deal with the longstanding issues of the
11 overthrow. Because currently there's a lot of
12 mistrust, misunderstanding and a lot of unresolved
13 issues.

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So you want to resolve
15 those --

16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But if you could
17 wave a magic wand --

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: --historical wrongs?

19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If you could wave
20 a magic wand and resolve the mistrust, then there
21 would be no need for this? In other words, the
22 substantive benefits for --

23 MS. KALIPI: No. The substantive issues--

24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: -- that flow from
25 this have nothing to do with it is what you're telling

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 me?

2 MS. KALIPI: No. The resolution of those
3 substantive issues need to happen for us to be able to
4 move forward.

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I think
6 that's the heart of Commissioner Kirsanow's question
7 is that what is it substantively that you feel you
8 need to achieve in order to move forward. Not just
9 process.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean, what
11 are you saying? I want to right historical wrongs?
12 There are a lot of historical wrongs to right in this
13 country.

14 MS. KALIPI: It's more than historical
15 wrongs, ma'am. It's the fact that there are
16 outstanding issues that need to be resolved that
17 people in Hawaii, both native and non-native, would
18 like to resolve.

19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is this the only
20 vehicle.

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let her finish.

22 MS. KALIPI: In addition with respect to
23 respect to the Statehood Act, you know under the
24 federal policy of self governance and self
25 determination allows for dual citizenship. The federal

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 policy just allows indigenous peoples to have greater
2 autonomy over their natural resources and assets. It
3 doesn't denounce being an American. We have many
4 proud Native Hawaiians, Alaska Natives and American
5 Indians who are proud to be American.

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So?

7 MS. KALIPI: So going back to that, I'd
8 like to say that for us to finish that sentence, it
9 finally provides the parity that Native Hawaiians have
10 sought because we have always been treated like
11 American Indians and Alaska Natives but our
12 relationship has never been formalized. So we're like
13 stepchildren and we're asking to be put at the same
14 level.

15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What's wrong with
16 just being treated like Americans, African-Americans,
17 Anglo-Americans, Irish Americans? I mean your
18 response is well we want to be treated the same as
19 other indigenous groups. And I guess the follow-up to
20 that is but why?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, I mean I'm
22 a part of the Israeli tribe, I suppose, as a Jew. I
23 mean, I'm an American.

24 MS. KALIPI: The answer would be because
25 Hawaii is our homeland. For all the ethnic groups that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you just mentioned, many can go back to their homeland
2 if they want to learn about their culture, their
3 tradition or they want to experience what it's like
4 to, with all due respect, ma'am, go back to Israel or
5 whatever. With respect to indigenous peoples, this is
6 our homeland and everyone has come in and taken it
7 over and this is the least part with respect to the
8 federal policy. This is a federal policy established
9 by President Nixon that says that the federal
10 government would deal with indigenous peoples in a
11 government-to-government relationship. Native
12 Hawaiians are seeking that.

13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But there was a
14 democratic vote on the issue of statehood, that was a
15 democratic process.

16 MS. KALIPI: Right. That has nothing to do
17 with the fact that -- this doesn't revolve, take away
18 statehood. The federal policy allows you to be a
19 state.

20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

21 MS. KALIPI: And allows you to have a
22 government-to-government relationship with indigenous
23 peoples. I think we're talking at cross purposes.
24 We're not saying we don't want to be a state. We want
25 to participate the way American Indians and Alaska

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Natives do as Americans in the federal policy of self
2 governance and self determination.

3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think what
4 several of us keep coming back to is you keep saying
5 you want to be treated in the same manner as other
6 Native American Indian tribes are treated under
7 federal law.

8 MS. KALIPI: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I'm trying to
10 understand why is that necessary? In other words, why
11 is the current state of affairs inequitable?, the
12 current state of affairs being that you're treated
13 like every other American citizen but you don't the
14 special status of the Native American tribes? Why is
15 that current state of affairs bad?

16 MS. KALIPI: Because like the American
17 Indians and Alaska Natives we have longstanding issues
18 with respect to lands, with respect to how our culture
19 and our traditions are preserved. And for that reason
20 we would like the current legal and political
21 relationship that we currently have with the United
22 States to merely be formalized.

23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But, see, now I
24 think you're getting to some of the substantive
25 reasons. So land, partial autonomy, right?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. KALIPI: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And so I think
3 that was the question that was originally asked by
4 Commissioner Kirsanow is what are the substantive
5 goals that you have, the substantive political goals.

6 MS. KALIPI: The substantive political
7 goals would be to give Native Hawaiians greater
8 autonomy over --

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Over what?

10 MS. KALIPI: -- any natural resources and
11 lands that would be afforded to them through the
12 negotiations process that is afforded in this --

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: These are tangible
14 benefits in part, is what you're seeking. The
15 cultural issues and resolving these longstanding
16 distrust, that could be worked out outside of the
17 context of this legislation. But the land piece, the
18 tangible benefits that has to be -- the process that's
19 on the table, that has to be enacted or signed into
20 law in order to resolve the land issue?

21 MS. KALIPI: No, sir. With all due
22 respect, we could pass legislation solely just dealing
23 with the land issue if we wanted to.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, wait a
25 minute. Land in 50 states?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. Not and
2 restricted to --

3 MS. KALIPI: In the United States. I
4 mean, in the state of Hawaii. We're not advocating
5 that we have land all over the United States outside
6 the state of Hawaii.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no, no, no. You
8 misunderstand me. You misunderstand me. For example,
9 the trust that's in place now and the 200,000 acres of
10 land to preserve that to ensure that Fourteenth
11 Amendment attacks aren't successful. This process
12 ultimately I assume is your hope that this process
13 will ultimately lead to a set of laws that will
14 protect the corpus of this process among other things?

15 MS. KALIPI: Yes. Yes. Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And that can't be done
18 any other way? But the other issues, maintaining and
19 preserving your culture, that can be done outside of--
20 I mean, you don't need to have the government to
21 preserve your culture, is that right?

22 MS. KALIPI: No, but it would allow Native
23 Hawaiians to interact with everyone else in a way that
24 is culturally sensitive. So --

25 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can you give me an

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 example of that? I'm not sure what that means.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean, other
3 groups in this country have a sense of culture and
4 community and they interact with other people without
5 giving up that sense of --

6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, they didn't get
7 their land stolen from them either.

8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or they got
9 themselves stolen from their land in the case of
10 African-Americans.

11 MR. BURGESS: No land was stolen from the
12 Hawaiian people.

13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No land was stolen
14 until about 50 years ago in this state. I think part
15 of the appreciation of the difficulty of this
16 situation, and there is a lot of difficulty I think in
17 understanding it from -- even I have difficulty
18 understanding it, even though I have family who live
19 in Oahu right now and I've followed this pretty
20 carefully. But the fact is that, you know, whatever
21 you want to call it there is I believe -- and I think
22 this is what Ms. Kalipi was trying to say and maybe
23 you should just say it better than I can, but the
24 structure that the government has provided to attempt
25 to provide some sort of recompense for the actions

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 taken by the government over time, such as the Hawaii
2 Homes Commission and others which really gave land
3 that really wasn't all that friendly to homes,
4 etcetera, was given only really half way in terms of
5 the ability of the Native Hawaiians to have a feeling
6 of control and autonomy over the decisions that were
7 made. These are decisions that have been accorded and
8 handed over to other American Indians tribes or
9 sovereign nations. That process is not yet completed
10 here.

11 It doesn't mean that they're non-
12 Americans. I mean, if you want to look at the
13 enrollment rates for the United States Army, they're
14 probably some of the highest are from the Islands of
15 Hawaii. So anyone who wants to go down that road had
16 first better take a look at what the recruiting rates
17 are. Because --

18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think
19 anyone's gone down that road.

20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, you know, when
21 someone says you know we should be Americans first,
22 yes, we are Americans. But we are Americans of
23 heritage. We're proud of our heritage. And here we
24 have a particular error in our history for a
25 particular people that Congress is looking to try and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 right that wrong and put it in a position where there
2 is a greater deal of autonomy, actual --

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think we're getting
4 to the heart of the matter here. It's reparations.

5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I don't think it
6 is reparations.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, you used the
8 term recompense.

9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I'm talking
10 about the fact that over the years the government --

11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You're talking about
12 land.

13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the government has
14 put out these programs, but they do it like about half
15 way, which is different.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, you know,
17 there are a lot of wrongs to be righted. Are we going
18 to right them all?

19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We can't. Well,
20 sometimes if we can, we should. It's silly to say we
21 can't right every wrong.

22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There are times when
23 attempts to undue these cosmic wrongs just add on to
24 the wrongs. There's some things that God will just
25 have to straighten out.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think that when we try to, looking for
2 slavery for example, there's not a check big enough
3 that you can write that can just undue the harm that
4 was just done to the Reynolds family.

5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I can appreciate that.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But the attempt to do
7 it through reparations, I think that it's divisive.
8 And I understand, Ms. Kalipi, that you disagree with
9 me that you think that it's not divisive.

10 MS. KALIPI: Oh, no, no, sir. I'm saying
11 the bill is not reparations. If we're going to do
12 reparations, we just pass a reparations bill. This is
13 not about that.

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But you couldn't pass
15 a reparations bill and restrict it to Native
16 Hawaiians.

17 MS. KALIPI: Oh, I think we could. We
18 did. We did the Japanese American internment. In
19 fact, one of the opponents to the bill has advocated
20 instead of doing this bill where we have structure in
21 process, we just slap \$20,000 to every Native
22 Hawaiian. And that's not what this bill is about.

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we disagree as
24 to the constitutional infirmities with that type of
25 proposal. But in any event, I mean we have two

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 patient Commissioners here.

2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I just want to rise
3 in defense of the principle that I hear at the heart
4 of the argument for the supporters. And that is one of
5 self determination, which I keenly appreciate. I
6 guess we're trying to unring the bell is what we're
7 trying to do in terms of addressing and recognizing
8 what the federal government has done by way of going
9 half way down the road and not going the whole way.
10 And the importance of self determination of a people
11 as they relate to the governing body, which quite
12 frankly, I completely understand.

13 My concern, I guess, is the only way we
14 can really do that is to truly advocate unringing the
15 bell.

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which is impossible.

17 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I mean, how do you
18 really unring the bell? I mean, it seems like we're
19 trying to unscramble eggs. And I appreciate the
20 attempt, but I mean how do you do it without saying
21 we're going to separate from the United States and
22 we're going to start this process of negotiation from
23 the beginning? I mean, I'm trying to recognize the
24 principle of self determination without the --

25 MS. KALIPI: Because it's a federal policy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of self governance and self determination, which I'm
2 sure Commissioner Melendez as a tribal leader has a
3 lot more experience with. And it's within the federal
4 framework. We're not trying to go back to --

5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean, the federal
6 government sets the terms and conditions.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
8 Melendez has been quite patient. Please?

9 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Just a comment. I
10 think that, and I've heard people say that this could
11 lead to secession or that -- you know, and I think
12 that what we have to understand here is similar to
13 Native American tribes is that Congress is still in
14 control. They're not going to let the Hawaiian people
15 separate from the Union, the same way they're going to
16 not let Indian tribes separate from the Union. They're
17 still in control. If there are issues such as whether
18 or not the Bill of Rights apply, I think that they
19 would do the same thing in the process that Native
20 Americans have put in place, is passing the Indian
21 Civil Rights legislation which mirrors the Bill of
22 Rights. May not be exactly the same, but I'm sure in
23 this process that's what the Hawaiian organization or
24 the recognition would do.

25 I think, you know, when we're talking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the question that was asked: What does it
2 actually mean? Well, it probably means the same thing
3 to the Hawaiians as it does to Native Americans as to
4 what really happened in history. And you're right, you
5 can't right every wrong. But you sure -- I think that
6 the integrity of the United States in trying to,
7 either whether you call it righting wrongs or to try
8 to do something to recognize the injustices that have
9 happened. I mean, even today there are things that
10 Indian tribes in the United States are still trying to
11 remedy, whether or not it the Allotment Act of the
12 1880 and '89 where basically encroachment of non
13 basically white people onto Indian reservations
14 subdivided their reservations; even today they're
15 still trying to buy lands back, they're trying to work
16 with Congress under the law to actually do that.

17 So the issue is that there's a lot of
18 things that have happened that the United States could
19 actually make right. And can you right every wrong?
20 Probably not. But can you make an attempt to right
21 some of the things that have happened in the past?

22 I read the Queen's statement here, I guess
23 it's her statement, in this public law. What she says,
24 "Now to avoid any collision of armed forces and
25 perhaps the loss of life I do under protest and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 impelled by said force yield my authority until such
2 time as the Government of the United States shall upon
3 the facts being presented to it undue the action of
4 its representatives and reinstate me in the authority
5 which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the
6 Hawaii Islands." I don't see very much difference
7 then what happened to Native Americans in this land.
8 And the question would be are we special interests
9 because we have certain privileges that maybe
10 Caucasian Americans and other ethnic groups within the
11 United States don't? I would say that the reason we
12 have that standing is because we're indigenous peoples
13 to this North American continent, the same reason that
14 the Hawaiian people are indigenous to those islands
15 there. And it seems to me that, you know, they were
16 basically -- whether you call them a tribe or not, I
17 understand that they actually had certain several
18 groups on each one of the islands until they came
19 together in 1810 under the king who basically
20 centralized the government there.

21 So, you know, I think that they're not
22 asking for anything different than what Native
23 American tribes in the United States have been
24 granted. And I don't see a lot of differences in the
25 way that they've been treated.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'm going to
2 take one more question from the Staff Director.

3 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman.

5 I'd like to recognize that some of the
6 panelists came a great distance to be here with us
7 today and others joined us on short notice. So thank
8 you all for the credit that you've brought to the
9 Commission by your participation today.

10 And also recognize that several staff did
11 excellent work in putting this together, including
12 Office of General Counsel John Blakeley and Bernard
13 Quarterman and Chris Byrnes of the Office of the Staff
14 Director.

15 Mr. Burgess and Professor Heriot, I'd like
16 to ask you a question about whether some of the
17 qualms, any of the qualms that you've raised today
18 might be addressed by a potential amendment to this
19 bill, not the one that Professor Heriot addressed
20 earlier, but rather one that might go to the selection
21 criteria for the ultimate governing entity?

22 If I understood Mr. Bartolomucci earlier,
23 he indicated that the legislation would not determine
24 the membership of the ultimate governing entity and
25 that as it stands if it were passed, the membership

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would be based on tribal law where the tribe could
2 determine based on their own criteria who would be the
3 members of the tribe. But what if there were an
4 amendment to the bill that ensured that membership in
5 the government entity would not be determined based on
6 racial characteristics, that it might be determined by
7 other grounds, for instance a lineal descent from
8 persons who lived in Hawaii at a particular time
9 regardless of racial characteristics? Would that
10 address you have?

11 MR. BURGESS: Well, that wouldn't satisfy
12 the laws as far as I understand it. Living at a
13 particular place at a particular time in history has
14 been held to be just a proxy for race. And that,
15 indeed, is what the definition of ancestry does here
16 in this case just as it did in the laws that were
17 dealt with in the *Rice* case. But as far as an
18 amendment, I heard Noe Kalipi say five or six times
19 that this bill would afford a process where the people
20 of Hawaii, native and non-native, would have an
21 opportunity to discuss the matter and move forward.
22 That's just the problem: The people of Hawaii if they
23 don't have a drop of the magic blood, don't
24 participate at all. And even people who have lived
25 here for generations, I mean lived in Hawaii for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 generations, would not have any right to participate
2 in the creation of the new government whereas some one
3 of the blood, even if they came, they'd never been to
4 Hawaii and never knew anything about Hawaii, they
5 would have the right to participate. That's the
6 problem.

7 And the way to allay that fear would be to
8 require that before anything in the bill becomes
9 effective, it first must be ratified by a vote of all
10 of the people of Hawaii. That would certainly solve
11 that problem. And if that were done and a vote was
12 taken, so be it. I mean, we'll just have to live with
13 it. But there is no process for that. In fact, the
14 bill as written does not give Congress the final say.

15 It gives the Executive Branch doing the negotiation
16 the final say. They have the ability and they may
17 under the bill go back to Congress and go to the
18 legislature of the state of Hawaii to ratify what
19 they've done, but they don't have to do that. And my
20 guess would be knowing the dynamics of the
21 negotiation, that if a deal is cut, it's very unlikely
22 that it's going to go back to Congress or to the state
23 legislature. They're going to simply carry it out.

24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Professor Heriot?

25 PROFESSOR HERIOT: I agree with Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Burgess that ancestry is often simply a proxy for
2 race. So if the bill were amended such that it were
3 defined in terms of ancestry as of, say, 1775 and
4 obviously that would be solely a particular racial
5 group. On the other hand if the group were defined in
6 ways that were based on ancestry as of, say, the
7 1890s, that would include a lot of people who are not
8 ethnically Hawaiian. And although that would not by
9 any means get rid of all my problems with this bill, I
10 nevertheless think it would make it a better bill than
11 if it did not define the group in terms of simply
12 ancestry without regard to race.

13 So I think it would make it a better bill.
14 You'd have to have that go from step-to-step rather
15 than just the initial group. But you'd have to have a
16 requirement that there be no discrimination based on
17 race or ethnicity at each stage as this group is
18 formed. But although it would not, I don't think,
19 make the bill constitutional because there are some
20 problems with the bill, it nevertheless would be a
21 better bill.

22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'd like to
23 thank the panelists for participating. This has been
24 an outstanding presentation. So, thank you.

25 We will take a ten minute break.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 (Whereupon, at 12:21 p.m. a recess until
2 12:44 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Folks,
4 let's get started so we can finish up. All right.
5 This is going to be a long day but I hope that if we
6 work efficiently that we can get through the rest of
7 the agenda.

8 Okay. I mean, we're too dedicated to
9 leave.

10 Okay. Here we go. First up is a motion
11 to keep the record of the Native Hawaiian hearing open
12 for public comment. I'll make the motion. I move that
13 the Commission keep the record open for this briefing,
14 open in order to provide the public enough time to
15 submit comments to the Commission and for the
16 Commission to perform the requisite defame and degrade
17 review. I recommend that the record be kept open for
18 60 days after the completion of this briefing until
19 March 21, 2006. Is there a second?

20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. I just
23 want to raise an issue here.

24 I was hoping we would bring this to a
25 close by the April 7th meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Bring what to a close?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sorry about
3 that. I don't have anything to clip it to, that's my
4 whole problem.

5 I was hoping we could bring this a vote at
6 the April 7th meeting. We are going to have
7 congressional action on this sometime this spring. And
8 so I wonder if we could work back from the April 7th
9 meeting to reopen the question of whether working back
10 from the April 7th meeting we need to reopen the
11 question of how long the record is open.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. How would you
13 feel if we kept the record open until March 3rd?

14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Actually, I think
15 that the original date would be sufficient in order to
16 get the document available for a vote on April 7th.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So that's not much to
18 do once we get the comments in?

19 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think it can be
20 done quickly enough.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, but the
23 document to be voted on has to be available to the
24 Commissioners to be voted on April 7th --

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, the comments

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 coming in won't effect that process. Whatever records
2 are sent in, we will keep them for the record.

3 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think we can
4 review them quickly enough to be able to turn this
5 around in time.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. I would
7 very much like for the record of this to come to a
8 vote on April 7th. And I hope, Mr. Staff Director,
9 that might be possible.

10 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, I do think
11 that that is possible.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other
14 questions or comments? All right. let's vote. All
15 favor please say aye.

16 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?

18 COMMISSIONER: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let the record reflect
20 that the motion passed unanimously.

21 Also let the record reflect that
22 Commissioner Kirsanow is no longer on the line.

23 **V. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

24 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

25 Next up is the Staff Director's Report.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman, Madam Vice Chair, Commissioners. In light of
3 the hour, I will try to keep the remarks brief but
4 will be open for questions and answers.

5 I do have a few things that I would like
6 to add beyond the contents of the monthly written
7 Staff Director's Report.

8 To start with I'd like to say that we do
9 have some good news regarding the state advisory
10 committees. As you know, the Commission's financial
11 condition prevented the SACs from conducting face-to-
12 face meeting during fiscal year 2004. And the
13 Commission's fiscal year '05 budget does not provide
14 funding for SAC face-to-face meeting. However, as we
15 concluded the first fiscal quarter of 2005 we achieved
16 sufficient savings to allow for a limited number of
17 additional meetings for the state advisory committees.
18 This will enable me to provide travel for face-to-face
19 meetings by each of the currently chartered state
20 advisory committees.

21 Now as you know, there are only too small
22 number of SACs that are currently chartered, but we
23 will be able to approve travel for one face-to-face
24 meeting, that I hope will take place within the next
25 few months for each of our current SACs.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And do we have a
2 proposed budget for that meeting?

3 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I am getting
4 proposed budgets for each of the meetings separately.

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

6 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The amounts will
7 differ depending on the travel issues, the size of the
8 state, etcetera, etcetera. It's typically a couple or
9 a few thousand dollars per meeting. We should have no
10 problem approving the ones that have been recommended
11 so far. And I'm sure that there will be a way for each
12 of the states to have a face-to-face meeting as long
13 as they don't go overboard with the nature of the
14 meeting they want to have.

15 I've communicated this to our regional
16 offices and they are now working on the state
17 committees to arrange meetings over the next few
18 months and to develop budgets accordingly. My hope is
19 that this will help to reinvigorate our state advisory
20 committees.

21 Speaking of state advisory committees, on
22 November 4, 2005 the Commission published for public
23 comment its proposed rule change for selecting state
24 advisory committee members. Comments were received
25 from 13 sources, including past and present state

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 advisory committee members; a nonprofit public policy
2 organization, a lawyer's organization, an agency of
3 the federal government and a private citizen. The
4 comment closed on December 5, 2005.

5 Based on the comments received, the Office
6 of General Counsel prepared the final draft of the
7 rule which was distributed to you on January 13, 2006
8 for a vote at this meeting.

9 I could discuss that later on further if
10 there are questions.

11 I'm also glad to report that over the last
12 week we have issued a series of four administrative
13 instructions which are intended to implement a number
14 of GAO recommendations as well as the work of the
15 working group on reform. For instance, last week I
16 issued AI-16 concerning national project developments
17 and revised AI-91 concerning the public affairs unit.
18 I also issued AI-92, a new AI concerning internal
19 communications.

20 Each of you should have received a copy.
21 If you not, please do let me know. They have also
22 been distributed to the staff.

23 I would also like to say a work to bring
24 you up to date on strategic planning. As you are
25 aware, the Commission originally agreed on April 8,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 2005 to implement all GAO and OPM recommendations
2 contained in reports issued from 1997 through April 6,
3 2005 by mid-January 2006 consistent, however, with any
4 strictures or confines imposed by the Anti-Deficiency
5 Act and to the extent that the recommendations are
6 nonrepetitive and funds are available for
7 implementation.

8 On December 16, 2005 the Commission
9 subsequently voted to extend implementation of these
10 recommendations to mid-February, 2006 and directed me
11 to apprise the Commission of any additional extensions
12 required by further cooperation with the House
13 Subcommittee on the Constitution in revising the
14 agency's draft strategic plan. The reason for the
15 December extension of time was that we have been talks
16 with the House Authorizing Committee which has asked
17 us to discuss with them and GAO future potential
18 changes to the strategic plan, and we're trying to
19 work with them rather than to prematurely finish the
20 project.

21 Staff continued to work with the House
22 Subcommittee on the Constitution and the GAO on the
23 draft strategic plan. On Monday we plan to have a
24 meeting with congressional staff, GAO staff and I
25 believe also with OMB representation. As a result of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this meeting, there may be subsequent time to
2 incorporate new comments from Congress and GAO. I
3 would have to apprise the Commission that a further
4 extension may be required since depending on the
5 nature of the input it may be unfeasible to complete
6 all implementation by the February meeting.

7 I would also like to indicate that we have
8 provided a performance and accountability report with
9 the audit of Williams Adley for our fiscal year 2005
10 to OMB. The Commissioners should have received copies
11 of that. We are not yet able to publicly discuss that
12 since it has not reached full clearance. But I would
13 say that the completion of this audit is a milestone
14 for the agency. It is, of course, required by law and
15 it really is a first in quite some time that we have
16 had a full scope audit of the Commission for the year.

17 And I'm very pleased by that.

18 I would say that the development of the
19 PAR, the Performance Accountability Report, really
20 involved a very significant amount of strategic
21 analysis and work. And I would like to thank the staff
22 for it and particularly to commend Debra Carr for her
23 extraordinary dedication to it including work all
24 through the holiday weekend in order to get the
25 document in time for the Sunday midnight deadline. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we did get it in just a little bit before the deadline
2 of Sunday, the night of the holiday weekend.

3 Those are the issues that I have for now,
4 but I'd be happy to take questions and comments.

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Questions? There
6 being none.

7 VI. PROGRAM PLANNING

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Next is program
9 planning. Next we'll deal with the national report on
10 the Voting Rights Act. On August 6, 2007 several core
11 provisions of this Act that are temporary are due to
12 expire. This report to the Commission's statutory
13 report on the enforcement of civil rights by the
14 federal government has to be done annually. This year
15 it has been done on the Voting Rights Act.

16 At our December 18, 2005 meeting the
17 Commission amended the scope of this report and
18 eliminated work formally assigned to the Office of
19 Civil Rights Evaluation. This was done so that the
20 Commission can submit timely findings and
21 recommendations to Congress since Congress has
22 expedited the reauthorization of the Voting Rights
23 Act.

24 We also directed staff to provide us with
25 a draft of this report in time for us to vote on the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 report during this meeting. The Staff Director has
2 provided us with a draft report as directed. This
3 draft includes some significant independent staff
4 analysis including data analysis, case analysis,
5 substantial editorial review and the inclusion of
6 several significant new graphics as well as the work
7 of the consultant Mark Posner.

8 On the other hand, the Staff Director has
9 apprised us that in his estimation the current draft
10 could be significantly improved if additional time is
11 allowed for further staff analysis, another round of
12 editorial review and another round of Commissioner
13 comments.

14 So based on those reasons, I move to
15 extend the vote on the national report on the Voting
16 Rights Act until March 10, 2006.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second it.

18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Point of
19 information. This is not the briefing?

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's on the
22 statutory report.

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Have a second
24 discussion? Yes?

25 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I want to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 commend the staff on the work they've done on this
2 statutory report and in the charts here and shifting
3 the date that it became available and so forth. It's
4 really, I think, a wonderful job. And I am voting,
5 obviously, to allow more time to do additional work,
6 but that does not come out of any discontent with the
7 work that has been done, which I'm full of admiration
8 for. So I thank the members of the staff who have
9 come up with what I think is a very strong document.

10 I mean, as everybody knows here, I am want
11 to put a million with track changes in my computer, a
12 million comments and so forth in margins. I didn't
13 find anything to comment on on this report. I thought
14 it was really well done. So, again, my thanks to the
15 staff.

16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that's scary.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I have stopped
18 making comments. But most of -- you know, the -- that
19 work was done in great part by Mark Posner and it is,
20 as far as I'm concerned, just terrific. So that's a
21 man on your side of the table.

22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's vote. All
23 in favor say aye.

24 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Any

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 abstentions. The motion carries.

2 Let's see, where am I? Okay. I'll read
3 the next motion into the record.

4 I move that the Staff Director develop a
5 proposals to communicate with college students about
6 their rights and remedies when faced with anti-semitic
7 harassment.

8 Do I have a second?

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. A second.

10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I have a
12 question.

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Maybe I'm
15 completely out of it, but at some point finding the
16 recommendations were circulated, right?

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Draft. Very
19 preliminary draft?

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: They were tabled. And
21 so we're going to have revisit that issue in the
22 future.

23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that the next
24 motion?

25 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: When did they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 tell us --

2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: In December.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Was it last meeting?

4 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: They were one of

5 the December --

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: In December.

7 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: -- issues that

8 were tabled until this meeting.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's what I
10 was going to say, they were tabled until meeting.

11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So that's
12 what I'm asking about. What's happening with those
13 and how does that relate to the current motion?

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There's your answer.

15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So how does it
16 relate to the current motion?

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, that's a very
18 good point. The document, the booklet has to have
19 content. And the content, presumably, would consist at
20 least in part, the recommendations. So it seems to me
21 that we need to put the --

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So the draft that
23 was circulated earlier, is it still something we
24 should be reviewing or is that wait until we get a new
25 version?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. Wait until you get
2 the second one.

3 Okay. How about this? I move that we
4 table this issue with the understanding that we would
5 circulate the recommendations. And once we've dealt
6 with that issue, then we would move forward developing
7 educational materials.

8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Was the Staff
9 Director about to say something? It looks like you
10 were?

11 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No. We could take
12 them in either way. They've been circulated. We have
13 the materials or we could wait.

14 As I understand it, the public education
15 campaign is intended to address the rights that
16 students would have under the federal civil rights
17 laws, whereas the findings and recommendations related
18 to a number of issues. Perhaps one or two were
19 related intentionally, but they're essentially two
20 different --

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Two separate
22 documents?

23 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Two separate
24 documents.

25 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. That's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fine. So are we still going to proceed with both of
2 those documents, the findings and recommendations as
3 well as the civil rights guidance?

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we just tabled
5 the recommendations. There was no --

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, we tabled
7 them until now.

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or did we table
10 them indefinitely?

11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Until this meeting.

12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So I was
13 just wondering did somebody have a problem with them
14 or--

15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, I had a problem.

16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I just
17 wasn't aware of what was going on.

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. I had some
19 issues with it and that's why it was tabled. And we
20 weren't able to get back to the document in time for
21 this meeting. So it's my fault.

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Is that
23 something we need to discuss as a Commission what
24 substantive concerns you have?

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I don't think so, but

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I just -- I wanted it to be clear of the
2 jurisdictional issue. The jurisdictional issue for
3 OCR, it's national origin -- I wanted it to be clear
4 that it was based on national origin and not religion.

5 And --

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I see.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: -- I thought that as
8 the document was drafted, I thought there were some
9 ambiguities.

10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I also thought that it
12 would be easy to fix.

13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So that was my issue.

15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's fine. That
16 answered it, that's exactly what I was wondering. But
17 that is still something we're going to try to produce
18 as a Commission?

19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Yes. Unless
20 there's a movement, unless there's a majority of folks
21 who decide that they don't want to move forward with
22 the recommendations and/or the educational materials.

23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. I mean, I
24 think it's a good idea to have two documents; one that
25 outlines student's rights and responsibilities, I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 guess, and one that makes findings and recommendations
2 based on the hearing. I would love to see us put out
3 documents on both of those.

4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

5 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If it's the
6 consensus of the Commission, we would certainly be
7 pleased to revise the proposed findings and
8 recommendations to make more clear that jurisdiction
9 under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is based on
10 national origin as opposed to religion. That would be
11 fairly easy and we could recirculate it in time for
12 the next Commission meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, it's an easy fix.

14 And I presume that there would be no controversy. I
15 think that we'll have complete consensus on this one.

16 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: As for the public
17 education campaign, we have given a little bit of
18 thought to it and it might be useful just to mention
19 the direction that we were thinking we might go in to
20 see if that's consistent with the interests of the
21 Commission. At least at present it appears we have
22 very limited funding of it. And so the question is how
23 can we take limited funding and get the word out as
24 best we can.

25 An approach that has been developed by

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 staff is the notion of providing an electronic
2 document, which is available on the website, and which
3 provides the rights in depth. That way we could
4 provide it in a little bit more detail than we would
5 be able to if we were actually publishing a pamphlet
6 where we would have to distribute large numbers. And
7 then we could compliment that with a poster that would
8 be distributed informing people generally of the issue
9 and telling them where on our website they could find
10 the information based on the --

11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, certainly,
12 couldn't we have some of the folks that we had
13 testify? I mean, if they are aware of the document,
14 they might take it upon themselves to distribute to
15 campuses?

16 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We certainly
17 could. Our hope would be that whichever way we but
18 particularly if we have the poster, that we would want
19 to try to work with a nongovernmental association,
20 perhaps one that we had testify, perhaps there are
21 others out there that would be able to get the word
22 out.

23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

24 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: And so we've been
25 looking into different forms of partnership.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Sounds good.

2 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: But is the hope is
3 that they can get the word out.

4 We've looked at the prospect of publishing
5 approximately a thousand posters and providing an
6 electronic pamphlet on the website.

7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Great.

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chairman
9 Thernstrom?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So we've been
11 held up by a rather narrow legal question, that is
12 national origin versus religion under Title VI. Is
13 there a larger issue here?

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. So this is
16 easy to resolve?

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions or
20 comments?

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. That answered
22 my questions.

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. His timing is
24 impeccable. We're about to vote. All in favor of
25 tabling the motion to develop campus anti-semitism

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 educational materials please say aye.

2 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition.

4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry.

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We're tabling? I
7 thought that we were authorizing the Staff Director to
8 develop those materials. Now we're tabling that.

9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, well, I thought
10 that.

11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Where I left
13 off, I started looking at my little gizmo here, is
14 that we would look at the recommendations to see what
15 would be incorporated and to be --

16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, they're two
17 separate documents.

18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, but the
19 information in one could be used in the other. But if
20 people are comfortable, I don't have strong feelings
21 one way or the other. I was just responding to what I
22 felt was a concern about one going before the other.

23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. I thought that
24 the current motion was to authorize the Staff Director
25 to begin the process of developing the --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How about this? How
2 about this then? This vote is to -- this motion is to
3 develop campus anti-Semitism education materials,
4 that's what we're going to vote on.

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All of them?
6 Whatever they are?

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor?

8 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any in
10 opposition? Any abstentions? The motion carries.

11 That's one less thing that we have to
12 carry over until next month.

13 Okay. I'm going to move that the
14 Commission keep the record open on the briefing on
15 campus anti-semitism until February 10, 2006. This
16 will enable the staff to complete the defame and
17 degrade process and to admit the additional statements
18 received from outside organizations. Is there a
19 second?

20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

22 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Wait a minute.

23 So is this we tabled --

24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We didn't table
25 anything.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Last month.

2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The recommendations.

3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We didn't table
4 anything. We just authorized the Staff Director --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I understand.
6 But what's now happening with the recommendations?

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The recommendations
8 will be presented next month.

9 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: At the next month
10 with --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's
12 unrelated to the motion you just made?

13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

14 DEAN: Well, no. The record will remain
15 open so outside organizations will still have an
16 opportunity to submit statements.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. But it
18 needed a new motion?

19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The staff can
22 begin work on it or they already have and when new
23 information comes in, they can incorporate it as they
24 see fit until the --

25 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. So

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 having tabled it until this meeting, we don't need to
2 incorporate in this motion some indication that --

3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We didn't table
4 anything. We just authorized the staff to --

5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We did at the
6 last meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You're saying that we
8 need to have something in the record extending it an
9 additional month officially?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, that's
11 exactly what I'm saying.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's right.

14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What's she saying is
15 that we tabled the recommendations until this meeting
16 and she just wants to put something on the record so
17 that the record reflects that we further extended it
18 until next month.

19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So, on that note, I
21 move that the recommendations concern of the campus
22 anti-semitism briefing be postponed until the February
23 meeting. Is there a second?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, and that
25 the record be kept open. Isn't it one part --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Yes. Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any discussion? All
4 in favor?

5 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
7 Any abstentions.

8 Let the record reflect that the motion
9 carried unanimously.

10 **VII. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS**

11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The
12 next motion up, I move to extend the deadline for the
13 Commission implementation of the recommendations from
14 the Government Accountability Office and the Office of
15 Personnel Management contained in reports issued from
16 1997 through April 6, 2005. The Commission originally
17 agreed on April 8, 2005 to implement these
18 recommendations by mid-January 2006. On December 16,
19 2005 we subsequently voted to extend the
20 implementation of these recommendations to mid-
21 February, 2006 and directed the Staff Director to
22 apprise us of any additional extensions required by
23 further cooperation with the House Subcommittee on the
24 Constitution in revising the agency's strategic plan.

25 The Staff Director has informed us that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the staff is continuing to work with the House
2 Subcommittee on the Constitution and GAO on the draft
3 strategic plan and has a meeting scheduled for next
4 Monday to discuss additional input. After approval of
5 the new strategic plan, it would take at least one
6 month to implement the GAO and OPM recommendations. I
7 now move that the Commission instead implement these
8 recommendations as expeditiously as possible
9 consistent with the need to continue cooperating the
10 House Subcommittee on the Constitution and revising
11 the Commission's draft strategic plan. This motion
12 would replace all previous deadlines for
13 implementation of these recommendations.

14 Is there a second?

15 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
17 favor please say aye.

18 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Any
20 abstentions? The motion carries unanimously.

21 Next up, I move that the Commission
22 meeting previously approved for Friday, July 7, 2006
23 instead be held on Friday, July 28, 2006. And this
24 was in response to a request from one of the
25 Commissioners.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Is there a second?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
4 favor?

5 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Any
7 abstentions?

8 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Let me suggest this
9 is now the July 4th meeting.

10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion carries.

11 **VIII. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

13 Commissioner Taylor, as Chairman ont he task force on
14 state advisory committees, do you have a motion to
15 approve a final rule on select state advisory
16 committee members?

17 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I do. Thank you.

18 I move that the Commission approve the
19 draft final rule on selecting state advisory committee
20 members. The Commission approved a proposed rule on
21 selecting SAC members at the October 31, 2005 business
22 meeting and it was published in the *Federal Register*
23 for notice and comment on November 4, 2005. The
24 period for notice and comment closed on December 5th
25 of that same year and staff prepared the draft final

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 rule based on the comments received during that
2 period.

3 The draft amends 45 CFR Section 703(a) and
4 (b) as follows:

5 (a) Subject to exceptions made from time-
6 to-time by the Commission to fit special
7 circumstances, each advisory committee shall consist
8 of at least 11 members appointed by the Commission.
9 Members of the advisory committees shall serve for a
10 fixed term to be set by the Commission upon the
11 appointment of a member subject to the duration of
12 advisory committees as prescribed by the charter
13 provided that members of the advisory committee may at
14 anytime be removed by the Commission.

15 (b) No person is to be denied an
16 opportunity to serve on a state advisory committee
17 because of race, age, sex, religion, national origin
18 or disability. The Commission shall encourage
19 membership on the state advisory committee to be
20 broadly diverse.

21 Once the Commission approves this draft
22 final rule the Office of the Staff Director will
23 submit it for publication in the *Federal Register* and
24 the rule will become effective 30 days after
25 publication in the *Federal Register* at which point the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Commission can proceed with soliciting recharter
2 packages from the state advisory committees.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second.

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
6 favor please say aye.

7 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
9 Any abstentions?

10 Please let the record reflect that the
11 Chairman, Commissioner Braceras, Commissioner
12 Thernstrom and Commissioner Taylor support the motion.
13 And Commissioner Yaki and Commissioner Melendez oppose
14 with no abstentions.

15 Okay. Commissioner Taylor, we're not
16 finished with you yet. I understand that you have a
17 second motion regarding the state advisory committees.

18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I do. And I'd move
19 that the Commission recommend that Congress extend the
20 term of the state advisory committees and their
21 members to four years when it considers
22 reauthorization legislation for the Commission. And
23 that the Commission authorize the Chairman to advise
24 the pertinent congressional committee of this
25 recommendation.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Although two years is the maximum term
2 generally allowable under the Federal Advisory
3 Committee Act, the situation at the Commission in my
4 view at least, warrants an exception. The
5 Commission's SACs are different from the usual
6 advisory committees addressed in the FACA statute
7 because they are well established as part of the
8 Commission and they play an important role in the
9 overall mission of our agency.

10 The Commission's regulations currently
11 applied to the FACA to "management, membership and
12 operations of the state advisory committees and their
13 subcommittees. FACA limits the term of such
14 committees to two years with various exceptions. One
15 exception is that Congress may specifically exempt an
16 advisory committee from the usual limit by statute.
17 This could be accomplished, of course, during the
18 Commission's reauthorization."

19 Two years is an insufficient period of
20 time for SAC membership given the time and resources
21 necessary for rechartering. We have seen that the
22 effort necessary for rechartering 51 SACs consumes a
23 substantial amount of regional resources and reduces
24 the resources available for SAC activities. We have
25 also seen over time that the constant exploration of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 SACs had led to a situation in which we frequently
2 have a large number of unchartered SACs. Expanding
3 the terms of the SACs and the members would enable the
4 regional staffs to focus their activities on important
5 state and local civil rights activities rather than
6 diverting their resources to the rechartering process.

7 This motion would have the Commission
8 recommend that Congress specifically exempt us from
9 FACA's two year cap in our reauthorizing statute. This
10 recommendation would be invited in a letter from the
11 Chairman to the relevant congressional committees.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And is there a
13 second?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, I second
15 it.

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
17 favor say aye.

18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: One moment. I think
19 we should add that since our last meeting when this
20 issue was raised and we all knew that we would vote on
21 it at this meeting, I think the Staff Director could
22 elaborate on this point, that we have received a
23 number of documents from the SAC chairs in support of
24 this motion, if I'm stating those comments correctly.

25 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right. Yes,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Commissioner Taylor. We did earlier this week get the
2 word out to chairman of currently chartered state
3 advisory committees and tried through them to get the
4 word out to additional committee members.

5 We've heard back and I wish we had been
6 able to get it out a little bit sooner, but we heard
7 back from five or six of them. And they all took
8 essentially the same position, which is that all of
9 the ones who responded to us indicated that they would
10 favor the recommendation that we ask Congress to
11 extend the SAC period to four years.

12 At the same time we also asked their view
13 about a related issue as to whether we should keep the
14 term of SAC chairs at two years, even if the charter
15 period of the SAC extended to four. And they
16 unanimously so far have indicated that they would
17 disagree with that proposal because they think that
18 chairman need a greater amount of time to come up to
19 speed and oversee the projects of the SACs.

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor
21 say aye.

22 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections? Any
24 abstentions. Please let the record reflect that
25 Commissioner Yaki and Commissioner Melendez abstain

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and the remaining Commissioners voted in favor of the
2 motion.

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: One moment, I'd like
4 to move that this next motion be tabled until the next
5 meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
9 favor say aye.

10 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections. Any
12 abstentions. The motion carries unanimously.

13 Okay.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I'm moving
15 that the next motion to accept for publication for the
16 Arizona state advisory --

17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's already
18 been tabled.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, it's
20 already been tabled. That's right. Forgot that. I
21 was about to move that it be tabled.

22 **IX. BRIEFING REPORTS**

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Now we're going
24 to deal with the Voting Rights Act Briefing Report as
25 opposed to the statutory report. Okay. I move to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 approve the report produced by the Office of Civil
2 Rights Evaluation on the briefing of the Commission
3 held on October 7, 2005 on the reauthorization of the
4 Voting Rights Act. Is there a second? Pretty please.

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is the final
8 version we're receiving incorporate Commissioner
9 comments, yes?

10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Discussion?

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. This is
14 not possible. We have not had a chance to -- I mean, I
15 just got this last night on my computer. I don't have
16 a printed out version. I have had no time to read it.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would you like to
18 table this issue?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I would like to
20 table this issue. And there were --

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, it's just
22 assuming it incorporated all your redlines.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, no. Well,
24 wait a minute. Some of my redlines were I need to go
25 back to the transcript because I need to check on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 things that actually went into the meeting. I haven't
2 got the transcript yet.

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I second the motion
4 to table it.

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor? Any
6 objections?

7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Similarly we haven't
8 been getting transcript for the past few months.
9 What's happened.

10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

11 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioners have
12 not gotten in the last few months?

13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.

14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Make sure that we
15 look at it and start getting them out.

16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And some of the old
17 ones also, the ones that we didn't receive. It's an
18 easy fix.

19 Okay. We can adjourn.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, fantastic.

21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, wait. I'm
22 sorry. May I ask a question?

23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Could we get a
25 rundown on the scheduled briefings for the next couple

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of months?

2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Ken, are you
3 prepared to review this information?

4 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'll try.

5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: March is no longer
6 Sanders, right?

7 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's right.
8 February is the Patriot Act. Now for the Patriot Act
9 three of our original speakers have agreed that they
10 would be able to participate in February. Those are
11 Professor Viet Dinh, former Congresswoman Mary Rose
12 Oakar and Mr. Parvez Ahmed. However, Andrew McCarthy
13 and Michael Ledeen are no longer available. We are now
14 looking at substitutes for them, and we're certainly
15 amenable for ideas of people to include the
16 appropriate substitutes to Mr. Ledeen or for Mr.
17 McCarthy.

18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: We should also make
19 that meeting a 9:00 meeting, don't you think?

20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What time did we start
21 today?

22 COMMISSIONERS: 9:30.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. I much
24 prefer 9:30.

25 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Well, I thought

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we were doing a -- wasn't it your bright idea last
2 time that --

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, it is helpful in
4 that we have been able to start. But Vice Chair
5 doesn't get up too early.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But, no, but
7 that was that --

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's a joke. That's
9 a joke.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That was
11 serious.

12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The thought was
13 that if people had to leave the meeting early, either
14 to catch a flight or because they were participating
15 from their home location and needed to get off the
16 phone, that by starting at 9:00 we can have half an
17 hour for the business portion of the meeting to take
18 the necessary votes before people have to catch a
19 plane. So I still favor that. But we can take it on
20 a month-by-month basis.

21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I definitely favor it
22 in February because that's my personal --

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We should have some
24 SAC issues to vote on at the February meeting as well.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, if you're

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 making a personal request for February, I'm certainly
2 happy to go --

3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, let's just
4 take it month-by-month.

5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But I would
7 like not to change it as a general rule.

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So we don't
9 need a vote on that. Just as an administrative
10 matter.

11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: February, right.

12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So March?

14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: March, I believe,
15 and we would have to check, but I believe that March
16 is the month for minority representation at the
17 Census.

18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right.
19 Okay.

20 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We do not yet have
21 a panel to announce for March.

22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And April?

23 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We can apprise you
24 after the meeting.

25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Would it be best

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 if we circulate a list.

2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So we're looking
3 forward to the Patriot Act and to the minority
4 representation of the Census; those are the two
5 issues?

6 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Those are the two
7 coming up on the next --

8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken, please distribute
9 an email that lists the remaining briefings for the
10 year.

11 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That would be
12 fine.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And we are
14 scheduled through what in terms of briefings, to what
15 month?

16 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We have briefings
17 that are scheduled through late in 2007, but we
18 haven't accepted briefings for every month in that
19 period. So we really have a two year schedule, but we
20 have open months throughout.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And do we want
22 suggestions for topics?

23 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Sure. I think that
24 that would be appropriate perhaps in the planning
25 meeting and under February or perhaps March.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Let's all think
2 about the open slots.

3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, you
4 had a question or comment?

5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Nope. I withdraw it.

6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I want to make one
7 announcement before the benediction is given.
8 Hopefully, we'll have a SAC chair meeting sometime, a
9 working group meeting rather within the next two weeks
10 to discuss how we go about accepting SAC reports.
11 We'll address that issue as well as the term of the
12 chair for SACs, as well as the overall relationship
13 between the SACs and the Commission, which is a
14 discussion I hope we can continue to have. And we will
15 make sure that we coordinate with all Commissioners'
16 calendars prior to setting the meeting.

17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Good luck.

18 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: And I'd also
19 recommend a meeting of the working group on the
20 budget. Coming up fairly soon are a number of budget
21 issues including special assistant issues.

22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We're done.

23 (Whereupon, at 1:25 p.m. the meeting was
24 adjourned.)
25

NEAL R. GROSS

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